

Sri Vedanta-sutra

Preface

All Glories to Guru and Gaurāṅga. *Om Namo Bhagavate Vāsudevāya*. Let me offer my respectful obeisances unto the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Vāsudeva.

First of all let me offer my respectful obeisances to my spiritual master Om Viṣṇupāda Śrīmad Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Gosvāmī Prabhupāda, then my respectful obeisances to the Supreme Personality of Godhead Lord Caitanya Mahāprabhu, who is associated with Śrī Advaita Prabhu, Nityānanda Prabhu, Gadādhara Prabhu, Śrīvāsa Prabhu, as well as whose eternal assistants are the six gosvāmīs, headed by Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī, Sanātana Gosvāmī Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī, Ragaunātha dāsa Gosvāmī, as well as whose private secretary is Śrī Svarūpa Dāmodara dāsa and His eternal attendant Govinda.

Then let us talk about the *Brahma-sūtra* or *Vedānta-sūtra*. There are many comments on the *Vedānta-sūtra*. In India especially the system is that anyone who is the head of a religious institution must be well conversed with the *Vedānta-sūtras*, and is expected to write comments on the *Vedānta-sūtra*, without which one is not accepted as an *ācārya*. *Ācārya* means one who knows the purpose of Vedic knowledge. He personally practices them as well as teaches to his disciples the system of Vedic knowledge.

There are many *ācāryas*, especially of the *vaiṣṇava-sampradāya*, like the four *sampradāyas*: *rāmānuja-sampradāya*, *madhvācārya-sampradāya*, *viṣṇusvāmī-sampradāya*, and *nimbārka-sampradāya*. Our *sampradāya* is called *gauḍīya-sampradāya*, or the Vaiṣṇavas who are in the disciplic succession of Lord Caitanya Mahāprabhu. The *gauḍīya-sampradāya* actually belongs to the *madhva-sampradāya* and the *madhva-sampradāya* belongs to the *brahma-sampradāya*.

Besides these four *vaiṣṇava-ācārya-sampradāyas*, there are also non-*vaiṣṇava-sampradāyas*, especially the impersonalist school headed by Śaṅkarācārya. Śaṅkarācārya has written a commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtras*, known as *Śārīraka-bhāṣya*. generally this *Śārīraka-bhāṣya* made by Śaṅkarācārya is very popular on account of the present Indians being influenced by materialistic activities. But still the other different *bhāṣyas*, or commentaries, made by the Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas* are also available in the *gauḍīya-sampradāya*, specifically headed by Rūpa Gosvāmī.

In the beginning there was no commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra* because according to *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* it is said that the real commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra* is *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* itself, presented by the author, Śrī Vyāsadeva Himself. In our english commentary on the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* First Canto, First Chapter, we have explained this fact that *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* is the right type of commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra*. As such the *gauḍīya-vaiṣṇava-sampradāya* did not take much care to present their commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra*.

About 200 years ago there was a conclusion in Golpa district in Jaipur, wherein the *ācāryas* or followers of other *sampradāyas* challenged the *gauḍīya-vaiṣṇava-sampradāya* that it has no commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra*. At that time Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartī Ṭhākura was living in Vṛndāvana, but he was too old, and when the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas approached him to present a commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra*, he asked his disciple, Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa to write a commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra*. As Vaiṣṇavas are generally very humble and meek, Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa thought himself unfit to write an authorized commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra*, so he approached Lord Govinda in the temple of Jaipur. He placed himself down before Lord Govinda to take his permission and authority to begin writing a commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra*, and he was assured by Govinda that he could do so. With this inspiration he wrote the *Vedānta-sūtra* commentary known as *Govinda-bhāṣya*. This *Govinda-bhāṣya* is very authorized and accepted by all the *vaiṣṇava-sampradāyas*, This commentary, which may be known as *Bhaktivedanta-bhāṣya*, follows the footprints of *Govinda-bhāṣya*.

The necessity of presenting the *Bhaktivedanta-bhāṣya* commentary on *Vedānta-sūtra* should also be explained herein. My spiritual master, Oṃ Viṣṇupāda Paramhaṃsa Śrī Śrīmad Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Gosvāmī Mahārāja, ordered me to present the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava philosophy in English as far as possible, and in this attempt for the english-knowing persons, since 1965 I have been in the western countries with my three books of the First Canto of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. Then I presented my commentary on the *Śrīmad-Bhagavad-gītā* known as *The Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*, and similarly I have presented *The Teachings of Lord Caitanya*. Also, requested by many of my western disciples, especially my worthy disciples Śrīmān Hansadutta Das Adhikari and Janardana Das Adhikari, who are in charge of the Montreal Center, and I am trying to present an English commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra* as follows.

At the present moment all over the world there are major portions of godless persons. Generally people are very attached to the void philosophy presented by Lord Buddha or the impersonal philosophy presented by Śaṅkarācārya. In other words, to be more plain and simple, people are becoming very atheistic. To say that there is no God, as the atheists declare, is rather bold and simple, but to say that there is a supreme cause that is void, or there is God but He has no form, is more dangerous than the simple declaration that there is no God.

Our society, known as the international Society for Krishna Consciousness, has now started the movement for Kṛṣṇa Consciousness, and it is very gratifying that the younger generation of the western part of the world, in America, Canada, and Europe, are taking interest in this great movement. We already have branches in almost every important city of the United States and Canada, and we have started centers also in London and Hamburg. We hope that our Kṛṣṇa Consciousness movement will gradually increase, as predicted by Lord Caitanya, who said that His missionary activities, the same as the Kṛṣṇa Consciousness movement, will be preached all over the world, in every village in every country. Taking into consideration the present activities of this movement, it is hoped that the prediction of Lord Caitanya will soon be fulfilled and the people of the world will be very happy, having Kṛṣṇa Consciousness.

As referred to above, generally the commentary known as *Śārīraka-bhāṣya* is taken by the people as the purport of *Vedānta*, or in other words *Vedānta* means

according to the opinion of the followers of Śaṅkarācārya's purport as explained by him in *Śārīraka-bhāṣya*. Besides the *Śārīraka-bhāṣya* of Śaṅkarācārya there are many other atheistic schools preaching *Vedānta* on the basis of godlessness.

One of the prominent followers of Śaṅkarācārya, namely Sadānanda Yogīndra, has compiled his book known as *Vedānta-sāra*, in which he writes to prove that the to understand both the *upaniṣads* and the *Vedānta-sūtra*, Śaṅkarācārya's *Śārīraka-bhāṣya* is the only means. This is the claim of monopoly by the *māyāvāda* school. Actually *Vedānta-sūtra* has many commentaries and all those commentaries are not on the basic principal of monism or impersonalism.

All the prominent *ācāryas* of the different *vaiṣṇava-sampradāyas* have compiled commentaries on *Vedānta-sūtra*, but they do not follow the principles of the Śaṅkarite school. On the other hand the impersonalist monists stress more on non-duality. Generally they declare themselves God and there is no existence of God separately.

The monistic school does not recognize the *Vedānta* commentaries presented by the Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas*, known as the *śuddhādvaita*, *viśiṣṭādvaita* and *dvaitādvaita*, as well as the inconceivably-one-and-different philosophy of Lord Caitanya, known as *acintyābhedābheda-tattva*. According to them the monistic commentary on *Vedānta-sūtra* is final, Lord Kṛṣṇa has a material body, and the followers of the philosophy of Kṛṣṇa Consciousness are not transcendentalists.

Vedānta means the last word in the matter of pursuing knowledge. Everyone is pursuing some sort of knowledge. There are universities, institutions, and many educational establishments pursuing knowledge, but *Vedānta* means the last word in the pursuit of knowledge. This last word in the pursuit of knowledge is explained in the *Bhagavad-gītā* by Lord Kṛṣṇa. The purpose of Vedic knowledge is to understand Kṛṣṇa. The exact words in the 15th Chapter of *Bhagavad-gītā* are *sarvasya cāham hṛdi sanniviṣṭaḥ*. "the Lord is situated in everyone's heart. He gives intelligence and delusion. He is the original source of knowledge. He is the goal of knowledge. He is the compiler of *Vedānta-sūtra*, and He knows what is *Vedānta*.."

These words are a very significant explanation of *Vedānta-sūtra* by Kṛṣṇa himself. In another place also He has referred to the *Vedānta-sūtra* by saying, "By the course of *Brahma-sūtra* one can actually understand what is the philosophy of *Bhagavad-gītā*." *Bhagavad-gītā* and *Vedānta-sūtra* are very intimately interrelated. To understand *Vedānta-sūtra* rightly is to understand *Bhagavad-gītā* rightly.

The word *sūtra* means "summarized code". In the *Skanda* and *Vāyu Purāṇas* the word *sūtra* is explained as "when a thesis is presented in few words, but with great volumes of meaning and, when understood, is very beautiful." Mentioned herein are the names of different commentaries on *Vedānta-sūtra* by different *ācāryas*.

This *Śārīraka-bhāṣya* of Śaṅkarācārya is also known as *Vedānta-siddhānta*. The summary of non-dualism philosophy expounded by Śaṅkarācārya is as follows.

According to this philosophy there is only the Absolute Truth. To this philosophy the living entity is Brahman and the cosmic manifestation is false. The example of reality and falsity is given by them in the comparison of mistaking a serpent and a rope. In the darkness, in illusion, a rope may be accepted as a serpent. When one comes to his senses he understands that the rope was not a serpent. Then the "serpent" becomes false. Similarly, according to Śaṅkara's philosophy this cosmic manifestation actually is not. *Māyā* means "What is not." *Ma* means "not" and *ya* means "this". In other words the phenomenal

representation of the material world has no reality. Behind this phenomena the noumenon is reality.

According to Śaṅkara's philosophy the Absolute Truth is impersonal. As such there is no diversity. In the material world there are different kinds of diversity, just as diversities of the species of life. The dog species are not like the human being species. This speciality, dog species or human species, is present in the material world, but spiritually there is no such differentiation. Even in personal considerations there are diversities. In a personal form one has legs, hands and head. But this differentiation, according to the *māyāvāda* philosophy of Śaṅkarācārya, is also false. Śaṅkarācārya does not recognize qualifying the Brahman, just as Vaiṣṇava philosophy qualifies the Supreme Brahman. Take for example: God is merciful. This is a qualification of God or the Absolute Truth. But, Śaṅkara's philosophy being impersonal, they do not accept the Absolute Truth qualified by mercifulness, or beauty, or opulence. They do not accept. According to them if the Absolute Truth is qualified then it becomes limited by the qualification. Their conclusion is that if Brahman, or the Absolute Truth, is unlimited, there should not be any limitation by qualification.

The incarnation of the Absolute Truth, or Godhead, is accepted by them as a manifestation of material designation. In other words, according to Śaṅkara's philosophy when God or the Absolute Truth incarnates He assumes a material body. Therefore He is designated. In that designated form only the Absolute Truth becomes the creator, sustainer, and annihilator of the cosmic manifestation, although in his commentary on the *Bhagavad-gītā*, in the beginning, Śaṅkarācārya has accepted that Nārāyaṇa is beyond this cosmic manifestation. Everything that is manifested in the material world is produced from the unmanifested *mahat-tattva*, but Nārāyaṇa is still transcendental to the *mahat-tattva*. In other words, he has accepted that the *mahat-tattva* is also created by the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Nārāyaṇa. There are so many contradictions in his philosophy. That is a different subject matter. We do not wish to enter into the contradictions of his philosophy, but as far as possible we are presenting the summary of *māyāvāda* philosophy, non-dualism.

According to Śaṅkarācārya, in the highest spiritual conception the Absolute Truth is without any contamination of material existence, and therefore He has no connection with the creation, sustenance, or annihilation (of the material world). He is always devoid of all qualities, without any diversity, without any material condition, and without any responsibility of activities. As such, the cosmic manifestation is also false. Similarly the Personality of Godhead, who accepts His designation from this false material manifestation, the conception of the Personality of Godhead, is also false. The Absolute Truth is only conceived as eternal, full of knowledge, and full of bliss. The appearance as Nārāyaṇa, or as an incarnation, is not eternal, but is temporary. For some purpose He appears like that. The ultimate end is impersonal.

According to Śaṅkara's philosophy, the differentiation between God and the living entities is an illusion. Actually, that is not the fact. The living entities are not subordinate energy of the Supreme. Simply being covered by the conception of *māyā*, the living entities appear to be different from the Absolute Truth. This differentiation between the living entities and the Supreme is manifested in the material world in ordinary dealings. Spiritually there is no such difference. The

activities of the living entity in the spirit of enjoyment in the material world, his infinitesimal quality, or his minuteness, or his innumerableness, are only designations of the false *māyā*.

An example in this connection given by the *māyāvādī* philosophers is that , when reflected by a red flower, crystal glass appears to be red, although this has nothing to do with the redness of the glass. It is completely different from the color. Similarly, the living entity in the contamination of *māyā* becomes active, or becomes an enjoyer, or becomes infinitesimal, or in other words becomes individual. All these things are artificial color reflection only. Actually, a living entity is pure Brahman. This theory of reflection is called *pratibimbavāda*. According to this philosophy, transcendently there is no difference between the Absolute Truth, the living entities, and material nature.

This non-differentiation between the Absolute Truth, the living entities, and the cosmic manifestation, is exemplified by the *māyāvādī* philosopher by the following example of the entire sky and the pot. The sky in the pot and the entire sky are the same. But the sky within the pot appears to be limited on account of being designated by the pot cover. When the pot is broken, or the illusion of *māyā* is dissipated, there is no such difference that this pot is different from that pot, or this sky is different from that sky. According to Śaṅkarācārya this cosmic manifestation is also *māyā*. When these material elements disappear, then only existential Brahman will remain. Therefore, Brahman is truth and this cosmic manifestation is false.

Śaṅkarācārya does not accept the theory of transformation, as the Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas*, do. The theory of transformation is explained in this way. Just as milk is transformed into yogurt under certain conditions, but yogurt cannot be transformed again into milk, nor can it be used as milk, in the same way the living entities cannot become the Supreme Absolute Truth. This theory of transformation is not accepted by the *mayāvādī* philosopher.

Actually, this kind of propaganda by Śaṅkarācārya was done under Supreme order to dissipate the dark Buddhist philosophy and to establish the Vedic philosophy, the Absolute truth. According to Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu, Śaṅkara's *māyāvāda* philosophy is another edition of Buddha's philosophy. Buddha's philosophy of voidness is almost equal to the impersonal philosophy of Śaṅkara. Therefore, according to Śaṅkara's philosophy, impersonal non-variegatedness is the ultimate stage of perfect knowledge.

The greatest opposition was offered by Śrī Rāmānujācārya to the Śaṅkara philosophy. Rāmānuja's philosophy is known as *viśiṣṭādvaitavāda*. This doctrine of *viśiṣṭādvaitavāda* was not newly presented by Śrī Rāmānujācārya, but before him there were other exponents of this doctrine and they are known as Nāthamuni and Yāmunācārya.

The basic principle of the *viśiṣṭādvaitavāda* doctrine is that in God's creation there is the division of sentient and non-sentient, just as in studying our own self we find that our body is material, or non-sentient, and our mind intelligence and false ego are the path between my self and my body. My self is sentient. Similarly, the Supreme Lord is sentient, and this material cosmic manifestation is His body. Combined together, the Absolute Truth forms a combination of the sentient and non-sentient features. This is called *viśiṣṭādvaitavāda*.

According to Śrī Rāmānujācārya there are three truths: namely the sentient, the

non-sentient, and the Supreme Lord. They are generally called *tattva-traya*. The innumerable living entities as a group are called the sentient energy of the Supreme Lord, whereas the cosmic manifestation is called the material energy of the Lord. The Lord Himself is above them. He has all-auspicious transcendental qualities. He is omniscient and omnipotent. He is self-effulgent. He is the Lord of the creation. He is known as the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Vāsudeva. The material world and the living entities are sentient and insentient bodily parts of the Lord.

Śrī Rāmānujācārya has elaborately delineated his philosophy in 12 divisions as follows;

1. The Supreme Absolute Truth is one in the combination of gross, subtle, sentient, and insentient groups,

2. He has protested against the doctrine of dualism as well as the doctrine of monism.

3. He has accepted that the Absolute Truth, Brahman, has transcendental qualities and transcendental potencies, and therefore He is not impersonal.

4. He has vehemently protested the doctrine of an impersonal, non-qualitative Absolute Truth.

5. He has deliberately established the doctrine of the living entities being infinitesimal and the in the supreme Lord being infinite, and therefore the infinitesimal living entities are constitutionally meant for serving the infinite Supreme Personality of Godhead.

6. He has established that the living entities, who are infinitesimal, are subject to fall victim under ignorance, but when they are out of that position of ignorance they become again liberated.

7. He has proved that only transcendental loving service to the Supreme Lord is the means of liberation from material entanglement.

8. According to his opinion, devotional service is the supermost process for self-realization.

9. He has stated strongly that even in the state of liberation one cannot be equal with the Supreme Lord.

10. He has put strong arguments against the impersonal doctrine of monism.

11. He has proved that this material world is abominable, and the spiritual world is real life for eternal bliss.

12. He has established that the living entities and the cosmic manifestation are different bodily parts of the Supreme Lord.

Also, Rāmānujācārya has explained that the Supreme Personality of Godhead descends in five different features, namely *arcā*, the Deity in the temple, the incarnations, such as the fish-incarnation, tortoise-incarnation, boar-incarnation, and Nṛsimha-incarnation, which are called *vaibhava*. Then He has expansions called *vyūha*, such as the expansions of Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, and Aniruddha. His impersonal expansion is the effulgence of His body. He is also present in everyone's heart as *Antaryāmī*, or the Supersoul. All these different plenary portions of the Supreme Lord are beyond material contamination, eternal, without any lamentation, always superior than the living entities, and full of six opulences.

According to Rāmānujācārya, there are five kinds of methods of worship, which are called *abhigamana*, *upadāna*, *ijya*, *sadhyāya*, and *yoga*. When devotees go to the temple, clean the temple or the path to the temple, and decorate the temple in

various ways, such activities are called *abhiḡamana*. The collection of ingredients such as flowers and other paraphernalia for worship is called *upadāna*. Worship of the Lord in the temple is called *ijya*. Chanting different mantras and offering different kinds of prayers is called *sadhya*. Meditation, or remembering the activities of the Lord in full absorption, is called *yoga*. Practicing all different kinds of worship one can attain the planets in the spiritual world known as Vaikuṅṭhaloka. According to Śrī Rāmānujācārya, attainment of Vaikuṅṭha is the highest perfectional stage.

The greatness of Rāmānujācārya is that he himself, and later on his disciplic succession, ever-increasingly protested the impersonalism of Śaṅkarācārya. Still in southern India these two parties come in conflict and generally the party belonging to the *rāmānujācārya-sampradāya* is victorious.

Pañcarātra regulative principals were current before the advent of Śaṅkarācārya, but on account of the influence of Buddha's philosophy such *pañcarātra* regulative principals were stopped. Śaṅkarācārya, instead of directly re-establishing the *pañcarātra* method, took shelter of *māyāvāda* philosophy to defeat Buddha's philosophy. Śrī Rāmānujācārya re-established the *pañcarātra*, or worship.

After Śrī Rāmānujācārya is the appearance of Madhvācārya, whose doctrine is *śuddha-dvaitavāda*. He very strongly established the doctrine of duality, that God, or the Absolute Truth, and the living entities are completely different entities, on the evidence of *Brahma-sūtra* or *Vedānta-sūtra*, as well as *Bhagavad-gītā*, the *purāṇas*, and the *Nārada-pañcarātra*.

He proved duality in every stage namely that the Supreme Lord and the living entity are two different entities. Similarly the cosmic manifestation and the Supreme Lord are also two different entities. One living entity is different form another living entity. In other words, each and every living entity is individual. There is a difference between sentient and non-sentient entities, and there is also a difference between one kind of insentient matter and another kind of insentient matter. Madhvācārya established that two is not one, but two.

One truth is completely independent and the other truth is dependent. Lord Viṣṇu is the supreme independent Personality of Godhead, qualified with transcendental qualities without any material contamination. Therefore He is fully independent. Except Lord Viṣṇu, anything else, either cosmic manifestation or living entities, are not independent but are dependent on the Supreme Lord.

The living entities are qualitatively representations of the Supreme Lord. The doctrine that man is made after God is accepted by Madhvācārya. The features of man are an exact reflection of the feature of the Supreme Lord. He also accepts that the Supreme Lord expands in multi-pleenary-portions, as well as separated-portions called *jīva-tattva*. All the *jīva-tattvas*, or living entities, are eternally associates of the Supreme Lord to render transcendental loving service to Him. The living entities' knowledge is always inferior or incomplete.

The Supreme Lord and the living entities are always in the position of Supreme and subordinate. The living entities are always subordinate. They have no independent power. As is confirmed in *Bhagavad-gītā*, 5th Chapter, 15th Verse, the Lord says that knowledge and remembrance are always given by the Supreme Lord, as *antaryāmī*, or Supersoul, to the living entities. Otherwise, the living entities have no independent power to memorize, think, or act.

In contrast to the living entity, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Viṣṇu, is

complete in knowledge and complete in bliss. He is always worshipable by the living entities and He is the original supreme dominator whereas the living entities are the original predominated. He is, therefore, the original creator of the cosmic manifestation, which is also eternal, although temporarily manifested. Therefore both the living entities and the cosmic manifestation are under the subordination of the Supreme Lord.

The Supreme Lord is always differently situated, as is also confirmed in the *Bhagavad-gītā*, where it is said that everything is resting on the Supreme Lord, but still He is always different from everything. According to Madhvācārya, even at the time of cosmic dissolution the living entities and the material energy remain separate from the Supreme Lord. They are never mixed up as is advocated by the impersonalists.

Madhvācārya was in very great opposition to the doctrine of Śaṅkarācārya. Practically the *madhvācārya-sampradāya* followers are simply fighting against the doctrine of *māyāvāda* philosophy propounded by Śaṅkarācārya. He defeated the doctrine of Śaṅkarācārya and established the doctrine of duality.

Apart from the above mentioned two doctrines of *viśiṣṭādvaitavāda* and *śuddha-dvaitavāda*, there are other doctrines advocated by the *viṣṇusvāmī-sampradāya* and *nimbārka-sampradāya*. The *viṣṇusvāmī-sampradāya* later on developed into the *baladeva-sampradāya*. Their doctrine is called *śuddhādvaitavāda*, and the doctrine of *nimbārka-sampradāya* is called *dvaitādvaitavāda*.

An adjustment of all the doctrines: *viśiṣṭādvaitavāda*, *śuddha-dvaitavāda*, *śuddhādvaitavāda*, and *dvaitādvaitavāda* was very nicely done by Lord Caitanya Mahāprabhu in his doctrine *acintya-bhedābheda-tattva*. In this doctrine, Lord Caitanya has discussed very elaborately all kinds of old and new doctrines in the matter of understanding transcendental subject matter, and in order to minimize the different views of different philosophers, He has added a very nice conception which is called *acintya*.

This word is very applicable to the philosophical doctrines of the conditioned soul. A conditioned soul actually cannot ascertain the nature of the Absolute Truth simply by speculation, but only through the authority of Vedic knowledge. The word *acintya* applies in all the doctrines.

Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu was not very concerned about these doctrines to understand the Absolute Truth. His main business was to distribute to the general mass of people the principles of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, which is the natural commentary on *Vedānta-sūtra*.

According to *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, all philosophical speculation and religious principles combined together culminate in the understanding of love of Godhead. Man cannot be satisfied simply by religious sentiments or philosophical speculation but, according to *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, when one is elevated to the platform of rendering loving service to the Supreme Personality of Godhead without any motive and without being hampered by any material condition, that stage of transcendental realization is the highest principle of spiritual understanding, and in that stage only one can be fully satisfied.

Caitanya Mahāprabhu was more concerned to deliver to the people this status of life without much bothering about philosophical speculations. Lord Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu never labored very much to present a thesis of this doctrine in a separate book, but later on his disciplic succession, especially, among the six

Gosvāmī, Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī has presented six theses, which combinedly are called *Ṣat-sandharbha*. Of the six *sandharbhas* the one known as *Tattva-sandharbha* is a practical presentation of this doctrine and explains *Vedānta-sūtra* strictly according to the principles of *acintya-bhedābheda-tattva*. Later on, Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa took this doctrine and explained *Vedānta-sūtra* strictly according to that principle of *acintya-bhedābheda-tattva*.

His Divine Grace A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

*satyaṁ jñānam anantaṁ
brahma-śivādi-stutaṁ bhajad-rūpam
govindaṁ tam acintyaṁ
hetum adoṣaṁ namasyāmaḥ*

Lord Govinda is the Supreme Brahman, the absolute transcendental reality. He is transcendental knowledge. He is the original cause of all causes. He is limitless and faultless. Lord Śiva and all the demigods praise Him. The devotees worship His transcendental form. We offer our respectful obeisances unto Him.

*sūtrāṁśubhis tamāṁsi
vyudasya vastūni yaḥ parīkṣayate
sa jayati satyavataye
harir anuvṛtto nata-preṣṭhaḥ*

All glories to Śrīla Vyāsadeva, the son of Satyavatī. Vyāsadeva is the incarnation of Lord Hari, and He is very dear to the devotees. With the effulgence of His *Vedānta-sūtra* He has dispelled the darkness of ignorance and revealed the truth.

During the Dvāpara-yuga the *Vedas* were destroyed. The Supreme Personality of Godhead, responding to the prayers of Lord Brahmā and the other bewildered demigods, appeared as Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa, restored the *Vedas*, divided them into parts, and composed the *Vedānta-sūtra* in four chapters to explain them. This is described in the *Skanda Purāṇa*.

At that time many fools propounded various misinterpretations of the *Vedas*. Some said that the highest goal of life was to act piously in order to reap the benefits of good *karma*. Some said that Lord Viṣṇu is Himself bound by the laws of *karma*. Some maintained that the fruits of good *karma*, such as residence in *svarga* (the upper material planets) were eternal. Some said the *jīvas* (individual living entities) and *prakṛti* (material energy) acted independently, without being subject to any higher power, or God. Some said the *jīvas* (individual living entities) are actually the Supreme Brahman (God), and that the *jīvas* are simply bewildered about their identity, or that the *jīvas* are a reflection of God, or separated fragments

of God. Some said that the *jīva* becomes free from the cycle of repeated birth and death when He understands his real identity as the perfectly spiritual Supreme Brahman (God).

The *Vedānta-sūtra* refutes all these misconceptions, and establishes Lord Viṣṇu as supremely independent, the original creator and cause of all causes, omniscient, the ultimate goal of life for all living entities, the supreme religious principle and the supreme transcendental knowledge.

The *Vedānta-sūtra* describes five *tattvas* (truths): 1. *īśvara* (The Supreme Personality of Godhead); 2. *jīva* (the individual living entity, or spirit-soul); 3. *prakṛti* (matter); 4. *kāla* (time); and 5. *karma* (action).

The *īśvara* is omniscient, but the *jīva* has only limited knowledge. Still, both are eternal beings, are aware of the spiritual reality, and have a variety of spiritual qualities. Both are alive, have personality, and are aware of their own identity.

At this point someone may object: "In one place you have said that the Supreme Godhead is omniscient, and in another place you have said that He is knowledge itself. This is a contradiction, for the knower and the object of knowledge must be different. They cannot be the same.

To this objection I reply: Just as a lamp is not different from the light it emanates and its light is both the object of knowledge and the method of attaining it, in the same way the Supreme Personality of Godhead is simultaneously the supreme knower and the supreme object of knowledge. There is no contradiction.

īśvara is supremely independent. He is the master of all potencies. He enters the universe and controls it. He awards both material enjoyment and ultimate liberation to the individual spirit souls (*jīvas*) residing in material bodies. Although He is one, He manifests in many forms. They who understand the transcendental science maintain that He is not different from His own transcendental form and qualities. Although He cannot be perceived by the material senses, He can be perceived by *bhakti* (devotional service). He is changeless. He reveals His own spiritual, blissful form to His devotees.

The many *jīvas* are situated in different conditions of existence. Some are averse to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and turn their faces from Him. Such *jīvas* are bound by material illusion. Other *jīvas* are friendly to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and turn their faces to Him. These *jīvas* become free from the two-fold bondage of material illusion, which hides the Supreme Lord's form and qualities, and in this way they become able to see the Supreme Personality of Godhead face-to-face.

Prakṛti (material nature) consists of the three modes: goodness, passion, and ignorance. *Prakṛti* is known by many names, such as *tamaḥ* and *māyā*. When the Supreme Personality of Godhead glances at *Prakṛti*, she becomes able to perform her various duties. *Prakṛti* is the mother of many variegated material universes.

Kāla (time) is the origin of past, present, future, simultaneity, slowness, quickness, and many other similar states. *Kāla* is divided into many different units from the extremely brief *kṣaṇa* to the extremely long *parārdha*. Turning like a wheel, time is the cause of repeated creation and annihilation of the universes. Time is unconscious. It is not a person.

These four *tattvas* (*īśvara*, *jīva*, *prakṛti*, and *kāla*) are eternal. This is confirmed by the following scriptural quotations:

nityo nityānām cetanaś cetanānām

"Of all the eternal one (the Supreme Personality of Godhead) is the supreme eternal. Of all conscious entities one (the Supreme Personality of Godhead) is the supreme conscious entity."

—*Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* 6.13

gaur anādy anantavatī

"*Prakṛti* is like a cow who was never born and never dies."

—*Culika Upaniṣad* mantra 5

sad eva saumyedaṃ agra āsīt

"My dear saintly student, please understand that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is eternal. He existed before the manifestation of this universe."

—*Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 6.2.1

The *jīvas*, *prakṛti*, and *kāla* are subordinate to *īśvara*, and subject to His control. This is confirmed by the following statement of *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (6.16):

*sa viśva-kṛd viśva-vid ātma-yonir
jñāḥ kāla-kāro guṇi sarva-vid yaḥ
pradhāna-ksetrajña-patir guṇeśaḥ
saṃsāra-mokṣa-sthiti-bandha-hetuḥ*

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead (*īśvara*) is the creator of the material universes. He is the creator of everything that exists within the universes. He is the father of all living entities. He is the creator of time. He is full of all transcendental virtues. He is omniscient. He is the master of *pradhāna* (the unmanifested material nature). He is the master of the *guṇas* (three modes of material nature). He is the master of the individual spirit souls residing material bodies (*kṣetrajña*). He imprisons the conditioned souls in the material world, and He also becomes their liberator from bondage."

Karma (the result of fruitive action) is not a conscious, living person. It is an inert material force. Although no one can trace out its beginning, it has a definite end at some point in time. It is known by the name *adr̥ṣṭa* (the unseen hand of fate) and many other names also.

These four (*jīva*, *prakṛti*, *kāla*, and *karma*) are all potencies of *īśvara*, the

supreme master of all potencies. Because everything that exists is the potency of the Supreme, the Vedic literatures declare: "Only Brahman exists, and nothing is separate from Him." This fact is nicely explained in the four chapters of this book, the *Vedānta-sūtra*.

In the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, which is the perfect commentary on *Vedānta-sūtra*, the Supreme *īśvara* and His potencies are described in the following words:

*bhakti-yogena manasi
samyak praṇihite 'male
apaśyat puruṣaṁ pūrṇaṁ
māyāṁ ca tad-apāśrayam*

"Thus he fixed his mind, perfectly engaging it by linking it in devotional service [*bhakti-yoga*] without any tinge of materialism, and thus he saw the Absolute Personality of Godhead along with His external energy, which was under full control.*

*yayā sammohito jīva
ātmānaṁ tri-guṇātmakam
paro 'pi manute 'narthaṁ
tat-kṛtaṁ cābhipadyate*

"Due to this external energy, the living entity, although transcendental to the three modes of material nature, thinks of himself as a material product and thus undergoes the reactions of material miseries.*

*anarthopaśamaṁ sākṣād
bhakti-yogam adhokṣaje
lokasyājānato vidvāṁś
cakre sātva-saṁhitāṁ*

"The material miseries of the living entity, which are superfluous to him, can be directly mitigated by the linking process of devotional service. But the mass of people do not know this, and therefore the learned Vyāsadeva compiled this Vedic literature, which is in relation to the Supreme Truth.*

—1.7.4-6

*dravyaṁ karma ca kālaś ca
svabhāvo jīva eva ca
yad-anugrahataḥ santi
na santi yad-upekṣayā*

"One should definitely know that all material ingredients, activities, time and modes, and the living entities who are meant to enjoy them all, exist by His mercy only, and as soon as He does not care for them, everything becomes nonexistent."*
—2.10.12

That *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* is the commentary on *Vedānta-sūtra* is confirmed by the following statement of *Garuḍa Purāṇa*—

artho 'yam brahma-sūtrānām

"*Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* is the commentary on *Vedānta-sūtra*."*

In this *Vedānta-sūtra* the first chapter explains that Brahman is the real subject matter discussed in all Vedic literatures. The second chapter explains that all Vedic literatures present the same conclusion. They do not actually contradict each other. The third chapter describes how to attain Brahman. The fourth chapter explains the result of attaining Brahman.

A person whose heart is pure, pious, and free from material desires, who is eager to associate with saintly devotees, who has faith in the Lord and the scriptures, and who is peaceful and decorated with saintly qualities, is qualified to study the scriptures and strive after Brahman.

The relationship between Brahman and the scriptures is that the scriptures describe Brahman and Brahman is the object described in the scriptures. The *Vedānta-sūtra* and other Vedic scriptures describe Brahman as the Supreme Personality of Godhead, whose form is eternal, full of knowledge and bliss, who is the master of unlimited inconceivable potencies, and who possesses unlimited pure, transcendental attributes. The result of properly understanding the *Vedānta-sūtra* and other Vedic scriptures is that the spiritual aspirant becomes free from all material imperfections, and able to see the Supreme Brahman, Personality of Godhead, face to face.

The *Vedānta-sūtra* is written in *adhikaraṇas*, Vedic syllogisms, which consist of five parts: 1. *viśaya* (thesis, or statement); 2. *saṁśaya* (the arising of doubt in the tenability of the statement); 3. *pūrvapakṣa* (presentation of a view opposing the original statement) 4. *siddhānta* (determination of the actual truth, the final conclusion, by quotation from Vedic scriptures), and *saṅgati* (confirmation of the final conclusion by quotation from Vedic scriptures).

Chapter 1

Pada 1

Adhikaraṇa 1 Inquiry Into Brahman

The first *adhikaraṇa* of the *Vedānta-sūtra* discusses *brahma-jijñāsā* (inquiry into Brahman). The *adhikaraṇa* may be shown in its five parts in the following way:

1. *Viṣaya* (statement): One should inquire about Brahman. This statement is confirmed by the following statements of Vedic scripture:

yo vai bhūma tat sukham nānyat sukham asti bhūmaiva sukham bhūmatveva vijijñāsitavyaḥ

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead (*bhūma*) is the source of genuine happiness. Nothing else can bring one actual happiness. Only the Supreme Personality of Godhead can bring one happiness. For this reason one should inquire about the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

—*Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 7.25.1

ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ śrotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsitavyo maitreyi

"O Maitreyī, one should see, hear, remember, and inquire about the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

—*Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 2.4.5

2. *Samśaya* (doubt): If one has studied the *Vedas* and *dharma-śāstras*, need he inquire about Brahman or not? The following statements of Vedic scriptures nourish this doubt:

apāma somam amṛtā abhūma

"We have attained immortality by drinking the soma-juice."

—*Rg Veda* 8.18.3

akṣayyam ha vai cāturmāsyaṅjinaḥ sukṛtam bhavati

"They who follow the vow of *cāturmāsya* attain an eternal reward."

3. *Pūrvapakṣa* (presentation of the opposing view): There is no need to inquire about Brahman. Simply by discharging ordinary pious duties described in the *dharma-śāstras* one can attain immortality and an eternal reward.

4. *Siddhānta* (the conclusive truth): In the first *sūtra* Bhagavān Vyāsadeva replies to his philosophical opponent.

Sūtra 1

athāto brahma-jijñāsā

atha—now; *ataḥ*—therefore; *brahma*—about Brahman; *jijñāsā*—there should be inquiry.

Now, therefore, one should inquire about Brahman.*

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this *sūtra* the word *atha* means "now", and the word *ataḥ* means "therefore". The *sūtra* means "Now one should inquire about Brahman."

Atha (now): When a person has properly studied the Vedic literature, understood its meaning, adhered to the principles of *varṇāśrama-dharma*, observed the vow of truthfulness, purified his mind and heart, and attained the association of a self-realized soul, he is qualified to inquire about Brahman.

Ataḥ (therefore): Because material piety brings results of material sense-happiness, which is inevitably limited and temporary, and because the transcendental form of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, which is realized by the proper attainment of real transcendental knowledge, and which is full of imperishable, limitless bliss, eternity, transcendental knowledge, and all transcendental attributes, brings eternal bliss to the devotee-beholder, therefore one should renounce all material pious duties for attaining material sense-gratification, and inquire about Brahman by studying the four chapters of *Vedānta-sūtra*.

At the point someone may object: Is it not true that simply by studying the *Vedas* one attains knowledge of Brahman, and as result of this knowledge one abandons the path of material piety and fruitive work and instead takes to the worship of the Supreme Personality of Godhead? If this result is obtained simply by studying the *Vedas*, what need is there to study the four chapters of *Vedānta-sūtra*?

To this objection I reply: Even if one carefully studies the *Vedas*, misunderstanding and doubt may destroy his intelligence and lead him away from the real meaning of the *Vedas*. For this reason it is necessary to study the *Vedānta-*

sūtra, to strengthen the students' understanding.

Performing the duties of *āśrama-dharma* are also helpful in purifying the heart and understanding the transcendental reality. How the *āśrama* duties of the *brāhmaṇa* help in this regard is described in the following statement of *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (4.4.22):

tam etaṁ vedānuvacanena brāhmaṇā vividiṣanti yajñena dānena tapasānaśanena

"By Vedic study, sacrifice, charity, austerity, and fasting, the *brāhmaṇas* strive to understand the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

The usefulness of the brahminical duties such as truthfulness, austerity, and *mantra* chanting is described in the following scriptural statements:

satyena labhayaṣ tapasā hy eṣa ātmā samyak jñānena brahmacaryeṇa nityam

"By constant truthfulness, austerity, transcendental knowledge, and austerity, one becomes eligible to associate with the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

—*Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* 3.1.5

*japyenaiva ca saṁsiddhyad
brahmaṇā nātra saṁśayaḥ
kuryād anyan na vā kuryān
maitro brāhmaṇa ucyate*

"Whether he performs other rituals and duties or not, one who perfectly chants *mantras* glorifying the Supreme Personality of Godhead should be considered a perfect *brāhmaṇa*, eligible to understand the Supreme Lord."

—*Manu-saṁhitā* 2.87

Association with those who understand the truth also brings one transcendental knowledge. By this association Nārada and many other spiritual aspirants attained interest to ask about spiritual life and were finally eligible to see the Supreme Personality of Godhead face-to-face. Sanat-kumāra and many other great sages have also helped many devotees by giving their association in this way. The great value of contact with a self-realized soul is described in the following statement of *Bhagavad-gītā* (4.34):

*tad viddhi praṇipātena
paripraśnena sevayā
upadekṣyanti te jñānaṁ*

jñāninas tattva-darśinaḥ

"Just try to learn the truth by approaching a spiritual master. Inquire from him submissively and render service unto him. The self-realized soul can impart knowledge unto you because he has seen the truth."*

The material benefits obtained by following the pious rituals of the *karma-kāṇḍa* section of the *Vedas* are all temporary in nature. This fact is confirmed by the following statement of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (8.1.3):

tad yatheha karma-cito lokāḥ kṣiyante evam evāmutra puṇya-cito lokāḥ kṣiyate

"By performing good works (*karma*) one is elevated to the celestial material world after death. One is not able to stay there forever, however, but one must lose that position after some time and accept another, less favorable residence. In the same way, by amassing pious credits (*puṇya*) one may reside in the upper planets. Still, he cannot stay there, but must eventually relinquish his comfortable position there, and accept a less favorable residence somewhere else."

The following statement of *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (1.2.12) affirms that only transcendental knowledge will help one approach the Supreme Brahman:

*parīkṣya lokān karma-citān brāhmaṇo
nirvedam ayan nāsty akṛtaḥ kṛtena
tad-vijñānārtham sa gurum evābhigacchet
samiṭ-pāṇiḥ śrotriyaṁ brahma-niṣṭham*

"Seeing that the celestial material planets, which one may obtain by pious work, provide only temporary benefits, a *brāhmaṇa*, in order to understand the truth the of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, should humbly approach a bona-fide spiritual master learned in the scriptures and full of faith in the Supreme Lord."

In contrast to the temporary material benefits obtained in the celestial material planets, the Supreme Brahman is the reservoir of eternal, limitless bliss. This is confirmed by the following statements of *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (2.1.1):

satyam jñānam anantaṁ brahma

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is limitless, eternal, and full of knowledge."

ānando brahmeti vyajanāt

"He then understood that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is full of transcendental bliss."

The Supreme Brahman is eternal, full of knowledge and endowed with all transcendental qualities. This is confirmed by the following statements of *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*:

*na tasya kāryaṁ karaṇaṁ ca vidyate
na tat-samaś cābhyadhikaś ca dṛśyate
parāsyā śaktir vividhaiva śrūyate
svā-bhāvikī jñāna-bala-kriyā ca*

"He does not possess bodily form like that of an ordinary living entity. There is no difference between His body and His soul. He is absolute. All his senses are transcendental. Any one of His senses can perform the action of any other sense. Therefore, no one is greater than Him or equal to Him. His potencies are multifarious, and thus His deeds are automatically performed as a natural sequence."*

—6.8

*sarvendriya-guṇābhāsaṁ
sarvendriya-vivarjitaṁ
asaktaṁ sarva-bhṛc caiva
nirguṇaṁ guṇa-bhoktṛ ca*

"The Supersoul is the original source of all senses, yet He is without senses. He is unattached, although He is the maintainer of all living beings. He transcends the modes of nature, and at the same time He is the master of all modes of material nature."*

—3.17

*bhāva-grahyam anidākhyam
bhāvābhāva-karaṁ śivam
kāla-sārga-karaṁ devam
ye vidus te jahus tanum*

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the creator and destroyer of the entire material cosmic manifestation. He is supremely auspicious, and He does not possess a material body, for His body is spiritual in all respects. He may be

reached and understood only by loving devotional service. Those who thus serve Him and understand Him may become free from having to repeatedly accept various material bodies for continued residence in the material world. They become liberated from this world, and obtain eternal spiritual bodies with which to serve Him."

—5.14

That the Supreme Personality of Godhead grants eternal transcendental bliss to His devotees is confirmed by the following statement of *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* (1.5):

tam pīṭha-stham ye tu yajanti dhīrās
teṣām sukham śāśvataṁ netareṣām

"The saintly devotees who worship the Supreme Personality of Godhead in the spiritual world attain eternal transcendental bliss. Except for them no others can attain this eternal bliss."

This uselessness of the temporary benefits obtained by following the material piety of the *karma-kāṇḍa* section of the *Vedas* will be described in the third chapter of this *Vedānta-sūtra*.

This may be summed up by saying: One who has studied the *Vedas*, *Upavedas*, and *Upaniṣads*, understood them, associated with a self-realized soul, and in this way understood the difference between the temporary and the eternal, who has lost all attraction for the temporary and chosen the eternal, becomes a student of the four chapters of *Vedānta-sūtra*.

It cannot be said that simply by completely studying and understanding the *karma-kāṇḍa* section of the *Vedas* one will naturally take up the study of *Vedānta-sūtra*. They who have studied *karma-kāṇḍa* but not associated with saintly devotees do not become eager to understand Brahman. On the other hand, they who have not studied *karma-kāṇḍa*, but who have become purified by association with saintly devotees, naturally become attracted to understand Brahman.

Neither can it be said that simply by understanding the difference between the temporary and the eternal, and simply by attaining the four qualities of saintly persons, one will become attracted to understand Brahman. These things are not enough. However, if one attains the association of a self-realized soul and follows his instructions, then these ordinarily difficult-to-attain qualifications are automatically attained at once.

Three kinds of persons inquire into the nature of Brahman: 1. *Sa-niṣṭha* (they who faithfully perform their duties); 2. *Pariniṣṭha* (they who act philanthropically for the benefit of all living entities); and 3. *Nirapekṣa* (they who are rapt in meditation and aloof from the activities of this world). According to their own respective abilities all these persons understand the nature of Brahman. They become more and more purified, and they eventually attain the association of Brahman.

At this point someone may raise the following objection: Is it not so that the words *om* and *atha* are auspicious sounds that sprang from Lord Brahmā's throat in ancient times? Is it not also so that these words are traditionally used at the

beginning of books to invoke auspiciousness and drive away all obstacles? For this reason I think the word *atha* in this *sūtra* does not mean "now". It is simply a word to invoke auspiciousness, and has no other meaning.

To this objection I reply: This is not true. Śrīla Vyāsadeva, the author of *Vedānta-sūtra*, is the incarnation of the Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself, and therefore He has no particular need to invoke auspiciousness or drive away obstacles and dangers. That Vyāsadeva is the Supreme Personality of Godhead is confirmed by the following statement of the *smṛti-śāstra*:

*kṛṣṇa-dvaipāyana-vyāsaṁ
viddhi nārāyaṇaṁ prabhum*

"Please understand that Kṛṣṇa Dvaipayana Vyāsa is actually the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Nārāyaṇa."

Still, ordinary people may take it that Lord Vyāsadeva has spoken the word *atha* at the beginning of *Vedānta-sūtra* just to invoke auspiciousness, just as one may sound a conch-shell to invoke auspiciousness. In conclusion, we have described here how at a certain point in time, after certain understandings (*atha*), a person may become eager to inquire about the nature of Brahman.

At this point someone may raise the following objection: Is it not so that the word *bhūma* or *brahma* may also refer to the individual spirit soul and not only to the Supreme Personality of Godhead? This fact is explained in *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*. Even the dictionary explains: "The word *brahma* means that which is big, the *brāhmaṇa* caste, the individual spirit soul, and the demigod Brahmā who sits on a great lotus flower."

To clear away the misunderstanding of this objector, the following scriptural passages may be quoted:

*bhṛgur vai varuṇir varuṇaṁ pitaram upasasāra adhīhi bho bhagavo brahma. . . yato
vā imāni bhūtāni jāyante yena jātāni jīvanti yat prayānty abhisamviśanti tad brahma
tad vijijñāsasva*

"Bhṛgu asked his father Varuṇa: 'My lord, please instruct me about the nature of Brahman.' Varuṇa replied: 'All living entities have taken their birth because of Brahman. They remain alive because they are maintained by Brahman, and at the time of death they again enter into Brahman. Please try to understand the nature of Brahman.'"

At this point someone may doubt: "In this *Vedānta-sūtra* does the word 'Brahman' refer to the individual spirit soul or the Supreme Personality of Godhead?"

Someone may indeed claim that the word "Brahman" here refers to the individual spirit soul, and to support his view he may quote the following statement of *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (2.5):

*vijñānaṁ brahma ced veda
tasmāc cen na pramadyati
śarīre pāpmāno hitvā
sarvaṅ kāmān samāśnute*

"If one understands the true nature of the Brahman who lives in the body and uses the senses of the body to perceive the material world, then such a knower of Brahman will never become bewildered by illusion. Such a knower of the Brahman in the body refrains from performing sinful actions, and at the time of leaving the body at death, he attains an exalted destination where all his desires become at once fulfilled."

Our philosophical opponent may claim in this way that the word "Brahman" should be interpreted to mean the individual spirit soul. In order to refute this false idea, Śrīla Vyāsadeva describes the true nature of Brahman in the next *sūtra*.

Adhikaraṇa 2 The Origin of Everything

Sūtra 2

janmādy asya yataḥ

janma—birth; ādi—beginning with; asya—of that; yataḥ—from whom.

Brahman is He from whom everything emanates.*

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word *janmādi* is a *tad-guṇa-samvijñāna-bahuvrīhi-samāsa*, and it should be interpreted to mean "creation, maintenance, and destruction." The word *asya* means "of this material universe with fourteen planetary systems, which is inhabited by various creatures from the demigod Brahmā down to the lowest unmoving blade of grass, who all enjoy and suffer the results of their various fruitive actions (*karma*), and who cannot understand the astonishing structure of

the universe where they live." The word *yataḥ* means "from whom", and it refers to the Supreme Brahman who manifested the universe from His inconceivable potency. This is the Brahman about whom one should inquire.

The words *bhūma* and *ātmā* both mean "all pervading". These words refer primarily to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This will be elaborately explained in the *Bhūmādhikaraṇa* (1.3.7) and *Vākyānvayādhikaraṇa* (1.4.19). The word "Brahman" in particular means "He who possesses boundless exalted qualities." Brahman, then, refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead and this is clearly confirmed in the following words of *śruti-śāstra*:

atha kasmād ucyate brahmeti bhṛhanto by asmin guṇāḥ

"From whom has this universe become manifest? From Brahman, who possesses an abundance of exalted transcendental qualities."

Brahman primarily refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and only secondarily to the individual spirit souls, who manifest in small degree the spiritual qualities of the Supreme Lord. In this way the individual spirit souls may be called Brahman, just as the royal title may be given not only to the king, but also to his associates and subordinates. Therefore, the individual spirit souls, who are all suffering the three-fold miseries of material life, should, in order to attain ultimate liberation, inquire about the Supreme Brahman, who is very merciful towards those who take shelter of Him. For these reasons it should be understood that the Supreme Brahman, the Personality of Godhead is the object of inquiry in this *Vedānta-sūtra*. This is not an imaginary description of Brahman's qualities. This is the truth about Brahman.

The word *jijñāsā* means "the desire to know." Knowledge is of two kinds: 1. *Parokṣa* (knowledge gathered from sources other than the senses e.g. logic, knowledge obtained from authority, etc.) and 2. *Aparokṣa* (knowledge gathered by the senses). An example of these two kinds of knowledge may be seen in the following quotation from the *śruti-śāstra*:

vijñāya prajñām kurvīta

"After learning about the Supreme Personality of Godhead one should become able to directly see Him in the trance of meditation."

Parokṣa knowledge helps bring us closer to the Supreme Brahman, and *aparokṣa* knowledge manifests the Supreme Lord before us.

If one understands his real identity as spirit soul, that is certainly very helpful in understanding Brahman, but that does not mean that the individual soul is the same as Brahman. The individual spirit soul is always different from Brahman, and even after liberation He remains eternally different from the Supreme Brahman. The difference between the individual soul and Brahman is described in *sūtras*

1.1.16, 1.1.17, 1.3.5, 1.3.21, and 1.3.41.

The Vedic literature gives the following guidelines for the interpretation of obscure passages:

*upakramopasamhārāv
abhyāso 'pūrvata-phalam
artha-vādopapattī ca
līngam tātparyā-nirṇaye*

"The *upakrama* (beginning), *opasamhāra* (ending), *abhyāsa* (what is repeated again and again), *apūrvatā* (what is unique and novel), *phalam* (the general purpose of the book), *artha-vāda* (the author's statement of his own intention), and *upapatti* (appropriateness) are the factors to consider in interpretation of obscure passages."

If we apply these criteria to the *śruti-śāstra*, we will clearly see that the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the individual spirit soul are described here as two distinct entities.

Let us analyze the following passage from *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (4.6-7) in the light of these six criteria.

*dvā suparṇā sayujā sakhāyā
samānam vṛkṣam pariśaṣvajāte
tayor anyañ pippalam svādv atty
anaśnann anyo 'bhicakāṣīti*

"The individual spirit-soul and the Supersoul, Personality of Godhead, are like two friendly birds sitting on the same tree. One of the birds (the individual atomic soul) is eating the fruit of the tree (the sense-gratification afforded to the material body), and the other bird (the Supersoul) is not trying to eat these fruits, but is simply watching His friend.

*samāne vṛkṣe puruṣo nimagno
'nīśāya śocati muhyamānaḥ
juṣṭam yadā paśyati anyam īsam
asya mahimānam iti vīta-śokaḥ*

"Although the two birds are on the same tree, the eating bird is fully engrossed with anxiety and moroseness as the enjoyer of the fruits of the tree. But if in some way or other he turns his face to his friend who is the Lord and knows His glories, at once the suffering bird becomes free from all anxieties."

In this passage the *upakrama* (beginning) is *dvā suparṇā* (two birds); the

upasaṁhāra (ending) is *anyam īśam* (the other person, who is the Supreme Personality of Godhead); the *abhyāsa* (repeated feature) is the word *anya* (the other person), as in the phrases *tayor anyo 'śnan* (the other person does not eat) and *anyam īśam* (He sees the other person, who is the Supreme Lord); the *apūrvatā* (unique feature) is the difference between the Supreme Lord and the individual spirit soul, which could never have been understood without the revelation of the Vedic scripture; the *phalam* (general purpose of the passage) is *vīta-śokaḥ* (the individual spirit soul becomes free from suffering by seeing the Lord); the *artha-vāda* (the author's statement of his own intention) is *mahimānam eti* (one who understands the Supreme Lord becomes glorious) and the *upapatti* (appropriateness) is *anyo 'naśan* (the other person, the Supreme Lord, does not eat the fruits of material happiness and distress).

By analyzing this passage and other passages from Vedic literatures, one may clearly understand the difference between the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the individual spirit soul.

At this point someone may raise the following objection:

Is it not true that when a scripture teaches something that had not been known to its readers, then it is useful, and if when a scripture simply repeats what its readers already know, it simply wastes time uselessly? People in general think they are different from the Supreme Brahman, and therefore if the scripture were to teach them something new it would have to be that the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the individual spirit souls are completely identical. For this reason it should be understood that the individual spirit souls are identical with Brahman.

To this objection I reply: This view is not supported by the words of the Vedic scriptures. For example the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (1.6) states:

*prthag-ātmānaṁ preritaṁ ca matvā
juṣṭas tatas tenāmṛtatvam eti*

"When one understands that the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the individual spirit souls are eternally distinct entities, then he may become qualified for liberation, and live eternally in the spiritual world."

The impersonalist conception of the identity of the individual and the Supreme is a preposterous phantasmagoria, like the horn of a rabbit. It has no reference to reality, and it is completely rejected by the people in general. They do not accept it. Those few texts of the *Upaniṣads* that apparently teach the impersonalist doctrine, are interpreted in a personalist way by the author, Vyāsadeva himself. This will be described later on in Sutra 1.1.30.

Adhikaraṇa 3

The Supreme Personality of Godhead May be Understood by the Revelation of the Vedic Scriptures

1. *Viṣaya* (Statement): The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the creator, maintainer and destroyer of the material universes. Because He is inconceivable to the tiny brains of the conditioned souls He must be understood by the revelation of *Vedānta* philosophy. This is confirmed by the following statements of the *Upaniṣads*:

sac-cid-ānanda-rūpāya
kṛṣṇāyākliṣṭa-kāriṇe
namo vedānta-vedyāya
gurave buddhi-sākṣiṇe

Om namaḥ. I offer my respectful obeisances to Śrī Kṛṣṇa, whose form is eternal and full of knowledge and bliss, who is the rescuer from distress, who is understood by Vedānta, who is the supreme spiritual master, and who is the witness in everyone's heart.

—*Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad*

taṁ tv aupaniṣadam puruṣam prcchāmi

"I shall now inquire about the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is revealed in the *Upaniṣads*."

—*Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 3.9.26

2. *Samśaya* (doubt): What is the best method for understanding supremely worshipable Lord Hari: the mental speculation of the logicians, or the revelation of the *Vedānta* scriptures?

3. *Pūrvapakṣa* (the argument of the philosophical opposition): The sage Gautama (*Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.5) and others maintain that the Supreme Personality of Godhead can be understood by the speculations of the logicians.

4. *Siddhānta* (the conclusion): In the *Vedānta-sūtra*, Śrīla Vyāsadeva explains that scriptural revelation is the real way to understand the Supreme Brahman. He says:

Sūtra 3

śāstra-yonitvāt

śāstra—the scriptures; *yonitvāt*—because of being the origin of knowledge.

(The speculations of the logicians are unable to teach us about Supreme Personality of Godhead) because He may only be known by the revelation of the Vedic scriptures.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this *sūtra* the word "not" should be understood, even though it is not expressed. They who aspire after liberation are not able to understand the Personality of Godhead simply by logic and speculation. Why? Because He is known only by the revelation of the Vedic scriptures. Among the Vedic scriptures, the *Upaniṣads* especially describe the Supreme Person. For this reason it is said *aupaniṣadam puruṣam* (the Supreme Person is understood through the revelation of the *Upaniṣads*). The process of logic and speculation as described by the word *mantavya* (to be understood by logic) as described in *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (4.5) should be employed to understand the revelation of the scriptures and not independently. This is confirmed by the following statement of *śruti-śāstra*:

pūrvāpara-virodhena
ko 'rtho 'trābhimato bhavet
ity ādyam uhanam tarkaḥ
śuṣka-tarkaṁ vivarjayet

"Logic is properly employed to resolve apparent contradictions in the texts of the *Vedas*. Dry logic, without reference to scriptural revelation, should be abandoned."

For this reason the dry logic of Gautama and others should be rejected. This is also confirmed in *sūtra* 2.1.11. After understanding the Supreme Person by study of the *Upaniṣads*, one should become rapt in meditation on Him. This will be explained later in *sūtra* 2.1.27.

The Supreme Lord, Hari, is identical with His own transcendental form. He and His form are not two separate identities. He is the witness of all living entities, He is the resting place of a host of transcendental qualities, He is the creator of the material universes, and He remains unchanged eternally. By hearing about His transcendental glories, one may worship Him perfectly.

At this point someone may raise the following objection: The *Vedānta* philosophy does not give either positive orders or negative prohibitions, but simply descriptions, as the sentence "On the earth there are seven continents." Men need instruction in how to act. Therefore, what is needed is a series of orders to guide men. Men need orders, such as the ordinary orders. "A man desiring wealth should approach the king," or "One suffering from indigestion should restrict his intake of water," or the orders of the *Vedas*: *svarga-kāmo yajeta* (One desiring to enter the celestial material planets should worship

the demigods), or *sūram na pibet* (No one should drink wine). The *Upaniṣads* do not give us a string of orders and prohibitions, but merely a description of the eternally perfect Brahman. For example the *Upaniṣads* tell us *satyam jñānam* (The Supreme Personality of Godhead is truth and knowledge). This is of small help in the matter of orders and prohibitions. Sometimes the *Upaniṣads'* descriptions may be a little useful, as for example when they describe a certain demigod, the description may be useful when one performs a sacrifice to that demigod, but otherwise these descriptions afford us little practical benefit, and are more or less useless. This is confirmed by the following statements of Jaimini Muni.

āmnāyasya kriyārthatvād anāsthākhyam atad-arthanam

"The scriptures teach us pious duties. Any scriptural passage that does not teach us our duty is a senseless waste of our time."

—*Pūrva-mīmāṃsā* 1.2.1

tad-bhūtānām kriyārthena samāmnāyo 'rthasya tan-nimittatvāt

"Just as a verb gives meaning to a sentence, in the same way instructions for action give meaning to the statements of the scriptures."

—*Pūrva-mīmāṃsā* 1.1.25

To this objection I reply: Do not be bewildered. Even though the *Upaniṣads* do not give us a series of orders and prohibitions, still they teach us about the Supreme Brahman, the most important and valuable object to be attained by any living entity. Just as if in your house there were hidden treasure, and a description of its location were spoken to you, those words would not be useless simply because they were a description. In the same way the *Upaniṣads'* description of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is the greatest treasure to be attained by any living being, whose form is eternal, full of knowledge and full of bliss, who is perfect and beyond any criticism, who is the friend of all living entities, the Supreme Lord who is so kind that He gives Himself to His devotees, and the supreme whole of all existence, of whom I am a tiny part, is not useless, but of great value to the conditioned soul. The descriptions of the Supreme Brahman in the *Upaniṣads* are valuable, just as the description "your son is now born" is useful and a source of great joy, and the description "This is not a snake, but only a rope partly seen in the darkness," is also useful and a great relief from fear.

The specific benefit attained by understanding the Supreme Brahman are described in the following statement of *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (2.1):

satyam jñānam anantaṁ brahma yo veda nihitaṁ guhāyām so 'śnute sarvān kāmān

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is limitless. He is transcendental knowledge, and He is the eternal transcendental reality. He is present in everyone's heart. One who properly understands Him becomes blessed and all his desires are completely fulfilled."

No one can say that the *Upaniṣads* teach about ordinary fruitive action (*karma*). Rather, one may say that the *Upaniṣads* teach one to give up all material, fruitive work. No one can say that the *Upaniṣads* describe anything other than the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is the original creator, maintainer, and destroyer of all the universes, whose spiritual form is eternal, who is a great ocean of unlimited auspicious transcendental qualities, and who is the resting-place of the goddess of fortune. Jaimini's description of the importance of *karma*, therefore, has no bearing on the *Upaniṣads*.

In fact Jaimini was a faithful devotee of the Lord, and his apparent criticisms (in the two quotations presented above) of the Vedic texts that do not encourage fruitive work (*karma*) with sufficient enthusiasm, are his hint to us that there is more than pious fruitive work in the instructions of the *Vedas*. In this way it may be understood that the Supreme Brahman is the subject-matter described in the Vedic scriptures.

Adhikaraṇa 4

This is Confirmed by the Vedic scriptures

1. *Viśaya* (statement): That the Supreme Personality of Godhead is described in all Vedic scriptures is described in the following scriptural quotations:

yo 'su sarvair vedair gīyate

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is glorified by all the *Vedas*."

—*Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad*

sarve vedā yat-padam āmananti

"All the *Vedas* describe the lotus feet of the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

—*Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 1.2.15

2. *Samśaya* (doubt): Lord Viṣṇu is the subject-matter described in all the *Vedas*. Is this statement true or false?

3. *Pūrvapakṣa* (the argument of our philosophical opponent): It is not true that the *Vedas* teach only about the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Actually the *Vedas* mainly describe various fruitive *karma-kāṇḍa* sacrifices, such as the *kariri-*

yajña for bringing rain, the *putra-kāmyeṣṭi-yajña* for gaining a son, and the *jyotiṣṭoma-yajña* for traveling to the celestial material planets (Svargaloka). For this reason it is not possible to say that Lord Viṣṇu is the only topic discussed in the *Vedas*.

4. *Siddhānta* (the proper conclusion): Vyāsadeva replies to the objections in the following *sūtra*:

Sūtra 4

tat tu samanvayāt

tat—this fact; tu—but; samanvayāt—because of the agreement of all the Vedic scriptures.

But that (Lord Viṣṇu is the sole topic of discussion in the *Vedas*) is confirmed by all scriptures.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word *tu* (but) in this *sūtra* is used to rebut the previously stated opposing argument. It is proper to say that Lord Viṣṇu is the sole topic of discussion in all the *Vedas*. Why? The answer is: *samanvayāt* (because the scriptures themselves bring us to this conclusion). The word *anvaya* means "understanding the actual meaning," and the word *samanvaya* means "perfect understanding after careful deliberation". When we apply the above-mentioned rules of interpretation (beginning with *upakrama* and *upasaṁhāra*) to the texts of the *Vedas*, we will come to the conclusion that Lord Viṣṇu is the sole topic of discussion in all the *Vedas*. If it were not so, then why should the *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* state that Lord Viṣṇu is glorified by all the *Vedas*? This is also confirmed by the lotus-eyed Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself, who says:

vedaiś ca sarvair aham eva vedyo vedānta-kṛd veda-vid eva cāham

"By all the *Vedas* I am to be known. Indeed, I am the compiler of the *Vedānta*, and I am the knower of the *Vedas*."*

—*Bhagavad-gītā* 15.15

*kim vidhatte kim ācaṣṭe
kim anūdyā vikalpayet
ity asyā kṛdayaṁ loke
nānyo mad veda kaścana*

*mām vidhatte 'bhidhatte mām
vikalpyāpohyate hy aham*

"What is the direction of all Vedic literatures? On whom do they set focus? Who is the purpose of all speculation? Outside of Me no one knows these things. Now you should know that all these activities are aimed at ordaining and setting forth Me. The purpose of Vedic literature is to know Me by different speculations, either by indirect understanding or by dictionary understanding. Everyone is speculating about Me."*

—*Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (11.21.42-43)

The Vedic literatures also state:

sākṣāt-paramparābhyām veda brahmaṇi pravartate

"Either directly or indirectly, the *Vedas* describe Brahman."

In the *jñāna-kāṇḍa* section of the *Vedas* {*fn 1*} the transcendental forms and qualities of the Supreme Personality of Godhead are directly described, and in the *karma-kāṇḍa* section of the *Vedas* the Lord is indirectly described in the discussion of fruitive action and various divisions of material knowledge

That the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the sole topic of discussion in the *Vedas* is also confirmed by the following scriptural passages:

tam tv aupaniṣadam puruṣam pṛcchāmi

"I shall now ask about the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is described in the *Upaniṣads*."

—*Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (9.21)

tam etam vedānuvacanena brāhmaṇa vividiṣanti

"*Brāhmaṇas* study the *Vedas* to understand the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

—*Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (4.4.22)

As for the various fruitive results, such as the attainment of rain, a son, or residence in the celestial material planets, that are offered to the followers of the *karma-kāṇḍa* rituals in the *Vedas*, these benefits are offered to attract the minds of ordinary men. When ordinary men see that these material benefits are actually attained by performing Vedic rituals, they become attracted to study the *Vedas*. By studying the *Vedas* they become able to discriminate between what is temporary and what is eternal. In this way they gradually become averse to the temporary things of this world and they come to hanker after Brahman. In this way it may be understood that all the parts of the *Vedas* describe the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Vedic rituals bring material benefits as a result only when the performer of the ritual is filled with material desire. If the performer is materially desireless, then he does not gain a material result, but rather the result he obtains is purification of the heart and the manifestation of spiritual knowledge. Therefore, the meaning of the previously quoted text from *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (4.4.22) is that the demigods are considered to be the various limbs of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and by worshiping them, one actually worships the Supreme Lord, and the result of such worship is that one gradually become pure in heart and awake with spiritual knowledge.

Adhikaraṇa 5 Brahman Is Knowable

1. *Viśaya* (statement): Now, by the use of logic and scriptural quotation, we shall refute the misconception that Brahman cannot be described. One may argue, however, that many scriptural passages support the theory that Brahman cannot be described by words. For example:

*yato vāco nivartate
aprāpya manasā saha*

"The mind cannot understand the Supreme Personality of Godhead and words cannot describe Him."

—*Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.4.1

*yad vacanābhyuditaṁ yena vāg abhyudyate tad eva
brahma tad viddhi nedaṁ yad idam upāsate*

"No one has the power to describe Brahman with words, even though everyone's speech occurs by the power granted by Brahman. Know that this Brahman is not material. Worship this Brahman."

—Kena Upaniṣad (1.5)

2. *Samśaya* (doubt): Is Brahman expressible by words or not?

3. *Pūrvapakṣa* (the opponenet argues): The *śruti-śāstra* states that Brahman cannot be described by words. If this were not so, it would not be said that the Supreme Brahman is self-manifested. That Brahman cannot be described with words is also explained in the following statement of {*Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (3.6.40):

*yato 'prāpya nyavartanta
vacaś ca manasā saha
ahaṁ cānya ime devās
tasmai bhagavate namaḥ*

"Words, mind and ego, with their respective controlling demigods, have failed to achieve success in knowing the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Therefore, we simply have to offer our respectful obeisances unto Him as a matter of sanity."*

4. Śrīla Vyāsadeva refutes these arguments in the following *sūtra*:

Sūtra 5

īkṣateḥ nāśabdāṁ

īkṣateḥ—because it is seen; *na*—not; *aśabdāṁ*—indescribable by words.

Because it is seen (that Brahman is vividly described in the Vedic scriptures, it should be understood that Brahman) is not indescribable by words.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here the word *aśabdāṁ* means "that which cannot be described by words." In this *sūtra* Brahman is described as not (*na*) indescribable by words (*aśabdāṁ*). Why is this so? Because *īkṣateḥ* (because it is seen that Brahman is described in the passages of the scriptures).

For example, *Bṛhad-āranyaka Upaniṣad* states:

taṁ tv aupaṇiṣadaṁ puruṣaṁ pṛcchāmi

"I shall now ask about the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is described in the *Upaniṣads*."

We may note in this connection that the word *aupaniṣada* means "that glorious person who is described in the *Upaniṣads*."

We may also note that the word *īkṣateḥ* is *bhava* (passive), and it is formed by adding the affix *tip-pratyaya*. The unusual usage here is *ārṣa* (a certain degree of grammatical liberty allowed to an exalted author).

That the Supreme Personality of Godhead may be described in words is also confirmed by the following statement of *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* (2.15):

sarve vedā yat-padam āmananti

"All the *Vedas* describe the feet of the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

When it is said that Brahman cannot be described in words, the intention is that He cannot be completely described in words. In the same way it is sometimes said that no one can see Mount Meru because no one can see the entire mountain, but only small parts of it at any one time. Without accepting this understanding, that Brahman is not completely expressible by words or understandable by the mind, we would not properly understand the meaning of the scriptural statements *yato vāco nivartate* (words cannot describe Brahman), *aprāpya manasā saha* (the mind cannot understand Brahman), and *yad vacanābhyuditam* (No one has the power to describe Brahman with words). These statements explain that Brahman cannot be completely described in words.

That Brahman can to some extent be described with words does not contradict the fact that Brahman reveals Himself by His own wish. The *Vedas* are actually the incarnation of Brahman, and therefore Brahman may reveal Himself in the words of the *Vedas*.

2. *Samśaya* (doubt): This may be so, but still the Supreme Person described in the words of the *Vedas* may be *saguṇa* (a manifestation of the Lord according to the modes of material nature), and not the perfect, complete and pure original Brahman who remains indescribable by words.

If this doubt were to arise, Śrīla Vyāsadeva would answer it in the following *sūtra*.

Sūtra 6

gauṇaś cen nātma-śabdāt

gauṇaḥ—*Saguṇa Brahman, or the Lord's potencies; cet*—if; *na*—not; *ātma*—*ātma*; *śabdāt*—because of the word.

If (one says that the Brahman described in the Vedas is) *Saguṇa* Brahman (a manifestation of the modes of material nature, and not the original Supreme Lord Himself), Then I say this cannot be true, because Brahman is described in the Vedas as "Atma" (the Supreme Self).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Brahman described in the *Vedas* is not merely a *saguṇa* manifestation of the mode of Goodness. Why? Because the *Vedas* use the word *ātmā* (the Supreme Self) to describe Him. For example:

ātmaivedam agra āsīt puruṣa-vidhaḥ

"The Supreme Self (*ātmā*), who is a transcendental person, existed before this material world was manifested in the beginning."

—*Vājasaneyā-saṁhitā*

*ātmā vā idam eka evāgra āsīt nānyat kiṅcana
miṣāt sa īkṣata lokān nu sṛja*

"Before the material world was manifest, the Supreme Self (*ātmā*) alone existed. Nothing else was manifested at that time. The Supreme Self then thought, 'Let me create the material planets.'"

—*Aitareya Āraṇyaka*

Both these texts clearly refer to the Supreme Self (*ātmā*) who existed before the creation of the material world. Also, In the commentary on *sūtra* 1.1.2, I have already explained that the word *ātmā* primarily refers to the perfect Supreme Brahman, and not to anyone or anything else. For this reason the word *ātmā* used in the scriptures should be understood to refer to the transcendental Supreme Personality of Godhead, and not to any material manifestation of the mode of goodness. The transcendental Supreme Person is described in the following statements of Vedic literature:

*vadanti tat tattva-vidas
tattvaṁ yaj jñānam advayam
brahmeti pāramātmēti
bhagavān iti śabdyate*

"Learned transcendentalist who know the Absolute Truth call this non-dual substance Brahman, Paramātmā or Bhagavān."*

'Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 1.2.11

*śuddhe mahā-vibhūtākhye
pare brahmaṇi śabdyate
maitreya bhagavac-chabdaḥ
sarva-kāraṇa-kāraṇe*

"O Maitreya, the word Bhagavān refers to the Supreme Brahman, who is full of all powers and opulences, the original cause of all causes, and the supreme transcendence, pure and always untouched by matter."

—Viṣṇu Purāṇa

In this way the supremely perfect and pure Brahman is described by the statements of the *smṛti-śāstras*. If it were not possible to describe Him with words, then the scriptures would not have been able to describe Him in the above quotations.

Sūtra 7

tan niṣṭhasya mokṣopadeśāt

tat—that; niṣṭhasya—of the faithful devotee; mokṣa—of the liberation; upadeśāt—because of the instructions.

(The Brahman described in the scriptures is the transcendental Supreme Lord, and not a temporary manifestation of the mode of goodness, because the scriptures) teach us that they who become His devotees attain liberation.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "not" is understood in this *sūtra* and the following three *sūtras* as well. The liberation of those devoted to Brahman is described in the following statement of *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (2.7):

asad vā idam agra āsīt tato vai sad ajāyata tad ātmānaṁ svayam akuruta. . . yadā hy evaiṣa etasminn adṛśye anātmnye anirukte 'nilayane abhayaṁ pratiṣṭhaṁ vindate 'tha so 'bhayaṁ gato bhavati yadā hy evaiṣa etasminn udāram antaram kurute atha tasya bhayaṁ bhavati

"Before the material cosmos was manifested, it existed in a subtle form. At a certain time it became manifested in a gross form, and at a certain time the Supreme Brahman manifested as the Universal Form. When an individual spirit soul takes shelter of that Supreme Brahman, who is different from the individual spirit souls, invisible to the gross material senses, indescribable by material words, and self-effulgent, then the individual spirit soul attains liberation and is no longer afraid of the cycle of repeated birth and death. If one does not take shelter of this Supreme Brahman, he must remain afraid of taking birth again and again in this world."

The Brahman described in this passage of the Vedic literature must be the Supreme Brahman who is beyond the limitations of the material world, and who is the creator of the material universes, and yet beyond them. This passage could not be interpreted to describe a Brahman that is actually a manifestation of the modes of material nature, for if this were so, then it would not have explained that they who become devoted to this Brahman attain ultimate liberation. They who are devoted to the manifestations of the modes of nature do not attain liberation by that material devotion. Therefore, because the devotees attain liberation, the Brahman mentioned here must be the transcendental Supreme Person, who is beyond the modes of nature, and completely non-material in nature.

This non-material, transcendental Supreme Brahman is described in the following statement of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (10.88.5):

*harir hi nirguṇaḥ sākṣāt
puruṣaḥ prakṛteḥ paraḥ
sa sarva-dṛg upadraṣṭā
taṁ bhajan nirguṇo bhavet*

"Śrī Hari, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, is situated beyond the range of material nature; therefore He is the supreme transcendental person. He can see everything inside and outside; therefore He is the supreme overseer of all living entities. If someone takes shelter at His lotus feet and worships Him, he also attains a transcendental position."*

Sūtra 8

heyatva-vacanāc ca

heyatva—worthy of being abandoned; vacanāt—because of the statement; ca—also.

(The Brahman described in the Vedic scriptures is not a manifestation of the modes of material nature,) because no scriptural passage advises one to abandon (Brahman in order to attain something higher).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

If the Brahman described in the scriptures were enmeshed in the modes of material nature, then why do the scriptures not direct men and women to abandon the worship of Brahman and worship something higher? If this Brahman were under the spell of the modes of nature, then why do those aspiring after liberation worship this Brahman to become free from the grip of the modes of nature? Clearly, the Brahman described in the scriptures is not entangled in the modes of material nature, and for this reason the scripture state:

anyā vāco vimuñcātha

"Give up talking about things that have no relation to the Supreme Brahman!"

They who aspire for liberation should meditate with pure faith on this Supreme Brahman, who is eternal, filled with all transcendental qualities, and the original creator of the material universes. In this way it may be understood that the Brahman described in the Vedic scriptures is not a product of the modes of material nature.

Sūtra 9

svāpyāt

sva—into Himself; apyāt—because He merges.

(The Supreme Brahman described in the Vedic literatures is not bound by the modes of nature,) because He merges into Himself, (unlike the creatures bound by nature's modes, who all merge into something other than their self).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (5.1.1) explains:

*om pūrṇam adaḥ pūrṇam idaṁ
pūrṇāt pūrṇam udacyate
pūrṇasya pūrṇam ādāya
pūrṇam evāvaśiṣyate*

"The Personality of Godhead is perfect and complete, and because He is completely perfect, all emanations from Him, such as this phenomenal world, are perfectly equipped as complete wholes. Whatever is produced of the complete whole is also complete in itself. Because He is the complete whole, even though so many complete units emanate from Him, He remains the complete balance."*

This verse explains that that which is *pūrṇa* (perfect and complete), enters into itself. This cannot be said of that which is not perfect and complete. If the Supreme Brahman described in the scriptures were a product of the modes of material nature, then it would merge into the Supreme and not into itself. In this way it could not be described as truly perfect and complete. In this verse the word *adaḥ* (this) refers to the *aprakāṭa* (not manifested in the material world) form of the Supreme Lord, which is the root from which the various *prakāṭa* forms of the Lord emanate. Both *aprakāṭa* and *prakāṭa* forms of the Lord are perfect and complete. The Lord expands from His *aprakāṭa* form and appears in the material world in His *prakāṭa* form, displaying His *rāsa-līlā* and other transcendental pastimes. When the *prakāṭa* form of the Lord leaves the material world and enters the *aprakāṭa* form of the Lord, the Lord remains unchanged, eternally perfect and complete. That the Lord is untouched by the modes of material nature, and that He expands into many forms, are confirmed by the following statement of *smṛti-śāstra*:

*sa devo bahudhā bhūtvā
nirguṇaḥ puruṣottamaḥ
ekī-bhūya punaḥ śete
nirdoṣo harir ādi-kṛt*

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is faultless. Even though He is the original creator of the material world, He remains always untouched by matter. He expands in innumerable *viṣṇu-tattva* incarnations, and then these incarnations enter Him and He again becomes one."

At this point someone may raise the following objection: There are actually two

kinds of Brahman: Saguṇa Brahman (Brahman enmeshed in the modes of material nature), and Nirguṇa Brahman (Brahman untouched by the modes of material nature). The first, or Saguṇa Brahman, has a form constructed of the mode of material goodness. This Saguṇa Brahman is the omniscient, all-powerful creator of the material universes. The second, or Nirguṇa Brahman, is pure transcendental existence only. This Nirguṇa Brahman is pure, perfect, and complete. The Saguṇa Brahman is the *śakti* (potency) described by the *Vedas*, and the Nirguṇa Brahman is the *tātparya* (meaning) of the *Vedas*.

Śrīla Vyāsadeva refutes this argument by explaining, in the next *sūtra*:

Sūtra 10

gati-samanyāt

gati—the conception; samanyāt—because of uniformity.

(This is not so) because the *Vedas* describe only one kind of Brahman.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this *sūtra* the word *gati* means "conception." The Vedic literatures describe Brahman as full of transcendental knowledge, omniscient, omnipotent, perfect, complete, pure, the all-pervading Supersoul, the original creator of the material universes, the object of worship for the saintly devotees, and the bestower of liberation. The *Vedas* do not describe two kinds of Brahman: Nirguṇa and Saguṇa. Rather, the *Vedas* describe only one kind of Brahman. This one Brahman is described by Lord Kṛṣṇa in the following words (*Bhagavad-gītā* 7.7):

*mattaḥ parataram nānyat
kiñcid asti dhanañjaya
mayi sarvam idaṁ protaṁ
sūtre maṇi-gaṇā iva*

"O conqueror of wealth, there is not truth superior to Me. Everything rests upon me as pearls strung on a thread."*

Thus the Vedic literatures describe only one kind of Brahman: Nirguṇa Brahman. Śrīla Vyāsadeva describes this Nirguṇa Brahman in the next *sūtra*:

Sūtra 11

śrutatvāc ca

śrutavāt—because of being described in the Vedas; ca—and.

(There is only one kind of Brahman: Nirguṇa Brahman), because Nirguṇa Brahman is described throughout the Vedic literatures.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Nirguṇa Brahman is described in the following statement of *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (6.11):

*eko devaḥ sarva-bhūteṣu gūḍhaḥ
sarva-vyāpī sarva-bhūtāntarātmā
karmādhyakṣaḥ sarva-bhūtādhivāsaḥ
sākṣī cetā kevalo nirguṇas ca*

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead manifests Himself as the all-pervading Supersoul, the witness present in the hearts of all living entities. He witnesses all activities of the living entity. He is the supreme living force. He is transcendental to all material qualities."

In this way Nirguṇa Brahman is described in the *śruti-śāstra*. The *śruti-śāstra* does not say that it is impossible to describe Brahman. Some say that Brahman may be understood not from the direct statements of the Vedic literatures, but merely indirectly, or from hints found in the Vedic texts. This is not the correct understanding, for if the Vedic scriptures had no power to directly describe Brahman, then naturally they would also not have any power to indirectly describe Him or hint about Him. The Vedic literatures may say that Brahman has no contact with *guṇas* (either qualities, or the three modes of material nature), and He cannot be seen by material eyes (*adr̥śya*), still it does not say that the words of the *Vedas* have no power to describe Him.

At this point someone may raise the following objection: Is it not said in the *Vedas* that Brahman has no *guṇas* (qualities)? Your statement that Brahman has qualities contradicts the description of the scriptures.

To this I reply: This is not true. You can only say this because you do not

understand the confidential meaning of the word *nirguṇa*. Because the Supreme Brahman is all-knowing and possess many transcendental qualities, when the scriptures say that He is *nirguṇa*, it should be understood to mean that He has no (niḥ) contact with the three modes of material nature (*guṇa*).

This is confirmed by the following statements of *smṛti-śāstra*:

sattvādayo na śāntiṣe
yatra cāprakṛtā guṇāḥ

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead, who possesses numberless transcendental qualities, is eternally free from the touch of the three modes of material nature: goodness, passion, and ignorance."

samasta-kalyāṇa-guṇātmako 'sau

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead possesses all auspicious qualities."

For all these reasons it should be accepted that the Vedic literatures have the power to describe the perfect, pure, complete Supreme Brahman. When it is said by the scriptures that the Supreme Brahman has no names, forms, or qualities it should be understood that the Supreme Brahman has no material names, forms, or qualities, and that His names, forms and qualities are limitless and beyond the counting of limited spirit souls.

At this point someone may object, saying that the literal interpretation of the Vedic statements is that Brahman is without qualities (*nirguṇa*), and your interpretation of the word *nirguṇa* is wrong.

To this objection I reply: Does this description that Brahman has no qualities help to positively understand Brahman? If you say yes, then you have to admit that the *Vedas* do have the power to describe Brahman; and if you say no, then you have to admit that your careful studies of the Vedic literature have been a great waste of time, and as a result you remain wholly ignorant of Brahman's real nature.

Adhikaraṇa 6

The Supreme Brahman is Full of Bliss

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

śabdā vācakatām yānti

*yantrānandamayādayaḥ
vibhum ānanda-vijñānam
taṁ śuddham śraddadhīmaḥ*

Let us place our faith in the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is supremely pure, all-powerful, all-knowing, and full of transcendental bliss. He is perfectly described in the *ānandamaya-sūtra* and the other statements of *Vedānta-sūtra*.

From the 12th Sūtra (*ānandamaya*) to the end of this First Chapter, Śrīla Vyāsadeva will prove that the statements of the Vedic literatures are intended to describe Brahman. In the First Pada, Śrīla Vyāsadeva discusses those words of the Vedic literatures, which, taken by themselves, would not necessarily refer to Brahman, but which, in their Vedic context, certainly do refer to Brahman.

1. *Viśaya* (Statement): In the passages from *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* beginning *brahma-vid āpnoti param* and *sa vā eṣa puruṣo 'nna-rasamayāḥ*, we find a description of the *annamaya*, *prāṇamaya*, *manomaya*, and *vijñānamaya* stages of existence, and after that we find the following statement:

tasmād vā etasmād vijñānamayād anyo 'ntarātmānandamayas tenaiṣa pūrṇaḥ. sa vā eṣa puruṣa-vidha eva tasya puruṣa-vidhatām anvayaṁ puruṣa-vidhaḥ. tasya priyam eva śiraḥ. modo dakṣiṇaḥ pakṣaḥ. pramoda uttaraḥ pakṣaḥ. ānanda ātmā. brahma-pucchaṁ pratiṣṭhā.

"Higher than the *vijñānamaya* stage is the *ānandamaya* stage of existence. The *ānandamaya* stage is a person whose head is pleasure (*priya*), whose right side is joy (*moda*), whose left side is delight (*pramoda*), and whose identity is bliss (*ānanda*). The *ānandamaya* is Brahman."

2. *Samśaya* (doubt): Is the *ānandamaya* person the individual spirit soul or the Supreme Brahman?

3. *Pūrvapakṣa* (the opposition speaks): Because *ānandamaya* is described as a person it must refer to the conditioned spirit soul residing in a material body.

4. *Siddhānta* (the proper conclusion): Śrīla Vyāsadeva answers this argument by speaking the following *sūtra*:

Sūtra 12

ānandamayo 'bhyāsāt

ānanda—bliss; mayah—full of ; abhyāsāt—because of repetition.

The word *ānandamaya* (full of bliss) used in the Vedic literatures must refer to the Supreme Brahman, for it is repeatedly used to describe Him.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Supreme Brahman is the *ānandamaya* described in Vedic literature. Why do we say so? Because the word *ānandamaya* is repeatedly used to describe the Supreme Brahman. Directly following the description of *ānandamaya* in the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (2.6.1), we find the following statement:

*asann eva sambhavati
asad brahmeti veda cet
asti brahmeti ced veda
santam enam tato viduḥ*

"One who thinks, 'The Supreme Brahman does not exist' becomes a demonic atheist, and one who thinks, 'The Supreme Brahman does exist' is known as a saint."

In this passage the word Brahman was repeated. This repetition is called *abhyāsa*. In the previous quotation from *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, the word Brahman appeared in the word *brahma-puc̣ham*, but in that case the word only occurred once, and therefore there was no *abhyāsa*.

The four verses of *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* beginning with the verse *annād vai prajāḥ prajāyante* describe the *annamaya*, *prāṇamaya*, *manomaya*, and *vijñānamaya* levels of existence. Each of these levels is progressively higher than the preceding one, and after them the *ānandamaya* level, which is different in quality, is the highest of all. This will be more elaborately explained in the passage following the *sūtra*: *priya-śiras tv ādya-prāpter* (3.3.13) of this book.

At this point someone may raise the following objection: These stages of existence describe the conditioned souls who have fallen into the raging river of material suffering. Why has the stage of blissfulness (*ānandamaya*) been made the chief of these stages of suffering?"

To this objection I reply: There is no fault in this. The all-blissful Personality of Godhead is present in the hearts of all the suffering conditioned souls, and therefore it is perfectly appropriate to mention them together.

The Vedic literatures speak in this way to make a difficult subject-matter intelligible for the unlettered common man. Just as one may point out the small, difficult-to-see star Arundhati by first pointing to a nearby large easy-to-see star, and then lead the viewer from that reference-point to the tiny Arundhati, in the same way the Vedic literatures first describe the suffering-filled life of the conditioned souls, and then from that reference point teach about the all-blissful

Supreme Personality of Godhead.

At this point someone may raise the following question: Is it, then, that the Vedic literatures mostly describe topics other than the Supreme Brahman, (because mostly they describe these "reference-points" to lead the reader to the Supreme), or do they mostly describe Brahman directly?"

I answer this question: Brahman is directly described in the Vedic literatures. For example, in the next chapter of *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, Varuṇa, upon being asked by his son to teach him about Brahman, explained to him that Brahman is the original creator, maintainer, and destroyer of the material universes. He further explains that the *annamaya*, *prāṇamaya*, *manomaya*, and *vijñānamaya* stages of existence, one by one, are all Brahman. Then he explained that the *ānandamaya* stage is the final Brahman. After explaining this, Varuṇa concluded his teaching by confirming that he has spoken a true description of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. He said:

*etam ānandamayam ātmānam upasaṅkramya imān lokān kāmāni kāma-rūpy
anusaṅcarann etat sama gāyann āste*

"After leaving his material body, one who understands the supreme *ānandamaya* person leaves this material world and enters the spiritual world. All his desires become fulfilled, he attains a spiritual form according to his own wish, and he dedicates himself to glorifying that supreme *ānandamaya* person."

That the *ānandamaya* person in the Vedic literatures is actually the Supreme Brahman is also described in the following statement of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (10.87.17):

*puruṣa-vidho 'nvayo 'tra caramo 'nnamyādiṣu yaḥ
sad asataḥ param tvam atha yad eṣv avaśeṣāmṛtam*

"O Lord, of these persons beginning with the *annamaya-puruṣa*, You are the Supreme."

We may note in this connection that it is not contradictory or illogical to say that the Supreme Brahman has a form. The form of the Supreme is described in the Vedic literatures. For example, the *Bṛhad-āranyaka Upaniṣad* (3.7.3) explains:

pṛthivī śarīram

"The material universe is the body of the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

It is because the Supreme Personality of Godhead has a form (*śarīra*), that this

book, the *Vedānta-sūtra*, is also called *Śārīraka-sūtra* (*sūtras* glorifying the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who has a form). Some may say that the word *ānandamaya* does not refer to the Supreme Brahman, and that only the word *brahma-puccham* refers to Brahman. This proposal is not very intelligent. Some others may say that the word *ānandamaya* does not refer to Brahman because the word *maya* means "transformation". These persons say the word *ānandamaya* (transformation of bliss) cannot refer to the Supreme Brahman, for Brahman is naturally full of bliss, and not a transformation of some pre-existing state of happiness. For this reason the word *ānandamaya* must refer to the individual spirit soul, and not Brahman. In order to refute this argument, Śrīla Vyāsadeva speaks the following *sūtra*:

Sūtra 13

vikāra-śabdān neti cen na pracuryāt

vikāra—transformation; śabdāt—from the word; na—not; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; pracuryāt—because of abundance.

If (someone argues that the Supreme Brahman cannot be the same as the *ānandamaya* person described in the Vedas) because the affix *maya* means "transformation", (and the Supreme Brahman is not a transformation of *ānanda*, or bliss, then I reply by saying that) because the affix *maya* used here means "abundance", this interpretation is not correct, (and therefore the word *ānandamaya* should be understood to mean "He who is filled with limitless bliss").

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word *ānandamaya* does not mean "he who is a transformation of bliss." Why? Because the affix *maya* here means "abundance", and therefore the word *ānandamaya* means "He who is filled with limitless bliss." The rules of Sanskrit grammar state that the affix *maya* may not be used to mean "transformation" in *vaidika* words of more than two syllables. The word *ānanda* has three syllables, and therefore when the word *ānandamaya* appears in the *vaidika* text of the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, it cannot be interpreted to mean "he who is a transformation of bliss."

The Supreme Brahman, therefore, is not only free from all suffering, but filled with limitless bliss. This is confirmed by the following statements of Vedic scripture:

eṣa sarva-bhūtāntarātmāpahata-pāpmā divyo deva eko nārāyaṇaḥ

"There is one Supreme Personality of Godhead: Lord Nārāyaṇa. He is the transcendental Supersoul in the hearts of all living entities, and He is completely free from all sin."

—*Subala Upaniṣad*

*parāḥ parāṇām sakalā na yatra
kleśādayaḥ sānti parāvareśaḥ*

"Suffering is not experienced by the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

When the affix *maya* means "abundance", it also implies the meaning "essential nature." Therefore, when we use *jyotirmaya* (full of light) to mean the sun, the affix *maya* can also be understood to mean "essential nature". In this way the word *jyotirmaya* means "that of which the essential nature is light." In this way the word *ānandamaya* may also be interpreted to mean "He whose essential nature is full of bliss." From all this it may be understood that the word *ānandamaya* clearly refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. It does not refer to the individual spirit soul.

Sūtra 14

tad-hetu-vyapadeśāc ca

tat—of that; hetu—the origin; vypadeśāt—because of the statement; ca—also.

Because the Vedic literatures declare that the *ānandamaya* person is the source of bliss for others, (it should be understood that the *ānandamaya* person is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and not the individual spirit soul).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This is confirmed by the following statement of *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (2.7):

ko hy evānyat kaḥ prāṇyāt yady eṣa ākāśa ānando na syāt. esa evānandayati.

"Who is that person, without whom the living entities cannot feel happiness? That is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who delights the individual spirit souls."

This passage explains that the Supreme Brahman is the origin of happiness for the individual spirit souls. From this we may understand that the cause of happiness (the Supreme Personality of Godhead), and the receiver of happiness (the individual spirit soul) must be different persons. They cannot be identical. Therefore the word *ānandamaya* refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead only. We may also note that the word *ānanda* used in this passage of *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (is identical with the word *ānandamaya*..

Sūtra 15

mantra-varṇikam eva ca gīyate

mantra—by the mantra portion of the Vedas; *varṇikam*—described; *eva*—certainly; *ca*—also; *gīyate*—is described.

(The same Supreme Personality of Godhead) described in the mantra-portion of the Vedas is also described (as the *ānandamaya*-person in the text of the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*).

Purport by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The same Supreme Brahman described in the Vedic *mantra*, *Satyam jñānam anantam brahma* (the Supreme Brahman has no limits. He is eternal and full of knowledge), is also described in the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* by the word *ānandamaya*. In this way the above *sūtra* explains that the word *ānandamaya* does not refer to the individual living entity. Further, the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* explains:

brahma-vid āpnoti param

"One who understands the Supreme Brahman attains the Supreme Brahman."

This sentence explains that the individual living entity worships the Supreme Brahman and then attains the association of that Supreme Brahman. This is the same Supreme Brahman previously described in the *mantra*, *satyam jñānam anantam brahma*. This is the Supreme Brahman described by the word

ānandamaya. This is the Supreme Brahman described in the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* in the passage beginning with the words *tasmād vā etasmāt*. Because the Supreme Brahman is the object of attainment for the individual spirit soul, and because the object of attainment and the attainer must be two distinct entities, and they cannot be identical, therefore the Supreme Brahman and the individual living entities must be distinct persons, and therefore the word *ānandamaya* refers only to the Supreme Personality of Godhead and not to the individual living entities.

At this point someone may raise the following objection: If the Supreme Brahman described in the Vedic *mantras* were different from the individual living entity, then the individual living entities could not be the *ānandamaya* person described in the scriptures. The actual fact is that the Supreme Brahman and the individual living entities are identical. The Vedic *mantras* state that when the individual spirit soul is free from ignorance and liberated from material bondage, then he become identical with the Supreme Brahman.

To answer this objection, Śrīla Vyāsadeva speaks the following *sūtra*.

Sūtra 16

netaro 'nupapatteḥ

na—not; itaraḥ—the other; upapatteḥ—because it is illogical.

The other person (individual living entity) is not described (in the mantra "satyam jñānam anantam brahma"), because such an interpretation of the mantra is illogical.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The *itara* (other person) mentioned in this *sūtra* is the individual living entity. This *sūtra*, therefore, states that the individual spirit soul, even in the liberated condition, cannot be the Supreme Person described in the *mantra*, satyam jñānam anantam brahma. This is confirmed by the following statement of Vedic literature:

so 'śnute sarvān kāmān saha brahmaṇā vipaścitā

"The liberated soul enjoys the fulfillment of all his desires in the company of the omniscient Supreme Brahman."

In this passage the difference between the liberated spirit-soul and the Supreme Brahman is described in the words "He enjoys in the company of the Supreme Brahman." The word *vipascit* means "He whose consciousness (*cit*) sees (*paśyati*) the great variety of that which exists (*vividham*). The word *paśya* is changed to *paś* in this word by the grammatical formula *ṛśodarādi-gaṇa* (Pāṇini 6.3.109). In this way the liberated individual soul attains the association of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is expert at enjoying many varieties of transcendental bliss, and with Him, the individual spirit soul enjoys, fulfilling all his desires.

The word *asnute* should be understood to mean "enjoys" in this context. The verb *aś* means "to enjoy", and although we would expect it to be conjugated in the *parasmaipada*, (*aśnāti*), in this passage it is conjugated in the *ātmanepada* (*aśnute*). The reason for this is explained by Pāṇini in the *sūtra vyatyayo bahulam iti chandasi tathā smṛteḥ* (3.1.85).

The Supreme Personality of Godhead is naturally the Supreme Enjoyer, and the individual spirit soul is His subordinate in the matter of enjoyment also. Still, the Supreme Personality of Godhead glorifies the liberated souls, when He says:

*vaśe kurvanti mām bhaktāḥ
sat-striyaḥ sat-patim yathā*

"My pure devotees bring Me under their control, just as faithful wives bring a kind-hearted husband under their control."

Sūtra 17

bheda-vyapadeśāc ca

bheda—difference; vyapadeśāt—because of the statement; ca—also.

(The Supreme Personality of Godhead and the individual spirit soul are) different, because the Vedic literature teaches this fact.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (7.1) explains:

raso vai saḥ rasam hy evāyam labdhvānandī bhavati.

"When one understands the Personality of God, the reservoir of pleasure, Kṛṣṇa, he actually becomes transcendently blissful."*

This passage clearly shows the difference between the liberated individual spirit soul and the Supreme Personality of Godhead, whom the Vedic *mantras* describe as *ānandamaya*, and who is the transcendental nectar attained by the individual spirit soul. This difference is also described in the following statement of *Bṛhad-āranyaka Upaniṣad* (4.4.6):

brahmaiva san brahmāpnoti

"After becoming Brahman, the individual spirit soul attains Brahman."

This statement does not mean that after liberation the individual spirit soul becomes non-different from the Supreme Brahman, but rather the liberated soul becomes similar to Brahman and in this condition meets Brahman and attains His association. This is confirmed by the following statement of *Māṇḍukya Upaniṣad* (3.1.31):

nirañjanaḥ paramam sāmīyam upaiti

"This liberated soul becomes like the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

Also, in the *Bhagavad-gīta* (14.2), the Supreme Personality of Godhead declares:

*idaṁ jñānam upāśrītya
mama sādharṁyam āgatāḥ*

"By becoming fixed in this knowledge, one can attain to the transcendental nature, which is like My own nature."*

In this way the Vedic literatures teach us that the liberated souls become like the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

At this point someone may raise the following objection: Is it not so that the *pradhāna* feature of the mode of material goodness (*sattva-guṇa*) is the actual origin of the *ānandamaya* person?

Śrīla Vyāsadeva answers this objection in the following *sūtra*.

kāmāc ca nānumānāpekṣā

kāmāt—because of desire; ca—also; na—not; anumāna—to the theory; apekṣā—in relation.

(The ānandamaya person) cannot be (a product of the mode of material goodness), because (the mode of goodness is insentient and desireless, whereas the ānandamaya person) is filled with desires.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* explains:

so 'kāmayata bahu syām prajāyeya

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead desired: Let Me become many. Let Me father many living entities."

In this way the *śruti-śāstra* explains that the universe was created by the desire of the ānandamaya person. Because the ānandamaya person is thus filled with desires, it is not possible for the *pradhāna* mode of material goodness, which is lifeless, insentient, and desireless, to be that ānandamaya person.

Sūtra 19

asminn asya ca tad-yogam śāsti

asmin—in that ānandamaya person; asya—of the individual spirit soul; ca—also; tat—of fearlessness; yogam—contact; śāsti—the Vedic scriptures teach.

(The ānandamaya person cannot be manifested from the *pradhāna* mode of material goodness, because) the Vedic scriptures teach that contact with the ānandamaya person brings fearlessness (to the individual spirit soul).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The *śruti-sāstra* teaches that by taking shelter of the *ānandamaya* person, the individual spirit soul attains fearlessness, and by declining to take shelter of Him, the soul becomes plagued with fears. This confirmed by the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (2.7.2) in the passage beginning with the words *yadā hy eva*.

On the other hand, contact with the material nature brings fear to the individual spirit souls. The material nature does not bring a condition of fearlessness to the living entities, and for this reason it is not possible that the *pradhāna* mode of material goodness is the *ānandamaya* person. Therefore, the *ānandamaya* person is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Hari. The *ānandamaya* person is not the individual spirit soul or the material nature.

Adhikaraṇa 7

The Nature of the Person Within

1. *Viśaya* (Statement): The Chāndogya Upaniṣad explains:

atha yā so 'ntar ādityo hiraṇmayah puruṣo dṛśyate hiraṇya-śmaśrur hiraṇya-keśa aprāṇakhāt sarva eva suvarṇas tasya yathā kapyasaṁ puṇḍarīkam evam akṣiṇi tasyodeti nāma sa eṣa sarvebhyaḥ pāpmābhyah udita udeti hā vai sarvebhyah pāpmābhyo ya evaṁ veda tasya ṛk sāma ca gesnau tasmād udīgithas tasmāt tv evodgataitasya hi gāthā sa eṣa ye cāmuṣmat paraṅco lokas teṣāṁ ceṣṭe deva-kāmānām cety adhidaivatam. . . athādhyātmam atha ya eṣo 'ntar-akṣiṇi puruṣo dṛśyate saiva ṛk tat sāma tad ukthaṁ tad yajus tad brahma tasyaitasya tad eva rūpaṁ yad amuṣya rūpam. yāv amuṣya gesnau tau gesnau yan nāma tan nāma.

"Within the sun-globe is a golden person, with golden hair, a golden beard, and a body golden from His fingernails to all His limbs. His eyes are like lotus flowers. He is above all sin. One who understands Him also becomes situated above all sin. The *Ṛg* and *Sāma Vedas* sing His glories. From Him the highest spiritual planets, where the demigods desire to go, have become manifested. This is the golden person present among the demigods. . . Now I shall describe the person within the human mind and heart. Within the eyes a wonderful person may be seen. The *Ṛg*, *Sāma*, and *Yajur Vedas* glorify Him. He is identical with the golden person who resides in the sun."

2. *Samśaya* (doubt): "Is this an individual spirit soul who by great piety and spiritual knowledge has attained this exalted position, or is this the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who appears as the all-pervading Supersoul?"

3. *Pūrvapakṣa* (the opposing argument): Because this person has a form and various humanlike features, He must be a pious spirit soul. By his piety and

spiritual knowledge he has become able to become the great controller of demigods and human beings, who fulfills their desires, and grants them the results of their actions.

4. *Siddhānta* (Conclusion): Śrīla Vyāsadeva addresses these views in the following *sūtra*.

Sūtra 20

antas tad-dharmopadeśāt

antah—within; tat—of Him; dharma—nature; upadeśāt' because of the instruction.

The person within (the sun and the eye is the Supreme Personality of Godhead), because the Vedic literatures explain that His nature fits the description of the Lord.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The person within the sun and the eye is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is present everywhere as the Supersoul. This person is not the individual spirit soul. Why? Because the Vedic literatures describe Him as being sinless and possessing all the qualities of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. For example, He is free from all sin and all *karma*. The slightest fragrance of *karma* cannot touch Him. This is not possible for the individual spirit souls, who remain subject to the laws of *karma*. In many other ways also the individual spirit soul does not fit the description of this person within the sun and the eye. For example: the individual spirit soul is not the fulfiller of the desires of the living entities, nor is he the awarder of the fruits of action, nor is he the object of the worship of the living entities.

At this point someone may raise the following objection: Because the person within the sun and the eye is described as having a body, therefore He must be an individual spirit soul, for the Supreme Brahman has no body.

To this objection I reply: This is not necessarily so. The *puruṣa-sūkta* prayers (*Rg Veda* 10.90) and many other Vedic verses describe the transcendental body of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The *Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad* also describes the Supreme Lord's transcendental body in the following words:

*vedhāham etaṁ puruṣaṁ mahāntam
āditya-varṇaṁ tamaśaḥ parastāt*

"I know that Supreme Personality of Godhead, whose form is transcendental to all material conceptions of darkness."*

Sūtra 21

bheda-vyapadeśāc cānyaḥ

bheda—difference; vyapadeśāt—because of the statement; ca—also; anyaḥ—another.

The Supreme Personality of Godhead is different from the individual spirit soul because this doctrine is taught in all Vedic literatures.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The golden person within the sun is not the individual spirit soul who is the solar deity and who thinks the sun-planet is his own body, but rather that golden person is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the Supersoul who is present in every atom. This is confirmed by the following statement of the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad*:

*ya āditye tiṣṭhann ādityād antaro yam ādityo
na veda yasyādityaḥ śarīraṁ ya ādityam antaro
yamayatya eṣa ta ātmāntaryāmy amṛtaḥ*

"That person situated within the sun, who is not the sun-god, whom the sun-god does not know, who manifests the sun-planet as His own body, who controls the sun-planet from within, that person is the immortal Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is present within the heart of every living entity as the Supersoul."

From this description we may understand that the golden person within the sun is not the individual spirit soul who is the sun-god, but the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Both this passage and the previous quoted passage from the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* agree on this point.

Adhikaraṇa 8

The Word "Ākāśa" Refers to Brahman

1. *Viṣaya* (Statement): The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* states:

*asya lokasya kā gatir iti ākāśa iti hovāca
sarvāṇi hā vā imāni bhūtāny ākāśād eva
samutpadyante. ākāśam pratyastaṁ yānty ākāśaḥ
parāyanam iti.*

"He asked: What is the ultimate destination of all living entities? He replied: *Ākāśa* is the ultimate destination. All living entities and all material elements have emanated from *ākāśa*, and they will again enter into *ākāśa*."

2. *Samśaya* (doubt): What is the meaning of the word *ākāśa* here? Does it mean the element ether, or does it mean the Supreme Brahman?

3. *Pūrvapakṣa* (the opposing argument): The word *ākāśa* here means "the element ether", because air and the other elements evolve from it. Indeed, ether is the origin of all the other elements.

4. *Siddhānta* (Conclusion): Śrīla Vyāsadeva refutes this argument in the following *sūtra*.

Sūtra 22

ākāśas tal-lingāt

ākāśaḥ—the word ākāśa; tat—of Him; lingāt—because of the qualities.

The word "*ākāśa*" in the Vedic literature refers to the Supreme Brahman, for the description of "*ākāśa*" aptly fits the description of the qualities of Brahman.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word *ākāśa* here refers to Brahman and not the material element ether. Why? Because the *ākāśa* described here has all the characteristics of Brahman. The *ākāśa* described here is the source from which the material elements emanate, the maintainer who sustains them, and the ultimate refuge into which they enter at the time of cosmic annihilation. That is Brahman. The scriptures explain: *sarvāṇi hā vā imāni bhūtāni* (All material elements have emanated from *ākāśa*). Because ether is one of the material elements, it is included in the word *sarvāṇi* (all the elements). It is not the independent origin of the causal chain, but merely one of

the links. For this reason it cannot be the *ākāśa* that is the source of all the elements (including ether). The use of the word *eva* (certainly) in this context reinforces the interpretation that *ākāśa* refers to Brahman because *eva* implies "there is no other cause". For this reason *ākāśa* cannot refer to the material element ether. For example, clay is the origin from which clay pots are produced, and other material substances are the origins of other objects, but all these "origins" are not primal origins, but merely intermediate steps in a great causal chain. By using the word *eva* (the sole cause) the text clearly refers to the primal, uncaused cause, Brahman, and not ether or any other particular intermediate stage in the causal chain. The Vedic literatures describe Brahman as the master of all potencies and the source of all forms, and therefore, because the *ākāśa* is described (*eva*) as the "sole cause", it can refer only to the primal cause Brahman and not the material element ether. Although the word *ākāśa* generally means "ether" in ordinary usage, in this context the secondary meaning "Brahman" is far more appropriate.

Adhikaraṇa 9

The Word "Prāṇa" Refers to Brahman

1. *Viśaya* (Statement): The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* explains:

katama sa devateti. prāṇa iti hovāca. sarvāṇi hā vai imāni bhūtāni prāṇam evābhisamviśanti prāṇam abhyujjīhate.

"They asked: Who is this deity of whom you speak? He replied: It is *prāṇa*. From *prāṇa* all the material elements have emanated, and into *prāṇa* they enter at the end."

2. *Samśaya* (doubt): Does the word *prāṇa* here refer to the breath that travels in and out of the mouth, or does it refer to the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

3. *Pūrvapakṣa* (opposing argument): The ordinary meaning of the word *prāṇa* is "the breath that travels in and out the mouth." That meaning is intended here.

4. *Siddhānta* (Conclusion): Śrīla Vyāsadeva refutes this view by speaking the following *sūtra*.

Sūtra 23

ata eva prāṇaḥ

ataḥ eva—therefore; prāṇaḥ—the word prāṇa.

The word "prāṇa" in the Vedic literatures refers to the Supreme Brahman, for the same reasons expressed in the previous sūtra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word *prāṇa* in this passage from *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and not to the transformations of air. Why? Because this text describes *prāṇa* as the original cause from which the material elements have emanated, and into which they enter at the end. These are the characteristics of the Supreme Brahman, and not the material element air.

Adhikaraṇa 10

The Word "Jyotis" Refers to Brahman

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (3.13.7) states:

*atha yad ataḥ paro divo jyotir dīpyate viśvataḥ pṛṣṭheṣu sarvataḥ pṛṣṭheṣv
anuttameṣūttameṣu lokeṣu idam vāva tad yad idam asminn antaḥ puruṣe jyotiḥ*

"Jyotis shines in the spiritual world, above all the material planets. Jyotis forms the background on which all material universes and all material planets, from lowest to highest, rest. This jyotis is present in the heart of every living being."

2. *Samśaya* (doubt): What is the *jyotis* described here? Is it the light of the sun and other luminous objects, or is it the Supreme Brahman?

3. *Pūrvapakṣa* (the opposing argument): Because there is no mention of Brahman in this passage, the word *jyotis* in this text must refer to the light of the sun and other luminous objects.

4. *Siddhānta* (Conclusion): Śrīla Vyāsadeva replies in the following sūtra.

Sūtra 24

jyotiś-caraṇābhidhānāt

jyotih—of the jyotih; caraṇa—of the feet; abhidhānāt' because of the mention.

Because the "jyotis" in this text is described as having feet, (it must refer to the Supreme Brahman).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word *jyotis* here should be understood to mean "the Supreme Brahman". Why? Because this *jyotis* is described as having feet. The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (3.12.6) states:

etāvan asya mahimato jyāyāms" ca puruṣaḥ. pado 'sya sarva-bhūtāni tri-pad asyāmṛtaṁ divi

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is full of glory and opulence. His one foot is all material elements and all living entities, and His three feet are the eternal spiritual world."

In the previously quoted text of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (3.13.7), as well as in this text from *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (3.12.6), (where Brahman is described as having four feet), the spiritual world is mentioned. Although both texts are separated by a little distance, they are brought together by joint mention of the spiritual world, as well as by use of the relative and co-relative pronouns *yat* and *tat*. For these reasons it should be understood that both texts describe the all-powerful Supreme Personality of Godhead. For these reasons the *jyotis* described in this text is the all-powerful Supreme Personality of Godhead, and not the light of the sun and other luminous objects.

Sūtra 25

chando-'bhidhānān neti cen na tathā ceto 'rpaṇa-nigādāt tathā hi darśanam

chandah—of a meter; abhidhānāt—because of being the description; na—not; tathā—in that way; cetah—the mind; arpaṇa—placing; nigādāt—because of the instruction; tathā hi' furthermore; darśanam—logical.

If someone were to claim: "The word {sy 1682}jyotis" here does not

refer to Brahman, but to the Gāyatrī meter," then I would reply: This is not true. The Gāyatrī meter is taught to assist meditation on Brahman. For this reason it is logical and appropriate to interpret the word *jyotis* to mean "Brahman".

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

At this point someone may raise the following objection: Is it not true that the Vedic literatures state:

gāyatrī vā idam sarvaṁ bhūtam yad idam kiñcit

"Gāyatrī is everything that exists."

tam eva bhūta-vāk-pṛthivī-śarīra-hṛdaya-prabhedaiḥ

"Gāyatrī is everything. Gāyatrī is speech, earth, body, and mind."

caiṣa catuṣ-padā ṣaḍ-vidhā gāyatrī tad etad ṛcābhyuktam

"The Gāyatrī meter, of which there are four feet and six varieties, is extensively employed in the *mantras* of the *Vedas*."

etāvan asya mahimā

"Gāyatrī is glorious."

For these reasons it should be understood that the word *jyotis* in the Vedic literatures refers to the Gāyatrī mantra. Why, without any good reason, do you insist that the word *jyotis* refers to Brahman?

To this objection I reply: Gāyatrī is a meter, and therefore it is not sensible to claim that it is everything, and everything has emanated from it. For this reason it is only reasonable to assume that the word *jyotis* in this context refers to Brahman and not Gāyatrī. Why? Because in this *sūtra* Śrīla Vyāsadeva states: *tathā hi darśanam* (that the word *jyotis* refers to Brahman is only logical and consistent. Any other interpretation is illogical).

The truth is that the Supreme Brahman has incarnated in this world in the form of the Gāyatrī mantra to enable the living entities to meditate on Him. This fact is

confirmed by the statements of Vedic literature. If we accept that Gāyatrī is an incarnation of Brahman, then the scriptural statement "Gāyatrī is everything" is perfectly sensible. Otherwise, the interpretation we concoct is illogical and forced. In this way we have demonstrated that the Gāyatrī mantra is an incarnation of Brahman.

Sūtra 26

bhūtādi-pada-vyapadeśopapatteś caivam

bhūta—the living entities; ādi—beginning with; pada—feet; vyapadeśa—of the statement; upapatteḥ—for the reason; ca—also; evam—in this way.

Because the Vedic literatures state that the living entities, (their speech, bodies, and minds are the four) feet (of Gāyatrī), it should be understood (that Gāyatrī is an incarnation of Brahman).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Gāyatrī should be considered the same as Brahman. Why? Because Gāyatrī is described in the words:

tam eva bhūta-vāk-pṛthivī-śarīra-hṛdaya-bhedaiḥ

"Gāyatrī is everything. The four feet of Gāyatrī are speech, earth, body, and mind."

Without Gāyatrī being an incarnation of Brahman, it is not possible for these four things to be Gāyatrī's feet. For this reason, as previously explained, it is only natural to interpret the word "Gāyatrī" to mean "Brahman". In the two quotations from Vedic literature that have formed the basis of our discussion, the word *dyu* (the spiritual world) has occurred. This appearance of the word *dyu* in both passages further confirms that the ambiguous words in these two passages refer to Brahman, and not to something else.

At this point someone may raise the following objection: The word *dyu* appearing in these two passages refers to different things.

To answer this objection, Śrīla Vyāsadeva speaks the following *sūtra*.

Sūtra 27

upadeśa-bhedān neti cen nobhayasminn apy avirodhāt

upadeśa—of instruction; bhedāt—because of the difference; na—not; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; ubhayasmin—in both places; api—also; avirodhāt—because of non-contradiction.

The objection that because the two scriptural passages employ the word "dyu" in two different cases (locative and ablative), therefore they describe two different objects, which cannot both be Brahman, is not a valid objection. The use of the two different cases does not mean that the two passages must describe two different things.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

At this point someone may raise the following objection: Is it not so that two contradictory descriptions of Brahman are found in the scriptures? In one place the scriptures state:

tri-padasyāmṛtaṁ divi

"The eternal Supreme Personality of Godhead resides in the spiritual world, which constitutes three-quarters of all existence."

In another place the scriptures state:

paro divaḥ

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead resides on top of the spiritual world."

In the first quotation the spiritual world was placed in the locative case. Since this is so, both passages contradict each other, They describe two different objects, one within the spiritual world, and the other above it.

To this objection I reply: Why do you say this? Both passages refer to the same object. The uses of the locative and ablative cases in these quotations does not present a contradiction. for example, in the material world a parrot may be said to be "in" a tree or "on" it. There is no real difference in the two statements. In the

same way the Supreme Personality of Godhead may be said to be "in" the spiritual world or "on" it. There is no real difference.

Adhikaraṇa 11

The Word "Prāṇa" Refers to Brahman

1. Viṣaya (Statement): In the *Kauṣītakī Brāhmaṇa*, Pratardana, the son of Mahārāja Divodasa, was able, by virtue of His chivalry and heroism, to enter the favorite residence of Mahārāja Indra. When Indra granted Pratardana a benediction, and Pratardana requested Indra choose the benediction he was to give, Indra instructed Pratardana in the following words:

prāṇo 'smi prajñātmā taṁ mām āyur-amṛtam upasasva

"I am *prāṇa*. An intelligent person will worship me as the great immortal person."

2. *Samśaya* (doubt): Who is this person named *prāṇa*? Is he an individual spirit soul, or is He the Supreme Personality of Godhead who resides in everyone's heart as the Supersoul?

3. *Pūrvapakṣa* (the opposing argument): The words "indra" and *prāṇa* here refer to a specific individual spirit soul. When pratardana inquired, Indra replied by saying the worship of Indra was the most beneficial activity for the living entities.

4. *Siddhānta* (conclusion): Śrīla Vyāsadeva responds to this argument in the following *sūtra*.

Sūtra 28

prāṇas tathānugamāt

prāṇaḥ—the word prāṇa; tathā—in the same way; anugamāt—because of the context.

The word "prāṇa" (should be understood to refer to Brahman) because of the context of it's use.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The *prāṇa* here must refer to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is present in everyone's heart as the Supersoul. *Prāṇa* here cannot refer to the individual spirit soul. Why? Śrīla Vyāsadeva explains: *tathānugamāt* (because of the context). The *prāṇa* described here is intelligence, the self, and transcendental bliss. He is free from old-age and death. These attributes clearly indicate that the word *prāṇa* here refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

At this point someone may raise the following objection: Is it not true that to interpret the word *prāṇa* here is mean *Brahman* is very inappropriate? Mahārāja Indra is speaking, and he says *prāṇo 'smi* (I am *prāṇa*). The speaker is Mahārāja Indra, and he clearly refers to himself. He then proceeds to further identify himself, saying: *tri-śiṛṣāṇaṁ tvaṣṭram ahanam aruṇmukhān ṛṣīn śalavṛkebhyaḥ prayacchan* (I killed Vṛtrāsura, the three-headed son of Tvaṣṭā, and I gave the Aruṇmukha sages to the śalavṛkas). All this shows that the Indra described here is an individual spirit soul who advises the living entities to worship him. Even though at the end of this passage *prāṇa* is described as *ānanda* (transcendental bliss), this also is not inconsistent, because the transcendental glories of the individual spirit souls are also described in the Vedic literatures. In fact, when Indra says he is *prāṇa* and everyone should worship him, he refers to himself, the individual spirit soul Indra. Indra's statement may be compared to the advice of the Vedic literature: *vācam dhenum upāsīta* (One should worship the goddess of speech just as one worships the cow). Because Mahārāja Indra is the strongest of living entities, and because strength is identified with the living-force (*prāṇa*), he identifies himself with that *prāṇa*. This is perfectly in accord with the statement of Vedic literature: *prāṇo vai balam* (the living-force is strength). In this way it should be understood that the words *prāṇa* and *indra* here refer to a specific individual spirit soul.

Śrīla Vyāsadeva refutes this argument in the next *sūtra*.

Sūtra 29

na vaktur ātmopadeśād iti ced adhyātma-sambandha-bhūma hy asmin

na—not; *vaktuḥ*—of the speaker; *ātma*—of the self; *upadeśāt*—because of the instruction; *iti*—thus; *cet*—if; *adhyātma*—to the Supreme Personality of Godhead; *sambandha'* references; *bhūma*—abundance; *hi*—indeed; *asmin*—in this Upaniṣad.

If it is said that the speaker here refers to himself, I say that is not true. In this passage there are many references to the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this *sūtra* the word *adhyātma-sambandha* means "with reference to the Supreme Personality of Godhead", and the word *bhuma* means "abundance". In this chapter of *Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad* the word *prāṇa* repeatedly appears in various contexts where it must unavoidably be interpreted to mean "the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

For example:

1. When Pratardana asked for the most beneficial gift, or in other words liberation, Indra replied by saying "Worship me as *prāṇa*." In this context *prāṇa* must mean "the Supreme Personality of Godhead", for only He can grant liberation.

2. The *Upaniṣad* explains:

eṣa eva sādhu karma kārayati

"*Prāṇa* bestows upon the living entity the power to act wonderfully."

This must refer to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the supreme controller, and not to the tiny demigod Indra.

3. The *Upaniṣad* also explains:

tad yathā rathasyāreṣu nemir arpitā nābhavara arpita evam evaita bhūta-mātraḥ. prajñā-mātrāsv arpitaḥ. prajñā-mātrāḥ prāṇe 'rpitaḥ.

"Just as in a chariot wheel the rim rests on the spokes, and the spokes on the hub, in the same way the material elements rest on *prajñā* (intelligence), and *prajñā* rests on *prāṇa*."

This quote states that everything sentient and insentient is maintained by *prāṇa*.

4. The *Upaniṣad* also explains:

sa eṣa prāṇa eva prajñātmanando 'jaro 'mṛtaḥ. eṣa lokādhipatir eṣa sarveśvaraḥ

"*Prāṇa* is the Supersoul present in all living entities. *Prāṇa* is the transcendental bliss. *Prāṇa* remains eternally untouched by old-age and death. *Prāṇa* is the master

of all living entities and all planets. *Prāṇa* is the Supreme Controller."

Because *prāṇa* is transcendental bliss and has the various qualities described here, the word *prāṇa* in this context can refer only to the Supreme Brahman, the Personality of Godhead, who is present in the hearts of all living entities as the Supersoul. The word *prāṇa* here cannot possibly refer to anyone else.

At this point someone may raise the following objection: Is it not so that Indra directly describes himself as *prāṇa*. Why does he do this if your interpretation that *prāṇa* means "Supreme Brahman" is correct?

Śrīla Vyāsadeva answers this objection in the following *sūtra*.

Sūtra 30

śāstra-dṛṣṭyā tūpadeśo vāmadevavat

śāstra—of scripture; *dṛṣṭyā*—from the viewpoint; *tu*—but; *upadeśaḥ*—instruction; *vāmadeva*—Vāmadeva; *vat*—like.

Indra speaks in this way (identifying himself with Brahman) in accordance with the teaching of Vedic literature. He does this just as the sage Vāmadeva also did.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word *tu* (but) is used here to remove doubt. Even though Indra was perfectly aware that he was an individual spirit soul and not the Supreme Brahman, he still said, "Worship me, knowing me to be Brahman", and this statement is actually perfectly correct according to the philosophy of Vedic literature. It is not untrue. For example, the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* states:

*na vai vāco na cakṣūmsi na śrotrāṇi na manāmsīty ācakṣate prāṇa ity evācakṣate
prāṇo hy evaitāni sarvāṇi bhavanti*

"The senses are not properly called 'voices', 'eyes', 'ears', and 'minds'. The proper name for them all is *prāṇa*. Everything that exists is *prāṇa*."

Because *prāṇa* maintains their activities, the senses are identified as *prāṇa*. The learned, self-realized speaker, Indra, wishing to teach his humble, well-behaved student, instructed him: "I am that *prāṇa*." This means that Indra is dependent on *prāṇa*, or Brahman, not that he is identical with Brahman in all respects.

The example of Vāmadeva is found in the following passage of *Bṛhad-āranyaka Upaniṣad* (1.4.10):

tad vaitat paśyan nṛṣir vāmadevaḥ pratipade ahaṁ manur abhavaṁ sūryaś ca

"Seeing this, the sage Vāmadeva repeated at every moment: 'I was Manu. I was the sun-god.'"

Here Vāmadeva identifies himself with Manu and the sun-god because the Supreme Brahman is the controller who grants powers to Vāmadeva, Manu, and the sun-god. Because they all obtain their powers from the Supreme Brahman, in one sense, they are all one. The Supreme Brahman is all-pervading. He is, in one sense, one with everything that is pervaded by Him. This confirmed by the following statements of *smṛti-śāstra*:

yo 'yaṁ tavāgato deva-samīpaṁ devatā-gaṇaḥ sa tvam eva jagat-sraṣṭā yataḥ sarva-gato bhavān

"Whoever comes before You, be he a demigod, is created by You, O Supreme Personality of Godhead."*

—*Viṣṇu Purāṇa* 1.9.69

sarvaṁ samāpnoṣi tato 'si sarvaṁ

"You are all-pervading, and thus you are everything."*

—*Bhagavad-gītā* 11.40

In ordinary usage also, when there is a great assembly in a certain place, people call that oneness, because there is unity of place, and also when there is agreement of opinion, that is also called oneness. For example, it is said: "In the evening the scattered cows assemble in one place and thus attain oneness," and "The disputing monarchs finally agreed and became one in their opinion."

At this point someone may raise the following objection: Is it not so that although there are many passages indicating that the word *prāṇa* in this passage refers to Brahman, still there are many other passages that demonstrate that it is not possible for the word *prāṇa* to refer Brahman. Some examples are:

na vācam vijijñāsītā vaktāraṁ vidyāt

"Do not try to understand the meaning of a statement without first

understanding who has spoken it."
—*Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad* (3.8)

tri-śirṣāṇaṃ tvaṣṭram ahanam

"I am the Indra who killed Vṛtrāsura, the three-headed son of Tvaṣṭā."

These two quotations clearly identify that the speaker of the passage in question was the demigod Indra, who is an individual spirit soul.

That the word *prāṇa* refers to the life-force, or breath within the body, is confirmed by the following scriptural statements:

yāvad asmin śarīre prāṇo vasati tāvad āyur atha khalu prāṇa eva prajñātma idaṃ śarīraṃ parigr̥hyotthāpayati

"As long as *prāṇa* remains within it, the body is alive. *Prāṇa* is the conscious spirit soul. *Prāṇa* grasps this material body, and makes it rise up and move about."
—*Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad* (2.2-3)

yo vai prāṇaḥ sa prajñā yā prajñā sa prāṇaḥ. sa hā hy etāv asmin śarīre vasataḥ. sahotkramate.

"*Prāṇa* is the same as *prajñā* (consciousness). *Prajñā* is the same as *prāṇa*. Together they reside in the material body. At the last moment they both leave the body together."
—*Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad*

These quotations clearly show that it is not impossible to interpret the word *prāṇa* in this context to mean "the individual spirit soul" or "living force". The scriptures teach us that both are actually identical, the living force being the active expression of the inactive spirit-soul.

In this way it is valid to interpret the word *prāṇa* in three ways: 1. the individual spirit soul; 2. *the living-force*; and 3. *the Supreme Brahman*. The word *prāṇa* here refers to all three. All three are worshipable for the living entities.

Śrīla Vyāsadeva refutes this argument in the following *sūtra*.

jīva-mukhya-prāṇa-līṅgān neti cen nopāsyā-traividhyād āśritavād iha tad-yogāt

jīva—of the individual spirit soul; *mukhya*—the primary; *prāṇa*—living force; *līṅgāt*—the signs; *na*—not; *iti*—thus; *cet' i*; *na*—not; *upāsyā*—worshipable; *taividhyāt*—because of being there; *āśritavāt*—because of taking shelter; *iha*—here; *tad-yogāt*—because of appropriateness.

If someone says the word "prāṇa" also refers to the individual spirit soul and the primary living-force in addition to referring to Brahman, then I reply that such an interpretation is not correct. If the word "prāṇa" referred to all three, then all three would be worshipable. This view is not correct, because neither logic nor the authority of scripture support it.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Someone may say that the natural features of the individual spirit soul and the living-force are such that they are proper objects of worship. To this I reply: This is not true. Why? For then there would be three objects of worship. When Indra says, "Worship me as *prāṇa*," he uses only one sentence. The rules of rhetoric demand that a sentence have only one correct interpretation, and therefore if we say that the word *prāṇa* here refers to three different objects, we shall break that rule. This is the true meaning: There are three possible ways to interpret the meaning of *prāṇa* in this context: 1. Take all these passages, including what directly mentions Brahman, as referring to the individual spirit soul and living-force; 2. Take these passages as referring some to the individual soul and living-force, and some to Brahman. and 3. Take these passages as all referring to Brahman. The first possibility has already been clearly refuted, The second possibility is not very acceptable, for it recommends that there are three distinct objects of worship. Śrīla Vyāsadeva says the third possibility is actually logical because *āśritavāt* (this view is supported by the statements of Vedic literature).

We may see that many passages in Vedic literature that seem to refer to the individual spirit soul or the living force, in fact refer to Brahman.

If at this point someone were to object: Is it not true that in this passage the natural sense of the words supports the interpretations of the individual spirit soul and the living force?" I would reply by saying: In this passage the worship of *prāṇa* is described as the most beneficial activity for the living entities. For this reason the interpretation of the Supreme Brahman is logical. For this reason Śrīla Vyāsadeva states in the *sūtra*, *tad-yogāt* (because this is logical).

Someone may then object: Is it not true that the scriptures explain that the *prāṇa* and *prajñā* both reside within the body of the individual spirit soul, and also leave that body together at the time of death? How is this possible if you say that *prāṇa* means "Brahman"?

To this objection I reply: Brahman is present in the body of the individual spirit soul in two ways: as *kriyā-śakti* (the potency of action), which is also known as

prāṇa, and as *jñāna-sakti* (the potency of knowledge), which is also known as *prajñā*. Both are manifested from Brahman. These two potencies remain within the body of the individual spirit soul, and also leave it together at the time of death.

Another objection may be raised in the following words: Is it not true that *prāṇa* and the other words you claim are names of the Supreme Brahman are all actually adjectives, and therefore cannot function as names?

To this objection I reply: This not true. These words are simultaneously adjectives and nouns. When Indra says *prāṇo 'smi prajñātmā* (I am *prāṇa*, *prajñā*, and *ātmā*), he uses these words as nouns. For these reasons *prāṇa*, *prajñā*, and other words used by Indra should be understood to refer to Brahman.

At this point a further objection may be raised: Is it not true that in the beginning you adequately demonstrated that the word *prāṇa* refers to Brahman? Most of your arguments are redundant.

To this objection I reply: This is not true. In the beginning I dispelled the doubts that may have arisen in regard to the single word *prāṇa* taken by itself. After that I discussed the word *prāṇa* in relation to a specific quotation, where it was related with other words, such as *ānanda*, and in this discussion I demonstrated that the word *prāṇa* was used there in such a way that it could only be understood to mean Brahman, and not the individual spirit soul, or anything else. For this reason I have discussed this specific passage of *Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad* separately.

Pada 2

Adhikaraṇa 1

The Word "Manomaya" Refers to Brahman

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

*manomayādibhiḥ śabdaiḥ
svarūpaṁ yasya kīrtiyate
hṛdaye sphuratu śrīmān
mamāsau śyāmasundaraḥ*

In the First Pada of this chapter it was said that one should inquire about the Supreme Brahman, the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the creator of all universes. Certain words used in Vedic literature were also clearly shown to refer to that Supreme Brahman. In the Second and Third Padas it will be demonstrated that certain other words, although less clearly related to Brahman, also describe Him.

In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, *Śāṅḍilya-vidyā* (3.14.1) the following explanation is given:

sarvaṃ khalv idaṃ brahma taj jalān iti sānta upāsīta. atha khalu kratumayaḥ puruṣaḥ. yathā kratuḥ asmin loke puruṣo bhavati tathetaḥ pretya bhavati. sa kratuṃ kurvīta. manomayaḥ prāṇa-śarīro bhā-rūpaḥ satya-saṅkalpa ākāśātmā sarva-karmā sarva-kāmāḥ sarva-gandhaḥ sarva-rasaḥ sarvaṃ idaṃ abhyāto avākyān ādaraḥ.

"Everything is Brahman. From Him everything has come. The peaceful sage should worship Brahman with this idea. The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the activities of devotional service. When devotional service is performed in this world the Supreme Personality of Godhead is present. As one performs devotional service in this life he will attain an appropriate body after death. The Supreme Personality of Godhead is known by those whose minds are pure. He is the controller of all life. He is effulgent and glorious. His every desire is automatically fulfilled. He is all-pervading. He is the original creator of everything. He fulfills all desires. He possesses all pleasant fragrances. He is all sweetness. He is present everywhere. He cannot be described in words. He cannot be known."

Samśaya: Do the adjectives (beginning with *manomaya*) in this passage describe the *jīva* or the *Paramātmā*?

Pūrvapakṣa: The words *manaḥ* and *prāṇa* here appropriately describe the *jīva*. The *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (2.1.2) explains: *aprāṇo hy amanāḥ śubhraḥ* (The splendid Supreme Person has neither breath nor mind). Because this passage from the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* contradicts the description of the Supreme Lord in this way, it should be understood to refer to the *jīva*. The opening words *sarvaṃ khalv idaṃ brahma* (Everything is Brahman) do not necessarily mean that the entire passage following them are about Brahman, but are merely spoken so that the worshiper may become peaceful. The teaching there is that because Brahman is everything one should become peaceful. The rest of the passage should then be understood to refer to the *jīva* and the word *brahma* at the end of the passage should also be understood to refer to the *jīva*.

Siddhānta: The proper conclusion is:

Sūtra 1

sarvatra prasiddhopadeśāt

sarvatra—everywhere; prasiddha—celebrated; upadeśāt—because of the teaching.

(The word "*manomaya*" here refers to the *Paramātmā*) because (in this passage) the famous (attributes of the *Paramātmā* as are taught) everywhere (in Vedānta literature are) described.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This passage describes the Paramātmā and not the *jīva*. Why? Because the qualities that belong only to the Paramātmā, beginning with His being the creator of the material universes, and which are described everywhere (*saravatra*) in Vedānta literature, are mentioned in this passage in the phrase *taj-jalān* and other phrases and words also.

Although the opening words of this passage (*sarvaṁ khalv idaṁ brahma*) are not intended to teach about Brahman but to invoke peacefulness, the word *manomaya* definitely describes the Supreme Brahman. The word *kratu* means "devotional service" and *manomaya* means "He who can be understood by a pure mind." The *Bṛhad-āranyaka Upaniṣad* (4.4.19) explains *manasaivānudraṣṭavyam* (He may be seen by a pure mind). The passage *yato vācā nivartante aprāpyo manasā saha* (The Supreme cannot be described in words or understood by the mind) means the foolish cannot understand the Supreme Personality of Godhead and even the wisest sages cannot understand Him completely.

The word *prāṇa-śarīra* (life-body) means {.sy 168}He who is the controller of life." Some also interpret this word to mean "He whose transcendental form is most dear." The words *aprāṇo hy amanāḥ* (He has neither breath nor mind) may mean either that He is supremely independent and does not need breath or mind, or it may mean that he does not possess material breath or material mind. The *śruti-śāstra* explains *manovān* (The Supreme has a spiritual mind) and *ānīda-vātam* (The Supreme has spiritual breath).

Other scriptural passages also state that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is described by the word *manomaya*. Some of these passages follow.

manomayaḥ prāṇa-śarīra-netā

"He is understood by the pure mind (*manomaya*). He is the guide of the body and senses."

—*Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* 2.2.7

sa eṣo 'ntar-hṛdaya ākāśas tasminn ayaṁ puruṣo manomayo 'mṛtamayo hiraṇmayah

"The golden Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is full of nectar, and who is known by the pure mind (*manomaya*), resides in the sky of the heart."

—*Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 1.6.1

hṛdā maṇiṣā manasābhikṣpto ya etad vidur amṛtas te bhavanti

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is known by they who have a pure heart and a pure mind. They who know Him in this way become free from death."

—*Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 7.9

prāṇasya prāṇah

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the life of all life."
—*Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.4.18

Sūtra 2

vivakṣita-guṇopapatteś ca

vivakṣita—wished to be said; *guṇa*—qualities; *upapatteḥ*—because of being appropriate; *ca*—and.

The word "manomaya" here must refer to Brahman) because the qualities (given here) most appropriately describe Brahman.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Manomaya (knowable by the pure mind), *prāṇa-śarīra* (the controller of life), *bhā-rūpa* (effulgent and glorious) and the other qualities mentioned here are appropriate for the Supreme Personality of Godhead but not at all for the *jīva*.

Sūtra 3

anupapattes tu na śārīraḥ

anupapatteḥ—because of inappropriateness; *tu*—indeed; *na*—not; *śārīraḥ*—the *jīva*.

(The word "manomaya" here) cannot refer to the *jīva* because the qualities (described in this passage) cannot be attributed to him.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The *manomaya* here cannot refer to the *jīva* because it is not possible that the qualities described here refer to the tiny, glowworm-like *jīva*.

Sūtra 4

karma-karṭṛ-vyapadeśāc ca

karma—object; karṭṛ—agent; vyapadeśāt—because of the statement; ca—also.

And because the distinction is drawn here between the agent and the object.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

With the words (*Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 3.14.4) *etam itaḥ pretyābhisambhavitāsmi* (After death I will attain Him) at the end the *manomaya* is clearly designated as the object of the sentence and the *jīva*, with the words *abhisambhavitāsmi* (I will attain) is clearly identified as the agent. Therefore the *manomaya*, being the object, must be different from the *jīva*, which is the agent. The *manomaya* must therefore be the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The word *abhisambhavitāsmi* here describes meeting. The *jīva* meets the Supreme Lord as a great river meets the ocean.

Sūtra 5

śabda-viśeṣāt

śabda—words; viśeṣāt—because of the difference.

(The word "manomaya" here cannot refer to the *jīva* because the words are in different cases.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The text says (*Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 3.14.3) *eṣa ma ātmāntar-hṛdaye* (He is within my heart). In these words the devotee *jīva* is placed in the genitive case and the object of his worship is placed in the nominative case. Because the *jīva* and the object of his worship are in different cases they must be two distinct persons.

Therefore the *manomaya* here must be the worshipable Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is different from the devotee *jīva*.

Sūtra 6

smṛteś ca

smṛteḥ—because of the smṛti-śāstra; ca—also.

And because of the statement of *smṛti-śāstra* also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

That the Supreme Personality of Godhead is different from the *jīva* is also confirmed by the following statement of *Bhagavad-gītā* (18.61):

*īśvaraḥ sarva-bhūtānām
hṛd-deśe 'rjuna tiṣṭhati
bhrāmayan sarva-bhūtāni
yantrārūḍhāni māyayā*

"The Supreme Lord is situated in everyone's heart, O Arjuna, and is directing the wanderings of all living entities, who are seated as on a machine, made of the material energy."*

Someone may object: The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (3.14.3) describes the *manomaya* in the following words: *eṣa ma ātmāntar-hṛdaye 'ñīyān vrīr heva yavād vā* (In my heart is the Self, smaller than a grain of rice or barley). This text shows that because it is very tiny the *manomaya* must be the *jīva* and cannot be the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Sūtra 7

arbhakaukastvāt tad-vyapadeśāc ca neti cen na nicāyyatvād evaṁ vyomavac ca

arbhaka—small; okastvāt—because of the residence; tat—of that; vyapadeśāt—because of the teaching; ca—and; na—not; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; nicāyyatvāt—because of meditation; evaṁ—in this way; vyomavat—like the sky; ca—also.

If it be said that the word "manomaya" here cannot refer to Brahman because here it is said that the residence of "manomaya" is very tiny, then I say no because Brahman should be meditated on in this way and because in the same passage the "manomaya" is said to be as great as the sky.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

For these two reasons it cannot be said that the *manomaya* is not the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In this passage from *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* the *manomaya* is said to be greater than the entire Earth planet. The text says *jyāyān antarīkṣāt* (He is greater than the sky). Because the Supreme Brahman is all-pervading the word *vyomavat* (like the sky) is used in this *sūtra*.

How may these two statements (that Brahman is very small and very great) be reconciled? To answer this question he says *nicāyyatvād evam* (Because Brahman should be meditated on in this way). This means that it is said that Brahman is very small so He may become the object of meditation. This means that when in the Vedic literatures it is said that the infinite, all-pervading Supreme Personality of Godhead is as small as the distance between the thumb and forefinger or some other very small distance, in some instances it is meant to be taken figuratively and in other places literally. In the first instance (figuratively) the devotee meditates on the Lord in his heart and in the second (literally) by His inconceivable potencies, the Lord personally appears in the heart out of kindness to His devotee. Although the Supreme Lord has only one original form, He still manifests in many different forms to His devotees. This is described in the *smṛti-śāstra* in the words *eko 'pi san bahudhā yo 'vabhāti* (Although He is one He manifests in many forms). Because of His inconceivable potency the Supreme Lord, although He is all-pervading, may become as small as an atom. This will be described (later in this book) in the section (Sūtra 25) describing Vaiśvānara. In this way when the Supreme Personality of Godhead is manifested in a very small form, as the size of an atom or the distance between the thumb and forefinger, that very small size is present everywhere, so in this way also the Supreme Lord is all-pervading.

Someone may object: If the Paramātmā is then also present within the material body just as the *jīva* is, then, because of His contact with the body the Paramātmā must also feel all the pleasures and sufferings of the body just as the *jīva* does. To answer this he says:

Sūtra 8

sambhoga-prāptir iti cen na vaiśeṣyāt

sambhoga—of enjoyment; *prāptir*—attainment; *iti*—thus; *cet*—if; *na*—not; *vaiśeṣyāt*—because of the difference.

If it is said that (the Paramātmā in the heart also) experiences (the pains and) pleasures (of the material body), then I say no because there is a great difference (between Him and the jīva).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the word *sambhoga* the prefix *sam* means "with" as it also does in the word *samvāda* (with+words=conversation). Therefore this *sūtra* states that the Supreme Personality of Godhead does not enjoy with (the jīva). Why? Because there is a difference between them. This is the meaning: mere contact with a certain body does not by itself bring suffering and enjoyment. Being under the dominion of *karma* is the real cause of material suffering and enjoyment. The Supreme Personality of Godhead is not under the power of the law of *karma*. This is described in the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (3.1.1): *anaśnann anyo 'bhicākaśīti* (Two birds sit in the metaphorical tree of the material body. One bird eats. The other bird does not eat, but only looks) and in the *Bhagavad-gītā* (4.14), where Lord Kṛṣṇa says: *na mām karmāṇi limpanti na me karma-phale sprhā* (There is no work that affects me; nor do I aspire for the fruits of action).

Adhikaraṇa 2

The Eater is Brahman

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viśaya: The *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* (1.2.25) says:

*yasya brahma ca kṣātram ca
ubhe bhavataḥ odanaḥ
mṛtyur yasyopasecanam
ka itthā veda yatra saḥ*

"There is a person for whom the *brāhmaṇas* and *kṣatriyas* are food and death is the sauce. Who knows where this person is?"

Samśaya: Here the words *odana* (food) and *upasecana* (sauce) indicate an eater.

Who is the eater? Is it fire, the *jīva*, or the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa: Because there is nothing specific to show that of these three fire is not the eater, and because the questions and answers in this passage seem to indicate fire, and because the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (1.4.6) declares *agnir annādaḥ* (Fire is the eater), therefore fire is the eater in this passage.

Or perhaps the *jīva* is the eater here because eating is an action and the *jīva* performs actions although the Supreme does not perform any actions. This is also confirmed by the *śruti-śāstra* (*Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* 3.1.1 and *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 3.1) which describes an eater accompanied by a non-eater who simply looks: *tayor anyañ pappalam* (Two friendly birds sit on a tree. One eats the *pippala* fruit and the other does not eat but only looks). From all this it may be understood that the eater here is the *jīva*.

Siddhānta: The proper understanding follows.

Sūtra 9

attā carācara-grahaṇāt

attā—the eater; cara—the moving; acara—and the non-moving; grahaṇāt—because of taking.

The eater (is Brahman) because He takes the moving and non-moving (as His food).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The eater is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Why? Because of the words *carācara-grahaṇāt* (Because He takes the moving and non-moving as His food). In this passage (*Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 1.2.25) the words *brahma kṣātram* indicate the entire universe, which is then sprinkled with the sauce of death and eaten. This passage must refer to the Supreme Personality of Godhead for no one other than He can eat the entire universe. A sauce is something which, while being eaten itself is the cause of other things being eaten also. The eating of the entire universe sprinkled with the sauce of death must refer to the periodic destruction of the material universes. In this way it is proved that the eater of the universes here is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is not refuted by the statement of *Upaniṣads* (*na caāśnan*) that He does not eat. The Supreme Personality of Godhead does not eat the results of *karma*, but He has His own transcendental eating.

Sūtra 10

prakaraṇāt—because of the context; ca—also.

This is also confirmed by the context.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

That this passage refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead is also confirmed by the following statement of *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* (1.2.20):

aṅor aṅīyān mahato mahīyān

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is smaller than the smallest and greater than the greatest."*

This is also confirmed by the following words of *smṛti-śāstra*:

atāsi lokasya carācarasya

"You are the eater of this complete cosmic manifestation, of the moving and the non-moving."

Adhikaraṇa 3

The Associate in the Cave is Brahman

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya: The *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* (1.3.1) states:

*ṛtaṁ pibantau sukṛtasya loke
guhām praviṣṭau parame parārdhe
chāyā-tapau brahma-vido vadanti
pañcāgnayo ye ca trināciketāḥ*

"Two persons drink the results of *karma* in cave of the heart. They who know

Brahman, they who keep the five sacred fires, and they who perform the three *nāciketa* sacrifices say these two persons are shade and light."

Samśaya: In this passage a companion to the *jīva*, who experiences the results of *karma*, is described. This companion may be interpreted to be either intelligence, life-breath, or the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Pūrvapakṣa: The companion here must be either intelligence or life-breath for they assist the *jīva* as he experiences the results of *karma*. The companion cannot be the Supreme Personality of Godhead for the Supreme Lord never experiences the results of *karma*. Therefore the companion must be either intelligence or life-breath.

Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 11

guhām praviṣṭāv ātmānau hi tad darśanāt

guhām—in the cave; *praviṣṭāu*—entered; *ātmānau*—two selves; *hi*—indeed; *tat*—that; *darśanāt*—because of being seen in other passages of Vedic literature.

The two persons that have entered the cave of the heart are the two selves (the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the *jīva* because this explanation is seen in Vedic literature.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The two persons that have entered the cave of the heart are the *jīva* and the Supreme Personality of Godhead, not the *jīva* and intelligence, and not the *jīva* and the life-breath. Why? The *sūtra* says *tad darśanāt* (because this explanation is seen in Vedic literature).

Ś The *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* (2.1.7) says that the *jīva* has entered the cave of the heart:

*yā prāṇena sambhavaty
aditir devatāmayī
guhām praviśya tiṣṭhantīm
yā bhūtebhir vyajāyata*

"Accompanied by the life-breath and a host of powers, the *jīva*, who is the king of the senses, enters the cave of the heart."

Another verse (*Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 1.2.12) says that the Supreme Personality of

Godhead has entered the cave of the heart:

*taṁ durdarśaṁ gūḍham anupraviṣṭam
guhāhitam gahvareṣṭam purāṇam
adhyātma-yogādhiḡamena devaṁ
matvā dhīro harṣa-śokau jahāti*

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is the oldest person, and who is worshiped in the jungle of this world, remains hidden in the cave of the heart. A wise man, meditating on Him in a trance of spiritual *yoga*, gives up all material joy and grief."

The word *hi* (indeed) in this *sūtra* means "This is indeed corroborated by all the *Purāṇas*." The word *pibantau* (they both drink) in the passage of the *Upaniṣad* is used in the same sense as the phrase "the two parasol-bearers." Although only one of the pair carries the parasol, they are still known as "the two parasol-bearers." In the same way only one of the two "drinkers" here actually drinks. The word *chāyā-tapau* (shade and light) here means either that the knowledge of the two persons is different, or it means that one of the persons is bound to the cycle of repeated birth and death and the other is free from the cycle of repeated birth and death.

Sūtra 12

viśeṣaṇāc ca

viśeṣaṇāt—because of distinctive qualities; ca—also.

Also because of the differences between them.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this section of *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* the *jīva* and the Supreme Personality of Godhead are carefully distinguished, the *jīva* described as the meditater and the Supreme Personality of Godhead as the object of meditation. Thus is *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 1.2.12 quoted above they are carefully distinguished: one as the meditater and the other as the object of meditation. In *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 1.3.1 in the words *chāyā-tapau* (shade and light) they are again distinguished: one being all-knowing and the other having only a small sphere of knowledge.

Kaṭha Upaniṣad 1.3.9 explains:

vijñāna-sārathir yas tu

*manah-pragrahavān narah
so 'dhvanah pāram āpnoti
tad viṣṇoḥ paramam padam*

"A person who has transcendental knowledge as his charioteer and who carefully holds the reins of the mind reaches the end of the path: the transcendental realm of Lord Viṣṇu."

In these words they are again distinguished: one being the goal to be attained and the other the person who attains the goal.

Adhikaraṇa 4

The Person in the Eye is the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya: Chāndogya Upaniṣad 4.15.1-2 says:

*ya eṣo 'ntar-akṣiṇi puruṣo dṛśyate sa eṣa ātmeti hovāca. etad amṛtam ayam etad
brahma tad yad yad asmin sarpir vodakam vā siñcati vartmani eva gacchati. etam
sampad-dhāma ity ācakṣate etam hi sarvāṇi kāmāny abhisamṃyanti*

"He said: He who is seen in the eye is the *ātmā*. He is immortal, He is nectar. He is the greatest. Because He is present neither water nor liquid butter will stay on the eye, but both will slide from it. He is the abode of all opulences. For one who sees Him all desires are at once fulfilled."

Samśaya: Is this person a reflection, a demigod, the *jīva*, or the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa: It may be the first, for the observer sees himself reflected in another's eye. It may be the second because *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (5.5.2)* says: *raśmibhir eṣo 'smin pratiṣṭhitah* (With the rays of sunlight the sun-god enters the eye). It may be the third because a person sees with his eyes, so he may also be the person in the eye. In this way the person in the eye is one of these three.

Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 13

antara upapatteḥ

antarah—the person within; upapatteḥ—because of reason.

The person in (the eye is the Supreme Personality of Godhead) because (that conclusion is dictated) by reason.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The person in the eye is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Why? The *sūtra* says *upapatteḥ* (because that conclusion is dictated by reason). This is so because of the proof given (in the quote from the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*) in the description of the qualities beginning with being the Supreme Self (*ātmā*), immortality (*amṛta*), being the greatest (*brahma*), being untouched by material things, and being the abode of all opulences (*sampad-dhāma*). (These qualities can properly be attributed only to the Supreme Personality of Godhead.)

Sūtra 14

sthānādi-vyapadeśāc ca

sthāna—the place; ādi—beginning with; vyapadeśāt—because of the statement. ca—also.

And also because of the teaching (in the scriptures that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is present) in this place and in other places as well.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

That the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the controller who resides with the eye is described in *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (3.7.18):

yaś cakṣuṣi tiṣṭhamś cakṣuṣo 'ntaro yaṁ cakṣur na veda yasya cakṣur śarīraṁ yaś cakṣur antaro yaṁ ayaty eṣa ta ātmāntaryāmy amṛtaḥ

"He who stays in the eye, who is within, whom the eye does not know, who is the ultimate proprietor of the eye and the body, and who, residing within, controls the eye, is the immortal Supersoul, the Supreme Personality of Godhead who resides in the heart."

Sūtra 15

sukha-viśiṣṭābhidhānād eva

sukha—by happiness; viśiṣṭa—distinguished; abhidhānāt—because of the description; eva—indeed.

Also because He is described as (full of) bliss.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This sūtra refers to *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (4.10.5), which says: *prāṇo brahma kaṁ brahma khaṁ brahma* (the Supreme Personality of Godhead is life. the Supreme Personality of Godhead is bliss. the Supreme Personality of Godhead is sky). The discussion of the Supreme Personality of Godhead that begins with these words continues through some paragraphs up to the paragraph under discussion (*Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 4.15.1), which describes the person in the eye. For this reason the person in the eye must be the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The interpolation of *agni-vidyā* between 4.10.5 and 4.15.1 does not break the context because *agni-vidyā* is a part of the discussion of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The word *viśiṣṭa* (distinguished) in this sūtra means that the Supreme Personality of Godhead has all-knowledge and all other transcendental qualities.

Sūtra 16

śrutopaniṣatka-gaty-abhidhānāc ca

śruta—heard; upaniṣatka—Upaniṣad; gati—destination; abhidhānāt—because of the description; ca—also.

And because of the description of the destination of they who hear the Upaniṣads.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

One who hears the *Upaniṣads* and understands the secret knowledge of the *Vedas* travels to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Of the person who knows the person in the eye Upakośala Muni says *arciṣam abhisambhavati* (He attains the realm of light). Because these two persons (he who knows the secrets of the *Vedas* and he who knows the person in the eye) attain the same destination it must be understood that the person in the eye is the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Sūtra 17

anavasthiter asambhavāc ca netaraḥ

anavasthiteḥ—because the abode is not eternal; asambhavāt—because of being impossible; ca—and; na—not; itaraḥ—anyone else.

(The person in the eye) is not anyone else (but the Supreme Personality of Godhead) because (the others) do not stay always in the eye and because it cannot be them (according to the context).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

These other persons cannot be the person in the eye because none of them stay permanently in the eye and because none of them possess immortality or any of the other qualities attributed to the person in the eye. The Supreme Personality of Godhead is therefore the person in the eye referred to in this text.

Adhikaraṇa 5

The Internal Ruler is the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya: Bṛhad-āranyaka Upaniṣad 3.7.18 says:

*yaḥ pṛthivyām tiṣṭhan pṛthivyā antaro yaṁ pṛthivī na veda yasya pṛthivī śarīraṁ
yaḥ pṛthivīm antaro yam ayaty eṣa ta ātmāntaryāmy amṛtaḥ*

"He who stays in the earth, who is within, whom the earth does not know, who is the ultimate proprietor of the earth and the body, and who, residing within, rules the earth, is the immortal Supersoul, the Supreme Personality of Godhead who resides in the heart."

Samśaya: In this verse is the ruler who lives within the earth and other places *pradhāna*, the *jīva*, or the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa: The ruler within may be *pradhāna* because *pradhāna* resides within. The cause is always woven into the effect. The cause is the controller if the effect. (Because *pradhāna* is the cause of the earth, *pradhāna* must therefore be the controller within the earth also.) Because it gives happiness the *pradhāna* may be figuratively called *ātmā* (the great self), or because it is all-pervading it may also be figuratively called *ātmā* (the great self). Because it is eternal it may also be called *amṛta* (eternal).

Or the ruler within may be a certain *jīva* who is a great *yogī*. With the *yogic* powers of entering everywhere and becoming invisible at will a great *yogī* may become the ruler (within) and with this ruling power, the ability to become invisible, and other *yogic* powers, he may be called *ātmā* (the great self), and *amṛta* (eternal) in the direct senses of the words without resorting to figurative language.

In this way the ruler within must be either the *pradhāna* or a *jīva*.

Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 18

antaryāmy adhidaivādiṣu tad-dharma-vyapadeśāt

antaryāmī—the ruler within; adhidaiva—the elements; ādiṣu—beginning with; tat—of Him; dharma—the nature; vyapadeśāt—because of the description.

The ruler who resides within the elements (is the Supreme Personality of Godhead) because His qualities are described (in this passage).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The ruler within described in these words of *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Why? The *sūtra* says *tad-dharma-vyapadeśāt* (because His qualities are described in this passage). The Supreme Person is described here because the qualities of the person described here, which include being situated within the earth and all other material elements, being unknowable, being the supreme controller, and being all-pervading, all-knowing, all-blissful,

and eternal, are all qualities of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Sūtra 19

na ca smārtam atad-dharmābhilāpāt

na—not; ca—and; smārtam—what is taught in the smṛti; atad—not of it; dharmā—the qualities; abhilāpāt—because of description.

The ruler within is not (the *pradhāna*, which is) described in the *smṛti*, because the qualities (mentioned in this passage) cannot be attributed (to *pradhāna*).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

For these reasons it may not be said that the *pradhāna*, which is described in the *smṛti*, is the ruler within. Why? The *sūtra* says *atad-dharmābhilāpāt* (because the qualities mentioned in this passage cannot be attributed to it.

The *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (3.7.23) says:

adṛṣṭo draṣṭā aśruto śrotā amato mantā avij{.sy 241}āto vijñātā nānyato 'sti draṣṭā nānyato 'sti śrotā nānyato 'sti mantā nānyato 'sti vijñātaiṣa ta ātmāntaryāmy amṛta ito 'nyat smārtam

"Unobserved, He is the observer. Unheard, He is the hearer. Inconceivable, He is the thinker. Unknown, he is the knower. There is no other observer. There is no other hearer. there is no other thinker. There is no other knower. he is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the eternal ruler within. (The *pradhāna*) described in the *smṛti* is different from Him."

The list of qualities here, beginning with being the observer, may be attributed to the Supreme Personality of Godhead only.

Sūtra 20

śarīraś cobhaye 'pi hi bhedenainam adhīyate

śarīraḥ—the jīva; ca—also; ubhaye—in bothe recensions; api—also; hi—indeed;

bhedena—by the difference; enam—this; adhīyate—is read.

The ruler within is not a *jīva* because in both (recensions of the Upaniṣad) the *jīva* is described as different from Him.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word *na* (not) from the preceding *sūtra* should be understood in this *sūtra* also. For the reasons already given it cannot be said that a *jīva* who is a great *yogī* is the ruler within. Why? The *sūtra* answers *hi*, which means "because," *ubhaye* (in both), which means "in both the *Kāṇva* and *Mādhyandina* recensions of the Upaniṣad," *enam* (He), which means "the ruler within," *bhedena adhīyate* (is described as different).

(The *Kāṇva* recension gives) *yo vij{.sy 241}ānam antaro yamayati* (The transcendental knowledge that rules within) and (the *Mādhyandina* recension, gives) *ya ātmānam antaro yamayati* (The Supreme Personality of Godhead who rules within). In both readings is a clear distinction between the ruler and the ruled. Therefore the ruler within is Lord Hari, the Personality of Godhead.

In the *Subala Upaniṣad* the Kaṭhas say: *pṛthivy-ādīnām avyaktākṣarāmṛtaāntānām śrī-nārāyaṇo 'ntaryāmī* (Lord Nārāyaṇa is the ruler within the earth and other elements, within the unmanifested *pradhāna*, and within the unchanging, eternal *jīva*).

The *Brāhmaṇas* say: *antaḥ-śarīre nihito guhāyām* (The Supreme Personality of Godhead stays in the heart of the *jīva*), *aja eko nityaḥ* (The Supreme Personality of Godhead is unborn, eternal, and one without a second), and *yasya pṛthivī śarīram yaḥ pṛthivīm antare sañcaran yaṁ pṛthivī na veda* (The earth is His body. He stays within the earth. The earth does not understand Him, the Supreme Personality of Godhead).

Adhikaraṇa 6

"Akṣara" is the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya: The *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (1.1.5-6) says:

atha parā yayā tad akṣaram adhigamyate. yat tad adreṣyam agrāhyam agotram avarṇam acakṣuḥ-śrotram tad apāṇi-pādam nityam vibhum sarva-gatam su-sūkṣmam tad avyayam yad bhūta-yoniṁ paripaśyanti dhīrāḥ

"Here is the transcendental knowledge by which the Supreme Personality of Godhead is known. The great sages directly see the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who cannot be seen, who cannot be grasped, who has no name, who has no color, who has no eyes or ears, who has no hands or feet, who is eternal, all-powerful, all-pervading, subtle, and changeless, and who is the creator of all that is."

Later the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (2.1.2) also says:

divyo hy amūrtaḥ puruṣaḥ sa-bāhyābhyantaro hy ajaḥ aprāṇo hy amanāḥ śubhro 'kṣarāt parataḥ paraḥ

"The Supreme Person is transcendental, formless, without inside or out, unborn, unbreathing, without mind, splendid, and higher than the highest of the eternal."

Samśaya: Do these two passages describe first the *pradhāna* and then the *puruṣa* (*jīva*), or do they describe the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa: Because in these passages there is no mention of being the observer or any other qualities of a conscious being, and because there is mention of the word *yoni* (source of everything), which refers to the ingredient of which the creation is made, these passages describe the eternal *pradhāna*, and above that eternal *pradhāna*, the *puruṣa* (*jīva*). Above the eternal, ever-changing *pradhāna* is the *jīva*, who is the knower of the field of activities. Therefore in these passages the *pradhāna* and *jīva* should be known to be the topics of discussion.

Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 21

adṛśyatvādi-guṇako dharmokteḥ

adṛśyatva—being invisible; *ādi*—beginning with; *guṇako*—qualities; *dharma*—qualities; *ukteḥ*—because of the statement.

(These passages describe the Supreme Personality of Godhead,) who possesses many transcendental qualities, including invisibility, because His qualities are described here.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In both passages the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who possesses many

transcendental qualities, including invisibility, should be understood (to be the topic of discussion). Why? the *sūtra* says *dharmokteḥ* (because His qualities are described here).

The *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (1.1.9) says:

yaḥ sarvajñaḥ sarvavid yasya jñānamayaṁ tapaḥ. tasmād etad brahma nāma-rūpam annaṁ ca jāyate

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead knows everything. He knows everything. He is full of knowledge. From Him is born that Brahman that is the material form of this world."

Because in the passage of *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (1.1.6) that begins *divyo hy amūrtaḥ puruṣaḥ* (The Supreme Person is transcendental and formless) the *akṣara* is described as possessing a host of transcendental qualities, which include omniscience, and because that *akṣara* is described as the ultimate goal of all knowledge, the *akṣara* must be the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Sūtra 22

viśeṣaṇa-bheda-vyapadeśābhyāṁ ca netarau

viśeṣaṇa—modifiers; *bheda*—difference; *vyapadeśābhyāṁ*—because of the description; *ca*—and; *na*—not; *itarau*—the other two.

Because of the description of the qualities (of the *akṣara*) in these two (passages, the *akṣara*) cannot be the other two (*pradhāna* and *jīva*).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The other two, that is *pradhāna* and *jīva*, should not be thought (to be the topic of discussion here). Why? the *sūtra* says *viśeṣaṇa* (because of the description of the qualities). Because the description in *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (1.1.9), beginning with the words *yaḥ sarvajña* (The Supreme Personality of Godhead knows everything), specifically identifies the *akṣara* as the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and because the description in *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (1.1.6), beginning with the word *divya* (The Supreme Person is transcendental), identifies the *akṣara* as a being different from the *jīva*, therefore the *akṣara* mentioned in both passages must be understood to be the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the original cause of all causes.

Sūtra 23

Ṣ

rūpopanyāsāc ca

rūpa—of a form; upanyāsāt—because of the mention; ca—also.

And also because there is mention of a form.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (3.1.3) says:

*yadā paśyaḥ paśyate rukma-varṇam
kārtāram īśam puruṣam brahma-yonim
tadā vidvān puṇya-pāpe vidhūya
nirañjanaḥ paramam samyam upaiti*

"One who sees the golden-colored Personality of Godhead, the Supreme Lord, the supreme actor, who is the source of the Supreme Brahman, becomes free from the reactions to past pious and sinful deeds, and becomes liberated, attaining the same transcendental platform as the Lord."*

Because the form of the *akṣara* is described in this way as the original cause of all causes, the form of the *akṣara* here must be the Supreme Personality of Godhead. It cannot be either *pradhāna* or *jīva*.

Sūtra 24

prakaraṇāt

prakaraṇāt—because of the context.

(The *akṣara* here must be the Supreme Personality of Godhead) because of the context.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The meaning of this sūtra is clear.

The *smṛti-śāstra* also confirms that this text refers to Lord Viṣṇu. The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (6.5.65-70) says:

*dve vidye veditavye
iti cātharvaṇī śrutih
parayā tv akṣara-prāptih
rñ-vedādi-mayī aparā*

*yat tad avyaktam ajaram
acintyam ajam avyayam
anirdeśyam arūpaṁ ca
pānīpādādy-asamyutam*

*vibhuṁ sarva-gataṁ nityaṁ
bhūta-yonim akāraṇam
vyāpya-vyāpyaṁ yataḥ sarvaṁ
tad vai paśyanti sūrayaḥ*

*tad brahma paramaṁ dhāma
tad dhyeyaṁ mokṣa-kāṅkṣiṇām
śruti-vākypditaṁ sūkṣmaṁ
tad viṣṇoḥ paramaṁ padam*

*tad eva bhagavad-vācyam
svarūpaṁ paramātmanaḥ
vācako bhagavac-chabdā
tasyādyasyākṣarātmanaḥ*

*evaṁ nigaditārthasya
sa-tattvaṁ tasya tattvataḥ
jñāyate yena taj-jñānaṁ
param anyat trayīmayam*

"The *Ātharva Veda* says there are two kinds of knowledge: superior and inferior. Superior knowledge is that which brings one to the eternal and inferior knowledge is the teaching of the *Ṛg Veda* and the other *Vedas*. The eternal is unmanifested, without decay, inconceivable, unborn, unchanging, without material form, without material hands or feet, all-powerful, all-pervading, eternal, the source of all living entities, causeless, present within everything, untouched by anything, and the source from which everything has come. Saintly persons see Him. He is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. He is the supreme abode. He is the object of meditation for they who yearn for liberation. He is described in the words of the *Vedas*. He is supremely subtle. He is Lord Viṣṇu. He is known as Bhagavān (the Supreme Personality of Godhead). He is the Supreme Lord who has a transcendental form. He is Bhagavān. He is eternal. One who knows these truths

knows the truth. He knows the real truth. The inferior truth of the three Vedas is something else."

Adhikaraṇa 7

"Vaiśvānara" is the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya: The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* says (5.11.1): *ko nu ātmā kiṁ brahmeti* (Who is the ātmā? Who is the Supreme Personality of Godhead?), and (5.11.6) *ātmānam evaṁ vaiśvānaraṁ sampraty adhyeṣi tam eva no bruhi* (You know about Vaiśvānara. Please describe Him.) and (5.18.1) *yas tv enam evaṁ prādeśa-mātram abhivimānam ātmānam vaiśvānaraṁ upāste sa sarveṣu lokeṣu sarveṣu bhūteṣu sarveṣu ātmasu annam atti* (One who meditates on Vaiśvānara, who is the size of the distance between the thumb and forefinger, and who is present in all worlds, in all elements, and in all hearts, eats food and is nourished.) and (5.18.2) *etasya ha vā etasyātmāno vaiśvānarasya mūrdhaiva su-tejās cakṣur viśvarūpaḥ prāṇaḥ pṛthag-vartmā sandeho bahulo vastir eva vayiḥ pṛthivy eva pādāv ura eva vedir lomānir bahir hṛdayaṁ gārhapatyo mano 'nvāhāryapacana āsyam āhvanīyaḥ* (Heaven is the head of Vaiśvānara, the sun is His eye, the wind is His breath, the sky is His body, the oceans are His bladder, the earth is His feet, the sacrificial arena is His chest, the sacrificial grass is His head, the *gārhapatya* fire is His heart, the *anvāhāryapacana* fire is His mind, and the *āhavanīya* fire is His mouth).

Samśaya: Is the Vaiśvānara the fire of digestion, the demigod Agni, the fire element, or Lord Viṣṇu? *Pūrvapakṣa:* The word *vaiśvānara* is commonly used in all these four meanings, so its meaning in this passage is unclear.

Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 25

vaiśvānaraḥ sādharmaṇa-śabda-viśeṣāt

vaiśvānaraḥ—Vaiśvānara; sādharmaṇa—common; śabda—word; viśeṣāt—because of the distinction.

The ambiguous word "vaiśvānara" (in this passage of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead) because the qualities described here (are appropriate for the Lord).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word *vaiśvānara* here refers to Lord Viṣṇu. Why? The *sūtra* says *sādharāṇa-śabda-viśeṣāt* (because the qualities described here are appropriate for the Lord). This is the meaning: Even though the word *vaiśvānara* has many meanings, here it means "Lord Viṣṇu." The description beginning with the phrase "Heaven is His head" clearly show that *vaiśvānara* here means Lord Viṣṇu. Also, the words *ātmā* and *brahma* generally refer to Lord Viṣṇu. The result one obtains by knowing *vaiśvānara* is the same as the result of knowing Lord Viṣṇu. The scriptures say *yatheṣikā tulam* (As reeds are burned by fire, so are sins burned into nothing by Vaiśvānara). This clearly shows that Vaiśvānara here is Lord Viṣṇu (for only Lord Viṣṇu has the power to negate sins). The word *vaiśvānara* is composed of the two words *viśva* (all) and *nara* (human beings), and thus means "He who is the resting place of all human beings." For these reasons the word *vaiśvānara* here must mean "Lord Viṣṇu."

Furthermore, he says:

Sūtra 26

smaryamāṇam anumānaṁ syād iti

smaryamāṇam—described in the *smṛti-śāstra*; *anumānaṁ*—inference; *syād*—is; *iti*—thus.

This may also be inferred from the statements of the *smṛti-śāstra*.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word *iti* here means "this is the reason." In *Bhagavad-gītā* (15.14), Lord Kṛṣṇa says:

*ahaṁ vaiśvānaro bhūtvā
prāṇināṁ deham āśritaḥ*

"I am the *vaiśvānara* in the bodies of all living entities."*

In these words the *smṛti-śāstra* affirms that the Vaiśvānara is Lord Viṣṇu. From this statement it may also be understood that the *vaiśvānara* in the *Chāndogya*

Upaniṣad is also Lord Viṣṇu.

Now he refutes the idea that *vaiśvānara* refers to the fire of digestion.

Sūtra 27

śabdādibhyo 'ntaḥ pratiṣṭhānāc ca neti cen na tathā dṛṣṭy-upadeśād asambhavāt puruṣa-vidham api cainam adhīyate

śabda—the words; *ādibhyaḥ*—beginning with; *antaḥ*—within; *pratiṣṭhānāt*—because of abiding; *ca*—and; *na*—not; *iti*—thus; *cet*—if; *na*—not; *tathā*—thus; *dṛṣṭi*—sight; *upadeśāt*—from the teaching; *asambhavāt*—because of being impossible; *puruṣa*—a person; *vidham*—the nature; *api*—also; *ca*—and; *enam*—Him; *adhīyate*—is read.

If (it is said the "vaiśvānara" here) cannot (be Lord Viṣṇu) because many words here refute this idea and because (the "vaiśvānara" is said here) to reside in the heart, (then I say) no because the teaching (of the scriptures is that one should) meditate (on Lord Viṣṇu in the heart) in this way, because it is not possible (to interpret the word here to mean anything else), and because (the text here describes the {sy 168}vaiśvānara") as a person with a humanlike form.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The objection may be raised: The *vaiśvānara* here cannot be Lord Viṣṇu. The text says *ayam agnir vaiśvānaraḥ* (This is the *vaiśvānara* fire). Because these words prove that *vaiśvānara* here means fire, the passage *hṛdayam gārhapatyo mano 'nvāhāryapacana āsyam āhvaniyaḥ* (the *gārhapatya* fire is His heart, the *anvāhāryapacana* fire is His mind, and the *āhvaniya* fire is His mouth) presents the *vaiśvānara* as a group of three fires. The *vaiśvānara* is fire, and not Lord Viṣṇu, because *vaiśvānara* is said to be the resting place of *prāṇa* (breath) and again because the *Vedas* say *vaiśvānara* stays within the heart of the living entity.

Here the *sūtra* answers this objection by saying *cen na*, which means "if it is said that the *vaiśvānara* is fire, then I say no." Why? The *sūtra* says *tathā dṛṣṭy-upadeśād asambhavāt puruṣa-vidham api cainam adhīyate* (because the teaching of the scriptures is that one should meditate on Lord Viṣṇu in the heart in this way, because it is not possible to interpret the word here to mean anything else, and because the text here describes the *vaiśvānara*) as a person with a humanlike form). *Tathā* here means {sy 168}by considering to be the fire of digestion," *dṛṣṭi*, means "meditation on Lord Viṣṇu," and *asambhavāt* means "it is not possible to interpret the word *vaiśvānara* to mean anything but Lord Viṣṇu because the text of the *Upaniṣad* says that heaven is the head of the *vaiśvānara* and the other parts of

the world are other parts of the body of *vaiśvānara*." Furthermore, the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (10.6.1.11) says *sa yo hy etam evāgniṃ vaiśvānaram puruṣa-vidhaṃ puruṣe 'ntaḥ pratiṣṭitam veda* (He knows the *agni vaiśvānara*, who has a humanlike form and who stays in the hearts of the living entities). If the word *vaiśvānara* is interpreted to mean {*.sy 168*}fire," then the explanations here that the *vaiśvānara* resides in the hearts of the living entities may be accepted but not the statement that *vaiśvānara* has a humanlike form. If *vaiśvānara* is interpreted to mean Lord Viṣṇu, then both statements may be easily accepted.

Next he refutes the idea that *vaiśvānara* means either the demigod Agni or the element fire.

Sūtra 28

ata eva na devatā bhūtam ca

ataḥ eva—therefore; na—not; devatā—demigod; bhūtam—element; ca—and;

For the same reasons "*vaiśvānara*" is neither the demigod Agni nor the element fire.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The objector may say: Because the demigod Agni is very powerful and great it may indeed be said that heaven is his head and (the other parts of the world are parts of his body), and the same may also be said of the fire element. This is so because of the following description of */Rg Veda* (10.88.3): *yo bhānunā pṛthivī dyām utemām ātatāna rodasī antarīkṣam* (Agni, in his form of the sun, is spread through the earth, heaven, and everything between).

Even if this be said, still I say no. Why? The *sūtra* says *ata eva* (therefore), which means "for the reasons already given *vaiśvānara* is neither the demigod Agni nor the element fire." The words of this *mantra* of the */Rg Veda* are flattery only.

Avatarāṇikā: In the opinion of Jaimini the word *agni* may also directly mean "The Supreme Personality of Godhead," just as the word *vaiśvānara* does.

Sūtra 29

sākṣād apy avirodham jaiminiḥ

sākṣāt—directly; api—also; avirodham—without contradiction; jaiminiḥ—Jaimini.

Jaimini is of the opinion that the word "agni" may be interpreted to directly mean "The Supreme Personality of Godhead," and there is no inconsistency in this.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Just as the word *vaiśvānara*, interpreted to mean either "the leader (*nara*) of the world (*viśva*) or "the proprietor of all human beings (*nara*) in the universe (*viśva*)," is name of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the original cause of all causes, in the same way the word *agni*, interpreted to mean "the leader of all," is also a name of Lord Viṣṇu. Jaimini Muni considers that there is no contradiction in these interpretations because they are based on the specific meanings of each word's component parts.

The objector may say: How can the limitless Supreme Personality of Godhead become the size of the distance between the thumb and forefinger, (as *vaiśvānara* is said to be in this passage of the *Upaniṣad*)?

To answer this question he says:

Sūtra 30

abhivyakter ity āśmarathyaḥ

abhivyakteḥ—because of manifestation; iti—thus; āśmarathyaḥ—Āśmarathya.

Āśmarathya is of the opinion that the Supreme Personality of Godhead appears in this way (a size the distance between the thumb and forefinger) because He manifests Himself (in the heart of His devotee).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Lord Viṣṇu appears in this way in the hearts of His devotees, who have the eyes to see Him. This is the opinion of Āśmarathya.

Sūtra 31

anusmṛter iti bādariḥ

anusmṛteḥ—because of meditation; iti—thus; bādariḥ—Bādari Muni.

The Supreme Personality of Godhead is thought to be this small size because that conception is very convenient for meditation. This is the opinion of Bādari.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because the Supreme Lord is meditated as residing in the heart, and because the heart itself is the size of the distance between thumb and forefinger, the Lord is thought to be the size of the distance between thumb and forefinger also.

Sūtra 32

sampatter iti jaiminis tathā hi darśayati

sampatteḥ—because of transcendental opulences; iti—thus; jaiminiḥ—Jaimini; tathā—in this way; hi—because; darśayati—the śruti-śāstra declares.

(The Supreme Personality of Godhead can assume this very small size) because of His transcendental powers and opulences. This is the opinion of Jaimini. (It is known that the Supreme Personality of Godhead assumes this very small size) because śruti-śāstra reveals (this information).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Supreme Personality of Godhead can become the size of the distance between the thumb and forefinger because of His *sampatti*, His transcendental opulence in the form of inconceivable potencies. This action does not limit or restrict the Lord in any way. Jaimini thinks in this way. Why? He says *tathā hi darśayati* (It is known that the Supreme Personality of Godhead assumes this very small size because *śruti-śāstra* reveals this information). The word *hi* here means

"because."

The *śruti-śāstra* says *tam ekaṁ govindam sac-cid-ānanda-vigraham* (The Supreme Personality of Godhead is Govinda, whose transcendental form is eternal and full of knowledge and bliss) and *eko 'pi san bahudhā yo 'vabhāti* (Although He is one, the Supreme Personality of Godhead manifests as many). In this way the *śruti-śāstra* teaches that by His inconceivable potencies many contradictory qualities are simultaneously present in the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Some of these contradictory qualities are that even though His Himself all transcendental knowledge, he still has a body, and even though He is one, He is also many. Later in this book this will be explained in detail. The Supreme Personality of Godhead is simultaneously all-pervading and of a small size. There is no fault in saying this.

Sūtra 33

āmananti cainam asmin

āmananti—they declare; *ca*—also; *enam*—this; *asmin*—in Him.

(The *ātharvaṇikas*) say this of Him.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The *ātharvaṇikas* declare that this inconceivable potency is present in the Supreme Lord. In the *Kaivalya Upaniṣad* (21) the Lord says *apāṇi-pādo 'ham acintya-śaktiḥ* (Although I have no hands or feet, I still have inconceivable potencies). *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (3.33.3) says *ātmeśvaro 'tarkya-sahasra-śaktiḥ* (My dear Lord, You are self-determined and are the Supreme Personality of Godhead for all living entities. For them You created this material manifestation, and although You are one, Your diverse energies can act multifariously. This is inconceivable to us*).

These different opinions do not contradict each other. The *Skanda Purāna* explains:

*vyāsa-citta-sthitākāśād
avicchinnāni kānicit
anye vyavaharanty etad
urī-kṛtya grhādivat*

"Other sages take up small portions broken from the vast sky of Vyāsadeva's

opinions just as houses and other enclosures take up a small portion of the vastness of space."

Pada 3

Adhikaraṇa 1

The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the Abode of Heaven

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

*viśvaṁ bibharti niḥsvaṁ yaḥ
kāruṇyād eva deva-rāt
mamāsau paramānando
govindas tanutām ratim*

I pray that Lord Govinda, the supremely blissful king of the demigods, who mercifully maintains this pathetic material world, may give me pure love for Him.

In this Third Pāda will be considered some scriptural texts that may seem to describe the jīva or some other topic but in truth describe the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Viṣaya: Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 2.2.5 says:

*yasmin dyauḥ pṛthivī cāntarikṣam
otaṁ manaḥ saha prāṇaiś ca sarvaiḥ
tam evaikam jānatha ātmānam
anyā vāco vimuñcathāmṛtasyaiṣa setuḥ*

"Know that He in whom heaven, earth, sky, mind, breath, and everything else, are woven, is the ātmā. Give up talking of anything else. He is the shore of the eternal."

Saṁśaya: Is the abode of heaven described here the pradhāna, jīva, or the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa: The abode of heaven here is the pradhāna because pradhāna is the cause of all material transformations and also because the words amṛta-setu (the shore of the eternal) appropriately describe pradhāna, which leads the living

entities to liberation just as milk brings nourishment to a calf. The word ātmā in this passage may refer to pradhāna either because pradhāna brings happiness to the living entities or because it is all-pervading. Then again the words in this passage may refer to the jīva because the jīva is the enjoyer of the things in this world and because the jīva possesses the mind and the breath mentioned in this passage.

Siddhānat: Now he speaks the conclusion.

Sūtra 1

dyu-bhv-ādy-āyatanam sva-śabdāt

dyu-of heaven; bhv-and earth; ādi-beginning with; āyatanam-the abode; sva-own; śabdāt-because of the word.

The description "the abode of heaven, earth, and other things," refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead because the words in this passage specifically describe Him.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "the abode of heaven" here refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Why? The sūtra says sva-śabdāt (because the words in this passage specifically describe Him). The Supreme Personality of Godhead is referred to here because the word amṛtasya setuḥ (the shore of the eternal) can refer to Him alone and no one else. Because it comes from the verb sinoti, which means "to bind," the phrase amṛtasya setuḥ means "He who enables one to attain the eternal." Or the word setuḥ here may mean "like a bridge." As a bridge enables one to cross to the other side of rivers and other bodies of water, in the same way this bridge enables one to attain the liberation that lies on the other shore of the cycle of repeated birth and death. That is the meaning of this word. In this matter the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (3.8 and 6.15) says tam eva viditvāti mṛtyum eti (One can overcome the path of birth and death only by understanding the Supreme Personality of Godhead).

Next he says:

Sūtra 2

muktopasṛpya vyapadeśāt

mukta-liberated; upasṛpya-attaining; vyapadeśāt-because of the statement.

Because it is said that this abode of heaven is attained by the liberated souls.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

That the Supreme Personality of Godhead is attained by the liberated souls is described in the following statement of Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (3.1.3):

yadā paśyaḥ paśyate rukma-varṇam
kārtāram īśam puruṣam brahma-yonim
tadā vidvān puṇya-pāpe vidhūya
nirañjanaḥ paramam samyam upaiti

"One who sees that golden-colored Personality of Godhead, the Supreme Lord, the supreme actor, who is the source of the Supreme Brahman, becomes free from the reactions to past pious and sinful deeds, and becomes liberated, attaining the same transcendental platform as the Lord."*

Sūtra 3

nānumānam atac-chabdāt

na-not; anumānam-that which is inferred; atac-not that; śabdāt-because of a word.

The "pradhāna" is not the "abode of heaven and earth" here because there is no word appropriate to it in this passage.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The pradhāna described in the smṛti-śāstras is not referred to in this passage. Why? The sūtra says atac-chabdāt, which means that none of the words in this passage are appropriate for the insentient pradhāna.

Sūtra 4

prāṇa-bhṛc ca

prāṇa-bhṛt-the jīva ca-and.

For the same reason the "jīva" is not the "abode of heaven and earth."

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word na (not) and the phrase giving the reason (tac-chabdāt) should be understood here from the previous sūtra. The word ātmā here also cannot be understood to be the jīva because the word ātmā, because it is derived from the verb atati (to go), must primarily refer to the all-pervading Supreme Personality of Godhead. The word sarva-vit (all-knowing) also cannot refer to the jīva. For these reasons, because the words in this passage of the Upaniṣad are not appropriate for such an interpretation, he says that the jīva cannot be the "abode of heaven and earth" mentioned here.

Sūtra 5

bheda-vyapadeśāc ca

bheda-difference; vyapadeśāt-because of the description; ca-and.

And also because the difference between them is specifically described.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The jīva is not the "abode of heaven and earth" because the scriptures affirm that the jīva and the Supreme Personality of Godhead are different, as explained in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.2.5) in the words tam evaikaṁ jānathātmānam (Know Him to be the only Supreme Lord).

Sūtra 6

prakaraṇāt

prakaraṇāt-because of the context.

And also because of the context.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The "abode of heaven and earth" here must be the Supreme Personality of Godhead because of the context. The opening statement of this passage under discussion (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (1.1.3)), asks *kasmin nu vijñāte sarvam idaṁ vijñātaṁ bhavati* (What is the one thing, knowing which everything becomes known?). Therefore the passage that follows must describe the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Sūtra 7

sthity-adanābhyām ca

sthiti-staying; adanābhyām-eating; ca-and.

And also because one is eating and the other standing.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

After describing the "abode of heaven and earth," the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (3.1.1) says:

dvā suparṇā sayujā sakhāyā
samānam vṛkṣam pariṣasvajāte
tayor anyah pippalam svādy atti
anaśnann anyo 'bhicākaśīti

"Two friendly birds stay on the same tree. One eats the sweet pippala fruits and the other, not eating, shines with great splendor."

If the "abode of heaven and earth" had not been previously mentioned then (there would be) no (reason to assume) that the splendid bird here is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Otherwise (if the "abode of heaven and earth" had not been mentioned), the sudden, unannounced mention of the Supreme Personality of Godhead (in this little allegory of the birds) would not be acceptable. The jīva, who is already well known in the world, did not need to have been previously mentioned in the same way here. For these reasons the "abode of heaven and earth" here refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Adhikaraṇa 2

The Fullness is the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya: When, after describing the Lord's holy names and qualities, he was asked a question by Śrī Nārada Muni, Śrī Sanat-kumāra said (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 7.23.1-7.24.1):

bhūmā tv eva vijijñāsītavya iti bhūmānam bhagavo vijijñāsa iti. yatra nānyat paśyati nānyac chṛṇoti nānyad vijānāti sa bhūmā. atha yatrānyat paśyaty anyac chṛṇoty anyad vijānāti tad-alpam

"One should ask about Bhūmā.' 'My lord, I wish to know about Bhūmā.' 'When one attains Him one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, and knows nothing else. That is Bhūmā. When one sees something else, hears something else, and knows something else, he knows that which is very small.'"

Here the word bhūmā does not mean "many." Here it means "all-pervading." The text says yatrānyat paśyati. . . tad-alpam (When one sees something else, he sees that which is very small). The Bhūmā is contrasted against alpa (the small). The opposite of small is "all-pervading," not "many." Therefore Bhūmā here means "all-pervading."

Samśaya: Does Bhūmā here mean prāṇa (life-breath) or Lord Viṣṇu?

Pūrvapakṣa: In the passage previous to this the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.15.1) says prāṇo vā āśāyā bhūyān (prāṇa is better than hope). Because prāṇa is the topic immediately preceding Bhūmā, and because no question and answer intervenes between them, therefore prāṇa and Bhūmā are the same. here the word prāṇa (life-breath) means the jīva soul who has breath for his companion. It does not mean merely air. Because this passage begins by describing the jīva soul (7.1.3) tarati

śokam ātma-vit (He who knows the soul crosses beyond grief) and ends by again describing the jīva soul (7.26.1) ātmana evedaṁ sarvam (The soul is everything), therefore the description of Bhūmā situated between these two statements must be a description of the jīva soul. When the Upaniṣad says (7.25.1) yatra nānyat paśyati (When one attains Him one sees nothing else), it means, in this interpretation, that when the jīva is rapt in deep sleep and his senses are all in the grip of prāṇa, he cannot see anything beyond himself. When the Upaniṣad says (7.23.1) yo vai bhūmā tat sukham (the Bhūmā is bliss) it does not contradict the idea that the Bhūmā is the jīva here because the śruti-śāstra says tasyāṁ sukham aham asvāpsam (I slept very happily). In this way it is proved that this passage of the Upaniṣad describes the jīva soul. All the other portions of this passage are also very favorable to this interpretation of the jīva.

Siddhānta: He says:

Sūtra 8

bhūmā samprasādād adhyupadeśāt

bhūmā-the Bhūmā; samprasādāt-than the jīva, who is the object of the Lord's mercy; adhi-greater; upadeśāt-because of the teaching.

(The Bhūmā here is the Supreme Personality of Godhead) because of the scriptural teaching that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is superior to the jīva soul.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Bhūmā here is Lord Viṣṇu and not the jīva, who has prāṇa (life-breath) as his companion. Why? The sūtra says samprasādād adhy upadeśāt (because of the scriptural teaching that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is superior to the jīva soul). The Bhūmā is the Supreme Personality of Godhead because the passage here in the words (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 7.23.1) yo vai bhūmā tat sukham (the Bhūmā is bliss) says that the Bhūmā is full of great bliss, and because the sūtra here says that the Bhūmā is superior to all. Or the Bhūmā is the Supreme Personality of Godhead because the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.3.4) in the words eṣa samprasādo 'smāc charīrāt samutthāya (The jīva who has attained the mercy of the Lord rises above the gross material body and attains the effulgent spiritual world) says that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is superior to the jīva, who is dependent on the Lord's mercy, and who has prāṇa (life-breath) as his companion. The meaning is this: After describing names and a host of other things, the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.15.2) says sa vā eṣa evaṁ paśyan evaṁ manvāna evaṁ vijānann ati-

vādī bhavati (He who sees prāṇa, meditates on prāṇa, and understands prāṇa becomes a true knower of things), and then after saying that the knower of prāṇa becomes a true knower of things, the Upaniṣad then says (7.16.1) eṣa tu vā ativadati yaḥ satyenātivadati (He who knows the Supreme Personality of Godhead is in reality the true knower of things). The word tu (but) here ends the discussion of prāṇa. Then the greatest ativādī (wise man) is described as he who knows the satya, which here means "Lord Viṣṇu." In this way the Upaniṣad explains that the Bhūmā is both different from and superior to prāṇa. Because in this way the Bhūmā is declared to be superior to prāṇa, prāṇa cannot be identical with the Bhūmā.

The Bhūmā is here taught to be superior to the series beginning with name and culminating in prāṇa and therefore it is clearly seen to be different from speech and the other items in this series. In this way the Bhūmā is taught to be superior to prāṇa.

The word satya is famous as a name for the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Lord Viṣṇu. The scriptures use the word satya in this way. For example, the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.1.2) says satyaṁ jñānam anantam (the unlimited Supreme Personality of Godhead is full of transcendental knowledge) and the Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (1.1.1) says satyaṁ paraṁ dhīmahi (I meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead). The word satyena is in the instrumental case to show in the sense of "because." The meaning here is that one becomes an ativādī (wise man) because of the satya, the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The person who meditates on prāṇa is called an ativādī (wise man) because he is wise in comparison to they who meditate on the series of objects mentioned previously, beginning with prāṇa and culminating in hope. But he who meditates on Lord Viṣṇu is superior to the person who meditates on prāṇa. Therefore he who meditates on Lord Viṣṇu is the real, the best ativādī (wise man).

For this reason the student asks (Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.16.1) so 'ham bhagavaḥ satyenātivadāni (my lord, I will become a man wise with knowledge of the Supreme Personality of Godhead). The guru then answers satyaṁ tv eva vijijñāsītavyam (one must yearn to understand the Supreme Personality of Godhead).

The objection that because after the description of the ativādī wise with knowledge of prāṇa there are no further questions and answers, therefore the subject of prāṇa continues into the next sentence, is not a valid objection. Moreover, (it may be said,) because there are no questions after the description of prāṇa, (therefore prāṇa is the highest). In describing the series of inanimate elements, beginning with name and culminating in hope, the guru did not say that the knower of any of these was an ativādī (wise man). However, when he described prāṇa, which here means the jīva, he did say that the knower of prāṇa is an ativādī. The student then assumes that prāṇa is the highest. That is why he asks no further question. The guru, however, not accepting prāṇa as the highest, proceeds to explain that Lord Viṣṇu is higher than prāṇa. The student, however, now taught that Lord Viṣṇu is the highest, becomes eager to know how to meditate on Him, and asks so 'ham bhagavaḥ satyenātivadāni (my lord, I will become a man wise with knowledge of the Supreme Personality of Godhead).

The opponent may say, "What is referred to here is the jīva, who is the companion of prāṇa (life-breath), and who is referred to in the beginning of this

passage as ātmā."

The reply is: No. Here the word ātmā primarily means the Supreme Personality of Godhead because to interpret the word otherwise would contradict the statement at the beginning of the passage (7.26.1) ātmanaḥ prāṇaḥ (from the ātmā prāṇa is manifested). This view of the opponent contradicts the statement (7.24.1) yatra nānyat paśyati nānyac chr̥ṇoti nānyad vijānāti sa bhūmā. (When one attains Him one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, and knows nothing else. That is Bhūmā). This description of the perception of Bhūmā clearly refutes any idea that the word Bhūmā could mean anything other than the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The scriptures say sauṣuptikam sukham alpam (the happiness of deep sleep is very slight), and therefore to say that the word Bhūmā here means "the jīva who is soundly sleeping" is simply laughable. For all these reasons, therefore, the Bhūmā described here is Lord Viṣṇu.

Sūtra 9

dharmopapatteś ca

dharma-qualities; upapatteḥ-because of the appropriateness; ca-and.

And also because the qualities described here can be ascribed to the Supreme Personality of Godhead only.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The qualities ascribed here to the Bhūmā are suitable only for the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Lord Viṣṇu, and not for anyone else. The Upaniṣad says (7.24.1) yo vai bhūmā tad amṛtam (The Bhūmā is the eternal). This describes the eternalness that is a natural feature of the Supreme. The Upaniṣad also says sa bhagavaḥ kasmin pratiṣṭhita iti sve mahimni (Where does the Supreme Personality of Godhead stay? He stays in His own glory). This explains that the Supreme Personality of Godhead does not depend on anyone. The scriptures also say sa evādhastāt (The Supreme Person is above, below, in front, behind, to the left and to the right). This shows that the Lord is the ultimate shelter of everyone and everything. The scriptures say (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 7.26.1) ātmanaḥ prāṇaḥ (From the Supreme Personality of Godhead the life-force is manifested). This shows that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the original cause of all causes. These are some of the qualities of the Supreme described in the Vedic literatures.

Adhikaraṇa 3

"Akṣara" Refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya: The Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.8.7-8) says:

kasmin khalu ākāśa otaś ca protaś ceti. sa hovāca. etad vai tad akṣaram gārgi
brāhmaṇā abhivadanti asthūlam anaṇv ahrasvam adīrgham alohitam asneham
acchāyam

"In what is the sky woven, warp and woof?' He said: 'O Gārgi, the brāhmaṇas say it is woven in the eternal. The eternal is not large, not small, not short, not tall, not red, not liquid, without shade).

Samśaya: Is the akṣara (eternal) here pradhāna, jīva, or the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa: The word Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣadakṣara here may denote any of the three. The meaning is ambiguous.

Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 10

akṣaram ambarānta-dhṛteḥ

akṣaram-the eternal; ambara-with sky; anta-at the end; dhṛteḥ-because of being the support.

The word "akṣara" here refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, because the "akṣara" is described as the resting place of all the elements, beginning with the grossest and culminating in sky.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The akṣara here is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Why? The sūtra says amabarānta-dhṛteḥ (because the akṣara is described as the resting place of all the elements, beginning with the grossest and culminating in sky). The Upaniṣad says etasmin khalu akṣare gārgy ākāśa otaś ca protaś ca (O Gārgi, the sky is woven,

warp and woof, in the eternal). the word akṣara must refer to the Supreme Personality of Godhead because it is here described as the resting place of all the elements, which culminate in sky.

The objection may be raised: "Akṣara here may refer to pradhāna because pradhāna is the origin of all the changes of this world. Akṣara may also refer to the jīva because the jīva is the resting place of all inanimate objects that come within its perception."

If these objections are raised, he then says:

Sūtra 11

sā ca praśāsanāt

sā-that; ca-and; praśāsanāt-because of the command.

"Akṣara" here must refer to the Supreme Personality of Godhead because the text says that everything is supported by His command.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the previous sūtra the Supreme Personality of Godhead is described as the resting place of all the elements, beginning with the grossest and culminating in sky. Why is this? The sūtra says praśāsanāt (because the text says that everything is supported by His command). The Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.8.9) says etasya vā akṣarasya praśāsane gārgi dyāvā-prthivī vidhr̥te tiṣṭhataḥ. etasya vā akṣarasya praśāsane gārgi sūryā-candramasau vidhr̥tau tiṣṭhataḥ (By the command of the eternal, O Gārgi, heaven and earth are manifest. By the command of the eternal, O Gārgi, the sun and moon are manifest). Because these words describe the order of the eternal, the eternal should be understood to be the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Neither the inanimate, unconscious pradhāna, nor the conditioned or liberated jīva can create everything simply by their command.

Sūtra 12

anya-bhāva-vyāvṛtteś ca

anya-another; bhāva-nature; vyāvṛtteḥ-because of the exclusion; ca-also.

And also because the text describes certain qualities that specifically exclude any other being.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.8.11) says tad vā etad akṣaram gārgy adṛṣtam draṣṭṛ aśrutam śroṭṛ (O Gārgi, this eternal sees, but is unseen. He hears, but is unheard). Because these words describe the akṣara in terms that cannot be applied to anyone but the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the word akṣara must refer to the Supreme Person. The pradhāna is inanimate and unconscious and therefore it cannot see. Because the text here says that the akṣara sees everything but cannot be seen by anyone, it cannot mean the jīva.

Adhikaraṇa 4

The "Puruṣa" Seen in Brahmaloḥa is the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Praśna Upaniṣad (5.2.2-5) the following passage is read:

etad vai satyakāma param cāparam ca brahma yad omkāras tasmād vidvān
etenaivāyatanenaikataram anveti. . . yaḥ punar etaṁ tri-mātreṇom ity
anenaivākṣareṇa param puruṣam abhidhyāyīta sa tejasi sūrye sampanno yathā
pādodaras tvacāvīnirmucyate evaṁ haiva sa pāpmabhir vinirmuktaḥ sa sāmabhir
unnīyate brahmalokaṁ sa etasmāt jīva-ghanāt parāt param puriṣayaṁ puruṣam
vīkṣatet1)

"O Satyakāma, the syllable om is both the superior Brahman and the inferior Brahman. A wise man attains one of these two Brahmans. . . One who, reciting the eternal om of three lengths, meditates on the Supreme Person, will attain the sun-planet. As a snake sheds its skin so does he become free from all sins. By the hymns of the Vedas he is carried to Brahmaloḥa. There he directly sees the Supreme Soul, the Supreme Person residing in the heart."

Saiṁśaya: Is the person seen and meditated on the four-faced demigod Brahmā or the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa: The text here says that the devotee who meditates on om of one length attains the world of men, the devotee who meditates on om of two lengths attains the world of heaven, and the devotee who meditates on om of one length attains the world of Brahma. The planet here is the planet of the four-faced

demigod Brahmā and the person seen by one who goes there is the four-faced demigod Brahmā.

Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 13

īkṣati-karma-vyapadeśāt saḥ

īkṣati-of seeing; karma-object; vyapadeśāt-because of the description; saḥ-He.

The person here is the Supreme Personality of Godhead because the description of the object of vision here fits the Supreme Person.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the īkṣati-karma, or object of vision. Why? the sūtra says vyapadeśāt (because the description of the object of vision here fits the Supreme Person). This is so because the Upaniṣad (5.2.7) describes the qualities of the Supreme Personality of Godhead in the following words: tam omkāreṇaivāyatanenānveti vidvān yat tac chāntam ajaram amṛtam abhayam paraṁ parāyaṇam ca (By reciting om the wise man attains the supremely peaceful, ageless, eternal, fearless Supreme, the ultimate goal of life). The conclusion is that, according to the argument of niṣāda-sthapaty-adhikaraṇa-nyāya, the word brahmaloka here means Viṣṇuloka (the planet of Lord Viṣṇu).

Adhikaraṇa 5

The "Dahara" is the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya: In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.1.1) is heard the following:

atha yad idam asmin brahma-pure daharam puṇḍarīkam veśma daharo śminn antar ākāśas tasmin yad antas tad anveṣṭavyam tad vijijñāsitavyam

"In a great city is a small lotus palace. In that palace is a small sky. That sky

should be sought. That sky should be asked about."

Samśaya: What is the small sky here in the lotus of the heart? Is it the element sky, the jīva, or Lord Viṣṇu?

Pūrvapakṣa: Because the word ākāśa generally means the element sky it must also have that same meaning here. Or, because the jīva is very small and also the master of the city of the body, it may mean the jīva.

Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 14

dahara uttarebhyaḥ

daharaḥ-the small; uttarebhyaḥ-because of the descriptions that follow.

The small sky here is the Supreme Personality of Godhead because of the description given in the remainder of the text.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The small sky here is Lord Viṣṇu. Why? The sūtra says uttarebhyaḥ, which means "because of the description given in the remainder of the text." The descriptions used here to describe the small sky, such as "as great as the sky," "maintaining everything," and "free from all sin," cannot be used to describe either the element sky or the jīva soul. The "great city" described in this Upaniṣad is the body of the devotee. The "lotus" is the heart in the body. The "palace" is the abode of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The word "small sky" is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who should be meditated upon and sought after, and who possesses a host of transcendental qualities, including being always free of all sin. The passage should be interpreted in this way. Therefore the small sky here is Lord Viṣṇu. Then he says-

Sūtra 15

gati-śabdābhyām tathā hi dr̥ṣṭam liṅgam ca

gati-because of going; śabdābhyām-and because of a certain word; tathā hi-furthermore; dr̥ṣṭam-seen; liṅgam-hinted; ca-and.

This is so because of the description of going, because of the use of a certain word, and because it is both directly seen and also hinted at.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.3.2) says:

yathā hiraṇya-nidhiṁ nihitam akṣetrajñā upari sañcaranto 'pi na vidus tathemāḥ
sarvāḥ prajā ahar ahar gacchantya enam brahmalokaṁ na vidanty anṛtena hi
pratyūdhāḥ

"As people, unaware of what the ground actually holds, walk again and again over buried golden treasure, so do the people of this world day after day go to the spiritual world of Brahman without knowing it."

"Enam" (this), which points to the "small sky," is the "certain word" mentioned in the sūtra, and the description here of the living entities' "going to the spiritual world of Brahman" is the "going" mentioned in the sūtra. Both enam and the going mentioned here show that Lord Viṣṇu is the "small sky."

Furthermore, in another place the scriptures again describe the living entities' going to the Supreme in these words: satā saumya tadā sampanno bhavati (O gentle one, the living entities are again and again in contact with the Supreme). This is the "directly seen" mentioned in the sūtra. The use of the word brahmaloka hints that Lord Viṣṇu is the topic of discussion here. This is the "hint" mentioned in the sūtra. The word brahmaloka here cannot refer to the Satyaloka planet because it is not possible for the living entities to go day after day to the Satyaloka planet.

Sūtra 16

dhṛteś ca mahimno 'syāsminn upalabdheḥ

dhṛteḥ-because of maintaining; ca-and; mahimnaḥ-of the glory; asya-of Him; asmin-in this; upalabdheḥ-because of being stated.

This is so because of the description of His glory in maintaining all the worlds.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the passage beginning with the words daharo 'sminn antar ākāśaḥ (in that palace is a small sky), the descriptions "as great as the sky," "maintaining everything," and "free from all sin," and the use of the word ātmā clearly, and without need to turn to any other passage, show that the "small sky" mentioned here is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.22) also says: atha ya ātmā sa setur vidhṛtir eṣām lokānām asaṁbhedāya (He is the Supreme Person, the bridge, the controller who prevents the worlds from becoming broken and destroyed). Because the "small sky" is thus shown to possess the glory of maintaining all the worlds, the "small sky" here must be Lord Viṣṇu.

The Chāndogya Upaniṣad also says: eṣa setur vidhāraṇa eṣām lokānām asaṁbhedāya (He is the bridge, the controller who prevents the worlds from becoming broken and destroyed). In these passages and in others also, this glory of the Supreme Personality of Godhead may be seen.

Sūtra 17

prasiddheś ca

prasiddheḥ-because of being famous in this way; ca-and.

And also because this is a traditional usage of the word.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This is so because the word "sky" is commonly used to mean "the Supreme Personality of Godhead," as may be seen in the following statement of Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.7.1): ko hy evānyat kaḥ prāṇyāt. yad eṣa ākāśa ānando na syāt. (Who could breathe if the sky were not bliss?)

Someone may raise the following objection: The Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.3.4) says: sa eṣa samprasādo 'smāc charīrāt samutthāya param jyotir upasampadya svena rūpeṇābhiniṣpadyate. eṣa ātmeti hovāca. etad amṛtam etad abhayam etad brahma ("The liberated jīva rises from the material body. He attains the spiritual effulgence and manifests his original form. This is the self," he said. "He is immortal. He is fearless. He is Brahman"). Because this description of the jīva appears immediately afterward, the description of the "small sky" should be understood to refer to the jīva.

If this objection is raised, he replies:

Sūtra 18

itara-parāmarṣāt sa iti cen nāsambhavāt

itara-the other; parāmarṣāt-because of reference; saḥ-he; iti-thus; cet-if; na-not; asambhavāt-because of impossibility.

If it is said that because there is mention of something else (the jīva) in the same passage (and therefore the "small sky" here is the jīva, then I say) No, because it is impossible.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Although in the middle of this passage there is a description of the jīva, nevertheless it is not possible to say that the beginning of this passage describes the jīva. Why? The sūtra says asambhavāt (because it is impossible). This is so because in the beginning of this passage there is a description of eight qualities, beginning with "being free from sin," that cannot be ascribed to the jīva.

Now our opponent may say: So be it. Still, after the description of the "small sky," the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.7.1) says ya ātmāpahata-pāpmā vijaro vimṛtyur viśoko vijighatso 'pipāsaḥ satya-kāmaḥ satya-saṅkalpaḥ so 'nveṣṭavyaḥ sa vijijñāsitavyaḥ (The soul is free from sin, old-age, death, suffering, hunger, and thirst. It desires only the good. Whatever it desires is attained at once). Because these words of the Prajāpati describe the jīva the qualities described in 7.7.1 and the "small sky" described before that may also refer to the jīva.

Considering that this doubt might arise, he says:

Sūtra 19

uttarāc ced āvirbhāva-svarūpas tu

uttarāt-because of a later passage; cet-if; āvirbhāva-manifestation; svarūpas-form; tu-indeed.

If it is said that a later passage (proves that the "small sky" is the jīva then I say no.) The description of the true nature of the jīva is confined to that passage alone.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word tu (but) is used here to dispel doubt. The word na (no) should be understood from the previous sūtra. In this passage spoken by the Prajāpati the teaching is that the jīva manifests these qualities by engaging in spiritual activities, but otherwise these qualities are not manifested. In the passage describing the "small sky" these eight attributes are said to be eternally manifested. The statement of the Prajāpati is, however, that these qualities are present in the jīva only if he engages in spiritual activities. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.3.4) clearly explains the difference between the Supreme Personality of Godhead (who possesses these eight qualities in all circumstances) and the jīva (who possesses these qualities only when he becomes liberated) in the following words: sa eṣa samprasādo 'smāc charīrāt samutthāya param jyotir upasampadya svena rūpeṇābhiniṣpadyate. eṣa ātmeti hovāca. etad amṛtam etad abhayam etad brahma ("The liberated jīva rises from the material body. He attains the spiritual effulgence and manifests his original form. This is the self," he said. "He is immortal. He is fearless. He is Brahman"). Although the jīva may manifest some of these eight qualities by engaging in spiritual activities, he still cannot manifest all of them. The qualities of being the "bridge that spans the worlds," and being the "maintainer of the worlds" are some of the qualities the jīva can never attain. This proves that the "small sky" is the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Now our opponent says: If this is so, then why is the jīva mentioned at all in this passage?

To answer this question he says:

Sūtra 20

anyārthaś ca parāmarṣaḥ

anya-another; arthaś-meaning; ca-and; parāmarṣaḥ-reference.

The description of the jīva here has a different object.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The jīva is described here in order to teach about the Supreme Personality of Godhead. When the jīva becomes liberated and attains his original spiritual form, he also manifests these eight qualities. In this way it may be understood that the

"small sky" is the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Now our opponent says: Because the "small sky" within is described as very small it must refer to the jīva, which was previously described as also being very small.

If this objection is given, then he says:

Sūtra 21

alpa-śruter iti cet tad-uktam

alpa-small; śruteḥ-from the śruti; iti-thus; cet-if; tat-that; uktam-said.

If it is said that when the śruti describes the "small" it must refer to the jīva, then I say no because of what has already been said.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Supreme Personality of Godhead manifests a very small form to facilitate meditation on Him. This has already been described in sūtra 1.2.7, which says nicāyyatvād evaṁ vyomavac ca. This sūtra explains that although the Supreme Personality of Godhead is all-pervading, in order to facilitate meditation on Him, He manifests a small form the size of the distance between the thumb and forefinger. He appears in this small form so He may be easily meditated upon. Of course, His glories have no limit and His size also has no limit.

Then he gives another explanation.

Sūtra 22

anukṛtes tasya ca

anukṛteḥ-because of imitation; tasya-of Him; ca-also.

And also because (the jīva) merely resembles in some respects (the Supreme Personality of Godhead).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because, according to the statement of the Prajāpati, the jīva, who only manifests the eight qualities when engaged in spiritual activities, merely resembles in some respects the "small sky," who manifests the eight qualities eternally, the "small sky" must be different from the jīva. Previously the original form of the jīva is covered by illusion, and then afterwards, by worshiping the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the illusion becomes broken and the jīva, manifesting these eight qualities, becomes equal, in some respects, to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In this way, as explained by the Prajāpati, the jīva resembles, in some respects, the "small sky." The sentence pavanam anuharate hanūmān (Hanuman resembles the wind) shows the difference between the resembled object and the thing that resembles it. That the liberated jīva resembles the Supreme Personality of Godhead may also be seen in the following words from Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (3.1.3): nirañjanaḥ paramaṁ sāmyam upaiti (the liberated jīva resembles the Supreme Personality of Godhead).

Sūtra 23

api smaryate

api-and; smaryate-described in the smṛti-śāstra.

This is also described in the smṛti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bhagavad-gīta (14.2) the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Lord Kṛṣṇa, also explains:

idaṁ jñānam upāśritya
mama sādharmaṁ āgataḥ
sarge 'pi nopajāyante
pralaye na vyathanti ca

"By becoming fixed in this knowledge, one can attain to the transcendental nature like My own. Once established, one is not born at the time of creation or disturbed at the time of dissolution."*

In this way the smṛti-śāstra explains that the liberated jīvas attain a nature like that of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. For these reasons the "small sky" is

Lord Hari and not the jīva.

Adhikaraṇa 6

The Person the Size of a Thumb is the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viśaya: In the Kaṭha Upaniṣad (2.1.12) the following words are read:

aṅguṣṭha-mātraḥ puruṣo
madhya ātmani tiṣṭhati
īśāno bhūta-bhavyaysya
tato na vijugupsate

"A person the size of a thumb stands in the heart. He is the master of the past and future. He does not fear."

Samśaya: Is this person the size of a thumb the jīva or Lord Viṣṇu?

Pūrvapakṣa: The person here is the jīva because the Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad (5.7-8) says prāṇādhipaḥ sañcarati sva-karmabhir aṅguṣṭha-mātro ravi-tulya-rūpaḥ (The ruler of breath moves about, impelled by his karma. He is the size of a thumb. He is splendid as the sun).

Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 24

śabdād eva pramitaḥ

śabdāt-because of the word; eva-even; pramitaḥ-limited.

Even though (He is) very small (this person is the Supreme Lord) because of the words (in the text).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The person here the size of a thumb is Lord Viṣṇu. Why? The sūtra says śabdāt

(because of the words in the text). The Upaniṣad text referred to here is *iṣāno bhūta-bhavya* (He is the master of the past and future). It is not possible for the *jīva*, who is controlled by his karma, to possess this power.

Now it may be asked: How is it possible for the all-pervading Supreme Personality of Godhead to become limited to this very small form?

To answer this question he says:

Sūtra 25

hr̥dy upekṣayā tu manuṣyādhikāratvāt

hr̥di-in the heart; upekṣayā-with relation; tu-indeed; manuṣya-of human beings; adhikāratvāt-because of the qualification.

This is so because the Supreme Personality of Godhead indeed appears in the hearts of men.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word *tu* (indeed) is used here for emphasis. The all-pervading Supreme Personality of Godhead becomes the size of a thumb because He is meditated on as being the size of thumb within the heart. Another interpretation is that because He appears, by His inconceivable potency, in such a small form in the heart He is meditated on in that way, as has been already described.

"Because the different species have bodies of different sizes and hearts of different sizes it is not possible that the Lord can appear in all of them in this size." If this objection is raised, to answer it he says *mānuṣyādhikāratvāt* (the Supreme Personality of Godhead appears in the hearts of men). Although the scriptures do not specify, he (*Vyāsa*) singles out human beings. He does this because it is human beings who are able to meditate and therefore the measurement is given here according to the human body. For this reason there is no contradiction here. In the same way in the hearts of elephants, horses, and all other creatures the Supreme Personality of Godhead appears in a form the size of the thumb of each creature. In this way there is no contradiction. It is not possible for the *jīva*, however, to be present within the heart in a form the size of a thumb because the original form of the *jīva* is atomic in size, as explained in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (5.9) in the words *bālāgra-śata-bhāgasya* (When the upper point of a hair is divided into one hundred parts and again each of such parts is further divided into one hundred parts, each such part is the measurement of the dimension of the *jīva* soul). For all these reasons, therefore, the person the size of a

thumb is Lord Viṣṇu.

Adhikaraṇa 7

The Devas Can Meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya: In order to prove that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the person the size of a thumb, the Vedic scriptures were quoted to establish that it is human beings who have the right to meditate on the Supreme Person. That evidence may lead to the belief that human beings alone have the right to meditate on the Supreme Person. Now, by refuting that false belief, the right of others to meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead will be proved.

The Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.10) says:

tad yo yo devānām pratyabudhyata sa eva tad abhavat tatharsīṇām tathā
manuṣyāṇām

"Whoever among the devas meditated on the Supreme Personality of Godhead, attained Supreme Personality of Godhead. Whoever among the sages meditated on Him attained Him. Whoever among the human beings meditated on Him attained Him."

The Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.16) also says:

tad devā jyotiṣām jyotir āyur hopāsate 'mṛtam

"The devas meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is the splendor of all splendors, and who is eternity and life."

Samśaya: Is it possible for the devas to meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead, as human beings do, or is it not possible?

Pūrvapakṣa: Because the devas have no senses they are not able to meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Indra and the other devas are beings created by mantras. They have no bodily senses. Because they have no senses they have neither material desires nor spiritual renunciation.

Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

tad upary api bādarāyaṇaḥ sambhavāt

tad-that; upari-above; api-also; bādarāyaṇaḥ-Vyāsadeva; sambhavāt-because of being possible.

Beings superior to humankind are able to meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is the opinion of Vyāsa.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The devas and other beings superior to humankind are able to meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is the opinion of Lord Vyāsadeva. Why? Because according to the Upaniṣads, Vedic mantras, Itihāsas, Purāṇas, and ancient tradition, they do indeed have bodies and senses. Because they have heavenly bodies and senses they are able to meditate and they are also able to become detached from their heavenly opulence and voluntarily renounce it. Because they are aware of the baseness and impermanence of their celestial opulence they are able to be detached from it and renounce it. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa (6.5.50) explains:

na kevalam dvija-śreṣṭha
narake duḥkha-paddhatiḥ
svarge 'pi yāta-bhītasya
kṣayiṣṇor nāsti nirvṛtiḥ

"O best of the brāhmaṇas, torment does not exist only in hell. The residents of the heavenly planets, afraid that they may one day fall from heaven, have no happiness."

For this reason the devas desire spiritual happiness. This is so because they have heard from the śruti-śāstra that spiritual bliss is limitless, eternal, and pure. The śruti explains that to attain spiritual knowledge the devas and other celestial beings observe vows of celibacy. This is described in the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (5.2.1) in these words: tatra yāḥ prajāpatyāḥ prajāpatau pitari brahmacaryam uṣur devā manuṣyā asurāḥ (The devas, humans, and asuras, who were all sons of Lord Brahmā, lived with their father as celibate students of spiritual knowledge). In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.11.3) King Indra is described in the following words: eka-śataṁ ha vai varṣāṇi maghavā prajāpatau brahmacaryam uvāsa (For a hundred years King Indra lived as a celibate student of spiritual knowledge in the home of Lord Brahmā). For these reasons, therefore, the devas and other higher beings are able to meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

The following objection may be raised: "This idea (that the devas are not beings created by mantras but are conditioned living entities residing in material bodies) is not consistent with the activities of the devas and other higher beings because it is not possible that a single embodied demigod could come to many different places at once when called to appear at many agnihotra-yajñas in many different

places simultaneously."

If this is said, he (Vyāsa) speaks the following words:

Sūtra 27

virodhaḥ karmaṇīti cen nāneka-pratipatter darśanāt

virodhaḥ-contradiction; karmaṇī-in activities; iti-thus; cet-if; na-not; aneka-many; pratipatteḥ-because of the acceptance; darśanāt-because of seeing.

If it is objected that this idea is refuted by the very activities of the devas, then I say no, because it is seen that the devas have the power to manifest many forms simultaneously.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

There is no contradiction here if it accepted that the devas are embodied souls with material bodies. Why? The sūtra says aneka-pratipatter darśanāt (because it is seen that the devas have the power to manifest many forms simultaneously). This is so because many powerful beings, such as Saubhari Muni and others, are able to manifest many forms simultaneously.

The objector may say: It may be that in the description of the devas' activities there is no contradiction for they who say that the devas have bodies. There remains, however, a contradiction in the description of the words of the Vedas. Before the birth and after the death of each demigod a period would exist when the name of that demigod would not have any meaning. At that time the words of the Vedas would become meaningless, like the statement "the son of a barren woman." In this way this idea is refuted. The Mīmāṃsā-sūtra says: autpattikas tu śabdenārthasya sambandhaḥ (In the Vedas the relation between name and the object named is eternal). This idea (that the devas are embodied souls) would then contradict the eternality of the names in the Vedas.

If this objection is raised, then he (Vyāsa) replies:

Sūtra 28

śabda iti cen nātaḥ prabhavāt pratyakṣānumānābhyām

śabdaḥ-the words of the Vedas; iti-thus; cet-if; na-no; ataḥ-from this; prabhavāt-

because of creation; pratyakṣa-because of śruti; anumānābhyām-and smṛti.

If someone objects that this idea is inconsistent with the eternal nature of the words in the Vedas, then I say no because of the description of the creation of the world and also because of the evidence given in śruti and smṛti.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The idea stated here (that the devas have bodies) is not inconsistent with the nature of the words in the Vedas. Why? The sūtra says prabhavāt pratyakṣānumānābhyām (because of the description of the creation of the world and also because of the evidence given in śruti and smṛti. The creation of the material bodies (of the devas and other beings in the universe) is done (by Lord Brahmā) remembering their eternal, archetypal forms recorded in the statements of the Vedas. These archetypal forms are eternal, and existed before any of the bodies of the living entities were manifested. These archetypal forms are described by Viśvakarmā in his own scripture for drawing forms in the words yamaṁ daṇḍa-pāṇim likhanti varuṇam tu pāśa-hastam (They draw the demigod Yama with a mace in his hand, and the demigod Varuṇa with a noose in his hand). The Vedic words describing the devas and other kinds of living entities are names of certain classes of living entity, just as the word "cow" is the name of a certain kind of living entity. The names of the devas are not names of specific persons, as for example, the name Caitra. Because the words of the Vedas are eternal in this way the Vedas are genuine sources of knowledge. This explanation is not at all inconsistent with the previously quoted explanation from the Mīmāṃsā-sūtra.

Why is this? The sūtra says pratyakṣānumānābhyām, which means "because of the evidence given in śruti and smṛti." The śruti (Pañca-vaimśati Brāhmaṇa (6.9,13,22) discussing the creation of the world, which was preceded by the (eternal) words (of the Vedas), gives the following description: eta iti ha vai prajāpatir devān asṛjat asṛgram iti manuṣyān indava iti pitṛiṁs tiraḥ-pavitram iti grahān āsuva iti stotraṁ viśvānīti mantraṁ abhisaubhagety anyāḥ prajāḥ (Reciting the word ete from the Vedas, Lord Brahmā created the devas. Reciting the word asṛgram, he created the human beings. Reciting the word indava, he created the pitās. Reciting the word tiraḥ-pavitram, he created the planets. Reciting the word asuva, he created songs. Reciting the word viśvāni, he created mantras. Reciting the word abhisaubhaga, he created the other creatures).

The smṛti also confirms this in the following words (Viṣṇu Purāṇa 1.5.64):

nāma rūpaṁ ca bhūtānām
kṛtyānām ca prapañcanam
veda-śabdebhya evātau
devādīnām cakāra saḥ

"By reciting the words of the Vedas in the beginning, Lord Brahmā created the

names and forms of the material elements, the rituals, the devas, and all other living entities."

Sūtra 29

ata eva ca nityatvam

ataḥ eva-therefore; ca-and; nityatvam-eternity.

And for this very reason the eternity (of the Veda is proved).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The eternity of the Vedas is proved by the fact that the creator (Brahmā) creates (the world) by (reciting the Vedic) words (describing the) eternal forms and by remembering (the previous creation). Kaṭhaka Muni and the (other sages) should be understood to be merely the speakers (and not the authors of the Vedas).

The objection may be raised: So be it. The śruti explains that by remembering the words of the Vedas Lord Brahmā creates the forms of the devas and other living entities. This may be in the case after the (naimittika) partial cosmic devastation, but how can this method of creation be employed after the (prākṛta) complete cosmic devastation, when absolutely everything is destroyed, and how can the Vedas be eternal under the circumstances of such complete destruction?

If this is said, then he replies:

Sūtra 30

samāna-nāma-rūpatvāc cāvṛttāv apy avirodho darśanāt smṛteś ca

samāna-same; nāma-because of the names; rūpatvāt-and forms; ca-also; avṛttāu-in the repetition; api-also; avirodhaḥ-not a contradiction; darśanāt #because of the śruti\$ smṛteś-because of the smṛti; ca-indeed.

Because the names and forms remain the same even at the beginning of a new creation, there is no contradiction. This is proved by śruti and smṛti.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word *ca* (indeed) is used here to dispel doubt. That after a complete cosmic devastation there must be a new creation does not at all disprove the eternalness of the words of the Vedas. Why? The sūtra says *samāna-nāma-rūpatvāc cāvṛttāv apy avirodho darśanāt smṛteś ca* (Because the names and forms remain the same even at the beginning of a new creation, there is no contradiction. This is proved by śruti and smṛti). The meaning here is "because the previously spoken names and forms remain the same." At the time of the great cosmic devastation the eternal Vedas and the eternal archetypal forms described by the Vedas enter Lord Hari, the master of transcendental potencies, and rest within Him, becoming one with Him. At the time of the next creation they again become manifested from the Lord. Lord Hari and the four-faced demigod Brahmā both precede their acts of creation with recitation of Vedic mantras, which recitation leads to meditation on the archetypal forms. At the time of a new creation the creator remembers what He created in the previous creation and He again creates as He had created before. This is like a potter who, by saying the word "pot" remembers the forms of pots he previously fashioned, and goes on to make another pot. Just as the process of creation is performed in this way after the partial cosmic devastation, in the same way the process of creation is also performed after the complete cosmic devastation.

How is all this known? The sūtra says *darśanāt smṛteś ca* (because this is proved by śruti and smṛti). The śruti says:

ātmā vā idam eka evāgra āsīt sa aikṣata lokān utsrjāḥ

"In the beginning was only the Supreme Personality of Godhead. He thought: I shall create many worlds).

Aitareya Upaniṣad 1.1

yo brahmāṇam vidadhāti pūrvam yo vai vedānīs ca prahiṇoti tasmi tam

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead created the Vedas and taught them to the demigod Brahmā).

Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 6.18

sūryā-candramasau dhātā yathā-pūrvam akalpat

"Brahmā created the sun and moon as he had done before."

Rg Veda

The smṛti says

*nyagrodhaḥ su-mahān alpe
yathā bīje vyavasthitaḥ*

samyame viśvam akhilam
bija-bhūte yathā tvayi

"O Lord, just as a great banyan tree rests within a tiny seed, in the same way at the time of cosmic devastation the entire universe rests within You, the seed from which it originally sprouted."

Viṣṇu Purāṇa

nārāyaṇaḥ paro devas
tasmā jātaś caturmukhaḥ

"Nārāyaṇa is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. From him the demigod Brahmā was born."

Varāha Purāṇa

tene brahma ḥṛdā ya ādi-kavaye

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead first imparted the Vedic knowledge unto the heart of Brahmājī, the original living being."*

Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 1.1.1

A summary of this gist of this explanation follows: The Supreme Personality of Godhead, at the end of the period of cosmic devastation, meditating on the material universe as it had been before, desiring in His heart "I shall become many," differentiating again the jīvas and material elements that had become merged within Him, creating again, as it had been before, the material universe extending from the mahat-tattva to the demigod Brahmā, manifesting the Vedas exactly as they had been before, teaching the Vedas to the demigod Brahmā within the heart, engaging the demigod Brahmā in the creation of the forms of the devas and other living entities as they had been before, and personally entered the universe and controlling it from within. Omniscient by the mercy of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the demigod Brahmā, meditating on the archetypal forms described in the Vedas, creates the devas and other creatures as they had been before. In this way the relationship between the names of the devas headed by Indra and their archetypal forms described in the Vedas is explained. In this way the opponent's argument of the Vedic words does not at all refute (this explanation of the nature of the devas). In this way it is proved that the devas and other superior beings have the ability to meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The Supreme Personality of Godhead's form the size of a thumb is not at all contradicted by this description of the ability of the devas to meditate on Him. This is so because the form of the Lord is the size of a deva's thumb in this case.

Now will be considered the question of whether the devas are eligible or not to engage in those meditations where they themselves are the object of meditation. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (3.1.1) is the statement asau vā ādityo deva-madhu tasya dyaus eva tiraścīna-vaṁśaḥ (The sun is honey for the devas. The heavenly planets are the crossbeam, the sky is the beehive, and the rays of sunlight are the children). The sun is here the honey of the devas and the rays of sunlight are the openings (for drinking the honey). Five classes of devas, the vasus, rudras, ādityas,

maruts, and sādhyas, all headed by their leaders, gaze at the honey of the sun and become happy. That is said here. The sun is here called honey because it is the abode of a certain sweetness one becomes eligible for by performing certain religious works described in the Ṛg Veda and one attains by entering through the doorway of the sun's rays. In other places in the scriptures it is said that the devas can perform these meditations. In this matter he now explains the opinions of others.

Sūtra 31

madhv-ādiṣv asambhavād anadhikāraṁ jaiminiḥ

madhu-ādiṣu-in madhu-vidyā and other Vedic meditations; asambhavāt-because of impossibility; anadhikāraṁ-qualification; jaiminiḥ-Jaimini.

Jaimini says the devas do not engage in madhu-vidyā and other forms of Vedic meditation because it is not possible for them to do so.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Jaimini Muni thinks that the devas are not qualified to engage in madhu-vidyā and other forms of Vedic meditation. Why? The sūtra says asambhavāt (because it is not possible for them to do so). The object of worship cannot also be the worshiper. It is not possible for one person to be both. Furthermore, because the devas do not aspire to attain the result of madhu-vidyā meditation, namely to become vasus or exalted devas, because they already are vasus and devas.

Sūtra 32

jyotiṣi bhāvāc ca

jyotiṣi-in the splendor; bhāvāt-because of existence; ca-and.

And because the devas do meditate on the effulgent Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.16) says tad devā jyotiṣāṃ jyotiḥ (the devas meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the light of all lights). Because the devas do meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is described in this passage from the śruti as the supreme effulgence, they naturally do not engage in the madhu-vidyā and other inferior meditations. The explanation that the devas, as well as the human beings, naturally engage in meditation on the Supreme Personality of Godhead shows that the devas are averse to any other kind of meditation.

Now that this view has been expressed, he (Vyāsa) gives his opinion.

Sūtra 33

bhāvaṃ tu bādarāyaṇo 'sti hi

bhāvaṃ-existence; tu-but; bādarāyaṇaḥ-Vyāsadeva; asti-is; hi-because.

Vyāsadeva says the devas do engage in these meditations.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word tu (but) is used here to dispel doubt. Lord Vyāsa thinks the devas are able to engage in madhu-vidyā and other kinds of Vedic meditation. The word hi (because) here implies "desiring to again become devas and ādityas, they worship the Supreme Personality of Godhead as the archetypal deva and aditya. Because of this worship they develop a desire to gain the company of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In this way it is possible for them to engage in the madhu-vidyā and other Vedic meditations." This is so because it is understood that the worship of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is both the goal and the means of attaining the goal.

They who are now vasus, ādityas, and other kinds of devas meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead as the archetypal vasu and āditya. At the end of the kalpa they become vasus and ādityas and engage in the meditation and worship of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is the Supersoul in their hearts, and who is the cause of their becoming vasus and ādityas again. As a result of this worship they will eventually become liberated.

The words āditya, vasu, and the names of the other devas, are all also names of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is confirmed by the words ya etam evaṃ brahmopaniṣadam veda (He who understands this Upaniṣad describing the Supreme Personality of Godhead) at the end of the Upaniṣad.

It is not that because the devas have already attained their exalted positions therefore they have no desire to become devas and therefore have no interest in attaining the results of Vedic meditation. This is so because it is seen in this world that many people, even though they already have sons in this lifetime, yearn to again have sons in the next life. Furthermore, because they are actually meditations on the Supreme Personality of Godhead the madhu-vidyā meditations of the devas are described in the words of the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.16) tad devā jyotiṣāṁ jyotir (The devas meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead).

The scriptures say prajāpatir akāmayata prajāyeyeti sa etad agnihotraṁ mithunam apaśyat. tad udite sūrye 'juhōt. (The demigod Brahmā desired: "Let me create children." He then saw two agnihotra sacrifices. When the sun rose he performed agnihotra sacrifices). The scriptures also say devā vai satram āsata (the devas then performed a Vedic sacrifice). These and other passages from the scriptures show that the śruti does not disagree with the idea that the devas are able to perform Vedic sacrifices. They perform these sacrifices by the order of the Supreme Personality of Godhead in order to protect the material world.

Now someone may object: They who perform the madhu-vidyā and other Vedic meditations must wait many kalpas before they attain liberation. How is it possible for one who yearns for liberation to tolerate such a delay? They who yearn for liberation do not desire to enjoy any material happiness, even the happiness of Brahmaloaka.

The answer is given: This is true. Still, the scriptures explain that because of certain unknown past actions some persons voluntarily postpone their personal liberation to take up the duties of administering the affairs of the material world. This adhikaraṇa shows that because even the devas perform the ordinary Vedic duties, how much more so should human beings perform these duties.

Adhikaraṇa 8 **Śūdras Not Qualified For Vedic Meditation**

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

It was said that human beings, devas, and other higher beings are qualified to meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead. It is not possible to meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead without having studied the Vedānta, for the scriptures say aupaniṣadaḥ puruṣaḥ (The Supreme Personality of Godhead is revealed in the Upaniṣads). From this the next topic follows.

Viśaya: In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (4.1.1-5) is a story beginning with the words jānaśrutir ha pautrāyaṇaḥ (There was a man named Janaśruti Pautrāyaṇa). In that story, after hearing the words of some swans, Jānaśruti approached Raiṅka Muni and offered him many cows, necklaces, and chariots. Raiṅka, however, said ahaha hāre tvā śūdra tavaiva saha gobhir astu (O śūdra, keep your cows, necklaces,

and chariots!). After being addressed as a śūdra in this way, Jānaśruti again came, this time offering cows, necklaces, chariots, and his daughter in marriage. Raiṅka this time replied tam ājahāremāḥ śūdrānaiva mukhenālāpayiṣyathāḥ (O śūdra, take this away! With this face alone you will make me speak). Then the Upaniṣad describes how Raiṅka taught him the science of saṁvarga-vidyā.

Samśaya: Is a śūdra qualified to study the Vedic knowledge or not?

Pūrvapakṣa: A śūdra is qualified to study the Vedas for the following reasons: 1. because it is said that all human beings are qualified, 2. because śūdras have the ability to study, 3. because the śruti sometimes uses the word śūdra, thus hinting that śūdras are qualified to read the Vedas, and 4. because in the Purāṇas and other Vedic literatures Vidura and other śūdras are described as knowers of the Vedas.

Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 34

śug asya tad-anādara-śravaṇāt tadādravaṇāt sūcyate hi

śug-sorrow; asya-of him; tad-that; anādara-disrespect; śravaṇāt-because of hearing; tadā-then; adravaṇāt-because of approaching; sūcyate-is indicated; hi-because.

Because he approached impelled by unhappiness from hearing an insult, the word śūdra here means "unhappy."

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word na (not), taken from sūtra 28, is understood in this sūtra also. Here it means "a śūdra is not qualified to study the Vedas." Why? The sūtra says hi, which here means "because." Because Jānaśruti Pautrāyaṇa, who was not enlightened with spiritual knowledge, by hearing the swans' disrespectful words kam u vara enam etat santam sayugvānam iva rainkam āttha (What is he compared to the great saint Raiṅka?) became unhappy (śuk) and thus ran (dru to meet Raiṅka. The word śūdra here means "he who was unhappy" and "he who ran." The sage uses the word śūdra here to display his omniscience in knowing the previous events. The word is not used here to indicate the fourth class of men: the śūdras.

If Jānaśruti is not a śūdra, then to what class does he belong? To answer this question the next sūtra says he is a kṣatriya.

Sūtra 35

kṣatriyatvāvagateś cottaratra caitrarathena liṅgāt

kṣatriyatva-status of being a kṣatriya; avagateś-from the understanding; ca-also; uttaratra-in a later passage; caitrarathena-with Caitraratha; liṅgāt-because of the sign.

That he is a kṣatriya is understood from the clue related to the caitraratha.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Jānaśruti is understood to be a kṣatriya. He possesses religious faith and a host of other virtues. He is very charitable. He gives charity generously. He is the ruler of the people. For these reasons it is said that he is a kṣatriya. Because he sent (a messenger to search for Rainka) and because he gave cows, necklaces, chariots, his daughter, and many other things in charity, it is said that he is a kṣatriya. It is not possible for anyone but a kṣatriya to possess these qualities. Because he thus displays the qualities of a king, Jānaśruti should be understood to be a kṣatriya. At the end of the story it is also understood that he is a kṣatriya. At the end of the story, where the description of saṁvarga-vidyā is concluded, there is mention of the kṣatriya status of a person named Abhipratārī Caitraratha. In the concluding passage a brahmacārī begged alms from Śaunaka Kāpeya and Abhipratārī Kākṣaseni when these two were serving food to others.

If someone objects: "In this passage the status of Abhipratārī as either a kṣatriya or caitraratha is not proved in any way," then the sūtra answers: liṅgāt (because of a clue). The clue that Śaunaka Kāpeya and Abhipratārī Kākṣaseni were friends proves it. The Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa (20.12.5) says: caitena caitrarathaṁ kāpeyo ayājayan (The members of the Kāpeya family made Caitraratha perform a sacrifice). In this way the śruti maintains that because of his relationship with the Kāpeyas, Abhipratārī must have been a Caitraratha.

That the Caitraratha family were kṣatriyas is confirmed by the words tasmāc caitrarathir nāma kṣatra-patir ajāyata (From him was born another kṣatriya of the Caitraratha family). In this way his kṣatriya status is clearly proved.

Therefore Śaunaka Kāpeya and Abhipratārī Caitraratha, who were both learned in saṁvarga-vidyā, were a brāhmaṇa and a kṣatriya respectively, and in the subject of saṁvarga-vidyā they were also guru and disciple respectively. Rainka and Jānaśruti had the same relationship, and therefore Jānaśruti must have been a kṣatriya. In this way it is proved that a śūdra is not qualified to study the Vedas.

Referring to the śruti, he again establishes this point.

saṁskāra-parāmarṣāt tad-abhāvābhilāpāc ca

saṁskāra-of the purificatory rituals; parāmarṣāt-because of the reference; tad-of them; abhāva-of the non-existence; abhilāpāt-because of the explanation; ca-also.

This is also so because the scriptures state both the necessity of undergoing the saṁskāras (rituals of purification) and the exclusion of the śūdras from these rituals.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the śruti-śāstra is the passage aṣṭa-varṣaṁ brāhmaṇam upanīyata tam adhyāpayed ekādeśe kṣatriyaṁ dvādaśe vaiśyaṁ (One should perform the saṁskāra and teach a brāhmaṇa boy when he is eight years old a kṣatriya boy when he is eleven years old, and a vaiśya boy when he is twelve years old). This shows that brāhmaṇas are eligible to study the Vedas because they are also eligible for the saṁskāras. The scriptures also say nāgnir na yajño na kriyā na saṁskāro na vratāni śūdrasya (A śūdra is not allowed to light the sacred fire, perform a fire-sacrifice, perform religious rituals, undergo the saṁskāras, or follow vows of penance). In this way it is established that because a śūdra is not allowed to undergo the saṁskāras he is also not allowed to study the Vedas.

Now he confirms the view that the śūdras are not eligible for the saṁskāras.

Sūtra 37

tad-abhāva-nirdhāraṇe ca pravṛtṭeḥ

tat-of that; abhāva-of the non-existence; nirdhāraṇe-in ascertaining; ca-also; pravṛtṭeḥ-because of endeavor.

(This is so) also because care is taken to determine that (a student) is not (a śūdra).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Chândogya Upaniṣad (4.4.4-5) (when asked about his caste, Jābāli said) nāham etad vede bho yad gotro 'ham asmi (I do not know into what caste I was born). These truthful words convinced the sage Gautama that Jābāli was not a śūdra. Gautama then said naitad abrāhmaṇo vivaktum arhati samidham saumyāhara tvopaneṣye na satyād agāḥ (One who is not a brāhmaṇa cannot speak in this way. O gentle one, please bring the sacred fuel and I shall initiate you as a brāhmaṇa. You did not deviate from the truth). This endeavor by the guru Gautama demonstrates that only the brāhmaṇas, kṣatriyas, and vaiśyas are eligible to receive the saṁskāras. The śūdras are not eligible.

Sūtra 38

śravaṇādhyayanārtham pratiṣedhāt smṛteś ca

śravaṇa-hearing; ādhyayana-study; artham-for the purpose; pratiṣedhāt-because of the prohibition; smṛteḥ-from the smṛti-śāstra ca-also.

This is so because the smṛti-śāstra also prohibits the śūdras from hearing and studying (the Vedas).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The smṛti-śāstra says pady u ha vā etat śmaśānam yac chūdras tasmāc chūdra-samīpe nādhyetavyam (A śūdra is a beast. He is a crematorium. For this reason he should not be taught the Vedas). The smṛti also says tasmāc chūdro bahu-paśur ayajñīyaḥ (A śūdra is a big beast. He cannot perform the Vedic sacrifices). Because of these prohibitions a śūdra is not eligible to hear the Vedas. Because he is not allowed to hear the Vedas, it is therefore also not possible for him to study the Vedas, understand their meaning, or follow the rituals and penances described in them. All these are forbidden for him. The smṛti-śāstra says nāgnir na yajñāḥ śūdrasya tathāivādhyayanam kutaḥ kevalaiva tu śuśruṣā tri-varṇānām vidhīyate (A śūdra is not allowed to light the sacred fire or perform Vedic sacrifices. Neither is he allowed to study the Vedas. What is he allowed to do? His sole duty is to faithfully serve the three higher castes). The smṛti also says vedākṣara-vicāraṇe śūdro patati tat-kṣaṇāt (A śūdra who studies the Vedas at once falls into degraded life).

Some souls, such as Vidura and others, although born as śūdras, become elevated by their attainment of perfect transcendental knowledge. By hearing and understanding the Purāṇas and other transcendental literatures, śūdras and others can become liberated. The only real classes of higher and lower among men are determined by the final result of their lives.

Adhikaraṇa 9

The Thunderbolt in Kaṭha Upaniṣad 2.3.2 Is The Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now that this digression is concluded, he again reflects on the original topic.

Viṣaya: In the Kaṭha Upaniṣad is read the following pasage:

yad idaṁ kiñcit jagat sarvaṁ
prāṇa ejati niḥsṛtam
mahad bhayaṁ vajram udyataṁ
ya etad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti

"When it breathes all the manifested world trembles in fear. They who know this thunderbolt become immortal."

Samśaya: Does the word vajra here mean "thunderbolt" or the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa: Because the vajra here causes trembling, and because the description of liberation attained by understanding this vajra is merely a collection of meaningless poetic words, the word vajra here should be understood to mean "thunderbolt." For these reasons, and because the word prāṇa here does not mean "breath" but "protector," in this passage it is not possible to say that the word vajra means "the Supreme Personality of Godhead." Because the phrase udyataṁ vajram (raised thunderbolt) contradicts this second interpretation, the word vajra must mean "thunderbolt."

Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 39

kampanāt

kampanāt-because of trembling.

Because (the entire world) trembles (the vajra must be the Supreme Personality of Godhead).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because it makes the entire universe tremble, this vajra must be the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is so also because of the following statement of Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇa:

cakraṁ caṅkramaṇād eṣa
vajanād vajram ucyate
khaṇḍanāt khaḍga evaiṣa
heti-nāmā hariḥ svayam

"Because He goes (caṅkramaṇa) everywhere He is called "Cakra" (moving in a circle). Because He moves about (vajana) He is called "Vajra" (thunderbolt). Because He cuts apart (khaṇḍana) the demons He is called "Khaḍga" (sword). These are names of Lord Hari."

Also, because the word prāṇa (breath) and the word bhaya (fear) are used, the passage must refer to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In these ways it is established that the word vajra here refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Sūtra 40

jyotir-darśanāt

jyotiḥ-effulgence; darśanāt-because of seeing.

It is so because the vajra is described as jyotiḥ (splendor).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Before the passage discussed is the following statement (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 2.2.15): na tatra sūryo bhāti na candra-tārake (When He does not shine, then neither sun, moon, nor stars show their splendor). After the passage discussed is the statement (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 2.3.3) bhayād asyāgnis tapati (Out of fear of Him fire glows). In both these passages the Supreme Personality of Godhead is described as transcendental splendor, and therefore the passage describing the vajra (thunderbolt) between these two passages, must refer to the efulgent Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Adhikaraṇa 10

The "Ākāśa" in Chāndogya Upaniṣad 8.14.1 is the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.14.1) is the following statement: ākāśo ha vai nāma-rūpayor nirvahitā te yad antarā tad brahma tad amṛtaṁ sa ātmā (Sky is the creator of names and forms. That sky within is expanded without limit. That sky is eternal. That sky is the Self).

Samśaya: Does the word "sky" here refer to the jīva liberated from bondage of repeated birth and death, or does "sky" here refer to the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa: The scriptures say aśva iva romāṇi vidhūya pāpam (As a horse shakes its mane, so do I shake off all sins and become liberated). This shows that the "sky" here refers to the liberated jīva. The words yad antarā (which is within) clearly points to the liberated jīva who is free from all names and forms. This is also so because the phrase "the creator of names and forms" may refer to the jīva before he was liberated. The word ākāśa here means "effulgence." Everything therefore indicates that the "sky" here is the liberated jīva. The words tad brahma tad amṛtam (it is expanded without limit. It is eternal) describe the qualities the jīva attains when he becomes liberated.

Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 41

ākāśo 'rthāntaratvādi-vyapadeśāt

ākāśaḥ-sky; artha-meaning; antaratva-difference; ādi-beginning with; vyapadeśāt-because of the description.

The "sky" here is the Supreme Personality of Godhead because the "sky" described here is different from the liberated jīva, and for other reasons also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The "sky" here is the Supreme Personality of Godhead and not the liberated jīva. Why? The sūtra says arthāntaratvādi-vyapadeśāt (because the "sky" described here is different from the liberated jīva, and for other reasons also). The meaning is this: Because the liberated jīva cannot be the creator of names and forms, the "sky" here must be something other than him. When the jīva is not liberated but bound to the material world, he attains various names and forms by the force of his previous karma. By himself he has no power to create these names and forms. When the jīva is liberated he takes no part in the affairs of the material world, as will be described in a later sūtra (4.4.17). The Supreme Personality of Godhead, however, is described in the śruti as the creator of the material world. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad therefore says anena jīvenātmanānupraviśya nāma-rūpe vyākaravāṇi (With the jīvas I will now enter the material world. Now I will create a variety of names and forms). For all these reasons the "sky" here should be understood to be the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

The word ādi (and for other reasons also) in the sūtra refers to the phrase brahma (expanded without limit) in the passage of the Upaniṣad. This phrase cannot describe the liberated jīva, although it may very naturally describe the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In this way the word "sky" refers to a sky that is all-pervading. Because this description can properly refer only to the Supreme, the "sky" here is proved to be the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Adhikaraṇa 11

At Both the Time of Dreamless Sleep and the Time of the Jīva's Departure From the Material World the Jīva and the Supreme Personality of Godhead Are Different

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Pūrvapakṣa: So be it. Still, it cannot be held that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is different from the liberated jīva. This is said because of the overwhelming evidence of scripture. For example, in the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad it is said:

katama ātmeti yo 'yaṁ vijñānamayaḥ puruṣaḥ prāṇeṣu hr̥dy-antar-jyotiḥ sa samānaḥ sann ubhau lokāv anusañcarati

"Who is the Self? He is a person full of knowledge who stays in the life-breath. He is the splendor in the heart. Remaining always the same, he wanders in the two worlds."

Describing the conditioned jīva in this way, the text continues:

sa vā ayam ātmā brahma vijñānamayaḥ

"This Self is the omniscient Brahman."

In this way it says that the jīva is Brahman. It further says:

athākāmayamānaḥ

"He becomes free from all desires."

This described the liberated jīva's condition. Then it says:

brahmaiva san brahmāpyeti

"Being Brahman, he attains Brahman."

In this way it is conclusively stated that he is identical with Brahman. Then, at the end it says:

abhayaṁ vai brahma bhavati ya eva veda

"He who knows this becomes the fearless Brahman."

The result of hearing the passage is given here.

The statement, in some passages, that the jīva and Brahman are different are like the sky within a pot and the great sky beyond it. When he is liberated, the jīva becomes the Supreme just as when the pot is broken the sky in the pot becomes the same as the great sky beyond. Because the jīva is thus the Supreme Personality of Godhead, he is the creator of the universes and everything else that the Supreme is. In this way there is no difference between the liberated jīva and the Supreme Brahman.

Siddhānta: To refute this, he says:

Sūtra 42

suṣṭy-utkrāntyor bhedena

suṣṭy-in dreamless sleep; utkrāntyor-and in death; bhedena-because of the difference.

Because the difference is present in both death and dreamless sleep.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word vyapadeśāt (because of the description), which was used in the previous sūtra, should be understood in this sūtra also. In the previously quoted passages it is not possible to draw the understanding that the liberated jīva is actually Brahman. Why? Because it is clearly explained that in the states of dreamless sleep and death the jīva and Brahman are different. The difference in dreamless sleep is described in these words (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.3.12):

prājñenātmanā sampariṣvaktō na bāhyaṁ kiñcana veda nāntaram

"Embraced by the omniscient Self, he knows nothing else, either without or within."

The difference in death is described in these words from the same passage:

prājñenātmanā anvārūḍha utsarjan yāti

"Mounted by the omniscient Self, and groaning, he leaves."

The word utsarjan here means groaning. It is not possible that the jīva, who knows hardly anything, can be the omniscient Self by whom he is mounted. Because the jīva is not omniscient it is also not possible that the omniscient Self here is another jīva.

If it is said "Because in these conditions the jīva is still influenced by material designations, your point is not proved," then the author replies:

Sūtra 43

paty-ādi-śabdebhyaḥ

pati-Lord; ādi-beginning with; śabdebhyaḥ-because of the words.

Because of the use of Pati (Lord) and other words.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the same Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad, a little afterwards, the word "pati" and other similar words are used in these words (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.22):

sa vā ayam ātmā sarvasya vaśī sarvasyeṣaṇaḥ sarvasyādhipatiḥ sarvam idam
praśāsti yad idam kiñca sa na sādhunā karmaṇā bhūyān nātra vāsādhunā kaniyān
eṣa bhūtādhipatir eṣa lokeśvara eṣa loka-pālaḥ sa setur vidharaṇa eṣām lokānām
asambhedāya

"He is the Self, the dominator over all, the controller of all, the king of all. He rules over all. He is not made greater by pious work, nor lesser by impious work. He is the king of all that is. He is the master of the worlds. He is the protector of the worlds. He is the boundary so the worlds will not break apart."

From this it may be understood that Brahman, or the Supreme Personality of Godhead, is different from the liberated jīva. Because it cannot be said that the liberated jīva has dominion over all or control over all, and because sūtra 4.4.17 will say jagad-vyāpāra-varjyam (The liberated jīva has not the power to create the universes), the idea the Brahman and the liberated jīva are identical is refuted.

This idea is also refuted by the Taittirīya Upaniṣad, where it is said of Brahman:

antaḥ praviṣṭaḥ śastā janānām

"He is the controller in the living entities hearts."

Neither can it be said that the difference between them is only because of the jīva's identification with a material body, because the śruti-śāstra explains that the difference between them is present even after the jīva is liberated. In the amśādhikaraṇa of this book (2.3.41) I will refute the identification of jīva and Brahman in more detail.

The statement *ayam ātmā brahma* (the self is Brahman) simply means that the *jīva* has a small portion of Brahman's qualities. The phrase *brahmaiva san brahmāpyeti* (Becoming Brahman, he attains Brahman) should be understood to mean that the *jīva*, by attaining a portion of eight of Brahman's qualities, becomes like Brahman. Because the *śruti-śāstra* says *paramaṁ sāmyam upaiti* (He becomes like Brahman), and because of the previous explanation of *brahmaiva san brahmāpyeti*, therefore the nature of Brahman is different from that of the liberated *jīva*.

In this proof that Brahman is different from the *jīva* in either conditioned or liberated states of existence, that the "sky" from which all names and forms have come is the Supreme Personality of Godhead and not the liberated *jīva*, is also proved. Any doubt that may have remained in spite of the statements of the *sūtras* *netaro 'nupapatteḥ* (1.1.16) and *bheda-vyapadeśāc ca* (1.1.17) is dispelled by this proof that even at the time of liberation the *jīva* remains different from Brahman. Therefore there is no fault in the explanations given for these two (1.1.16 and 1.1.17) *sūtras*.

Pāda 4

Adhikaraṇa 1

The Word "Avyakta" in Kaṭha Upaniṣad 1.3.11 Refers to the Subtle Body and Not to Pradhāna

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Invocation

*tamaḥ saṅkhya-ghanodīrṇa-
vidīrṇam yasya go-gaṇaiḥ
tam samvid-bhūṣaṇam kṛṣṇa-
pūṣaṇam samupāsmāhe*

Let us offer our respectful obeisances to the Kṛṣṇa-sun, which is decorated with transcendental knowledge, and which with its effulgence dispels the deep darkness of Saṅkhya.

(Viṣaya): Previously the sūtras affirmed that the Supreme Brahman is He the knowledge of whom brings liberation, He who is the seed of the birth, maintenance, and destruction of the material universes, who is different from both the jīvas and dead matter, who possesses innumerable inconceivable potencies, who is all-knowing, who possesses all auspicious qualities, who is free from all inauspiciousness, who possesses unlimited opulences, and who is supremely pure.

Now we will consider the theory that the pradhāna (primordial material nature) and the pum (individual living entities) together comprise all that exists (and there is no God separate from them), which is propounded in the Kapila-tantra and perhaps also seen in some branches of the Vedas. They quote the following passage from Kātha Upaniṣad:

*indriyebhyaḥ parā hy arthā
arthebhyaś ca param manah
manasas tu parā buddhir
buddher ātmā mahān paraḥ*

*mahataḥ param avyaktam
avyaktāt puruṣaḥ paraḥ
puruṣān na param kiñcit
sā kāṣṭhā sā parā gatīḥ*

"The sense-objects are higher than the senses. The mind is higher than the sense-objects. Intelligence is higher than the mind. The mahat is higher than the intelligence. The avyakta (the unmanifested) is higher than the mahat. The puruṣa (the person) is higher than the unmanifested. Nothing is higher than the person. The person is the highest."

Samśaya: The doubt here is whether the word avyakta (the unmanifested) refers to the pradhāna (the primordial stage of material nature) or the śarīra (the body).

Pūrvapakṣa: The opponent may answer this doubt by saying that because both śruti and smṛti give the sequence as first mahat, then avyakta, and then puruṣa, therefore the word avyakta here must refer to the pradhāna.

Siddhānta: Whether the word avyakta refers to pradhāna or śarīra is explained in the following sūtra.

Sūtra 1

anumānikam apy ekeṣām iti cen na śarīra-rūpaka-vinyasta-grhītair darśayati ca.

anumānikam -the inference; apy -even; ekeṣām -of some; iti -thus; cen -if; na -not; śarīra-the body; rūpaka-the metaphor; vinyasta-placed; grhītair -because of being accepted; darśayati -reveals; ca-and.

If some assume (that the word "avyakta" in this passage of the Kaṭha Upaniṣad refers to the pradhāna), then I say "No." The fact that this passage is part of a metaphor referring to the body clearly shows (that the word "avyakta" here means śarīra).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Kathakas (ekeṣām) consider (anumānikam) that the word avyakta here refers to the pradhāna. The opponent may object: The etymology of the word avyakta is "That which is not (a) manifested" (vyakta). If this is so, then the word avyakta cannot mean anything except the pradhāna (unmanifested material nature).

What is the answer to this objection? The answer is given in this sūtra in the phrase beginning with the word śarīra. Because it is employed in a passage where the body is compared to a chariot, the word avyakta here refers to the śarīra (body). The passage preceding this mention of avyakta, which is a metaphor where the material body is considered to be a chariot, clearly shows this. The preceding passage is given here.

*ātmānaṁ rathinaṁ viddhi
śarīraṁ ratham eva ca
buddhiṁ tu sārathiṁ viddhi
manaḥ pragrahaṁ eva ca*

*indriyāṇi hayān āhur
viśayāṁs teṣu gocarān
ātmendriya-mano-yuktaṁ
bhoktety āhur maṇiṣiṇaḥ*

*yas tv aviñṇānavān bhavaty
ayuktena manasā sadā
tasyendriyāny avaśyāni
duṣṭāśvā iv sārathēḥ*

*yas tu vijñānavān bhavati
yuktena manasā sadā
tasyendriyāni vaśyāni
sad-aśvā iva sārathēḥ*

*yas tu vijñānavān bhavaty
amanaskaḥ sadā-śuciḥ
na sa tat-padam āpnoti
saṁsāraṁ cādhigacchati*

*yas tu vijñānavān bhavati
sa-manaskaḥ sadā śuciḥ
sa tu tat-padam āpnoti
yasmād bhūyo na jāyate*

*vijñāna-sārathir yas tu
manaḥ pragrahavān naraḥ
so 'dhvanaḥ pāram āpnoti
tad viṣṇoḥ paramam padam*

*indriyebhyaḥ parā hy arthā
arthebhyaś ca param manaḥ
manasas tu parā buddhir
buddher ātmā mahān paraḥ*

*mahataḥ param avyaktam
avyaktāt puruṣaḥ paraḥ
puruṣān na param kiñcit
sā kāṣṭhā sā parā gatiḥ*

"The individual is the passenger in the car of the material body, and the intelligence is the driver. Mind is the driving instrument, and the senses are the horses. The self is thus the enjoyer or sufferer in the association of the mind and senses. So it is understood by great thinkers.

"For a fool who does not control his mind, the senses are wild horses drawing the charioteer. For the wise man who controls his mind the senses are good horses obedient to the charioteer.

"An impious fool who does not control his mind does not attain the spiritual world. He attains the world of repeated birth and death. A pious wise man who controls his mind attains the spiritual world. He never again takes birth.

"A person who has transcendental knowledge as a charioteer, and who tightly holds the reins of the mind, attains the path's final destination: the supreme abode of Lord Viṣṇu.

"The sense-objects are higher than the senses. The mind is higher than the sense-objects. Intelligence is higher than the mind. The mahat (material nature) is higher than the intelligence. The avyakta (the unmanifested) is higher than the mahat. The puruṣa (person) is higher than the unmanifested. Nothing is higher than the person. The person is the highest."

Here the devotee who desires to attain the abode of Lord Viṣṇu is described as the passenger in a chariot. His body and other possessions are described as a chariot with its various parts. The traveller who keeps the chariot and its parts under control attains the supreme abode of Lord Viṣṇu. After this is explained, the verses beginning *indriyebhyaḥ parā hy arthāḥ* explain how in the control of the body and its various adjuncts, which are metaphorically considered a chariot and its adjuncts, the various members is more or less difficult to control. In this

metaphor of the chariot the senses and other adjuncts of the body are described as horses or other adjuncts of the chariot. The indriyebhyaḥ verses continue this discussion. Of the things mentioned in the previous verses only the body itself is not listed in the indriyebhyaḥ verses, and therefore the single ambiguous item (avyakta) must refer to the śarīra (body) by default. The pradhāna interpretation of this word is also disproved because the content of the indriyebhyaḥ verses disagrees with the tenants of sāṅkhya philosophy.

Now the following objection may be raised. The body is clearly manifest. How is it that it is here described as unmanifest? To answer this doubt the author says:

Sūtra 2

sūkṣmaṁ tu tad-arhatvāt

sūkṣmaṁ -subtle; tu -certainly; tad-arhatvāt-because of appropriateness.

The word "śarīra" (body) here certainly means the subtle body (sūkṣma-śarīra) because that is appropriate in this context.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word tu (certainly) is used here to dispel doubt. The word śarīra here means sūkṣma-śarīra (the subtle body). Why? Because that meaning is appropriate. Because it is appropriate to describe the sūkṣma-śarīra as avyakta (unmanifest). The quote from Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.7) "tad dhedaṁ tarhy avyākṛtam āsīt (Then there was the unmanifested)" shows that before the gross material universe was manifested the living force was present. This shows that the word "unmanifested" is appropriate to describe the subtle body.

The objection may be raised: If the original cause is subtle, then why should that subtle cause not be described as the pradhāna (unmanifested material nature) of the sāṅkhya theory.

To answer this doubt he says:

Sūtra 3

tad-adhīnatvād arthavat

tad-on Him; adhīnatvād -because of dependence; arthavat-possessing the meaning.

This meaning should be accepted because the pradhāna (unmanifested material nature) is ultimately dependent on Him (the Supreme Brahman).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The meaning here is that because pradhāna is ultimately dependent on the Supreme Brahman, which is the original cause of all causes, the creative actions of pradhāna are not the original cause, but are themselves caused by the Supreme Brahman. Because pradhāna is naturally inactive, it only acts when inspired by the glance of Brahman. This is described in the following statements of Vedic literature.

māyām tu prakṛtiṁ vidyān
māyinaṁ tu maheśvaram

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is a magician, and the material world is His magical show."

Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (4.10)

asmān māyī sṛjate viśvam etat

"The master of Māyā creates this world."

Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (4.9).

ya eka varṇo bahudhā śakti-yogād
varṇān anekān nihitārtho dadhāti

"He who has no rival creates the varieties of this world, using His own potencies according to His own wish."

Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (4.1).

sa eva bhūyo nija-vīrya-coditṁ
sva-jīva-māyām prakṛtiṁ sisṛkṣatīm

anāma-rūpātmani rūpa-nāmani
vidhitsamāno 'nusasāra śāstra-kṛt

"The Personality of Godhead, again desiring to give names and forms to His parts and parcels, the living entities, placed them under the guidance of material nature. By His own potency, material nature is empowered to re-create."

Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 1.10.22

pradhānam puruṣam cāpi
praviśyātmecchayā hariḥ
kṣobhayām āsa samprāpte
sarga-kāle vyayāvyaṃyau

"At the time of creation Lord Hari enters the changing pradhāna and the unchanging living souls, and agitates them according to His wish."

Viṣṇu Purāṇa

mayādhyākṣeṇa prakṛtiḥ
sūyate sa-carācaram
hetunānena kaunteya
jagad viparivartate

"The material nature, which is one of my energies, is working under my direction, O son of Kuntī, producing all moving and non-moving beings. Under its rule this manifestation is created and annihilated again and again."

Bhagavad-gītā 9.10

We do not accept the saṅkhya theory because it considers pradhāna the original, independent cause of all causes.

Sūtra 4

jñeyatvāvacanatvāc ca

jñeyatva-the state of being the object of knowledge; avacanatvāt-because of non-description; ca-and.

The "avyakta" of this passage is not described as the object of knowledge. This another reason for not interpreting this "avyakta" to be pradhāna.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Claiming that liberation is obtained by understanding the difference between the the spiritual living entity, or soul and the modes of material nature, the saṅkhya theorists affirm that one should know the real nature of pradhāna in order to obtain certain powers. Because this passage from the Kaṭha Upaniṣad in no way describes any of this, the word avyakta here cannot refer to the pradhāna of the Sāṅkhyites.

Sūtra 5

vadatīti cen na prājño hi prakaraṇāt

vadati-says; iti -thus; cet -if; na -no; prājño -the omniscient Paramātmā; hi -indeed; prakaraṇāt-because of reference.

If someone says "This passage does describe pradhāna in this way" then I say "No. That statement refers to the omniscient Personality of Godhead."

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Someone may object: "Your contention that the word avyakta in this passage of Kaṭha Upaniṣad cannot refer to pradhāna because the avyakta here is not described as the object of knowledge has in no way been proved. Pradhāna is described in this way in the very next verse (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 1.3.15):

aśabdam asparśam arūpam avyayaṁ
tathā-rasaṁ nityam agandhavaḥ ca yat
anādy anantaṁ mahataḥ paraṁ dhruvaṁ
nicāyya taṁ mṛtyu-mukhāt pramucyate

"By meditating on the soundless, touchless, formless, unchanging, tasteless, eternal, fragranceless, beginningless, endless, Supreme Great, one becomes free from the mouth of death."

Someone may object: If these words do not describe pradhāna as the ultimate object of knowledge, then what do they describe?

To this objection I reply: These words describe the omniscient Personality of Godhead. These words are an appropriate description of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, about whom the following words are said:

puruṣān na paraṁ kiñcit
sā kāṣṭhā sā parā gatiḥ

"Nothing is higher than the Supreme Person. The Supreme Person is the highest."

Kaṭha Upaniṣad 1.3.11

eṣa sarveṣu bhūteṣu
gūḍhātmā na prakāśate

"Hiding in the hearts of all beings, the Supreme Personality of Godhead is not openly manifest."

Kaṭha Upaniṣad 1.3.12

To further explain that the word in question does not refer to pradhāna he says:

Sūtra 6

trayāṇām eva caivam upanyāśah praśnāś ca

trayāṇām -of the three;eva -indeed; ca-certainly; evam -in this way; upanyāśah - mention; praśnāś -question; ca-and.

In this context three questions certainly are mentioned.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word ca (certainly) here is meant to remove doubt. In this passage of Kaṭha Upaniṣad only three questions are asked. They are: 1. Naciketa's request that his father be kind to him, 2. his request for celestial fire, and 3. his desire to know the true nature of the self. Nothing else is asked. There is no mention of pradhāna.

Sūtra 7

mahadvac ca

mahat-the mahat; vat -like; ca-also.

This usage is like the usage of the word "mahat".

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because the word mahān in the phrase buddher ātmā mahān paraḥ (The Great Self is higher than the intelligence.) is never taken to mean the mahat-tattva (material nature) of the sāṅkhya theory, in the same way the avyakta (unmanifested) mentioned here to be higher than this mahat should not be taken to mean the pradhāna of sāṅkhya.

Adhikaraṇa 2

The "Ajā" of Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 4.5 Does Not Mean Pradhāna

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now another smārta theory is refuted. The following is quoted from the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (4.5):

ajām ekām lohita-śukla-kṛṣṇām
bahvīḥ prajāḥ sṛjamānām sarūpāḥ
ajo hy eko juṣamāno 'nuśete
jahaty enam bhukta-bhogam ajo 'nyaḥ

"A certain unborn male serves the red, white, and black unborn female that creates the many living entities and their forms, while another another unborn male abandons her as she enjoys pleasures."

Samśaya: Does the word ajā here mean the pradhāna of saṅkhya, or does it mean the potency of Brahman described in this Upaniṣad?

Pūrva-pakṣa: Without any external help the unborn material nature creates the innumerable living entities.

Siddhānta: In regard to this, the saṅkhyas' belief concerning the creation, he says:

Sūtra 8

camasavad aviśeṣāt

camasa-a cup; vat -like; aviśeṣāt-because of not being specific.

(The word "ajā" in Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 4.5 does not mean the saṅkhya conception of material nature) because of the lack of a specific description. It is like the word "camasa" (cup) in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2.2.3.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word na (not) should be read into this sūtra from sūtra 1.4.5. It cannot be said that the female described here is the material nature as described in the saṅkhya-smṛti. Why? Because the material nature is not specifically described in this passage. Because there is no specific description, but only the mention of being unborn in the word ajā, which is derived from the phrase na jāyate (it is not born). It is like the example of the cup. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (2.2.3) it is said:

arvāg-bilaś camasa ūrdhva-budhna

"There is a cup with its mouth down and its bottom up."

It is not possible to take the word camasa, which is derived from the verb cam (to drink), in this mantra as literally a cup, or vessel to consume what was offered in a yajña. It is also not possible to consider the meaning of a word without reference to etymology. For this reason it is not possible to interpret the word in this mantra as the material nature described in the saṅkhya-smṛti. It is also not possible because the saṅkhya-smṛti considers that material nature creates the living entities independently.

The ajā here is the potency of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, which is described in the Vedas. Giving a specific reason to accept this, he says:

Sūtra 9

jyotir upakramā tu tathā hy adhīyate eke

jyotiḥ-light; upakramā-beginning with; tu-indeed; tathā-in that way; hi-indeed; adhīyate-iread; eke-some.

Light is its origin. Also, other passages confirm it.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word tu (but) is used in the sense of certainty. The word light is used to mean the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In this way He is celebrated in the śruti-śāstra (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 10.4.16):

tad devā jyotiṣāṁ jyotiḥ

"The demigods meditate on Him, the light of lights."

The word upakrama should be understood here in the sense of "cause". Because this aja (unborn) has Brahman as its cause, its being unborn is metaphorical only, just as the "cup" in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2.2.3.

In that passage it is said:

arvāg-bilaś camasa ūrdhva-budhna

"There is a cup with its mouth down and its bottom up."

As the "cup" here is actually the skull, in the same way the ajā (unborn) here is not actually unborn, but is the potency born from Brahman, as is described in the first and fourth chapters of Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad.

The first quote is (Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad 1.3):

te dhyāna-yogānugata apaśyan
devātma-śaktim sva-guṇair nigūḍhām

"The dhyāna-yogīs saw the Supreme Lord's potency, which was hidden by its own qualities."

The second quote is (Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad 4.1):

ya eka-varṇo bahudhā śakti-yogāt

"He (the Lord) who is one has become many by the touch of His potency."

Then the author gives another reason in the sūtra's words tathā hi. Hi in this context means "reason". The reason is the evidence given in other passages (adhīyate eke). That the material nature is born from the Supreme Personality of Godhead is also explained in the following passage (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 1.1.9):

tasmād etad brahma nāma rūpam annam ca jāyate

"From Him (the Lord), pradhāna, names, forms, and food, are all born."

The word brahma here means pradhāna, which is situated in the three modes of nature, and which is also called brahma in Bhagavad-gīta (14.3):

mama yonir mahad brahma

"The total material substance, called Brahman, is the source of birth."*

Now our opponent may ask: How, then, is the material nature unborn? Then, if it is unborn, how can it be born from light?

Fearing that these questions may be raised, he says:

Sūtra 10

kalpanopadeśāc ca madhv-ādi-vad avirodhaḥ

kalpana-creation; upadeśāt-from the instruction; ca-certainly; madhv-honey; ādi-beginning with; vad -like; avirodhaḥ-not a contradiction.

Because it is said to be created by the Supreme it is not a contradiction to say

that pradhāna is both created and uncreated. In this way its is like honey and some other things that are both created and uncreated.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This doubt is dispelled by the word *ca* (certainly). It is possible for pradhāna to be both created and uncreated. How is that? That is explained by the word *kalpana*. *Kalpana* here means "creation". It should be understood in that way because it was used with that sense in the R̥g Veda's statement, *yathā-pūrvam akalpayat* (In the beginning the Supreme Personality of Godhead created the world). The meaning of this is that the pradhāna is manifested from the Supreme Brahman, who is the master of the potencies of darkness. That is the truth in this matter. The Lord has an eternal and very subtle potency named *tamas* (darkness), which is described in the following statement (R̥g Veda 10.1.29.3):

tama āsīt tamasā gūḍham agre praketaṁ yadā tamas tan na divā na rātriḥ

"In the beginning was darkness. Darkness covered everything. When the darkness was manifested there was neither day nor night."

Tamas is also described in the *Culika Upaniṣad*:

gaur anādavatī

"Matter has no power to speak."

At the time of cosmic annihilation pradhāna attains oneness with Brahman, but does not merge into Brahman. In the passage from *śruti-śāstra* beginning with the words *pṛthivy apsu pralīyate* it is said that the material elements, beginning from earth and culminating in ether, all merge into *tamas* (darkness), but there is no mention of *tamas* merging into another substance because *tamas* is already one with the Supreme. Because *tamas* is very subtle there is no possibility of it being separate from the Supreme, and therefore it is one with Him. It is not otherwise. This does not mean that *tamas* is identical with the Supreme. If it meant identity with the Supreme the use of the *pratyaya cvi in ekī-bhavati*, would not be appropriate.

When the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the master of the *tamas* potency, desires to create, from Him arises the unmanifested (*avyakta*) three modes of material nature. The *śruti-śāstra* explains:

mahān avyakte liyate avyaktam akṣare akṣaram tamsi

"The mahat merges into the *avyakta*, the *avyakta* merges into the *akṣara*, and the *akṣara* merges into *tamas*."

The *Mahābhārata* explains,

tasmād avyaktam utpannam tri-guṇam dvija-sattama

"O best of the brāhmaṇas, the unmanifested three modes of material nature was born from the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

These passages from scripture clearly describe the creation of pradhāna and the other elements. In this way the scriptures teach that pradhāna is created and that it is both cause and effect simultaneously. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa explains this in the following words:

pradhāna-puṁsor ajayoḥ
kāraṇam kārya-bhūtayoh

"Lord Viṣṇu is the cause of the unborn Pradhāna and Puruṣa."

At the time of creation the three modes of material nature arise in pradhāna and pradhāna manifests many different names, such as pradhāna-avyakta, and many different forms in red and other colors. At this time it is said that the pradhāna is manifested from the Supreme Light (jyotir-utpannā).

Next he (the author of the sutras) gives an example: "It is like honey and other similar things (madhv-ādi-vat)." The sun, when it is a cause, remains one, and when it is an effect it becomes other things, such as the honey enjoyed by the Vasus. In this way the sun is both cause and effect simultaneously. There is no contradiction in this.

Adhikaraṇa 3

The Phrase "Pañca-pañca-janāḥ" in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.17 Does Not Refer to the 25 Elements of Sāṅkhya

Viṣaya: The Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.17 explains:

yasmin pañca-pañca-janā
ākāśās ca pratiṣṭhitāḥ tam eva manya ātmānam vidvān brahmāmṛto 'mṛtam

"I, who am immortal spirit, meditate on the Supreme Brahman, in whom the ether element and the pañca-pañca-jana rest."

Saiṁśaya: Do the words pañca-pañca-jana refer to the 25 elements described in the Kapila-tantra, or to some five other things?

Pūrvapakṣa: Because pañca-pañca is a bahuvrīhi-samāsa and pañca-pañca-janāḥ is a karmadhāraya-samāsa, the word pañca-pañca-janāḥ refers to the 25 elements described by Kapila. Somehow the two elements ātmā and ākāśa are here added to the list of elements. The word jana here means tattva (elements).

Siddhānta: He says:

Sūtra 11

na saṅkhyopasaṅgrahād api nānā-bhāvād atirekāc ca

na -not; saṅkhyā-of numbers; upasaṅgrahāt -because of enumeration; api -even; nānā-various; bhāvāt-states; atirekāt-because of going beyond; ca-and.

Even though they give the same numbers as the saṅkhyā theory, these words do not refer to the saṅkhyā theory because the the numbers here actually exceed saṅkhyā's numbers and because the elements of saṅkhyā are variegated (and not grouped into five groups of five).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word api (even) here is used in the sense of "even if we consider for a moment this view." By noting that the number here is the same number as the saṅkhyā elements does not prove that pañca-pañca-jana refers to the saṅkhyā elements. Why? The answer is given in the words beginning nānā-bhāvāt. Because the variegated saṅkhyā elements are not divided into five groups of five, it is not possible to accept the 5 X 5 here as referring to the 25 saṅkhyā elements. Also, the addition of atmā and ākāśa brings the number up to 27. Simply by hearing the word pañca five) twice one should not be bewildered into thinking these two fives refer to the 25 elements of the saṅkhyā theory. "What is your interpretation of pañca-pañca-jana?" someone may ask. The word pañca-jana is the name of a group just as the word saptarṣi (the seven sages) is the name of a group. This is explained by Pāṇini (Aṣṭādhyāyī 2.1.50) in the words dik-saṅkhye saṁjñāyām (Words indicating direction or number may be compounded with another word in the same case). As each of the saptarṣis may be called saptarṣi, in the same way there may be five pañca-janas, each of whom may be called a pañca-jana, and all the pañca-janas together may be called the five pañca-janas. In this way the meaning of the word pañca-jana is very clear.

Who are these pañca-janas? To answer this question he says:

Sūtra 12

prānādayo vākya-śeṣāt

prāna-breath; ādayaḥ -beginning with; vākya-of the statement; śeṣāt-from the remainder.

The pañca-janas here are five things beginning with prāṇa (breath), as is clear from the words immediately following the mention of pañca-jana.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The five things beginning with prāṇa are described in the following words (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.18):

prānasya prāṇam uta cakṣuṣaś cakṣur uta śrotrasya śrotram annasyānnaṁ manaso
ye mano viduḥ

"They know the breath of breath, the eye of the eye, the ear of the ear, the food of food, the mind of the mind."

The objection may be raised: The word annam (food) here is included in the Madhyandina recension of the Upaniṣad but not in the Kaṇva recension. In the Kaṇva recension, then, there are only four items and not five.

To answer this doubt he says:

Sūtra 13

jyotiṣaikeṣāṁ asaty anne

jyotiṣā-by light; ekeṣāṁ -of some; asaty -in the absence; anne-of food.

In some versions (the Kaṇva recension) the word "jyotiḥ" (light) replaces the word "anna" (food).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the version of some (the Kaṇvas), even though the word anna is missing, the addition of the word jyotiḥ brings the number up to five. This word jyotiḥ is found in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.6 in the words tad devā jyotiṣāṁ jyotiḥ (The demigods worship Him, the light of lights). The word jyotiḥ appears here in both recensions and it should be counted among the five or not as is appropriate.

Adhikaraṇa 4 Brahman Is The Only Original Cause

The saṅkhya theorist raises another doubt: "It cannot be said that the Vedānta describes Brahman as the sole cause of the universe, for the Vedānta philosophy does not describe a single original cause of creation. In Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.1.1 ātma (self) is revealed as the source of creation in the following words:

tasmād vā etasmād ātmana ākāśaḥ sambhūtaḥ

"From ātmā the sky was born."

Another passage (Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.7.1) describes asat (non-existence) as the original cause in the following words:

asad vā idam agra āsīt tato vā sad ajāyata tad ātmānam svayam akuruta

"In the beginning was non-existence. From non-existence existence was born. Existence created the self."

Another passage (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 1.9.1) affirms that ākāśa (sky) is the original cause:

asya lokasya kā gatiḥ ity ākāśa ity hovāca

"What is the origin of this world? Sky is the origin, he said."

Another passage (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 1.11.5) affirms that breath is the original cause in the following words:

sarvāṇi hā vā imāni bhūtāni prāṇam evābhisamviśanti

"Everything was born from breath and ultimately enters into breath again."

Another passage again proclaims asat (non-existence) as the original cause in the following words:

asad evedam agra āsīt tat samabhavat

"In the beginning was non-existence. From non-existence this world was manifested."

Another passage (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.2.1) proclaims Brahman the original cause in the following words:

sad eva saumyedaṁ agra āsīt

"O saintly one, in the beginning was Brahman."

Another passage (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 1.4.7) proclaims avyākṛta (the unmanifested) as the original cause in the following words:

tad vaidam tarhy avyākṛtam āsit tan-nāma-rūpābhyām vyākriyata

" In the beginning was the unmanifested. From it all the names and forms have come."

Many other passages could also be quoted to show the different theories of creation. Because in these passages of the Vedas many different things have been described as the sole original cause of creation, it cannot be said that Brahman is the sole cause of the creation of the world. However, it is possible to say that pradhāna is the sole cause of creation, as we find in the passage (beginning with the word tarhi already quoted from the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad. If this view is accepted, then the contradiction of seeing one thing sometimes as the original cause and sometimes as a product of the original cause becomes at once resolved.

Because it is all-pervading the pradhāna can appropriately be called ātmā, ākāśa, and brahma, because it is the resting-place of all transformations and because it is eternal it may appropriately be called asat, and because it is the origin of all breathing it may metaphorically be called breath. When the scriptures state that the original cause performed activities, such as thinking (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 1.2.5 explains sa aikṣata: The original cause thought.) these may also be considered metaphors. All this evidence clearly demonstrates that pradhāna is the original cause of creation of the world as described in the Vedānta literature. In the context of this argument:

Sūtra 14

kāraṇatvena cākāśādiṣu yathā vyapadiṣtokteḥ

kāraṇatvena -as the cause; ca-certainly; ākāśa-sky; ādiṣu -beginning with; yathā -as; vyapadiṣta-described; ukteḥ-from the statement.

The Upaniṣads state that Brahman is the cause of sky and the other elements.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word ca (certainly) is used here to dispel doubt. It may be said that Brahman is the only cause of the world. Why? Because "the Upaniṣads state that Brahman is the cause of sky and the other elements." The words yathā vyapadiṣtam (as described) mean "Brahman who in the lakṣaṇa-sūtra of Vedānta

(1.1.2) and in other places in Vedic literature is described as all-knowing, all-powerful, and full of all other powers and virtues." This is true because in all Vedānta literatures Brahman is described as the original cause of sky and all the elements. That Brahman is all-knowing and full of a host of transcendental qualities: is described in the following words (Taittirīya Upaniṣad 1.2.2):

satyam jñānam anantam

"Brahman is eternal, limitless, and full of knowledge."

That Brahman is the original cause of all causes is described in these words (Taittirīya Upaniṣad 1.2.3):

tasmād vā etasmāt

"From Brahman sky is manifested."

The qualities of Brahman are described in the following words (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.2.1):

sad eva saumyedaṁ

"O gentle one, in the beginning was the eternal Brahman."

Also, in these words (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.2.3):

tad aikṣata bah syām

"He thought: I shall become many."

The truth of Brahman is also described in the following words (Taittirīya Upaniṣad 6.2.3):

tat tejo 'sṛjata

" Then He created light."

The relationship between cause and effect in regard to Brahman we will describe later on. The words atmā, ākāśa, prāṇa, sat, and Brahman mean "all-pervading", "all-effulgent," "all-powerful," "the supreme existence," and "the greatest," respectively. These words are very appropriate as names for Brahman. In the same way the statement sa aikṣata (He thought.) is very appropriate for Brahman.

Now, describing the meaning of the words asat (non-existence) and avyākṛta (unmanifested), he says:

Sūtra 15

samākarṣāt

samākarṣāt-from appropriateness.

The words "asat" (non-existence) and "avyākṛta" (unmanifested) also refer to Brahman, for that interpretation is appropriate in this context.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because it is preceded by the words so 'kāmayata (He desired.) the word asat in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.7.1 passage asad vā idam agra āsīt (In the beginning was asat) must refer to the Supreme Brahman, and because it is preceded by the words ādityo brahma (splendid Brahman) the word asat in the passage asad evedam (In the beginning was asat) must also refer to the Supreme Brahman. Because before the creation of the material world the Supreme Brahman's names and forms had not existed in the material world, the Supreme Brahman is sometimes known as asat (non-existence).

The idea that asat and not the Supreme Brahman is the original cause of creation is refuted in the following statement of Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.2.1-2):

sad eva saumyedaṃ agra āsīd ekam evādvitīyaṃ tad dhaika āhur asad evedam agra āsīd ekam evādvitīyaṃ tasmād asataḥ saḥ jāyate. kutas tu khalu saumyaivaṃ syād iti hovāca katham asataḥ saḥ jāyeteṣu sat tv eva saumyedaṃ agra āsīd ekam evādvitīyaṃ.

"O gentle one, in the beginning was sat, who is one without a second. Some say that in the beginning was asat, who is one without a second, and from that asat the sat was born. O gentle one," he said, "how is it possible that the sat was born from the asat? O gentle one, it is the sat, which is one without a second, that existed in the beginning."

The idea that asat was the original cause of creation is also refuted by the argument of time.

Note: The argument of time is that it is not possible to use the verb "to be" with the noun asat (non-existence). Because it is thus not possible to say "In the beginning non-existence was," it is also not possible to say that asat (non-existence) was the original cause of creation.

In this way the wise declare that it is not possible for non-existence to be the cause of creation and for this reason when asat is described as the cause of creation it must refer to the Supreme Brahman, who is asat because His transcendental

potencies are supremely subtle and fine. That is the proper understanding of the word *asat* in this context.

The *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (1.4.7) explains:

tad vaidam tarhy avyākṛtam āsit tan-nāma-rūpābhyām vyākriyata

"In the beginning was the *avyākṛta*. From it all the names and forms have come."

The word *avyākṛta* should be understood to mean Brahman. In the words *sa eṣa iha praviṣṭaḥ* (Then He entered within) that immediately follow it becomes clear that the *avyākṛta* that becomes manifested by name and form is the powerful Supreme Brahman who appears by His own wish. Any conclusion other than this would oppose the clear teachings of *Vedānta-sūtra* and the general conclusions of all the *śruti-śāstras*. For these reasons it is therefore confirmed that the Supreme Brahman is the actual cause of the material universes.

Adhikaraṇa 5

The "Puruṣa" of the *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* Is Brahman

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the next passage the author of the *sūtras*) again refutes the *saṅkhya* theory. In the *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* 4.18 *Bālākī Vipra* promises "I shall tell you about Brahman," and proceeds to describe 16 *puruṣas*, beginning with the sun-god, as Brahman. King *Ajātaśatru* then rejects these instructions and says: "O *Bālākī*, the person who is the creator of these 16 *puruṣas*, the person engaged in this *karma* is the actual Brahman."

Samśaya: At this point the doubt may be raised: "Is the superintendent of matter, the enjoyer described in the *saṅkhya* texts, or is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Lord *Viṣṇu*, to be understood as the Brahman mentioned here?"

Pūrvapakṣa: Someone may object: Because the use of the word *karma* here identifies this Brahman with the experiencing the results of good and bad work, because in the next passage this Brahman is described as sometimes sleeping (*tau ha suptam puruṣam ājagmatuḥ*), and because in the passage after that this Brahman is described as an enjoyer (*tad yathā śreṣṭhī svair bhunkte*), it should be understood that the Brahman here is the *jīva* (individual spirit soul) described in the *tantras*. The use of the word *prāṇa* (life-breath) here also confirms that the Brahman described here is the living individual soul. This Brahman (the *jīva*), which is different from matter, should thus be understood as the original cause of the many enjoyer *puruṣas* and the original cause of their sinless activities as well. In this way it has been proven that the Brahman described in this passage is the individual spirit soul (*jīva*). The theory that there is a Supreme Personality of

Godhead is separate from the individual spirit soul (jīva) is thus completely untenable. The text (sa aikṣata) that explains that the creator thinks is thus very appropriate if it is understood that the original cause, the controller of the material energy that creates this world, is in fact the individual soul (jīva).

Siddhānta: In response to this:

Sūtra 16

jagad-vācivāt

jagat-the world; vācivāt-because of the word.

(The word Brahman here means the Supreme Personality of Godhead, because the word "karma" here should be understood) to mean "jagat" (creation).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word Brahman here does not mean the kṣetrajña (individual spiritual soul) described in the tantras, but rather it means the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is known by study of Vedānta. Why? Because of the use of the word jagat. Because it is accompanied by the word jagat, the word karma in this passage means "the material world composed of a mixture of matter and spirit." Because He is the original creator, this karma (material world) may be understood to be His property (yasya karma). The truth is this: the word karma, which is derived from the verb kṛ (to do, create) here means "creation". When this interpretation is accepted the actual meaning of the word here is understood. This interpretation refutes the mistaken idea that the individual spirit soul (jīva) is the original creator. Even the Kapila-tantra does not accept the individual living entity as the original creator. One also cannot say that by adhyāsa (association) the individual living entity may be considered the creator of the material world, for all the scriptures maintain that the spirit soul is always aloof from matter. For these reasons it is the Supreme Personality of Godhead who is the original creator of the material world. It cannot be that King Ajātaśatru speaks lies in this passage. Rejecting Bālākī's teaching that the sixteen puruṣas (persons) are Brahman, Ajātaśatru promises, "I will tell you about Brahman." If Ajātaśatru then teaches that the jīvas (individual spirit souls) are Brahman then his teaching is no different than Bālākī's, and he is dishonest to reject Bālākī's instruction as untrue, and then teach the same instruction as the truth. In this way the meaning of this passage is understood. "You have described these puruṣas (persons) as Brahman, but I will tell you of someone who is the creator of all of them," is the gist of Ajātaśatru's statement. In this way it should be understood that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the original cause and the entire material world is His creation.

Pūrvapakṣa: If someone objects "Because it mentions mukhya-prāṇa (the chief breath of life) the Brahman here must be the jīva and not anyone else," then he replies:

Sūtra 17

jīva-mukhya-prāṇa-liṅgān neti cet tad-vyākhyātam

jīva-the individual spiritual entity; mukhya-the chief; prāṇa-breath of life; liṅgān -because of the characteristics; na-not; iti -thus; cet -if; tad-that; vyākhyātam-has been explained.

If the objection is raised that the jīva or chief breath of life is described as Brahman in this passage, then I say, "No. This has already been explained (in 1.1.31)."

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In sūtra 1.1.31, which dealt with the conversation of Indra and Pratardana, this question was conclusively decided. There it was explained that in a passage where in both the beginning and the end Brahman was explicitly named, what in the beginning may seem perhaps by its characteristics to refer to the jīvas or something else (without them being explicitly named) must be taken as referring to Brahman also.

This passage from the Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad begins with the words brahma te bravāṇi (Now I will tell you about Brahman), and ends with the words sarvān pāpmāno 'pahatya sarveṣāṁ bhūtānām śreṣṭham ādhipatyam paryeti ya eva veda (A person who understands this becomes free from all sins. He becomes the king of all men). Because of these words understood according to the explanation given in the conversation of Indra and Pratardana (1.1.31) and because of the other arguments given here the words yasya caitat karma in this passage of Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad should not be understood to refer to anything other than Brahman, the Personality of Godhead.

Samśaya: Certainly you may connect the words karma and prāṇa with the word etat and then interpret them to refer to Brahman, but still there are direct references to the jīva in this passage (of Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad). The evidence of the questions and answers in this passage make it impossible to consider Brahman different from the jīva. In the question about the sleeper the jīva is asked about, and in the questions about the place of sleep, the naḍis, and the senses, the jīva, who is here called prāṇa, is also asked about. It is the jīva who awakens (at the end). In this way the entire passage is about the jīva. In this way it may be understood that the jīva is the Supreme.

To answer this doubt he says:

Sūtra 18

anyārthaṁ tu jaiminiḥ praśna-vyākhyānābhyāṁ api caivam eke

anya-another; arthaṁ -meaning; tu -but; jaiminiḥ -Jaimini; praśna-with the questions; vyākhyānābhyāṁ -and answers; api -also; ca-and; evam -in this way. eke-some.

Jaimini thinks these questions and answers convey a different meaning and some versions of the text also give a different meaning.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word tu (but) is used here to dispel doubt. The description of the jīva here has a different meaning. Jaimini considers that this passage explains that Brahman and the jīva are different. Why? Because of the questions and answers in this passage. The questions ask about the living soul, sleeping and awake, who is different from the life-breath. The text reads: kvaṣa etad bālāke puruṣa śayīṣṭa kva vā etad abhūt kuta etad agāt (O Bālākī, where does this person rest while he sleeps? From where does he come when he wakes?) In this question the difference between Brahman and the jīva may be clearly seen. The answer is given yadā suptaḥ svapnaṁ na kañcana paśyati tathāsmiṁ prāṇa evaikadhā bhavati (When he sleeps without seeing a dream he becomes one with the life-breath). The passage etasmād ātmanaḥ prāṇā yathāyatanaṁ vipratīṣṭante prāṇebhyo devā devebhyo lokāḥ (From that Supreme Self the breath of life comes. From the breath of life the demigods come. From the demigods the planets come.) shows the difference between Brahman and the jīva. The word prāṇa here means Lord Paramātmā because Paramātmā is famous as the resting-place of dreamless sleep. Into Him the jīvas merge and from Him they become manifested again. The meaning of the following passage is that the nāḍīs are merely the gateways leading to the realm of sleep. The Paramātmā should be understood to be the realm where the sleepy jīva sleeps and from which the jīva emerges to enjoy (in wakefulness). In the Vājasaneyī recension of this conversation between Bālākī and Ajātaśatru the jīva is described as vijñānamaya full of knowledge and Brahman is clearly distinguished from him. In that reading the question is: ya eṣa vijñānamayaḥ puruṣaḥ kvaṣa tadabhūt kuta etad agāt (O Bālākī, where does this person full of knowledge rest while he sleeps? From where does he come when he wakes?) and the answer is given: ya eṣo 'ntar hṛdaya ākāśas tasmiṁ śete (He rests in the sky within the heart). In this way the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the object of knowledge taught in this passage.

Adhikaraṇa 6

The "Ātmā" of Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.5 is Brahman and Not Jīva

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.5.6 Yājñavalkya teaches his wife, Maitreyī:

na vā are patyuh kāmāya patiḥ priyo bhavati

"A husband is not dear because the wife loves the husband. A husband is dear because she loves the Self."

He also says:

na vā are sarvasya kāmāya sarvaṁ priyaṁ bhavati ātmanas tu kāmāya sarvaṁ priyaṁ bhavati

"Everything is not dear because one loves everything. Everything is dear because one loves the Self."

Again, he says:

ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ śrotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsitavyo maitreyī ātmano vā are darśanena śravaṇena matyā vijñānena idaṁ sarvaṁ viditam

"The Self should be seen, heard, worshiped, and always meditated on. O Maitreyī, by seeing, hearing, worshiping, and understanding the Self, everything becomes known."

Samśaya: In this passage which self is to be understood: the jīva (individual spirit soul) described in the Kapila-tantra, or the Paramātmā (the Supreme Personality of Godhead)?

Pūrvapakṣa: Because in this passage he describes the love of husband and wife and because in the middle of the passage he says: etebhyo bhūtebhyaḥ samutthāya tāny evānuvinaśyati na pretya-samjñāsti (He leaves the material elements, his body is destroyed, he dies and is no longer conscious), words that clearly describe a resident of the material world who is subject to birth and death, and because at the end he says: vijñātāram are kena vijānīyāt (How should we understand the person who is the knower?) this passage should be interpreted to describe the jīva, who is the knower described in the Kapila-tantra. One may object: "But it says that by knowing the Self everything becomes known. Certainly this refers to the Paramātmā and not the jīva." but this objection is not valid. The jīva takes birth in

this world with an aim to enjoy and one may figuratively say that by knowing the jīva one knows everything for one then knows the world around him meant for his enjoyment. One may again object, "This passage cannot refer to the jīva because the text says amṛtatvasya tu nāśāsti vittena (By knowing Him one becomes immortal). Because it is only by knowing the Paramātmā that one becomes immortal, how can this passage refer to the jīva?" This objection is also not valid because by understanding that the jīva is by nature different from matter one may also attain immortality. In the same way all descriptions in this passage that seem to refer to Brahman should be understood to refer to the jīva. In this way this entire passage describes the jīva. In this way it should be understood that the material nature, which is under the control of the jīva, is the original cause of the world.

Siddhānta: In this matter:

Sūtra 19

vākyānvayāt

vākya-statement; anvayāt-because of the connection.

The context of this passage proves that Brahman is the object of discussion.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this passage the Paramātmā, and not the jīva of the Kapila-tantra, is described. Why? Because in the context of the whole passage, including what precedes and follows this quote, that is the appropriate interpretation.

Three sages also confirm this interpretation:

Sūtra 20

pratijñā-siddher liṅgam āśmarathyah

pratijñā-of the promise; siddher -of the fulfillment; liṅgam -the mark;
āśmarathyah-Aśmarathya.

Āśmarthya (maintains that the Self here is Paramātmā because only in that way) is the promise (that by knowledge of the Self everything is known) fulfilled.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Āśmarathya maintains that the promise *ātmano vijñānena sarvaṁ viditam* (By knowledge of the Self everything is known) indicates that the Self referred to here is the Paramātmā. It is not taught here that by knowledge of the jīva everything becomes known. On the other hand by knowledge of the cause of all causes everything becomes known. It is not possible to interpret these words in a figurative way because after promising that by knowing the Self everything becomes known, in the passage beginning *brahma taṁ parādāt* (One who thinks the brāhmaṇas rest in a place other than the Self is spurned by the brāhmaṇas. One who thinks the kṣatriyas rest in a place other than the Self is spurned by the kṣatriyas. One who thinks the worlds rest in a place other than the self is spurned by the worlds) he affirms that the Paramātmā is the form of everything and the resting place of the brāhmaṇas, kṣatriyas, and world. For these reasons it is not possible that the Self here can be any other than the Paramātmā. It is also not possible for the individual living entity who remains under the control of karma to be the original cause of all causes described in the passage beginning *tasya vā etasya mahato bhūtasya niḥśvasitam* (transcendental he Vedas were manifested from the breathing of this Supreme Being). It is also not possible for (the sage Yājñavalkya) to have taught his wife, who had renounced all wealth and material benefits to attain liberation, only about the jīva and not about the Supreme Brahman. It is also not possible that the Self referred to here is the jīva because one cannot attain liberation simply by knowing the jīva. That liberation is attained only by understanding the Supreme Brahman is confirmed in the following statement of Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 3.8 and 6.15: *tam eva viditvāti mṛtyum eti* (By understanding the Supreme Brahman one is able to transcend death). For all these reasons it should be understood that the Self described in this passage is the Paramātmā.

Pūrvapakṣa: The objection may be raised: Because the Self in this passage is described as the object of love for the husband and other persons, this self must be the jīva bound to the cycle of repeated birth and death and not the Paramātmā. It cannot be said that the Self described here must be the Paramātmā because that interpretation answers the promise (of Yājñavalkya to speak certain words), nor can it be said that the Self here must be the Paramātmā because this Self is the shelter of the devotees, the creator of everything, all-powerful, and the origin of transcendental bliss. The jīva may also be these things, as the Padma Purāṇa explains: *yenārcito hariḥ tena tarpitāni jaganty api rajyanti jantavas tatra sthāvarā jaṅgamā api* (One who worships Lord Hari pleases all the worlds. All moving and non-moving creatures love the devotee). In this way the Self described here is not the Paramātmā.

Siddhānta: Fearing that the opponent may speak these words, he says:

utkramiṣyata evaṁ bhāvād ity auḍulomiḥ

utkramiṣyataḥ -of a person about to depart; evaṁ-in this way; bhāvāt-from this condition; iti-thus; auḍulomiḥ-Auḍulomi.

Auḍulomi maintains that one about to become liberated attains the transcendental qualities of the Lord.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word utkramiṣyataḥ here means a person who by following spiritual practices attains the Paramātmā. Evaṁ bhāvāt means "because of being dear to everyone." Ātmā means "Paramātmā." This is the opinion of Auḍulomi. The passage patyuh kāmāya patiḥ priyo bhavati (A husband is not dear because the wife loves the husband. A husband is dear because she loves the Self) means that if a wife thinks "By my own power I shall become dear to my husband" her husband will not love her. However, if the wife loves the Paramātmā, then Lord Paramātmā will make everyone love this devotee-wife. The word kāma here means "desire" and kāmāya means "to fulfill the desire." The use of the dative case here is described in Pāṇini's sūtras (Aṣṭādhyāyī 2.3.1 or Siddhānta-kaumudī 581) in the following words: kriyārthopapadasya ca karmaṇi sthāninaḥ (The dative case is used for the object of a verb understood but not expressed. In the dative two verbs are used together and the action is in the future). In other words this passage (patyuh kāmāya) of the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad means "When He is worshiped with devotion, the Supreme Personality of Godhead makes everything a source of happiness for His devotees." This is corroborated by the following statement of Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (11.14.13):

akiñcānasya dāntasya
śāntasya sama-cetasah
mayā santuṣṭa-manasah
sarvāḥ sukhamayā diśah

"For a person who is renounced, self-controlled, peaceful, equal to all, and who finds his happiness in Me, every place in this world is full of joy."

The passage patyuh kāmāya may also be interpreted to mean "Trying to please the husband does not please him. Only when the wife tries to please the Paramātmā does the husband become pleased." This interpretation is corroborated by the following statement of Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (10.23.27):

prāṇa-buddhi-maṇah-svātma-

dārāpatya-dhanādayaḥ
yat-samparkāt priyā āsāms
tataḥ ko 'nyaḥ paraḥ priyaḥ

"Our life, property, home, wife, children, house, country, society, and all paraphernalia which are very dear to us are expansions of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Who is more dear to us than the Supreme Person?"

In this interpretation the word *kāma* means "happiness" and the dative case is used in the same sense as the previous interpretation. This interpretation means that by the will of the *Paramātmā*, by the nearness of the *Paramātmā*, or by the touch of the *Paramātmā*, even what is ordinarily unpleasant becomes blissful. Therefore when the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* says *ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ* (The Self should be seen), the word *ātmā* means the dear Lord Hari. It is not possible to interpret the word *ātmā* here to mean the *jīva* because here the primary meaning of *ātmā* is the supremely powerful Personality of Godhead. To interpret *ātmā* in any other way would contradict the way the word had been used in the previous passage (*vākya-bheda*). We do not see how it is possible to interpret *ātmā* in a way different from the way it was clearly used in the immediately previous passage. In this way the word *ātmā* in *ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ* must be the *Paramātmā*. In both passages (*ātmanas tu kāmāya* and *ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ*) the word *ātmā* cannot mean the *jīva*, for in these contexts the word *ātmā* can only refer to Brahman.

Although *Auḍulomi* is a *nirguṇa-ātmavādī* (impersonalist) as will be explained later on in the words (*Vedānta-sūtra* 4.4.6) *citi tan-mātreṇa tad-ātmakatvād ity auḍulomiḥ* (When he is liberated the *jīva* enters the Supreme Intelligence, for the *jīva* is actually intelligence only. This is the opinion of *Auḍulomi*.), still *Auḍulomi* maintains that in order to dispel ignorance and reveal the true nature of the self Lord Hari should be worshiped, as will be explained in the following words (*Vedānta-sūtra* 3.4.45): *ārtvijyam ity auḍulomis tasmai hi parikriyate* (Just as a Vedic priest is purchased to perform a *yajña*, the Supreme Personality of Godhead is purchased by His devotees' love). In this way it is proved that pure devotion to Lord Hari fulfills all desires.

Our opponent may say: So be it. However, in the same *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (2.4.12) we find the following words:

sa yathā saindhava-khilya udake prāptam udakam evānulīyate na
hāsyodgrahaṇāyaiva syād yato yatas tv ādīta lavaṇam evaivaṁ vā. are idaṁ mahad
bhūtam anantam apāraṁ vijñāna-ghana evaitebhyo bhūtebhyaḥ samutthāya tāny
evānuvinaśyati

"As a little salt merges into water and cannot be again extracted from it, although the water itself becomes salty, so does this great being, limitless, endless, and full of knowledge, rise from these elements and then vanish into them."

How do you reconcile this statement with your interpretation of the word *ātmā* in this *Upaniṣad*? Clearly this passage refers to the *jīva* described in the *Kapila-tantra* because that is the appropriate interpretation.

To answer this doubt he says:

Sūtra 22

avasthiter iti kāśakṛtsnaḥ

avasthiter -because of residence; iti -thus; kāśakṛtsnaḥ-Kāśakṛtsna.

This passage refers to Paramātmā, for Paramātmā resides within the jīva. This is the opinion of Kāśakṛtsna.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this statement the word avasthiteḥ (residing) which refers to the Paramātmā, the Great Being who is different from the jīva, and who is described as vijñāna-ghana (full of knowledge), teaches that the Paramātmā is different from the jīva and resides within him. Kāśakṛtsna considers that because the Paramātmā and the jīva are different the words mahad-bhūtam (Great being), anantam (limitless) and vijñāna-ghana cannot refer to the jīva. A summary of the passage from Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad under discussion follows.

Yenāhaṁ nāmṛtaḥ syāṁ kim ahaṁ tena kuryāṁ

"Tell me what I must do to become free of death)."

Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.5.4)

Asked this question about the means to attain liberation, the sage answered:

ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ śrotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsitavyo maitreyy ātmano vā are darśanena śravaṇena matyā vijñānena idaṁ sarvaṁ viditam

"The Self should be seen, heard, worshiped, and always meditated on. O Maitreyī, by seeing, hearing, worshiping, and understanding the Self, everything becomes known."

In this way he explains that the worship of Paramātmā is the way to attain liberation.

Then he says:

sa yathā dundubher hanyamānasya bāhyāṅ chabdāṅ chakruyād grahaṇāya dundubhes tu grahaṇena dundubhy-āghātasya vā śabdo grhītaḥ

"As the sounds of a drum when beaten cannot be seized externally, although when the drum or the player of the drum are seized then the sounds are also seized). Thus, in a very general way he explains the proper method of worshipping the Paramātmā: sense-control.

He continues in the following words:

sa yathārdhraidho 'gner abhyāhitasya pṛthag dhūmā viniścaranty evaṃ vā are
'sya mahato bhūtasya niśvāsitaṃ etad yad ṛg vedo yajur vedaḥ sāma-vedo
'tharvāṅgīrasa itihāsaḥ purāṇaṃ vidyā upaniśadaḥ ślokāḥ sūtrāṇy anuvyākhyānāni
vyākhyānāniṣṭaṃ hutam āsitaṃ pāyitam ayaṃ ca lokaḥ paraś ca lokaḥ sarvāṇi ca
bhūtāny asyaikaitāni sarvāṇi niśvasitāni. sa yathā sarvāsām apām samudra
ekāyanam evaṃ sarveṣām sparśānām tvacaikāyanam evaṃ sarveṣām rasānām
jihvaikāyanam evaṃ sarveṣām gandhānām nāsikaikāyanam evaṃ sarveṣām
rūpānām cak.sur ekāyanam evaṃ sarveṣām śabdānām śrotram ekāyanam evaṃ
sarveṣām saṅkalpānām mana ekāyanam evaṃ sarvāsām vidyānām hṛdayam
ekāyanam evaṃ sarveṣām karmaṇām hastāv ekāyanam evaṃ sarveṣām ānandānām
upastha ekāyanam evaṃ sarveṣām visargānām pāyur ekāyanam evaṃ sarveṣām
adhvanām pādāv ekāyanam evaṃ sarveṣām vedānām vāg ekāyanam

"As smoke comes from a fire made with wet fuel, the Ṛg Veda, Sāma Veda, Yajur Veda, Atharva Veda, Purāṇas, Itihāsas, Vidyās, Upaniśads, ślokas, sūtras, vyākhyās, and anuvyākhyās, come from the breath of the Supreme Person. As the ocean is the sole resting place of all waters, so the skin is the sole resting-place of all tactile sensations, the nose is the sole resting-place of all fragrances, the tongue is the sole resting-place of all tastes, the eyes are the sole resting-place of all forms, the ears are the sole resting-place of all sounds, the mind is the sole resting-place of all thoughts and desires, the heart is the sole resting place of all knowledge, the hands are the sole resting-place of all work, the genitals are the sole resting-place of all material bliss, the anus is the sole resting-place of all expulsions, the feet are the sole resting-place of all pathways, and words are the sole resting-place of all the Vedas)."

To encourage the desire for liberation he says:

sa yathā saindhava-khilya udake prāptam udakam evānuliṅyate na
hāsyodgrahaṇāyaiva syād yato yatas tv ādīta lavaṇam evaivam vā. are idaṃ mahad
bhūtam anantam apāram vijñāna-ghana evaitebhyo bhūtebhyaḥ samutthāya tāny
evānuvinaśyati

"As a little salt merges into water and cannot be again extracted from it, although the water itself becomes salty, so does this great being, limitless, endless, and full of knowledge, rise from these elements and then vanish into them."

In this way he explains that the supreme object of worship is immanent: always near to the jīva.

In the words etebhyo bhūtebhyaḥ samutthāya tāny evānuvinaśyati (So does this great being, limitless, endless, and full of knowledge, rise from these elements and

then vanish into them) he describes the non-devotees who do not worship the Lord, who mistake the external material body for the self, who at the time of death remain in the cycle of repeated birth and death, and for whom the Supreme Lord remains invisible, hidden within the material elements.

The words *na pretya samjñāsti* (After death he becomes free of the world of names) describe the devotee when he leaves the material body and attains liberation. At that time the liberated devotee becomes aware of his real spiritual identity. He then considers all material designations to be the same and he no longer thinks of himself as a human being, demigod, or any other kind of material being.

The words *yatra hi dvaitam iva bhavati tad itara itaram paśyati tad itara itaram jighrati tad itara itaram rasayate tad itara itaram abhivadati tad itara itaram śṛṇoti tad itara itaram manute tad itara itaram spṛśati tad itara itaram vijānāti yatra tv asya sarvaṃ ātmaivābhūt tat tena kaṃ paśyet tat tena kaṃ jighret tat kena kaṃ rasayet tat kena kaṃ abhivadet tat kena kaṃ śṛṇuyāt tat kena kaṃ manvīta tata tena kaṃ spṛśet tat tena kaṃ vijānīyāt* (Where there is duality one sees another, smells another, tastes another, offers respect to another, hears another, thinks of another, touches another, and is aware of another. But for one for whom the Supreme Self is everything how can he see another? How can he smell another? How can he taste another? How can he offer respect to another? How can he hear another? How can he think of another? How can he touch another? How can he be aware of another?) explain how the liberated *jīva* takes shelter of the the *Paramātmā*.

The words *yenedaṃ sarvaṃ vijānāti taṃ kena vijānīyāt* (How can a person, even if he understands the entire world, understand Him?) teach that it is very difficult to understand the Supreme Lord.

The words *vijñāram* are *kena vijānīyāt* (How can one understand the Supreme Knower?) mean "How can one understand the all-knowing Supreme Personality of Godhead without first worshiping Him and attaining His mercy? There is no other way than this." In this way the worship of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is described as the actual means of liberation. The speaker of the *Upaniṣad* concludes by declaring that actual liberation is the same as attaining the *Paramātmā*.

From all this it may be understood that this passage of the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* describes the *Paramātmā* and not the *puruṣa* as described in the *Kapila-tantra*, or the material nature controlled by the *puruṣa*.

Adhikaraṇa 7

Brahman is Both Primary and Secondary Cause

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya: Now that he has refuted the atheistic *pradhāna* theory, he will refute some theistic theories and prove that all scriptural descriptions of the cause of the

universe refer to the Supreme Brahman.

Let us consider the following scriptural passages.

tasmād vā etasmād ātmana ākāśaḥ sambhūtaḥ

"From ātmā the sky was manifested."

Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.1.1

yato vā imāni bhūtāni jāyante

"From the Supreme these creatures were born."

Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.1.1

sad eva saumyedam agra āsīd ekam evādvitīyaṁ tad aikṣata bahu syām prajāyeya

"O gentle one, in the beginning was the Supreme, who was one without a second. He thought: Let me become many. Let me become the father of many."

Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.2.1

sa aikṣata lokān nu sṛjā

"He thought: Now I shall create the worlds."

Aitareya Upaniṣad 1.1.2

Samśaya: Should Brahman be considering the Primary Cause or the ingredient of the creation? Because the Upaniṣads say sa aikṣata (He thought: "Now I shall create the worlds") the first proposal, that Brahman is the Primary cause and not the ingredient of creation, should be considered true. Although the Upaniṣad says tasmād vā etasmād ātmana ākāśaḥ sambhūtaḥ (From ātmā the sky was manifested) still this should be interpreted to mean only that the Supreme is the Primary Creator (and not the ingredient of creation) of the worlds. The quotes tad aikṣata bahu syām prajāyeya (He thought: "Let me become many. Let me become the father of many.") and sa aikṣata lokān nu sṛjā (He thought: "Now I shall create the worlds."), because of their clear explanation that the Lord's thinking precedes the creation, show that the Lord is the Primary Creator in the same way a potter is the creator of pots. Because the creation itself and the ingredients of which it is made must have the same nature, the ingredient of the material creation must be the material energy (prakṛti). It is not possible to say that the Primary Cause of creation is identical with the ingredients of the creation. In the material world made of dull matter the ingredients are earth and the other elements and the creator is consciousness, just as pots are made of the elements and the creator of the pots is the conscious potter. Here the pots and the potter are clearly different. Furthermore many diverse causes may create a single effect. Therefore it cannot be said that a single thing is both the primary cause and the ingredient of creation. The changing material energy (prakṛti), which is controlled by the unchanging Brahman is the ingredient of the changing material

universe and Brahman is only its Primary Cause. This statement is not based only on logic, for it is also supported by the following passage of the Culika Upaniṣad:

vikāra-jananīm ajñām
aṣṭa-rūpām ajām dhruvam
dhyāyate 'dhyāsītā tena
tanyate preritā punaḥ

sūyate puruṣārthaṁ ca
tenaivādhiṣṭhitā jagat
gaur anādy-antavatī sā

janitrī bhūta-bhāvinī

sitāsītā ca raktā ca
sarvakām adhunā vibhoḥ
pibanty enām aṣamām
avijñātāḥ kumārakāḥ

ekas tu pibate devaḥ
svacchando 'tra vaśānugām
dhyāna-kriyābhyām bhagavān
bhuṅkte 'sau prasabhaṁ vibhuḥ

sarva-sādhāraṇīm dogdhrīm
pīyamānām tu yajvabhīḥ
catur-vimśati-saṅkhyākām
avyaktaṁ vyaktam ucyate

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead meditates on the unborn, eternal, unintelligent material nature (prakṛti), who has eight forms, and by His order the material nature creates the material worlds and the various goals of life adopted by the living entities. Material nature is a beginningless, endless cow, the mother of the worlds. Without knowing, her children, the creatures in goodness, passion, and ignorance all drink her nourishing milk. The one independent, all-powerful Supreme Personality of Godhead strongly enjoys her with thought and deed, she who is the milk-giving mother of all, who is drunk by the performers of sacrifice, and who is said to be both the unmanifested and the manifested divided into 24 elements."

Furthermore, the Viṣṇu Purāṇa says:

yathā sannidhi-mātreṇa
gandhaḥ kṣobhāya jāyate
manaso nopakartṛtvāt
tathāsau parameśvaraḥ

sannidhānād yathākāśa-
kālādyāḥ kāraṇaṁ taroḥ
tathaivāparigāmena
viśvasya bhagavān hariḥ

nimitta-mātram evāsau
sṛṣṭānām sarga-karmaṇi
pradhāna-kāriṇī bhūtā
yato vai sṛjya-śaktayaḥ

"When there is a fragrant flower before someone, the fragrance is touched by the smelling power of the person, yet the smelling and the flower are detached from one another. There is a similar connection between the material world and the Supreme Personality of Godhead: actually He has nothing to do with this material world, but He creates by His glance and ordains. In summary, material nature, without the superintendence of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, cannot do anything. Yet the Supreme Personality is detached from all material activities."

For these reasons whatever scriptural passages state that Brahman is the ingredient of the creation should be interpreted to have a different meaning.
Siddhānta To this argument:

Sūtra 23

prakṛtiś ca pratijñā dṛṣṭāntānuparodhāt

prakṛtiḥ -material nature; ca -and; pratijñā -the proposition to be proved;
dṛṣṭānta-example; anuparodhāt-because of not contradicting.

Brahman is also the material nature (prakṛti) because this view is not contradicted by the statements and examples (given in the scriptures).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Brahman is the material nature (prakṛti), the ingredient of the world. How is that? It is so because pratijñā-dṛṣṭāntānuparodhāt, which means "Because this view is not contradicted by the statements and examples of the scriptures." An example may be given from the Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.1.3:

śvetaketo yan nu saumyedaṁ mahā-manā anūcāna-mānī stabdho 'sy uta tam

ādeśam aprākṣīr yenāśrutam śrutam bhavaty amataṁ matam avijñātam vijñātam
ity eka-vijñānena sarva-vijñāna-viṣayā pratijñā

"Gentle Śvetaketu, you are now very proud and arrogant, thinking yourself a great Vedic scholar. Did you ask for the teaching that makes the unheard heard, the unthinkable thinkable, and the unknown known?"

Here the statement is the existence of a single teaching, the knowledge of which makes everything known. This teaching must be about the ingredient of the world for only that knowledge would not contradict the description in this passage. That ingredient of the world is not different from the original creator of the world. They are one, unlike the pot and the potter, which are different from each other.

The following example is given (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.1.10):

yathā saumyaikena mṛt-piṇḍena sarvaṁ mṛṇ-mayaṁ vijñātam syāt

"O gentle one, as by knowing the nature of clay, everything made of clay becomes known, in the same way by understanding this one teaching everything becomes known."

These words of the śruti must refer to the ingredient of the world. they cannot refer to only the original creator of the world, for by understanding only the potter one does not understand the pot. Therefore, to avoid contradicting these words of the scripture, it must be concluded that Brahman is not only the original creator of the world, but the ingredient of which the world is made as well.

Sūtra 24

abhidhyopadeśāc ca

abhidhya-will; upadeśāc -because of the teaching; ca-and.

Because (the scriptures) teach (that in this age the world was created by His) will and (in previous creations the world was also created by His will, it must be concluded that Brahman is both the original cause of creation and the ingredient of the creation as well).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this sūtra the word ca (and) means "and many other things that are not explicitly mentioned here."

The Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.6.1) explains:

so 'kāmayata bahu syām prajāyeya sa tapo 'tapyata tapas taptvā idam sarvam asrjat.
yad idam kiñcana tat sṛṣṭvā tad evānuprāviśat. tad anupraviśya sac ca tyac
cābhavat.

"He desired: I will become many. I will father many children. He performed austerities and created everything. Then He entered within the world He had created. After He entered He became all that is manifest and all that is unmanifest."

Because it is here taught that by His own desire He resides as Paramātmā within all conscious living entities and unconscious matter, and because it is also taught here that he is the creator of everything, it must be concluded that He is both the ingredient of the which the creation is made and the original creator and as well.

Sūtra 25

sākṣāc cobhayāmnānāt

sākṣāt -directly; ca-certainly; ubhaya-both; āmnānāt-because of direct statement.

(Brahman is both creator and the ingredient of creation) because both (truths) are directly stated (in the scriptures).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word ca here means "certainly." The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa (2.8.9.6) explains:

kiṁsvid vanam ka u sa vṛkṣa āsīt
yato dyāvā-pṛthivī niṣṭatakṣuḥ
mañiṣiṇo manasā pṛcchataitāt
yad adhyatiṣṭhad bhuvanāni dhārayan

brahma vanam brahma sa vṛkṣa āsīt
yato dyāvā-pṛthivī niṣṭatakṣuḥ
mañiṣiṇo manasā prabravīmi
vo brahmādhyatiṣṭhad buvanāni dhārayan

"What was the forest? What was the tree? From what tree in what forest did He fashion heaven and earth? Ask these questions, O wise ones. Where did He stand when He created the worlds? Brahman was the forest. Brahman was the tree. From Brahman He created heaven and earth. O wise ones, I tell you, He stood on Brahman when He created the worlds."

These questions and answers clearly show that Brahman is both the creator and the ingredient from which the creation is made. From the tree-ingredient the creation, designated by the word "heaven and earth" comes. The word *niṣṭatakṣuḥ* means "the Supreme Personality of Godhead created." Although *niṣṭatakṣuḥ* is plural, the opposite, the singular, is intended here. This is a use of Vedic poetic license. The questions "What is the tree? What is the forest where the tree rests? Where does He stand when He created the worlds?" are asked in terms of the things of this world and the answers describe something beyond this world. In this way it may be understood that Brahman is both the creator and the ingredient of which the world is made.

Sūtra 26

ātma-kṛteḥ pariṇāmāt

ātma-self; kṛteḥ -because of making; pariṇāmāt-because of transformation.

(Brahman is both the creator and the ingredient of the creation) because He transformed Himself (into the world).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.6.2) says:

so 'kāmayata

"He desired: I shall become many."

It also says (2.7.1):

tad ātmānam svayam akuruta

"He created the world from His own Self."

In this way the scriptures explain that Brahman is both the creator and the ingredient from which the creation is made.

Someone may object: How can the eternally-perfect creator be also the

creation?

To answer this objection he says pariṇmāt (because He has transformed Himself). This does not contradict the changelessness of Brahman for a certain kind of transformation is not incompatible with changelessness. Here is the truth of this. In the following passages the śruti explains that Brahman has three potencies:

parāśya śaktir vividhaiva śrūyate

"The Supreme has many potencies."

Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 6.8

pradhāna-kṣetrajña-patir guṇeśaḥ

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the master of pradhāna (material nature), kṣetrajña (the individual spirit souls), and guṇa (the three material modes)."

Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 6.16

The smṛti (Viṣṇu Purāna) also explains:

viṣṇu-śaktiḥ parā proktā
kṣetrajñākhyā tathā parā
avidyā-karma-saṁjñānyā
ṭṭīyā śaktir ucyate

"The potency of Lord Viṣṇu is summarized in three categories: namely the spiritual potency, the living entities, and ignorance. The spiritual potency is full of knowledge; the living entities, although belonging to the spiritual potency, are subject to bewilderment; and the third energy, which is full of ignorance, is always visible in fruitive activities."

In this way the scriptures explain that Brahman is both the creator and the ingredient of which the creation is made. He is the first (the creator) by the agency of His spiritual potency and He is the second (the ingredient of which the creation is made) by the agency of the other two potencies. This interpretation is confirmed by the aphorism sa-viśeṣeṇa vidhi-niṣedhau viśeṣaṇam upasaṅkrāmate (an adjective describes both what a noun is and what it is not).

The scriptures also explain (Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 4.1):

ya eko 'varṇo bahudhā śakti-yogād
varṇān anekān nihitārtho dadhāti
vi caiti cānte viśvam ādau sa devaḥ
sa no buddhyā śubhayā saṁyunaktau

"May the one, unrivalled Supreme Personality of Godhead, who for His own purpose created the many varieties of living entities by the agency of His potencies, who created everything in the beginning and into whom everything enters at the end, grant pure intelligence to us."

As the supreme unchangeable the Supreme Brahman is the original cause of creation, and as the pariṇāmi (the transformable) Brahman is also the ingredient of which the creation is made. In His subtle nature Brahman is the creator and in His nature as gross matter He is the creation itself. In this way it is established that the Supreme Brahman is both creator and creation. The creation is thus like a lump of clay that may be shaped in different ways. The word pariṇāmāt (because of transformation) in this sūtra clearly refutes the theory that declares the material world a vivarta (illusion) that has no reality. The statement that the material world is an illusion superimposed on Brahman just as the existence of silver is an illusion superimposed on an oyster shell with a silvery sheen cannot be accepted because the oyster shell is an object that can be placed before the viewer, but Brahman, because it is all-pervading cannot be placed before the viewer and therefore an illusion cannot be superimposed on it. One may object that although the sky is all-pervading illusions may be superimposed on it. However, Brahman is not like the sky in the sense that the sky may be approached by the material observer but Brahman remains beyond the reach of the material senses and therefore an illusion cannot be superimposed on it. Furthermore, the existence of an illusion implies the existence of something different from the thing on which the illusion is superimposed. Without the existence of something separate there is no possibility of an illusion. In the end, therefore, the vivarta theory postulates the existence of something different from Brahman. This is the fault in their theory. When the scriptures state that the material world is an illusion it should be understood these words are a device intended to create renunciation. This is the opinion of they who know the truth. The material world, however, displays a complicated structure of different elements grouped in categories of higher and lower, and in this way it is very much unlike an illusion, where nothing is very stable and one things is continually changing into another. In this way it may be understood that the vivarta theory (that the material world isd an illusion) is untrue and the pariṇāma theory (that the material world is a transformation of Brahman) is the truth taught in the Vedic scriptures.

Sūtra 27

yoniś ca hi gīyate

yoniḥ-the place of birth; ca -also; hi -indeed; gīyate-is declared.

(The scriptures) declare that (Brahman is the) womb (from which the material world was born).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The śruti-sāstra explains:

yad bhūta-yoniṃ paripaśyanti dhīrāḥ

"The wise see that Brahman is the womb from which everything was born."
Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 1.1.6

kartāram īśaṃ puruṣaṃ brahma-yoniṃ

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the original creator, the womb from which everything was born."
Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 3.1.6

In these verses the word yoniṃ (womb) describes Brahman as the ingredient of creation and the words kartāram puruṣaṃ (the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the original creator) describe Brahman as the creator. In this way Brahman is described as both the creator and the ingredient of which the creation is made. The word yoni (womb) means "the ingredient of which the creation is made." This is confirmed in the words:

pṛthivī yonir ośadhi-vanaspatīnām

"The earth is the womb from which the trees and plants are born."

In both common sense and Vedic revelation the creator and the ingredients from which the creation is made are always considered different and it is not possible to say that the creator and the ingredient of which his creation is made are identical. However, the previously quoted passages from the śruti clearly explain that in this case Brahman is both the creator and the ingredient of which His creation is made.

Adhikaraṇa 8

All Names Are Names of Lord Viṣṇu

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Someone may object: Many passages in the scriptures do not support your conclusion at all.

This adhikaraṇa is written to dispel this doubt. The Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad

explains:

kṣaram pradhānam amṛtākṣaraḥ haraḥ

"Material nature is in constant flux and the Supreme, Lord Hara is eternal and unchanging." (1.10)

eko rudro na dvitīyāya tasthuḥ

"Lord Rudra is the Supreme. He has no rival." (3.2)

yo devānām prabhavaś codbhavaś ca
viśvādhiko rudraḥ śivo maharṣiḥ

"Lord Śiva, who is known as Rudra, is the omniscient ruler of the universe. He is the father of all the demigods. He gives the demigods all their powers and opulences." (3.4)

yadā tamas tan na divā na rātrir
na san na cāsac chiva eva kevalaḥ

"When the final darkness comes and there is no longer day or night, when there is no longer being and non-being, then only Lord Śiva exists." (4.18)

The scriptures also explain:

pradhānād idam utpannam
pradhānam adhigacchati
pradhāne layam abhyeti
na hy anyat kāraṇam matam

"From pradhāna this material world was born. This world knows only pradhāna. This world merges into pradhāna at the time of annihilation. Nothing else is the cause of this world."

jīvād bhavanti bhūtāni
jīve tiṣṭhanty acañcalāḥ
jīve ca layam icchanti
na jīvāt kāraṇam param

"From the jīva all the elements of this world have come. In the jīva they rest without moving, and they finally merge into the jīva. Nothing else is the cause of this world."

Samśaya: Should Hara and the other names given in these quotes be understood in their ordinary senses, as names of Lord Śiva, pradhāna, and jīva, or should they all be understood to be names of the Supreme Brahman?

Pūrvapakṣa: The names should all be understood in their ordinary senses, as

names of Lord Śiva, pradhāna, and jīva.
Siddhānta: The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 28

etena sarve vyākhyātā vyākhyātāḥ

etena -in this way; sarve -all; vyākhyātāḥ -explained; vyākhyātāḥ-explained.

All (words in the scriptures) should be interpreted to agree with the explanation (that the Supreme Brahman is the original cause).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this sūtra the word etena means "according to the explanations already given," sarve means "Hara and the other names," and vyākhyātāḥ means "should be understood to be names of the Supreme Brahman because all names are originally names of the Supreme Brahman."

The Bhālvaveya-śruti explains:

nāmāni viśvāni na santi loke
yad āvirāsīt puruṣasya sarvam
nāmāni sarvāṇi yam āviśanti
taṁ vai viṣṇuṁ paramam udāharanti

"The names of this world are not different from Him. All names in this world are names of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. All names refer to Him, Lord Viṣṇu, whom the wise declare is the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

Vaiśampāyana Muni explains that all these names are names of Lord Kṛṣṇa. The Skanda Purāṇa also explains:

śrī-nārāyaṇādīni nāmāni vinānyāni rudrādibhyo harir dattavān

"Except for Nārāyaṇa and some other names, Lord Hari gave away His names to Lord Śiva and the other demigods."

This is the rule that should be followed: When the ordinary sense of these names does not contradict the essential teaching of the Vedas, the ordinary meaning should be accepted. When the ordinary sense of these names does contradict the teaching of the Vedas, these names should be understood to be names of Lord Viṣṇu.

The repetition of the last word (vyākṛyātāḥ) here indicates the end of the chapter.

sarve vedāḥ paryavasyanti yasmin
satyānantācintya-śaktau pareśe
viśvotpatti-sthema-bhaṅgādi-līle
nityam tasmin nas tu kṛṣṇe matir naḥ

On Lord Kṛṣṇa, who is the final goal taught by all the Vedas, who is the master of unlimited and inconcievable transcendental potencies, who is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and who in His own pastimes creates, maintains and destroys the material universes, may we always fix our hearts.

Chapter 2

Pada 1

Mangalacarana By Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

durvuktika-droṇaja-bāṇa-vikṣatam
parīkṣitam yaḥ sphuṭam uttarāśrayam
sudarśanena śruti-maulim avyatham
vyadhāt sa kṛṣṇaḥ prabhur astu me gatiḥ*

(Translation 1) With His sudarśana-cakra Lord Kṛṣṇa protected (the great devotee) Parīkṣit, who within Uttarā's womb was wounded by the arrows of the wicked son of Droṇa. Lord Kṛṣṇa may him free from all suffering and enlightened him with the crest jewel of Vedic knowledge. I pray that Lord Kṛṣṇa may become my shelter.

(Translation 2) With the perfect logic of His scriptural analysis, Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa protected the Upaniṣads, which contain the answers to all questions, and which were wounded by the arrows of the black crows of false logicians. Lord Vyāsa made the Upaniṣads free from all suffering. I pray that Lord Vyāsa may become my shelter.

Note: By carefully using certain ambiguous words Śrīla Baladeva Viśyābhūṣaṇa has composed this verse so it has two distinct meanings.

Adhikaraṇa 1

The Sāṅkhya Philosophy Refuted

Introduction By Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya---In the First Chapter was proved that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is faultless, is the master of unlimited inconceivable potencies, has unlimited transcendental virtues, is the Supersoul present everywhere, is different from everything, is the creator of the material world and the ingredient of which the creation is made, is the controller and master of everything, is the object of Vedānta study, and is described by all the Vedas.

In the Second Chapter the arguments claiming that this Vedānta philosophy is contradicted by the smṛti- śāstra and by logic will be refuted, the saṅkhya theory that pradhāna is the original cause of creation will be refuted with clear logic, and the Vedānta explanation of creation will be proved to be the only truth. These are the topics that will be described. In the beginning the idea that the śruti-śāstra contradicts the Vedānta view will be refuted.

Samśaya---Is the view that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the original cause of everything refuted by the saṅkhya-smṛti or not?

Pūrvapakṣa---According to Vedānta philosophy the saṅkhya-smṛti is untrue. The saṅkhya smṛti was written by the great sage Kapila as a commentary to explain the jñāna-kāṇḍa portion of the Vedas. He hoped in this way to teach the path of liberation. Kapila firmly approved of the agnihotra-yajñas and other rituals described in the karma-kāṇḍa portion of the Vedas. The śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (5.2) glorifies him in the words ṛṣim prasūtam kapilam (the great sage Kapila). In his Kapila-smṛti, which contains statements like atha tri-vidha-duḥkhātyanta-nivṛttir atyanta-puruṣārthaḥ (the complete cessation of the threefold miseries of the material world is the ultimate goal of human life) and na dṛṣṭārtha-siddhir nivṛtter apy anuvṛtti-darśanāt (The threefold miseries cannot be completely stopped by any method seen in this world, for whenever they are stopped it is seen that they always return) he explained in the words vimukta-mokṣārtham svārtham vā pradhānasya (the pradhāna creates the material world either to fulfill the living entities' material desires or grant them liberation), the words acetanatve 'pi kṣiravac ceṣṭitam pradhānasya (although it is lifeless and unconscious, the pradhāna creates this world just as milk spontaneously creates cheese), and other statements of his writings, the truth that insentient pradhāna is the independent creator of the material universes. If the idea that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the original cause of everything is accepted, then the statements of the Kapila-smṛti must be held to be useless. This is especially so because the Kapila-smṛti is a book of philosophy with the understanding of the ultimate truth as its sole objective. For this reason the Vedānta texts must be interpreted in such a way that they do not contradict the great Kapila-smṛti. This interpretation, even if it contradicts the Manu-smṛti and other smṛti- śāstras would not make these scriptures useless. Because these scriptures explain the karma-kāṇḍa portion of the Vedas, and because they explain the path of dharma (and not theoretical philosophy), they would not be made useless by contradicting their philosophical

basis.

Siddhānta---To this argument he replies---

Sūtra 1

smṛty-anavakāśa-doṣa-prasaṅga iti cen nānya-smṛty- anavakāśa-doṣa-prasaṅgāt

If someone objects that the Vedānta philosophy should not be accepted because it contradicts the Kapila-smṛti, then I say: No. The Kapila-smṛti should not be accepted because it contradicts the other smṛti-śāstras.

Purport By Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word anavakāśa in this sūtra means "without any proper place." This means "useless and irrelevant." the sūtra says: If someone says "When interpreted literally, the Vedānta texts seem to denounce the Sāṅkhya-smṛti as untrue. This is a great mistake. For this reason the Vedānta texts should be interpreted metaphorically (so not to contradict the sāṅkhya-smṛti)," then I say no. Why? The sūtra says: anya-smṛty- anavakāśa-doṣa-prasaṅgāt (The Kapila-smṛti should not be accepted because it contradicts the other smṛti-śāstras). To reject the Manu-smṛti and the other smṛtis that follow the Vedānta philosophy and declare the Supreme Personality of Godhead to be the sole original cause of all causes is a great mistake. In these scriptures the Supreme Personality of Godhead is proved to be the original cause of the creation, maintenance, and destruction of the material universes. These scriptures do not accept Kapila's conclusions.

In this question the Manu-smṛti (1.5-9) says:

āsīd idam tamo-bhūtam*
aprajñātam alakṣaṇam
apratarkyam avijñeyam
prasuptam iva sarvataḥ

"The material universe was dark, unconscious, amorphous, inconceivable, and unknowable. It was as if completely asleep.

tataḥ svayambhūr bhagavān*
avyakto vyañjayann idam
mahā-bhūtādi-vṛttaujāḥ
prādurāsīt tamonudaḥ

"The self-manifested Supreme Personality of Godhead, who had been unmanifested, then manifested within this world. He manifested the material elements and dispelled the darkness.

yo 'sāv atīndriya-grāhyaḥ*
sūkṣmo 'vyaktaḥ sanātanaḥ

sarva-bhūtamayo 'cintyaḥ
sa eṣa svayam udbabhau

"He who is beyond the reach of the material senses, who is subtle, unmanifested, eternal, inconceivable, and within whom everything rests, then personally appeared in this world.

so 'bhidyāya śarīrāt svāt*
sīrṅṅsur vividhāḥ prajāḥ
apa eva sasarjādu
tāsu bījam avāsrjat

"Desiring to create the many living beings from His own body, He meditated and then created the waters. In the waters He placed a seed.

tad aṅḅam abhavad dhaimam*
sahasrāmśu-sama-prabham
tasmin jajñe svayam brahmā
sarva-loka-pitāmahaḥ

"That seed became a golden egg as splendid as the sun. In that egg was born the demigod Brahmā, the grandfather of all living beings."

Parāśara Muni (Viṣṇu Purāṇa 1.1.31-32) also says:

viṣṇoḥ sakāśād udbhūtam*
jagat tatraiva ca sthitam
sthiti-samyama-kartāsau
jagato 'sya jagac ca saḥ

"From Lord Viṣṇu this material was manifested. In Him it rests. He controls it. This material world is His property, and He is this material world.

yathorṇanābho hṛdayād*
ūrṇām santatya vakrataḥ
tayā vihrtya bhūyas tām
grasaty evam janārdanaḥ

"As a spider creates a web within its chest and then manifests it from its mouth, so does Lord Viṣṇu manifest this world and then swallow it again."

The other smṛtis also present the same view. They are not merely explanations of karma-kāṅḅa duties. They teach karma-kāṅḅa duties as a means to purify the heart so knowledge of the Supreme Personality of Godhead may arise there. In this way they may be understood as explanations of the jñāna-kāṅḅa portion of the Vedas. This effort to purify the heart is seen in the following statement of the Bṛhad-āraṅyaka Upaniṣad (1.5.4.22): tam etaṁ vedānuvacanena (By studying the Vedas and performing spiritual activities, the brāhmaṇas understand the Supreme Personality of Godhead). Although in some places they grant results such as the

attainment of rain, sons, or residence in Svargaloka, these results are intended to bring faith in the words of the Vedas. This is confirmed by the Kāṭha Upaniṣad (1.3.15) in the words sarve vedāḥ yat-padam āmananti (All the Vedas aspire to attain the feet of the Supreme Personality of Godhead) and the śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (2.5.15) in the words nārāyaṇa-parā vedāḥ (The Vedic literatures are made by and are meant for the Supreme Lord). Because it contradicts the conclusions of the Vedas, the Sāṅkhya-smṛti cannot properly explain the meanings of the Vedas. A text that agrees with the conclusions of the Vedas may properly explain the Vedas. The Sāṅkhya-smṛti does not even agree with the conclusion of the Vedas. The Sāṅkhya-smṛti invented by Kapila contradicts the Vedas. It is not a genuine scripture. Because it is thus worthless we do not fear to reject it. Even if it was written by a famous author, a book that contradicts the Vedas should not be accepted. There are many smṛtis presenting many different philosophies that are all worthless because they contradict the truths of the Vedas. Smṛti that contradicts the Vedas should be rejected, and smṛti that follows the teachings of the Vedas should be accepted.

Using evidence from the smṛtis that support the Vedas, we shall refute the smṛtis that reject the Vedas. In this way we shall proclaim those smṛtis to be in error because they contradict the other smṛtis.

The quotation from śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (5.2) rṣīm prasūtaṁ kapilaṁ yas tam agre jñānair bibharti (The great sage Kapila is full of knowledge) does not give authority to the Sāṅkhya-smṛti. Because the Upaniṣads would not glorify a sage who opposed the Vedic conclusion, the Kapila here must be a person different from the author of the Sāṅkhya-smṛti. The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, however, considers Manu (the author of Manu-smṛti) an exalted authority in these words: yad vai kiñcana manur avadat tad bheṣajam (Whatever Manu has said is certainly the cure for the ills of this world). In the same way the smṛti says that by the mercy of Pulastya Muni and Vasiṣṭha Muni, the sage Parāśara (the author of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa) attained transcendental knowledge of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. However, the Kapila who wrote a book contradicting the Vedas, and who was born in the family of Agni, was an ordinary jīva bewildered by the illusory potency māyā. He was not the same Kapila who was born as the son of Kardama Muni and who was an incarnation of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Lord Vāsudeva. This is so because the Padma Purāṇa says:

kapilo vāsudevākhyah*
sāṅkhyam tattvam jagāda ha
brahmādibhyaś ca devebhyo
bhṛgv-ādibhyas tathaiva ca

tathaivāsuraye sarvam
vedārthair upabṛmhitam
sarva-veda-viruddham ca
kapilo 'nyo jagāda ha
. . .sāṅkhyam āsuraye 'nyasmai

kutarka-paribṛmhitam

"One Kapila Muni, who was named Vāsudeva, spoke to Brahmā and the other demigods, āsuri Muni, Bhṛgu Muni, and the other sages, a saṅkhya philosophy in perfect harmony with the Vedas. Another person, also named Kapila, spoke a different saṅkhya philosophy contradicting the teachings of all the Vedas. . .He spoke his illogical theories to a different āsuri Muni."

Therefore, because it contradicts the Vedas, and because its author is not a genuine spiritual authority, there is no fault in rejecting the saṅkhya-smṛti.

Sūtra 2

itareṣāṁ cānupalabdheḥ

(The Saṅkhya-smṛti should be rejected also) because many of its other doctrines are not seen (in the Vedas).

Purport By Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because many of its other doctrines are not seen in the Vedas, the Saṅkhya-smṛti is not an authentic scripture. Thus it teaches that the living entities are all-pervading spirit-souls and that the material energy creates the liberated and conditioned states of these souls. It teaches that both bondage and liberation are both different aspects of the material energy. It teaches that there is no one distinct person who is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the Lord of all. It teaches that time is not real. It teaches that the five prāṇas (life-air) are identical with the five senses. These and other similar doctrines may be seen in the Saṅkhya-smṛti.

Adhikaraṇa 2 Yoga Refuted

Introduction By Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

An opponent may say: "The Vedānta texts should not be interpreted in the terms of the Saṅkhya-smṛti because it is opposed to the conclusion of Vedānta. However, the Vedānta may be explained by the Yoga-smṛti, for it is said that the Yoga-smṛti is based on Vedānta. Indeed, yoga is part of the Vedas. This may be seen from the following descriptions. The Kaṭha Upaniṣad (2.3.11) says tām yogam iti manyante sthirām indriya-dhāraṇām (The sages consider yoga to be firm restraint of the senses). the Kaṭha Upaniṣad (2.3.18) again says vidyām etām yoga-vidhiṁ ca kṛtsnam (He understood everything about the philosophy and practice of yoga). This may also be seen from the following description of the yoga postures in the śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (2.8): trir unnatam sthāpya samam śarīram (One should practice yoga, holding the body straight and the head, neck, and chest erect). The great authority Lord Patañjali composed the Yoga-smṛti (to teach) men

how to overcome the disadvantaged position of living in the material world. In the first two sūtras of the Yoga-smṛti he says atha yogānuśāsanam (Now yoga will be taught) and yogaś citta-vṛtti- nirodhaḥ (Yoga stops the activities of the mind). When the Vedas are interpreted literally the yoga- smṛti may not be always in harmony with them because the yoga-smṛti teaches about yoga exclusively. The Manu-smṛti and other dharma-śāstras, however, because they only teach the performance of religious duties, are always in harmony with the Vedas. Therefore the Vedas should not be interpreted in a literal sense. They should be interpreted in the light of the Yoga- smṛti.

Siddhānta---The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 3

etena yoga-prayuktaḥ

By the preceding refutation of saṅkhya, yoga is also refuted.

Purport By Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

By the preceding refutation of the Saṅkhya-smṛti, the Yoga-smṛti is understood to be also refuted. This is so because the Yoga-smṛti also contradicts the Vedānta philosophy. When the Vedānta is interpreted according to the Yoga-smṛti, the the Manu-smṛti and the other smṛtis that follow the Vedas, all become meaningless. For this reason the Vedānta should not be interpreted according to the Yoga-smṛti. It cannot be said that the Yoga-smṛti does not contradict Vedānta. In the Yoga-smṛti the pradhāna is held to be the original independent cause of all causes. Both the Supreme Personality of Godhead and all jīvas are held to be all- pervading consciousness only. Liberation, obtained only by yoga, is described as merely the cessation of pain. Because it contradicts the Vedānta on these points, the Yoga-smṛti should not be accepted. Also because its views on sensory perception and other sources of knowledge, its views on mental activities, and many other of its views, are outside of the Vedānta conclusions, the Yoga-smṛti should not be accepted. These views are found only in the Yoga-smṛti. Because it is opposed to Vedānta its conclusions are all worthless. For this reason we do not fear to reject it. We reject it just as we rejected saṅkhya previously. The truth about the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the jīvas, liberation, and the method to attain liberation, which are all revealed in the Vedānta philosophy, will be shown, one by one, in the later portions of this book. This being so, in the two quotations from śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (2.8 and 6.13), trir unnataṁ sthāpya samaṁ śarīram (One should practice yoga, holding the body straight and the head, neck, and chest erect), which describes the yoga-āsana, and tat-kāraṇaṁ saṅkhya-yogādhighamyam (The original cause of all causes, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, may be known by either saṅkhya or yoga), the word saṅkhya is used merely to mean "knowledge," and in the same way the word yoga is used merely to mean "meditation." The two philosophies that go by the names yoga and saṅkhya should be understood to be philosophies different from the conclusions of Vedānta.

Liberation is not attained by following the path of yoga, nor is it attained by the knowledge of saṅkhya, where the soul is distinguished from matter. The śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (3.8) says tam eva viditvāti mṛtyum eti (One can overcome the path of birth and death only by understanding the Supreme Personality of Godhead). The Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.21) says vijñāya prajñām kurvīta (One should meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead). The scriptures also say etad yo dhyāyati rasati bhajati so 'mṛto bhavati (He who meditates on the Supreme Personality of Godhead, finds his happiness in Him, and worships Him, attains liberation).

We are not opposed to those portions of the saṅkhya and yoga philosophies that do not contradict the Vedas. However, we completely reject those portions that contradict the Vedas.

Although the Yoga-smṛti teaches faith in the Supreme Personality of Godhead, as in the passages īśvara- paridhānād vā (Yoga may be attained by devotion to the Supreme Personality of Godhead) and kleśa-karma- vipākāśayair aparākṛṣṭaḥ puruṣa-viśeṣa īśvaraḥ (God is a single specific person who is untouched by suffering or the fruits of action), still many people reject these sūtras and say that their author was bewildered when he spoke them. Actually it is Gautama Muni and other atheists who are bewildered, for they propound theories that defy the Vedas. (The author of Vedānta) will refute these theories (in future sūtras). Even though they were very learned and intelligent, still they were bewildered. In the opinion of some they had become very proud, thinking themselves omniscient, and in the opinion of others they were bewildered by the illusory potency of Lord Hari, who had His own purpose in making them speak these theories.

Because the yoga philosophy accepts the existence of God, there may be some reluctance to reject it. Therefore in order to refute the yoga philosophy the argument from the previous Adhikaraṇa is repeated here. Even though it was authored by the demigod Brahmā himself, the yoga-smṛti is rejected here.

Adhikaraṇa 3

The Vedas Are Eternal and Infallible

Introduction By Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Some followers of saṅkhya and yoga may argue: "You may reject the saṅkhya-smṛti and yoga-smṛti because they contradict the Vedas, but we reject the Vedas because they contradict saṅkhya and yoga." The following is a refutation of this argument.

Samśaya---Are the Vedas are reliable source of knowledge or not?

Pūrvapakṣa---the Vedas say kārīryā yajate vṛṣṭi-kāmaḥ (He who desires rain should perform a kārīri-yajña). If one thus performs a kārīri-yajña or other Vedic ritual, he may not necessarily attain the promised result. For this reason the Vedas are an unreliable source of knowledge.

Siddhānta---The conclusion follows.

Sūtra 4

na vilakṣaṇatvād asya tathātvam ca śabdāt

Because they have a fundamentally different nature, and because their own words are evidence for them, the Vedas are not an unreliable source of knowledge.

Purport By Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Vedas are not an unreliable source of knowledge, as the saṅkhya-smṛti and yoga-smṛti are. Why? The sūtra says vilakṣaṇāt (Because they have a fundamentally different nature). This means that because they were written by jīvas, the saṅkhya-smṛti and yoga-smṛti are subject to the four defects of being prone to mistakes, illusions, cheating, and defective perception. The Vedas, however, because they are eternal, are free from these defects. The śruti says vācā virūpa nityayā (O Virūpa, the Vedas are eternal) and the smṛti says:

anādi-nidhanā nityā*
vāg utsṛṣṭā svayambhuvā
ādau vedamayī divyā
yataḥ sarvāḥ pravṛttayaḥ

"In the beginning of creation the Supreme Personality of Godhead spoke and from His words the eternal, beginningless, endless, transcendental Vedas were manifested. From the Vedas all other scriptures have come."

The Manu-smṛti and the other smṛtis authoritative because they have emanated from the Vedas. In a previous sūtra (1.3.29) the eternity of the Vedas was proved by logic, and in this sūtra it is proved by the Vedas themselves. That is the difference between these two sūtras.

An opponent may object: "In the Puruṣa-sūkta (R̥g Veda 10.90.9) are the words:

tasmād yajñāt sarva-huta*
ṛcaḥ sāmāni jajñire
chandāmsi jajñire tasmād
yajus tasmād ajāyata

'From that sacrifice all fire-sacrifices, the ṛg Veda and the Sāma Veda were born. From it the Vedic hymns were born. From it the Yajur Veda was born.' This passage proves that the Vedas were born and, because they were born, must also perish in the end. For this reason the Vedas are not eternal."

To this opponent I say: No. It is not so. The word "born" here means "manifested" (not born in the ordinary sense). For this reason the scriptures say:

svayambhūr eṣa bhagavān*
vedo gītas tvayā purā
śivādyā ṛṣi-paryantāḥ
smartāro 'sya na kārakāḥ

"O Lord, You first recited the self-manifested, transcendental Vedas. Zīva, the demigods, and the sages, are not the authors, but are only reciters of the Vedas."

The Vedas do not cease to be a source of genuine knowledge because sometimes the results promised by it do not occur. This so because the promised results always occur when the Vedic rituals are performed by properly qualified persons. When sometimes the promised results do not occur, this means that the performer of the rituals was not properly qualified. Therefore, because they contradict the Vedas the saṅkhyā- smṛti and yoga-smṛti are not genuine sources of knowledge.

Adhikaraṇa 4

The Words "Fire" and "Earth" Refer to the Devas

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣana

Someone may say: "In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad is the following passage: tat teja aikṣata bahu syām. tā āpa aikṣanta bahvyaḥ syāmaḥ (Fire thought: 'Let me become many,' and the waters thought: 'Let us become many'), and in the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad is this passage: te heme prāṇā aham ṛeyase vivadamānā brahma jagmuḥ ko no viṛiṣṭaḥ (The breaths quarrelled over who was the best among themselves. They went to the demigod Brahmā and asked: 'Who is the best amongst us?') These impossible statements are as plausible as saying 'The barren woman's son is very splendid.' For this reason the Vedas are not a genuine source of knowledge. Because in this way one portion of the Vedas is found to be not authoritative, the other portions of the Vedas are also not authoritative, and therefore the Vedas' claim that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the original creator of the material world is not true. If this objection is raised, then he answers in the following words---

Sutra5

abhimāni-vyapadeṣas tu viṛeṣānugatibhyām

Because the elements are called demigods, and because there is a description of the demigods entering the elements, the words here refer to the presiding deities of the elements (and not the elements themselves).

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣana

The word tu (but) is used here to dispel doubt. The passage (Chândogyā Upaniṣad 6.2.3) tat teja aikṣata (the fire thought) refers to the conscious, thinking fire-god, and not to the inanimate fire element. Why? The sūtra says viṣeṣānugatibhyām (because the elements are called demigods, and because there is a description of the demigods entering the elements). The previously quoted passage of the Chândogyā Upaniṣad continues by affirming (6.3.2) that the fire, water, and food previously mentioned in the passage are demigods: hantāham imās tistro devatā (I am these three demigods). The Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad (2.14) says sarvā ha vai devatā aham ṛeyase vivādamānāḥ. . .te devā prāṇe niḥṛeyasam viditvā (All the demigods argued, each saying "I am the best." . .The demigods finally understood that among them breath is the best). The breath and each of the other senses in this passages are described as "demigods." For this reason it may be understood that the names of the senses and elements here refer to the demigods that control them. The Aitareya āraṇyaka (2.4) says agnir vāg bhūtvā mukham prāvīṛat. . . ādityaṛ cakṣur bhūtvākṣiṇī prāvīṛat (The fire-god became speech and entered the mouth. . .The sun-god became sight and entered the eyes). Because this passage explains how the fire-god enters speech and the other demigods enter the other senses, (it may again be understood that the names of the senses and elements here refer to the demigods that control them). The Bhaviṣya Purāṇa says:

pr̥thivyādy-abhimāninyo*
 devatāḥ prathitaujasah
 acintyāḥ ṛaktayas tāsām
 dṛṣyante munibhiṛ ca tāḥ

"The sages know that the word 'earth' and the names of the other elements are names of the powerful demigods, whose potencies are beyond conception."

The passage gravāṇaḥ plavante (the stones float) praises the demigods, who were able, in a certain way, to enter even the stones. This happened when Lord Rāma began to build the bridge (of stones). In this way nothing in the Vedas is incorrect, and the Vedic statement that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the sole creator of the material universes is clearly proved.

Adhikaraṇa 5

That The Supreme Personality of Godhead Is The Original Creator Is Proved By Logic

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣana

Taking shelter this time of logic, the sāṅkhya philosopher again tries to refute the idea that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the ingredient of which the material universe is made. Although in the words (Sāṅkhya-smṛti 6.35) ṛuti-virodhān na kutarkāpasadasyātma-lābhaḥ (Self-realization is not attained by mere logic, for logic contradicts the Vedas) it rejects mere logic, the sāṅkhya philosophy

(hypocritically) does so only to defeat its opponents.

Saiṅśaya---Is or is not the Supreme Personality of Godhead the ingredient of which the material universe is made?

Pūrvapakṣa---Is the Supreme Personality of Godhead the ingredient of which the material universe is made? No, because the Supreme Personality of Godhead is completely different from this world of matter. It is generally accepted that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is all-knowing, all-powerful, completely pure, and full of all transcendental bliss. The material universe, on the other hand, is directly seen to be full of ignorance, weakness, impurity, and misery. Therefore there is no debate about whether the two of them have differing natures. That a substance and the ingredient of which it is made must have the same nature is clearly seen. For example clay, gold, and thread are the ingredients of which pottery, crowns, and cloth are made. However, because the Supreme Personality of Godhead is different in nature from the material universe, another ingredient should be sought. That ingredient is pradhāna because pradhāna possesses the same nature as this material universe filled with material happinesses, material sufferings, and various illusions. In order to prove that the Supreme Personality of Godhead has the same nature as the material universe, someone may say: "Within the Supreme Personality of Godhead are two very subtle potencies: a conscious spiritual potency, and an inert material potency. In this way the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the ingredient of which the material universe is made." Because it states that a very subtle potency is the ingredient of which the very gross material world is made, even this argument does not resolve the great difference between the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the material universe. Other differences between the two may also be seen. In this way the Supreme Personality of Godhead is not the ingredient of which the material universe is made. Although logic must be subordinate to scripture, still, in order to understand the truth scripture must sometimes be subordinate to logic. This is the statement of the Pūrvapakṣa.

Siddhānta---He now refutes this argument.

Sutra 6

dṛṣyate tu

But this is (not) seen by direct perception.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣana

The word tu (but) is used here to dispel doubt. The word na (not), taken from the previous sūtra, should be understood in this sūtra also. Someone may say: "Because He is different in nature, the Supreme Personality of Godhead cannot be the ingredient from which the material universe is made." The answer is given: "Because it is many times seen that there is a difference between things and the ingredients of which they are made, it cannot be said that the Supreme Personality of Godhead cannot be the ingredient of which the material universe is made." The

material universe is made from the Supreme Personality of Godhead, just as many things are manifested from sources very different in nature, just as worms come from honey, as elephants, horses, and other animals come from the kalpa-drumatree, and as gold and other things come from the cintāmaṇi jewel. The ātharvaṇikas give the following example (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 1.1.7):

yathorṇanābhiḥ sṛjate gṛṇate ca*
yathā pṛthivyām ośadhayaḥ sambhavanti
yathā sataḥ puruṣāt keṛā-lomani
tathākṣarāt sambhavatīha viṣvam

"As a spider expands and withdraws its web, as innumerable plants sprout from the soil, and as hairs grow on a person's body, so is the material universe manifested from the imperishable Supreme Personality of Godhead."

Adhikaraṇa 6 Nothingness Is Not The First Cause

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣana

Someone may object: "If the material world is different from its ingredient, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, then before the world was manifested, it was not already existent within the Supreme. Before it was manifested it did not exist. Because the Supreme Personality of Godhead alone existed then, in the beginning the material world did not exist. However this view cannot be held by they who affirm that the the material world is real because it is created by the Supreme Reality." If this objection is raised, he replies is the following words.

Sutra7

If someone maintains the material world to be unreal, then I say no. The world is not unreal merely because it is in nature different from the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣana

There is no fault in this. Why? The sūtra says pratiṣedha-mātratvāt (The world is not unreal merely because it is in nature different from the Supreme Personality of Godhead). The previous sūtra denied that a substance and its ingredient must have the same nature. It is not that a thing and its ingredient are different in substance. This is so because the Supreme Personality of Godhead becomes transformed, becoming the body of the material world, which is by nature different from Him. This is the meaning: Is it because 1. His nature is different from the

nature of the world, or because 2. none of His qualities are present in the world that you reject the idea that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the ingredient of the material world? The first is not a good reason because (difference) is naturally present in the relation between ingredient and product. For example a clay pot or other piece of pottery is, because it is not an amorphous lump, unlike the ball of clay that is its ingredient. In this way they are different. The second argument is, because existence (sat) and many other qualities of the Supreme Personality of Godhead are present in the material world, not a valid argument either.

If the objection is raised: "The qualities of the ingredient that differentiate it from other things should be transferred from the ingredient to the substance it creates. The qualities that distinguish gold from thread are also seen to distinguish golden bracelets and other ornaments from cloth made of thread," then the following answer may be given: "Because insects come from honey, many other things are also created from ingredients very unlike the final product, and even articles of gold often present a nature very different from the original substance, this argument is not valid. Just as gold is not different from the cintāmaṇi jewel that created it and a bracelet is not different from the gold that created it, in the same way the material world, because it is created from the Supreme Reality, is not different from Him, and is therefore not unreal.

Sutra 8

apītau tadvat prasāṅgād asama/vjasam

(Someone may object: "If the Supreme Personality of Godhead were the ingredient of which the material world is made, then) at the time when the material world is destroyed, (the Supreme Personality of Godhead would be destroyed). Because this view is untenable (the Supreme Personality of Godhead cannot be the ingredient of the material world)."

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣana

If the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the master of all subtle spiritual potencies, is the ingredient from which the material world, which consists of both matter and spirit, and which thwarts the spiritual aspirations of the living entities, then at the time of cosmic devastation, (when the material universes enter the Lord's body), the Lord must become like the material world (infected with all its faults). In the sūtra's word tadvat the word tad is in the genitive case and the word vat means "like."

(CHAPTER II Pada 1 - Sutras 9 onwards and the complete Pada 2 missing!)

Pada 3

Adhikaraṇa 1 Ether Is Created

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

vyomādi-viṣayaṃ gobhir
bibharti vijaghāna yaḥ
sa tām mad-viṣayām bhāsvān
krṣṇaḥ praṇihaniṣyati

May the brilliant sun of Lord Kṛṣṇa, who with rays of logic destroys a host of misconceptions about ether and the other elements, destroy the misconceptions in my heart.

In the Second Pada were revealed the fallacies present in the theories of they who say pradhāna is the the first cause and they who claim something other than the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the first cause. In the Third Pada will be shown the truth that the various elements of the material world are manifested from the Supreme Personality of Godhead, that they merge into Him at the end, that the individual spirit souls always existed, there not being a point in time when they were created, that the individual spirit souls have spiritual bodies full of knowledge, that the individual spirit souls are atomic in size although by their consciousness they are all-pervading within the material body, that the individual spirit souls are part-and-parcel of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, that Matsya-avatāra and the other avatāras are directly the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and that the variety of situations into which the conditioned souls are placed is caused by the previous karma. These will all be proved by refuting the ideas of they who claim that these statements are not true.

The various aspects of the material world are created in the following sequence: 1. pradhāna, 2. mahat-tattva, 3. false-ego, 4. the tan-mātras, 5. the senses, and 6. the gross elements, beginning with ether. This sequence is given in the Subala-śruti and other scriptures. The sequence found in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad and other scriptures will also be discussed in order to show that sequence does not contradict what has already been said.

Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.2.1) explains:

sad eva saumyedyam agra āsīt

"O gentle one, in the beginning the Supreme Personality of Godhead alone existed."

Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.2.3-4) continues:

tad aikṣata bahu syām prajāyeyeti tat tejo 'srjata. tat teja aikṣata bahu syām prajāyeyeti tad āpo 'srjata . . . tā āpa aikṣanta bahvayaḥ syāma prajāyemahīti tā annam asrjanta.

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead thought: 'I shall become many. I shall father children.' Then He created fire. Then fire thought: 'I shall become many. I shall father children.' Then fire created water. . . . Then water thought: 'I shall become many. I shall father children.' Then water created grains."

In this way it is clearly shown that fire, water, and grains were created. In this, however, there is a doubt.

Samśaya (doubt): Was ether ever created or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the Śruti-śāstra does not mention any creation of ether, therefore ether was never created, but was always existing.

This idea is expressed in the following sūtra.

Sūtra 1

na viyad aśruteḥ

na—not; viyat—ether; aśruteḥ—because of not being described in the Śruti-śāstra.

Not so for ether, because that is not described in the Śruti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Ether is eternal and was never created. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "Because that is not described in the Śruti-śāstra." The relevant passage of Chāndogya Upaniṣad mentions the creation of the other elements, but it does not

mention the creation of ether. In the previously quoted passage of Chāndogya Upaniṣad the creation of fire, water, and grains is mentioned. However there is no mention of the creation of ether. For this reason ether must not have been created. That is the meaning.

This idea is refuted in the following sūtra:

Sūtra 2

asti tu

asti—is; tu—indeed.

Indeed it is so.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (indeed) is used here to remove doubt. The word "asti" (it is so) means, "It is so that ether was created." Although the creation of ether is not described in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, it is described in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad in the following words:

tasmād vā etasmād ātmana ākāśaḥ sambhūtaḥ ākāśād vāyur vāyor agnir agner āpo
ābhyo mahatī pṛthivī

"From the Supreme Personality of Godhead, ether was manifested. From ether, air was manifested. From air, fire was manifested. From fire, water was manifested. From water, earth was manifested."

Another doubt is expressed in the next sūtra.

Sūtra 3

gauṇy asambhavāc chabdāc ca

gauṇī—figure of speech; asambhavāt—because of being impossible; śabdāt—because of scripture; ca—also.

Because of scripture, and because it is impossible, it must be a mere figure of speech.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

It is not possible that ether was created. This is confirmed by Kaṇāda Muni and other great philosophers. The Taittirīya Upaniṣad's description of the creation of ether is a mere figure of speech, as when, in ordinary speech one says, "Please make some space" or "Some space has been made". For what other reasons is it not possible that ether is created? Because it is impossible to create ether. It is not possible to create ether because ether is formless and all-pervading, because it is not included in the chain of causes, and because scripture proclaims that ether is not created. Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (2.3.2-3) proclaims:

vāyus cāntarikṣam caitad amṛtam

"Air and ether are both eternal."

This proves that ether was never created.

However, if the passage from the Taittirīya Upaniṣad used the word "sambhūta" (created) only once to refer to the list of elements beginning with fire, how is it possible to claim that this word is used literally for all the elements and figuratively for ether alone?

The opponent of Vedānta replies in the next sūtra.

Sūtra 4

syāc caikasya brahma-śabda-vat

syāt—may be; ca—and; ekasya—of one; brahma—Brahma; śabda—the word; vat—like.

It may be for one, as in the word "Brahman".

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (3.2) it is said:

tapasā brahma vijijñāśasva tapo brahma

"By performing austerities strive to understand Brahman, for austerities are Brahman."

In this passage the word Brahman is used in two ways. Used to describe the object of knowledge attained by performing austerities, Brahman is used in its literal sense. Then, equated with austerities, it is used figuratively to mean, "the way to know Brahman". In the same way the word "sambhūta" in the previously discussed passage can be use literally and figuratively simultaneously. In this way the fact that the passage of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad makes no mention of it refutes the description in other Upaniṣads that ether was created.

The author of the sūtras refutes this idea in the following words.

Sūtra 5

pratijñāhānir avyatirekāc cabdebhyaḥ

pratijñā—statement of intent; ahāniḥ—non-abandonment; avyatirekāt—because of non-difference; śabdebhyaḥ—from the statements of scripture.

It is affirmed because it is not different and because of the statements of scripture.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.1.3) affirms:

yenāśrutam śrutam bhavati

"Now I will teach how to hear what cannot be heard."

In these words the intention to teach about Brahman is expressed. If this intention is not broken, then all that follows must be about Brahman and it must be affirmed that nothing is different from Brahman. The idea that something is different from Brahman is to be rejected. If everything is not-different from Brahman, then Brahman is clearly the ingredient of which everything is made. Thus, simply by knowing Brahman one knows everything. If this is accepted then

it is also accepted that ether was created.

The Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.2.1) again affirms:

sad eva saumyedaṃ agra āsīd ekam evādvitīyam aitaḍ-ātmyam idaṃ sarvaṃ

"O gentle one, in the beginning the Supreme Personality of Godhead alone existed. He was alone. There was no one else. Everything has Him as its ingredient."

These words affirm that in the beginning everything was manifested from Him, and after the creation was manifested everything had Him as its ingredient. This should be accepted.

Here someone may object: There is no clear statement in that Upaniṣad that ether was created. How can you talk like that?

In the following words the author of the sūtras replies to this objection.

Sūtra 6

yāvad vikāraṃ tu vibhāgo loka-vat

yāvat—to what extent; vikāraṃ—creation; tu—indeed; vibhāgaḥ—creator; loka—the world; vat—like.

Indeed, if there is a creation there must be a creator, as we see in the world.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (indeed) is used here to remove doubt. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad explains:

aitad-ātmyam idaṃ sarvaṃ

"Everything has Him as its ingredient."

This statement shows that there is both a creator and a creation. When the

Subala Upaniṣad and other scriptures explain that the pradhāna, mahat-tattva, and other things are created, they imply that everything that exists was created. That is the meaning.

The following example from the material world may be given. A person may say, "All these are the sons of Caitra." In this way he affirms that they were all born from a man named Caitra. In the same way, when the Upaniṣad affirms that, "Everything has the Supreme Personality of Godhead as its ingredient," it is clear that pradhāna, mahat-tattva, and everything else has come from the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Thus when the Upaniṣad states that fire, water, and grains come from the Supreme Personality of Godhead, it means to say that everything comes from Him. In this way it is understood that ether also was created.

The word "vibhāgaḥ" in this sūtra means "creation". Sūtra 3 affirmed that it is not possible for ether to have been created. However, the Śruti-śāstra affirms that the Supreme Personality of Godhead has inconceivable powers. Even though it may be inconceivable, He can do anything without restriction. In some passages it is said that ether is immortal, which means that it is neither created nor destroyed. These statements may be taken as figures of speech because we can find other passages describing the creation and destruction of ether.

Because ether is counted among the elements it must be created and also destroyed. Because ether has temporary material qualities, as fire and the other elements do, it must also be temporary, as the other elements are.

Whatever is not matter is spirit. Ether is not like spirit. It is different. In this way the idea that ether was not created is disproved. Modern philosophers that state the contrary are wrong. It must be accepted that ether was created.

Adhikaraṇa 2 Air Is Created

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

To show that the same arguments may also show the creation of air, the author of the sūtras gives the following explanation.

Sūtra 7

etena mātariśvā vyākhyātaḥ

etena—by this; mātariśvā—air; vyākhyātaḥ—is explained.

This also refers to air.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This proof that ether was created clearly shows that air, which exists within ether, must also have been created. That is the meaning. This is so because the limbs of something must have the same qualities as the whole of which they are parts.

Our opponent may object: Because it was never described in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, it is clear that air was never created.

To this I reply: The Taittirīya Upaniṣad explains that air was created from ether.

Then our opponent may say: That description of the creation of air must have been a figure of speech, because the Śruti-śāstra explains that air is eternal.

To this I reply: The Chāndogya Upaniṣad affirms in a pratijñā statement (aitad-ātmyam idaṁ sarvaṁ) that everything was created by the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In this way the creation of air is proved. When it is said that air is eternal the intention is that it is so only relative to some other things. Air was discussed in a separate sūtra and not discussed together with ether. This was done to facilitate the argument of Sūtra 9.

Adhikaraṇa 3

The Eternal Supreme Personality of Godhead Is Not Created

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.2.1) affirms:

sad eva saumyedaṁ

"O gentle one, in the beginning the Supreme Personality of Godhead alone existed."

A doubt may arise about this statement. Was the eternal Supreme Personality of Godhead created or not? Pradhāna, mahat-tattva, and many other things that are causes or creators of other things were created, so perhaps the Supreme

Personality of Godhead was also created at some point. This may be so because the Supreme Personality of Godhead is not really different from these other causes.

In the following words the author of the sūtras addresses this doubt.

Sūtra 8

asambhavas tu sato 'nupapatteḥ

asambhavaḥ—the state of not being created; tu—indeed; sataḥ—of the eternal Supreme Personality of Godhead; anupapatteḥ—because of impossibility

Indeed, the eternal Supreme Personality of Godhead was never created, for such a creation is impossible.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (indeed) is used here either to remove doubt or affirm the truth of this statement. The eternal Supreme Personality of Godhead was never created. Why not? The sūtra explains: "anupapatteḥ" (because that is impossible). There is no creator of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, because it is illogical and inappropriate to assume the existence of such a creator. That is the meaning here.

Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (6.9) explains:

sa kāraṇaṁ kāraṇādhipādhipo
na cāsyā kaścij janitā na cādhipaḥ

"the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the cause of all causes. He is the king of all other causes. No one is His creator. No one is His king."

It is not possible to say that because all other causes are created by something else therefore the Supreme Personality of Godhead must have been created by someone else, for such a statement contradicts these words of the Śruti-śāstra. A root cause of everything must be accepted, for if it is not then there is an unending chain of causes. By definition the root cause of everything does not have another cause, a root from which it has sprung. This is described in the Sāṅkhya-sūtra (1.67) in these words:

mūle mūlābhāvāt

"This is so because the root cause of everything is not caused by another root cause."

In this way the doubt that perhaps the Supreme Personality of Godhead is created by someone else is clearly refuted. Because the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the first cause of all causes, by definition He is not caused by someone else. However, the secondary causes, such as the avyakta and the mahat-tattva are all created by another cause. The sūtras explaining that ether and the other material elements were all created were given as examples of this general truth.

Adhikaraṇa 4 Fire Is Manifested From Air

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

After concluding this discussion, we will consider what seems to be a contradiction in the Śruti-sāstra's description of fire. Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.2.3) explains:

tat tejo 'srjata

"Then the Supreme Personality of Godhead created fire."

In this way it is explained that the Supreme Personality of Godhead created fire.

However, the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.1.3) explains:

vāyor agniḥ

"From air, fire is manifested."

These words explain that air created fire. Someone may say that in this second quote the word "vāyoḥ" is in the ablative case (meaning "after fire"), and in this way there is no contradiction because both elements were created by the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and fire was created after air was created.

Considering that someone may say this, the author of the sūtras speaks the

following words.

Sūtra 9

tejo 'tas tathā hy āha

tejaḥ—fire; ataḥ—from that; tathā—so; hy—indeed; āha—said.

Fire comes from it. Indeed, it said that.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

From air comes fire. This is confirmed in the Śruti-śāstra, which explains:

vāyor agniḥ

"From air comes fire."

The word "sambhūta" is used here. The use of that word shows that the meaning is that from air fire is created. Also, the primary meaning of the ablative-case is "from". If the primary meaning of a word makes sense, then the primary meaning should be accepted. In that circumstance the secondary meaning should not be accepted. As will be explained later, this statement does not contradict the statement that everything is created by the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Adhikaraṇa 5

Water Is Manifested From Fire

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the author describes the origin of water. In some places the scriptures

affirm that water is manifested from fire, and in other places the scriptures do not agree with this idea. In this way a doubt arises. To remove this doubt, the author of the sūtras gives the following explanation.

Sūtra 10

āpaḥ

āpaḥ—water.

Water.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

To this sūtra should be added the previous sūtra's phrase "atas tathā hy āha" (Water comes from it. Indeed it said that.) This means that water is manifested from fire. This is so because the Śruti-śāstra declares it. Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.2.3) explains:

tad āpo 'srjata

"Fire created water."

Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.1) also explains:

agner āpaḥ

"From fire water was manifested."

These two quotes are clear and need no elaborate explanation. Why water comes from fire is explained in the following words of Chāndogya Upaniṣad:

tasmād yatra kva ca śocati svedate vā puruṣas tejasa eva tad adhy āpo jāyante

"Heat makes a person produce water. This is so when a person perspires or weeps."

Adhikaraṇa 6

Earth Is Manifested From Water, and the Word "Anna" in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad Means "Earth"

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad it is said:

tā āpa aikṣanta bahvayaḥ syāma prajāyemahīti tā annam asṛjanta

"Water thought: 'I shall become many. I shall father many children.' Then water created anna."

What is the meaning of the word "anna" here? Does it mean "barley and other food", or does it mean "earth"?

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad it is said:

tasmād yatra kvacana varṣati tad eva bhūyiṣṭham annam bhavaty adbhya eva tad adhy annādyam jāyate

"Therefore, whenever it rains there is abundant anna. In this way anna is produced by water."

This passage seems, therefore, to support the idea that the word "anna" here means "barley and other food". To explain the proper meaning here, the author of the sūtras speaks the following words.

Sūtra 11

pr̥thivy-adhikāra-rūpa-śabdāntarebhyaḥ

pr̥thivi—earth; adhikāra—context; rūpa—color; śabda—quotes from the Śruti-

śāstra; antarebhyaḥ—because of other.

"Because its color, its context, and other quotes from the Śruti-śāstra, all confirm that earth is the proper meaning.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here the meaning "earth" should be accepted. Why? Because of the context and other reasons. It should be accepted because the context (adhikāra) of the passage is a description of the creation of the five material elements. It is also so, because the "anna" here is described as being black in color (rūpa), in the words:

yat kṛṣṇam tad annasya

"That anna is black in color."

It is also so because in other scriptures (śāstrāntarebhyaḥ) it is said (in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad):

adbhyaḥ pṛthivī

"From water, earth is manifested."

The passage: "Therefore, whenever it rains there is abundant anna. In this way anna is produced by water," clearly uses the word "anna" to mean "food". However, because this passage is in the context of a description of the five material elements being manifested one from the other, the "food" here is a metaphor for "earth". Thus the two meanings "food" and "earth" combine in the word "anna" in this passage.

Adhikaraṇa 7

The Elements Are Manifested From the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The description here, that the material elements are manifested in a particular sequence, beginning with ether, is given to remove controversy in regard to the sequence in which the elements are manifested. The fact that the pradhāna, mahat-tattva, and all the elements are created by the Supreme Personality of Godhead has already been proved in sūtra 1.1.2 (janmādy asya yataḥ). Now the author of the sūtras begins a more detailed description of that creation. In the Subala Upaniṣad it is said:

tad āhuḥ kiṁ tad āsīt tasmai sa hovāca na san nasan na sad asad iti tasmāt tamaḥ sañjāyate tamaso bhūtādir bhūtāder ākāśam ākāśād vāyur vāyor agnir agner āpo 'dbhyaḥ pṛthivī tad aṇḍam abhavat

"They said: What was in the beginning? He replied: In the beginning was neither existence nor non-existence. Nothing existed and nothing did not exist. In the beginning there was darkness. From the darkness the origin of the material elements was born. From the origin of the material elements, ether was born. From ether, air was born. From air, fire was born. From fire, water was born. From water, earth was born. In this way the egg of the material universe was created."

Here it should be understood that akṣara, avyakta, mahat-tattva, tan-mātras, and material senses should also be placed, in this sequence, between darkness and ether. This should be done to complement the following statement of Agnimalaya:

sandagdhvā sarvāṇi bhūtāni pṛthivy apsu praliyate. āpas tejasi praliyante. tejo vāyau praliyate. vāyur ākāśe praliyate. ākāśam indriyeṣv indriyāṇi tan-mātreṣu tan-mātrāṇi bhūtādau vilīyante. bhūtādir mahati vilīyate. mahān avyakte vilīyate. avyaktam akṣare vilīyate. akṣaram tamasi vilīyate. tama ekī-bhavati parasmin. parasmān na san nasan na sad asat.

"When the all the elements are burned up, earth merges into water, water merges into fire, fire merges into air, air merges into ether, ether merges into the senses, the senses merge into the tan-mātras, the tan-mātras merge into the origin of the material elements, the origin of the material elements merges into the mahat-tattva, the mahat-tattva merges into the avyakta, the avyakta merges into the akṣara, and the akṣara merges into the great darkness. Then the great darkness becomes one with the Supreme. In the Supreme is neither existence nor non-existence. Nothing exists and nothing does not exist."

The word "origin of the material elements" here means "the false-ego". False-ego is of three kinds. From false-ego in the mode of goodness, the mind and the demigods are manifested. From false-ego in the mode of passion, the material senses are manifested. From false-ego in the mode of ignorance are manifested the tan-mātras, from which are manifested the ether and the other elements. In this way these different explanations all corroborate each other.

In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said:

pūrvam hy ekam evādvitīyam brahmāsīt. tasmād avkyataṁ vyaktaṁ evākṣaraṁ
tasmād akṣarān mahān mahato vā ahaṅkāras tasmād ahaṅkārāt pañca-tan-mātrāṇi
tebhyo bhūtāni tair āvṛtam akṣaraṁ bhavati.

"Before the material world was manifest, only the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is one without a second, existed. From Him came the avyakta. From the avyakta came the akṣara. From the akṣara came the mahat-tattva. From the mahat-tattva came false-ego. From false-ego came the five tan-mātras. From them came the material elements. The akṣara is filled with all these."

Samśaya (doubt): Do the pradhāna and other parts of this sequence arise one from the other or do they all arise directly from the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa: They arise from each other, for that is the statement of the texts.

Siddhānta (the conclusion): The author of the sūtras gives His conclusion in the following words.

Sūtra 12

tad abhidhyānād eva tu tal liṅgāt saḥ

tat—that; abhidhyānāt—because of meditation; eva—indeed; tu—indeed; tat—that; liṅgāt—because of the body; saḥ—He.

Because of meditation and because of the body, it is indeed He.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (indeed) is used to dispel doubt. The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the master of all potencies, including the potency of great darkness, the potency that begins the material creation. He is the direct cause, and the pradhāna, earth, and other features of the material creation are effects created by Him. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "Because of meditation and because of the body."

The Śruti-śāstra explains:

so 'kāmayata bahu syām prajāyeya

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead desired: Let Me become many. Let me create the material world."

Thus, it is by the desire of the all-powerful Supreme Personality of Godhead that the pradhāna and other features of the material world are created. That is how He is the cause of the material world. Also, the material world is the body of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The Supreme Personality of Godhead enters the great darkness of the material world and transforms it into pradhāna and the others aspects of matter. In this sense the material world is His body. This is confirmed by the Antaryāmi-brāhmaṇa of the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad, and also by the Subala Upaniṣad, which explains:

yasya pṛthivī śarīram

"The world is the body of the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

Adhikaraṇa 8

The Supreme Personality of Godhead Is the Cause of Matter's Transformations

Sūtra 13

viparyayeṇa tu kramo 'ta upapadyate ca

viparyayeṇa—by the reverse; tu—indeed; kramaḥ—sequence; ataḥ—from this; upapadyate—is manifested; ca—and.

Indeed, this sequence is also reversed.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (indeed) is used here for emphasis. In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.1.3) it is said:

etasmāj jāyate prāṇo manaḥ sarvendriyāṇi ca. khaṁ vāyur jyotir āpaḥ pṛthivī
viśvasya dhāriṇī

"From Him are born life, mind, all the senses, ether, air, fire, water, and earth,
the support of the world."

In the Subala Upaniṣad, the sequence is reversed, with pradhāna and mahat-tattva coming first. Everything actually comes from the Supreme Personality of Godhead. He is present within everything, beginning with the life-air and ending with earth, and when one feature of creation comes from another, the second feature actually comes from the all-powerful Supreme Personality of Godhead present within the first feature. If this were not so, then these two different versions would contradict each other. The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the origin of all and the creator of all. By knowing Him everything becomes known. The pradhāna and other features of matter, being inert and unconscious, cannot by themselves create changes in the material world. That is why the word "ca" (also) is used here. Therefore the Supreme Personality of Godhead is in every case the real cause of these transformations in the material world.

Adhikaraṇa 9

The Supreme Personality of Godhead Is the Creator of Mind and Intelligence

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the author of the sūtras removes a specific doubt.

Sūtra 14

antarā vijñāna-manasī-krameṇa tal-liṅgād iti cen nāviśeṣāt

antarāḥ—in the middle; vijñāna—knowledge; manasī—and mind; krameṇa—with the sequence; tat—of that; liṅgāt—because of the sign; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; aviśeṣāt—because of not being different.

If it is said that the sequence of mind and intelligence appears in this way, then I reply: No. Because they are not different.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "vijñāna" here means "the material senses of the conditioned soul".

Here someone may object: It is not proper to assume that this quotation from Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (text 2.1.3 quoted in the previous purport) supports the idea that all the features of the material world are directly created by the Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself. The list given in that verse merely gives the sequence in which those material features were manifested. It says that first come the material senses and then comes the mind. This does not mean that everything comes directly from the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

If this objection is raised, then I reply: No. It is not so. Why not? The sūtra explains: "na viśeṣāt" (because they are not different). This means that the material senses and the mind are not different from the life-force, the element earth, or any of the other material features. They have all come directly from the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In this passage the life-force and all the other material features all come from the Supreme Personality of Godhead (etasmāt=from Him). That is the meaning. The following scripture quotes also declare that the elements are all created by the Supreme Personality of Godhead:

so 'kāmayata bahu syām prajāyeya

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead desired: Let Me become many. Let me create the material world."

etasmāj jāyate prāṇaḥ

"The life-force and everything else was manifested from the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

In the Bhagavad-gītā (10.8) the Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself declares:

ahaṁ sarvasya prabhavo
mattaḥ sarvaṁ pravartate

"I am the source of all spiritual and material worlds. Everything emanates from me."*

In the Vāmana Purāṇa it is said:

tatra tatra sthito viṣṇus
tat tac chaktim prabodhayet
eka eva mahā-śaktiḥ
kurute sarvam añjasā

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead, Lord Viṣṇu, enters everywhere and awakens the power dormant in everything. He is the supremely powerful one. He does everything perfectly."

In this way it is shown that pradhāna and all other material features all come directly from the Supreme Personality of Godhead. That fact is not at all contradicted by the sequence of events presented in the Subala Upaniṣad and the other scriptures. This is so because the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the creator of the original material darkness, the pradhāna and the other features of the material world. Thus when the scripture says tat tejo 'srjata (The Supreme Personality of Godhead created fire), it is understood that He also created darkness, a host of other potencies, pradhāna, air, and other aspects of matter. When the scriptures say tasmād vai (From the Supreme Personality of Godhead everything has come), it is understood that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the master of material darkness and a host of other potencies, the pradhāna and other features of matter were born from Him, and the material element ether was also manifested from Him.

Adhikaraṇa 10

All Words Are Names of the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: Is it not so that if Lord Hari is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the master of all, and the all-pervading Supersoul, then the names of all that is moving and inert would also be names of Him? However, this is not so, for words are primarily the names of the various moving and inert things.

Thinking that someone may accept this idea that words are primarily names of various things and only secondarily names of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the author of the sūtras gives the following explanation.

Sūtra 15

carācara-vyapāśrayas tu syāt tad-vyapadeśo 'bhāktas tad-bhāva-bhāvitvāt

cara—moving; acara—and unmoving; vyapāśrayaḥ—the abode; tu—indeed; syāt—may be; tat—of that; vyapadeśaḥ—name; abhāktaḥ—not figurative; tat—of Him; bhāva—the nature; bhāvitvāt—because of being in the future.

Indeed, He resides in all that move and does not move. Therefore it will be learned that every word is one of His names.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (indeed) is used here to dispel doubt. The word "carācara-vyapāśrayaḥ" means that the Supreme Personality of Godhead resides in all moving and unmoving beings. The word "tad-vyapadeśaḥ" means "the names of the moving and unmoving beings". The word "abhāktaḥ" means "these names are primarily names of the Supreme Personality of Godhead". Why is that? The sūtra explains: "bhāva-bhāvitvāt" (the real meaning of names will be learned in the future). This means that by studying the scriptures one will come to understand that all words are names of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The Śruti-śāstras explain:

so 'kāmayata bahu syām

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead desired: Let Me become many. Let me create the material world."

sa vāsudevo na yato 'nyad asti

"He is the all-pervading Supreme Personality of Godhead. Nothing is different from Him."

In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (3.7.16) it is said:

kaṭaka-mukuṭa-karṇikādi-bhedaiḥ
kanakam abhedam apīśyate yathaikam
sura-paśu-manujādi-kalpanābhir

harir akhilābhir udīryate tathaikaḥ

"As golden bracelets, crowns, earrings, and other golden ornaments are all one because they are all made of gold, so all demigods, men, and animals are one with Lord because they are all made of Lord Hari's potencies."

The meaning is this: Names of potencies are primarily the names of the master of these potencies. This is so because the master is the very self of His potencies.

Adhikaraṇa 11

The Individual Spirit Souls Are Eternal and Without Beginning

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because He is the origin of everything, the Supreme Personality of Godhead has no other origin from which He was created. This has already been described. Now we will determine the nature of the individual spirit soul. First the idea that the individual soul has an origin will be refuted.

In the Taittirīya Aranyaka, Mahā-Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad (1.4) it is said:

yataḥ prasūtā jagataḥ prasūtī
toyena jīvān vyasarja bhūmyām

"From the Supreme Personality of Godhead the universe was born. With water He created the living entities on the earth."

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad it is said:

san-mūlāḥ saumyamāḥ sarvāḥ prajāḥ

"O gentle one, all living entities have their roots in the Supreme."

Samśaya (doubt): Do the individual spirit souls have an origin or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because He is the creator of the material universe, which contains both sentient living entities and insentient matter, the

Supreme Personality of Godhead must be the creator of the individual spirit souls. Any other idea would be illogical.

Siddhānta (conclusion): The author of the sūtras gives the following conclusion.

Sūtra 16

nātmā śruter nityatvāc ca tābhyaḥ

na—not; ātmā—the individual spirit soul; śruteḥ—from the Śruti-śāstra; nityatvāt—because of being eternal; ca—and; tābhyaḥ—from them.

Because the individual spirit soul is eternal, and because of the statements of Śruti-śāstra and other scriptures, this idea about the individual spirit soul is not true.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The individual spirit soul was never created. Why not? The sūtra explains: "śruteḥ" (because of the statements of Śruti-śāstra). In Kaṭha Upaniṣad (1.2.18) it is said:

na jāyate mriyate vā vipaścīn
nāyaṁ kutaścīn na babhūva kaścīn
ajo nityaḥ śāśvato 'yaṁ purāṇo
na hanyate hanyamāne śarīre

"O wise one, for the soul there is neither birth nor death at any time. He has not come into being, does not come into being, and will not come into being. He is unborn, eternal, ever-existing, and primeval. He is not slain when the body is slain."*

That the individual spirit soul was never born is also declared in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (1.9):

jñājñāu dvāv ajāv īśānīśau

"Neither the Supreme Personality of Godhead nor the individual spirit souls

were ever born."

The word "tābhyaḥ" in the sūtra means "the eternality of the individual spirit soul is described in the Śruti and Smṛti -śāstras". The word "ca" (and) in the sūtra means that the individual spirit soul is also conscious and full of knowledge.

In the Kaṭha Upaniṣad (2.5.13) it is said:

nityo nityānām cetanaś cetanānām

"Of all eternal living souls there is one who is the leader. Of all eternal souls there is one who is the leader."

In the Bhagavad-gītā the Supreme Lord explains:

ajo nityaḥ śāśvato 'yaṁ purāṇaḥ

"The soul is unborn, eternal, ever-existing, and primeval."

Therefore, when it is said, "Yajñadatta is born and again he dies," such words refer only to the external material body. The jāta-karma ceremony and other ceremonies like it also refer to the external material body. The individual spirit soul is different from the external material body and resides in it like a passenger. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.3.8) it is said:

sa vā ayaṁ puruṣo jāyamānaḥ śarīram abhisampadyamānaḥ sa utkraman
mriyamānaḥ

"At the moment of birth the spirit soul enters a material body and at the moment of death the soul leaves the body."

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.11.3) it is said:

jīvopetam vāva kiledaṁ mriyate na jīvo mriyate

"The soul resides in the material body. When the body dies the soul does not die."

Here someone may object: How can this be? If this is so, then this fact disagrees with the scriptural description of the individual souls' creation.

To this objection I reply: The individual spirit souls are said to be created because they are effects of the Supreme. The Supreme Personality of Godhead has two potencies, and these are said to be His effects. Here is what makes these two

potencies different. One potency is the pradhāna and other inert, unconscious, not alive potencies that are meant to be objects of enjoyment and various experiences. The other potency is the individual spirit souls, who are not inert, dull matter, but are conscious, alive beings, and who are able to enjoy and perceive various experiences. These two potencies share one common feature: that they are both the effects of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In this way the scriptural description of the souls' creation is not contradicted. In this way the scriptures are correct, and in this way, also, the individual spirit souls are never born.

Adhikaraṇa 12

The Individual Spirit Souls Are Both Knowledge and Knowers

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the author of the sūtras considers the nature of the individual spirit soul. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.7.22) it is said:

yo vijñāne tiṣṭhan

"The individual spirit soul is situated in knowledge."

In another passage it is said:

sukham aham asvapsam na kiñcid avediṣi

"I slept happily. I did not know anything."

Saṁśaya (doubt): Is the individual spirit soul unalloyed knowledge only, or is the soul the knower that experiences knowledge?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The individual spirit soul consists of knowledge only. This is confirmed by the statement of Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.7.22): "The individual spirit soul is situated in knowledge." The soul is not the knower or the perceiver of knowledge. The intelligence is the knower. Therefore statement, "I slept happily. I did not know anything." is spoken by the intelligence, not by the soul.

Siddhānta (conclusion): The author of the sūtras gives the following conclusion.

Sūtra 17

jñō 'ta eva

jñāḥ—knower; ataḥ eva—therefore.

Therefore he is the knower.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The individual spirit soul is both knowledge and knower. In the Praśna Upaniṣad (4.9) it is said:

eṣa hi draṣṭā spraṣṭā śrotā rasayitā ghrātā mantā boddhā kartā vijñānātmā puruṣaḥ

"The individual spirit soul is the seer, the toucher, the hearer, the taster, the smeller, the thinker, the determiner, the doer, and the knower."

This truth is accepted because it is declared by scripture, not because it is understood by logic. Our acceptance of the truth of scripture is described in sūtra 2.1.27:

śrutes tu śabda-mūlatvāt

"The statements of Śruti-śāstra are the root of real knowledge."

In the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

jñātā jñāna-svarūpo 'yam

"The individual spirit soul is both knower and knowledge."

Therefore the individual spirit soul is not knowledge alone without being anything else, and this is not at all proved by the statement, "I slept happily. I did

not know anything," for such an idea would contradict these scripture statements that affirm the soul to be the knower. Therefore it is concluded that the individual spirit soul is both knowledge and knower.

Adhikaraṇa 13 The Individual Spirit Souls Are Atomic

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the author of the sūtras considers the size of the individual spirit souls. In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (3.1.9) it is said:

eṣo 'ṅur ātmā cetasā veditavyo yasmin prāṇaḥ pañcadhā samviveṣa

"When the life-breath withdraws the five activities, the mind can understand the atomic soul."

Samśaya (doubt): Is the individual spirit soul atomic or all-pervading?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The individual spirit soul is all-pervading. Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.14) declares that the soul is "mahān" (great). The statement that the soul is atomic is merely a poetic metaphor.

Siddhānta (conclusion): The author of the sūtras gives the conclusion in the following words.

Sūtra 18

utkrānti-gaty-āgatīnām

utkrānti—departure; gati—travel; āgatīnām—and of return

Because of departure, travel, and return.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this sūtra the word "aṇuḥ" (the atomic soul) should be understood from the previous sūtra. In this sūtra the genitive case is used in the sense of the ablative. The individual spirit soul is atomic and not all-pervading. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "Because of departure, travel, and return."

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.2) it is said:

tasya haitasya hṛdayasyāgraṁ pradyotate. tena pradyotenaiṣa ātmā niṣkrāmati
cakṣuṣo vā mūrdhno vānyebhyo vā śarīra-deśebhyaḥ

"The soul shines in the heart. At the moment of death the effulgent soul leaves through the opening of the eyes, the opening at the top of the the head, or another opening in the body."

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.11) it is said:

anandā nāma te lokā
andhena tamasāvṛtāḥ
tāms te pretyābhigacchanti
avidvāmsō 'budhā janāḥ

"Sinful fools enter into planets known as the worlds of torment, full of darkness and ignorance."

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.6) it is said:

prāpyāntaṁ karmaṇas tasya
yat kiñcedam karoty ayam
tasmāt lokāt punar etya
yasmai lokāya karmaṇe

"At the time of death the soul reaps the results of his works. He goes to the world where he deserves to go. When the results of his past deeds are exhausted, again he returns to the middle planets, the world of karma."

In this way the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad describes the soul's travel from one place to another. If he were all-pervading, the soul would not be able to travel from one place to another, for he would already be everywhere.

In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (10.87.30) it is said:

aparimitā dhruvās tanu-bhṛto yadi sarva-gatās
tarhi na śāsyateti niyamo dhruva netarathā

"O Lord, although the living entities who have accepted material bodies are spiritual and unlimited in number, if they were all-pervading there would be no question of their being under Your control."*

However, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, although all-pervading, can travel from place to place. This is possible because He possesses inconceivable powers.

Here someone may object: The individual spirit soul can be all-pervading and unmoving, and still, because he mistakenly identifies with the external material body, imagine that he goes and comes. He is like the ruler of a village who never really leaves his realm.

To this the reply is given: Because it is said that he both departs and returns it is not possible that the soul is actually stationary and unmoving. The author of the sūtras confirms this in the following words.

Sūtra 19

svātmanaś cottarayoh
sva—own; ātmanaḥ—of the soul; ca—and; uttarayoh—of the latter two.

Also because the last two refer to the soul.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" (also) is used here for emphasis. Here the word "uttarayoh" (the last two) means "of the coming and going". The coming and going here definitely occurs to the individual spirit soul. This is so because the coming and going in the pervious sūtra clearly refer to an agent, to the performer of the action. The coming and going here are understood to be coming and going from a material body. This is clearly seen in the first Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.2) passage quoted in the previous purport. It is also seen in the following words of Bhagavad-gītā (15.4):

śarīraṁ yad avāpnoti
yac cāpy utkrāmatīśvaraḥ

gr̥hītvaitani samyāti
vāyur gandhān ivāśayāt

"The living entity in the material world carries his different conceptions of life from one body to another as the air carries aromas. Thus he takes one kind of body and again quits it to take another."*

If someone says that the soul actually never goes anywhere, although it seems to go places because of the misidentification of the external material body as the self, then I say this is a foolish idea. In the following words the Kauśītakī Upaniṣad refutes this idea:

sa yadāsmāt śarīrāt samutkrāmati sahaivaitaiḥ sarvair utkrāmati

"At the time of death the soul, accompanied by all his powers, leaves the material body."

The word "saha" (accompanied by) is used when the more important is accompanied by another of lesser importance. An example is the sentence: "Accompanied by (saha) his son, the father took his meal." Another example is in Bhagavad-gītā (15.4), which declares that the soul carries his different conceptions of life from one body to another as the air carries aromas. In this way the foolish example pushed forward by the impersonalists, the example of the air in the jar and in the sky, is clearly refuted.

Sūtra 20

nāṇur atac chruter iti cen netarādhikārāt

na—not; aṇuḥ—atom; atat—not that; śruteḥ—from the scriptures; iti—thus; cet—is; na—not; itara—other; adhikārāt—because of being appropriate.

If it is claimed that the Śruti-śāstra denies the idea that the soul is atomic, then I reply that it is not so, because those descriptions apply to someone else.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: Is it not so that that the individual spirit soul is not atomic? After all, the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.22) affirms:

sa vā eṣa mahā-jana ātmā

"The soul is very great."

After all, to be great in size is the very opposite of being atomic.

If someone claims this, then the sūtra replies: "No. It is not so." Why not? The sūtra explains: "itara" (because these descriptions apply to someone else). These words are descriptions of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the all-pervading Supersoul. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.3.7) it is said:

yo 'yam vijñānamayaḥ prāṇeṣu

"He is full of knowledge. He stays among the life-airs."

Although this passage begins by describing the individual spirit soul, it proceeds with a description of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, as is seen in a following passage (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.3.13):

yasyānuvittaḥ pratibuddha ātmā

"He is the self who knows everything."

These words clearly describe the Supreme Personality of Godhead and not the individual spirit soul.

Sūtra 21

sva-śabdonmānābhyām ca

sva—own; śabda—word; unmānābhyām—with measure; ca—and.

Because of its word and measurement.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "sva-śabda" (the word describing it) here means that the word atomic is used to describe the individual spirit soul. An example of this is in Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.1.9):

eṣo 'ṇur ātmā

"The soul is atomic in size."

The word "unmāna" here means "Its measurement is atomic in size". The precise measurement of the individual spirit soul is given in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (4.9):

bālāgra-śata-bhāgasya
śatadhā kalpitasya ca
bhāgo jīvaḥ sa vijñeyaḥ
sa cāntantyāya kalpate

"When the upper point of a hair is divided into one hundred parts and again each of these parts is further divided into one hundred parts, each such part is the measurement of the dimension of the spirit soul."*

In these two ways the atomic size of the soul is proved. the word ānantya" here means "liberation". "Anta" means "death", and "an" means "without". Therefore the word "ānantya" means "the condition of being free from death".

Here someone may object: Is it not so that if it is atomic in size and situated in a specific place in the material body, the soul could not perceive sensations in all other parts of the body, where the soul is not actually present?

If this is said, then the author of the sūtras replies in the following words.

Sūtra 22

avirodhaś candana-vat

avirodhaḥ—not contradicting; candana—sandal; vat—like

It does not contradict. It is like sandal paste.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

As a drop of sandal paste placed on one part of the body brings a pleasant sensation to the body as a whole, so the soul, although situated in one place, perceives what happens in the entire body. Therefore, there is no contradiction. In the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa it is said:

aṅu-mātro 'py ayam jīvaḥ
sva-dehaṁ vyāpya tiṣṭhati
yathā vyāpya śarīrāṇi
haricandana-vipruṣaḥ

"As the sensation created by a drop of sandal paste pervades the entire body, so the individual spirit soul, although atomic in size, is conscious of what happens in the entire body."

Sūtra 23

avasthiti-vaiśeṣyād iti cen nābhyupagamād hṛdi hi

avasthiti—abode; vaiśeṣyāt—because of being specific; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; abhyupagamāt—because of acceptance; hṛdi—in the heart; hi—certainly.

If it is denied because it has no specific abode, then I say no, because it resides in the heart.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: Is it not so that the drop of sandal paste has a single, clearly visible, place where it resides on the body but the soul has no such single residence in the body? There is no reason to make guesses about the location of the soul in the body. The soul is clearly present everywhere in the body, just as the element ether is present everywhere. Therefore the sandal-paste example is clumsy and wrong.

If this objection is raised, then the author of the sūtras replies: "No. It is not so." Why not? The sūtra explains: "Because it resides in the heart." This means that the soul really does reside in a single place in the material body. The soul resides in the heart. This is confirmed in the following words of Praśna Upaniṣad (3.6):

hṛdi hy eṣa ātmā

"The soul resides in the heart."

In the final conclusion the spirit soul, although atomic in size is, in one sense, all-pervading throughout the entire material body. This is explained in the following sūtra.

Sūtra 24

guṇād vālokavat

guṇāt—by quality; vā—or; āloka—light; vat—like.

By quality or like light.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Although the soul is atomic in size, it pervades the body by the quality of consciousness. Like light it pervades the entire body. As the sun, although situated in one place, fills the universe with light, so the soul fills the body with consciousness. The Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself declares this in Bhagavad-gītā (13.34):

yathā prakāśayaty ekaḥ
kṛtsnam lokam imam raviḥ
kṣetram kṣetrī tathā kṛtsnam
prakāśayati bhārata

"O son of Bharata, as the sun alone illuminates all this universe, so does the living entity, one within the body, illuminate the entire body by consciousness."*

When the sun emanates sunlight it does not lose any atoms from its mass, nor does it become diminished in any way. Rubies and other jewels also emanate light without losing atoms from their mass or becoming diminished in any way. It is not possible to say that when light is emanated from them these things become diminished in size. The light they emanate is their quality, not their mass.

The quality can function in a plane apart from the substance that possesses it. The author of the sūtras explains this in the following example.

Sūtra 25

vyatireko gandhavat tathā hi darśayati

vyatirekaḥ—difference; gandha—fragrance; vat—like; tathā—so; hi—indeed; darśayati—shows.

As a fragrance is in a different place, so it is also in a different place. This the scripture shows.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

As the fragrance of flowers or other objects may travel to a place far from its source, so the consciousness that emanates from the soul may travel from the heart and enter the head, feet, or other parts of the body. The Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad (3.6) explains:

prajñayā śarīraṁ samāruhya

"By consciousness the soul is all-pervading in the material body."

Even though the fragrance may travel very far it is never actually separated from its source, just as the light of a jewel is also not separated from its source. In the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

upalabhyāpsu ced gandham
kecid brūyur anaipuṇaḥ
pṛthivyām eva tam vidyād
apo vāyum ca samśritam

"They who do not understand may sometimes say that fragrance is present in water. Earth is the natural home of fragrance, although it may sometimes take shelter of water or air."

In the Praśna Upaniṣad (4.9) it is said:

eṣa hi dr̥ṣṭā

"The soul is the person who sees."

Samśaya (doubt): Is the consciousness that the soul possesses eternal or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The soul is by nature unconscious. It is like a stone. Consciousness only arises when the soul comes in contact with the mind. This is seen in the scriptures' statement: "I slept happily. I was not conscious of anything." This statement shows that consciousness is not an inherent quality of the soul but rather is attained by contact with something else. It is like iron and fire. When placed in fire, an iron rod gradually assumes the qualities of fire. If it were an inherent quality of the soul, then consciousness would not be lost in deep sleep.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives the conclusion.

Sūtra 26

pr̥thag-upadeśāt

pr̥thak—separate; upadeśāt—because of the teaching.

Because there is a specific teaching.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The soul is conscious eternally. How is that known? The sūtra explains: "Because there is a specific teaching." Some examples of that teaching follow.

In the Praśna Upaniṣad (4.9) it is said:

eṣa hi dr̥ṣṭā

"The soul sees eternally."

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.5.14) it is said:

avināśī vā are ayam ātmānucitti-dharmā

"The soul's consciousness is never destroyed."

The soul does not become conscious merely by contact with the mind, for soul and mind are both indivisible and cannot interact. Turning away from the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the soul obscures its natural spiritual knowledge. Turning towards the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the soul revives its natural spiritual consciousness. This is described in the Smṛti-śāstra:

yathā na kriyate jyotsnā
mala-prakṣālanān maṇeḥ
doṣa-prahāṇān na jñānam
ātmanah kriyate tathā

"As by washing away the dirt that covered a jewel, the jewel's splendor is not created but merely uncovered, so by removing the dirt of materialism that covered the soul, the soul's splendor is not created, but merely uncovered.

yathodapāna-khananāt
kriyate na jalāntaram
sad eva niyate vyaktim
asataḥ sambhavaḥ kutaḥ

"As by digging a well, water is brought forth but not created, so by spiritual activities the nature of the soul is brought forth but not created. How would it be possible to create the the soul's qualities from nothing?

tathā heya-guṇa-dhvamsād
avarodhādayo guṇāḥ
prakāśyante na jānyante
nitya evātmano hi te

"When material faults are destroyed, the soul's qualities become revealed. The soul's qualities are eternal. they are never created."

Here someone may object: These quotes from scripture merely show that the soul is synonymous with consciousness. They do not prove that the soul itself is conscious.

To this objection the author of the sūtras replies in the following words.

Sūtra 27

tad-guṇa-sāratvāt tad vyapadeśaḥ prājña-vat

tat—of that; guṇa—quality; sāratvāt—because of being the essence; tat—that; vyapadeśaḥ—designation; prājña—intelligent; vat—like.

It is called that because that is its essential nature, just as He who is intelligent.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because the soul is consciousness itself, therefore it is conscious. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "It is called that because that is its essential nature."

In this sūtra the word "guṇa" (quality) refers to the soul's quality of consciousness. The word "sāra" means "the essential nature of the thing, the absence of which makes the thing non-existent." The word "prājña-vat" means "Like Lord Viṣṇu, who is known as "prājña" (all-knowing) because He is all knowledge. Because He is all-knowledge personified, Lord Viṣṇu is said to know everything. In the same way, because the soul is consciousness personified, therefore the soul is conscious. That the statements "the soul is consciousness personified" and "the soul is conscious" mean the same thing is also confirmed in the next sūtra.

Sūtra 28

yāvad ātma-bhāvitvāc ca na doṣas tad-darśanāt

yāvat—as long as; ātma—of the soul; bhāvitvāt—because of existence; ca—and; na—not; doṣaḥ—fault; tat—of that; darśanāt—because of the sight.

It exists as long as the soul exists. There is no fault in this, because it is clearly seen.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

There is no fault in saying that the two sentences "the soul is consciousness" and "the soul is conscious" mean the same thing. That is the meaning here. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "It exists as long as the soul exists. There is no fault in this, because it is clearly seen." The soul's consciousness exists for as long as the soul exists. As long as the soul exists, the soul's consciousness will not be destroyed. The soul exists eternally, without a beginning or end in time, and the soul's consciousness also exists eternally. The sun may be given here as an example. The sun is both light and the bringer of light. As long as the sun exists it will have these two features, which are actually not different. In the same way the soul is both consciousness and conscious.

Here someone may object: Is it not true that consciousness is born from the modes of material nature? Is it not true that, because it does not exist in the state of dreamless sleep, consciousness is not eternal? Is it not true that even when the living entity is fully awake his consciousness is in fact created by a barrage of various sense-objects?

If these objections are raised, the author of the sūtras replies in the following words.

Sūtra 29

pūṁstvādi-vat tv asya sato 'bhivyakti-yogāt

pūṁstva—virility; ādi—beginning with; vat—like; tu—but; asya—of him; sataḥ—of the existing; abhivyakti-yogāt—because of manifestation.

But like virility and other things it exists and then is manifest.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to dispel doubt. The word "na" (It is not like that) is understood in this sūtra. It is not true that consciousness is non-existent in dreamless sleep and only exists in the waking state. Why is that? the sūtra explains: "But like virility and other things it exists and then is manifest." In the state of dreamless sleep the soul's consciousness exists in a dormant state, and in the state of wakefulness that dormant consciousness becomes fully manifested. Here the sūtra gives the example of virility. In childhood virility and other qualities associated with it exist in a dormant state. Then, at the beginning of adulthood, they become manifested. In the same way consciousness is dormant in dreamless sleep and fully manifested in the waking state. This is described in the

following words of Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.3.30):

yad vai tan na vijānāti vijānan vaitad vijñeyam na vijānāti na hi vijnātur vijñānāt
viparilopo vidyate avināśitvān na tu tad dvitīyam asti tato 'nyad vibhaktam yad
vijānīyāt

"In the state of dreamless sleep the soul is both conscious and unconscious. The soul is always conscious, and consciousness can never be separated from it, because the soul and its consciousness can never be destroyed. Still, in the state of dreamless sleep no object is presented before the soul for it to be conscious of."

When there is no object for consciousness to perceive, then consciousness is dormant. Therefore in dreamless sleep consciousness is dormant. When the senses contact the sense-objects, then consciousness becomes manifested. Had it not existed in a dormant state during dreamless sleep, consciousness could not have manifested itself in the waking state, just as a person born a eunuch cannot manifest virility at the beginning of adulthood. In this way it is proved that the individual spirit soul is atomic, is consciousness, and is conscious eternally.

Now the author of the sūtras refutes the theory of the saṅkhya philosophers.

Samśaya (doubt): Is the individual spirit soul consciousness and nothing else? Is the individual spirit soul all-pervading?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The individual spirit soul is all-pervading. This is so because the results of its actions are seen everywhere. Had it been atomic, the soul would be unable to perceive the pains and pleasures present in different parts of the body. Had it been of a medium size, the soul would not be eternal. Therefore the individual spirit soul must be all-pervading.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives the proper conclusion.

Sūtra 30

nityopalabdhy-anupalabdhi-prasaṅgo 'nyatara-niyamo vānyathā

nitya—eternal; upalabdhi—perception; anupalabdhi—non-perception;
prasaṅgaḥ—result; anyatara—otherwise; niyamaḥ—restriction; vā—or; anyathā—
otherwise.

Otherwise there would be eternal consciousness, eternal unconsciousness, or

the limited existence of one or the other.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

If the soul were only consciousness and nothing else, and if it were all-pervading, then the soul would be either always conscious or always unconscious. Either that or there would be a limited existence of one or the other. This is the meaning: It is clear to the entire world that consciousness and unconsciousness both exist. If the cause of this were a soul that is consciousness only and also all-pervading, then consciousness and unconsciousness would both be perceived simultaneously at every moment by the entire world. If this all-pervading soul were the cause of consciousness only and not unconsciousness, then no one would ever be unconscious, and if this all-pervading soul were the cause of unconsciousness only and not consciousness, then no one would ever be conscious.

It cannot be said that consciousness is created by contact with the senses and unconsciousness is created when there is no contact with the senses, because if the soul is all-pervading then it would be always in contact with the senses. Furthermore, if the individual spirit soul were all-pervading then everyone would simultaneously experience the pains and pleasures of everyone else. If this were so there would be no meaning to individual experience, individual desire, or individual destiny. This effectively refutes the theory that the individual spirit soul is all-pervading.

However, our theory, which affirms that the spirit soul is atomic in size and different in each material body, is not refuted by these considerations. Although atomic in size, the individual spirit soul can act in any place, although it cannot act in every place simultaneously. By its quality of consciousness the individual spirit soul can pervade its material body and perceive the happiness and other sensations present in the various parts of the material body.

Adhikaraṇa 14

The Individual Spirit Soul Performs Actions

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the author of the sūtras will consider another point. In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.5.1) it is said:

vijñānam yajñam tanute. karmāṇi tanute 'pi ca.

"Consciousness performs yajñas. Consciousness performs actions."

Saṁśaya (doubt): Does the individual soul, indicated in this passage by the word "consciousness", perform actions or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): In the Kāṭha Upaniṣad (2.18) it is said:

hantā cen manyate hantum
hataś cen manyate hatam
ubhau tau na vijānītau
nāyam hanti na hanyate

"Neither he who thinks the living entity the slayer nor he who thinks it slain is in knowledge, for the self slays not nor is slain."*

These words clearly declare that the individual spirit soul never performs actions. In the Bhagavad-gītā (3.27) it is said:

prakṛteḥ kriyamāṇāni
guṇaiḥ karmāṇi sarvaśaḥ
ahaṅkāra-vimūḍhātmā
kartāham iti manyate

"The spirit soul bewildered by the influence of false-ego thinks himself the doer of activities that are in actuality carried out by the three modes of material nature."*

In the Bhagavad-gītā (13.21) it is also said:

kārya-kāraṇa-kartṛtve
hatuḥ prakṛtir ucyate
puruṣaḥ sukha-duḥkhānām
bhokṛtve hetur ucyate

"Nature is said to be the cause of all material causes and effects, whereas the living entity is the cause of the various sufferings and enjoyments in this world."*

Therefore the individual spirit soul does not perform actions. When a person understands the truth he understands that all actions are actually performed by the material energy and the individual spirit soul is merely the person who experiences the fruits of action.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives the proper conclusion.

Sūtra 31

kartā śāstrārthavat-tvāt

kartā—the doer; śāstra—of the scriptures; ārtha—meaning; vat—possessing; tvāt—because of having the nature.

He performs actions. This is so because the scriptures are meaningful.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

It is the individual spirit soul who performs actions, not the modes of material nature. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "Because the scriptures are meaningful." In the scriptures it is said:

svarga-kāmo yajeta

"A person who desires Svargaloka should perform yajñas."

and

ātmānam eva lokam upāsīta

"One should worship the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

These statements have meaning only if the individual spirit soul does actually perform actions. If all actions are performed by the modes of nature and the individual spirit soul never does anything, these statements of the scriptures are meaningless. These statements of scripture are intended to motivate the individual spirit soul to act in a certain way so he can enjoy the results of his actions. It is not even possible in this way to try to motivate the inert material modes to act in any way at all.

That the individual spirit soul does actually perform actions is also confirmed in the next sūtra.

Sūtra 32

vihāropadeśāt

vihāra—of pastimes; upadeśāt—because of the teaching.

Because of the teaching about pastimes.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.12.3) describes the activities of the liberated souls:

sa tatra paryeti jakṣan kṛīḍan ramamāṇaḥ

"In the spiritual world the individual spirit soul eats, plays, and enjoys."

Therefore action by itself does not bring pain and unhappiness to the soul, rather it is the bondage of the three modes of nature that brings unhappiness. This is so because the three modes of nature obscure the reality of the soul's spiritual nature.

Sūtra 33

upādānāt

upādānāt—because of taking.

Because of taking.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (2.1.18) it is said:

sa yathā mahā-rājaḥ . . . evam evaiṣa etān prāṇān gṛhītvā sve śarīre yathā-kāmaṁ parivartate

"In the dreaming state the individual spirit soul acts like a king. The soul grasps the life-airs and does as it wishes."

In the Bhagavad-gītā (15.8) it is also said:

gṛhītvaitāni samyāti
vāyur gandhān ivāśayāt

"The living entity in the material world carries his different conceptions of life from one body to another as the air carries aromas. Thus he takes one kind of body and again quits it to take another."*

In these passages it is seen that the individual spirit soul does perform actions, for the soul moves the life-airs as a magnet moves iron. The life-airs may move many things, but it is the individual spirit soul who moves the life-airs. Nothing else moves them.

In the following words the author of the sūtras now gives another reason.

Sūtra 34

vyapadeśac ca kriyāyām na cen nirdeśa-viparyayaḥ

vyapadeśāt—because of designation; ca—and; kriyāyām—in action; na—mpt; cet—if; nirdeśa—grammatical construction; viparyayaḥ—different.

Also because of the name in the action. If this were not so the grammatical structure would be different.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.5.1) it is said:

vijñānaṁ yajñāṁ tanute. karmāṇi tanute 'pi ca.

"Consciousness performs yajñas. Consciousness performs actions."

These words clearly show that the individual spirit soul is the primary performer of Vedic and ordinary actions. If the word "vijñānam" is interpreted to mean not the individual spirit soul, but the intelligence, then the grammatical structure of the sentence would be different. Then the word "vijñāna" would be in the instrumental case, for the intelligence would be the instrument by which the action is performed. However, the word is not in the instrumental case. If the intelligence were the performer of the action here, then another word must be given in the instrumental case to show with what instrument the intelligence performs the action, for there must be an instrument in every action. However, if the individual spirit soul is the performer of the action there is not need for another word in the instrumental case to show the instrument used, for in that situation the individual spirit soul is both the performer of the action and the instrument employed.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that the individual spirit soul, being independent and able to act as he likes, will naturally act for his own welfare and will not perform actions that bring him harm?

To this I reply: No. It is not like that. The individual spirit soul desires to benefit himself, but because his past karma acts against him, he sometimes creates his own misfortune.

For these reasons it is clear that the individual spirit soul certainly performs actions. When the scriptures sometimes say that the individual spirit soul does not perform actions, the meaning is that the soul is not independent and free to do exactly everything he wishes.

Here someone may object: It is not possible that the individual spirit soul is the performer of actions, for it is clearly seen that these actions often bring him suffering.

To this I reply: No. It is not so. If the individual spirit soul is not the performer of actions, then the scriptural descriptions of the darśa, paurṇamassa, and other yajñas would not make any sense.

In the following words the author of the sūtras refutes the idea that material nature is the real performer of actions.

Sūtra 35

uplabdhi-vad aniyamaḥ

uplabdhi—consciousness; vat—like; aniyamaḥ—uncertainty.

As in the situation of consciousness, it would be indefinite.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In previous sūtras it was shown that if the individual spirit soul were all-pervading, then consciousness would be vague and indefinite. In the same way if all-pervading material nature were the sole performer of all actions, then all actions would bring the same result to all spirit souls simultaneously. Clearly this is not so. Also, it could not be said that the individual spirit soul would need to be near the place where a certain action was performed in order to experience the result of that action. The saṅkhya philosophers cannot say this, for in their theory each individual spirit soul is all-pervading and is thus already near the places where all actions are performed.

Sūtra 36

śakti-viparyayāt

śakti—of power; viparyayāt—because of difference.

Because the power is changed.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

If the material nature is the performer of actions, then material nature must also experience the good and bad results of those actions. However, the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (1.8) affirms:

bhokṛ-bhāvāt

"The individual spirit soul enjoys the good and bad results of actions."

In this way the idea that the material nature is the performer of actions is refuted. Because the individual spirit soul enjoys the good and bad results of actions, the individual spirit soul must also be the performer of those actions.

Sūtra 37

samādhy-abhāvāc ca

samādhi—of liberation; abhāvāt—because of the non-existence; ca—also.

Also because there is no liberation.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Actions are meant to bring one to liberation from the material world. Because it is not possible for the material nature to act in such a way and attain such a goal, the idea that the material nature is the performer of actions cannot be entertained. Liberation means understanding the truth "I am different from matter". Because it is unconscious, and also because it really is matter, it is not possible for the material nature to come to this understanding. In this way it is proved that the individual spirit soul is the performer of actions.

Adhikaraṇa 15

Activity Is the Soul's Nature

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the following words the author of the sūtras gives an example to show that the individual spirit soul performs actions, using other its own potency, or some other instrument to perform them.

Sūtra 38

yathā ca takṣobhayathā

yathā—as; ca—and; takṣa—carpenter; ubhayathā—in both ways.

In both ways like a carpenter.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

As a carpenter performs actions, employing both his own power and a host of tools, so does the individual spirit soul, employing both his own power and the various life-air. Thus the soul employs the material body and other instruments also, to perform actions. It is the pure spirit soul who thus uses the modes of material nature to perform actions. That is why the scriptures sometimes say that the modes of material nature are the performer of actions.

That the individual spirit soul is indeed the performer of actions is confirmed in Bhagavad-gītā (13.22), where it is said:

kāraṇaṁ guṇa-saṅgo 'sya
sad-asad-yoṇi-janmasu

"The living entity in material nature thus follows the ways of life, enjoying the three modes of nature. Thus he meets with good and evil among the various species."*

These words explain the scripture passages that declare the modes of nature to be the performers of action. It is foolish for a person to think himself the sole performer of action and ignore the five factors of action. Of course it is not that the individual spirit soul never performs any action. The idea that the soul never does anything is clearly refuted by the many scriptural statements urging the soul to act such a way that he may attain liberation. When in the Bhagavad-gītā (2.19) the Lord says:

nāyaṁ hanti na hanyate

"The self slays not nor is slain."

that does not mean that the individual spirit soul never performs any action, but rather that the eternal spirit soul can never be cut or slain. The meaning of the statement that the soul never acts has thus already been explained.

In both this life and the next the devotees perform various actions of devotional service to the Lord. Because these actions are free from the touch of the modes of nature, because they are under the jurisdiction of the Lord's spiritual potency and because they lead to liberation, these actions are said not to be action, for they are not material actions. This is explained by the Supreme Lord Himself in these words:

sāttvikaḥ kārako 'saṅgī

rāgāndho rājasah smṛtaḥ
tāmasah smṛti-vibhraṣṭo
nirguṇo mad-apāśrayaḥ

"One who acts without attachment is in the mode of goodness. One who is blinded with desire is in the mode of passion. One whose intelligence is broken is in the mode of ignorance. One who takes shelter of Me is free from the grip of the modes of nature."

That the pure spirit soul experiences the results of his actions is described in Bhagavad-gītā (13.21):

puruṣaḥ sukha-duḥkhānām
bhoktṛtve hetur ucyate

"The living entity is the cause of the various sufferings and enjoyments in this world."*

Because it is by nature conscious it is the soul that experiences the results of actions, the modes of nature do not experience them. This refutes the idea that the modes are active and the soul is not. In this way it is proved that it is the conscious soul who experiences happiness and other sensations. In this way the individual spirit soul brings knowledge to itself and others. Both kinds of action exist for the soul. In the Praśna Upaniṣad (4.9) it is said:

eṣa hi draṣṭā spraṣṭā śrotā

"It is the soul who sees, touches, and hears."

Thus, by this example of the carpenter, the idea that the individual spirit soul is the only factor in action, and there are no others, is clearly refuted.

Adhikaraṇa 16

The Individual Spirit Soul is Dependent on the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now another doubt is considered.

Samśaya (doubt): Is the individual spirit soul independent in his actions, or does he depend on another?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The scriptures say:

svarga-kāmo yajeta

"One who desires Svargaloka should perform yajñas."

and

tasmād brāhmaṇaḥ surāṁ na pibet pāpmanotsamsrja

"A brāhmaṇa should not drink liquor and should not commit sins."

That the scriptures give orders and prohibitions for the soul to follow is proof that the soul is independent, for independence means to have the power to do one thing and to refrain from doing another.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives his conclusion.

Sūtra 39

parāt tu tac-chruteḥ

parāt—from the Supreme; tu—but; tat—of that; śruteḥ—from the scriptures.

But from the Supreme, because of the scriptures.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used to remove doubt. The Supreme Personality of Godhead inspires the individual spirit soul to act. How is that known? The sūtra explains: "tac-chruteḥ" (It is known from the scriptures). The scriptures give the following explanations:

antaḥ praviṣṭaḥ śāstā janānām

"Entering their hearts, the Supreme Personality of Godhead controls all living entities."

ya ātmani tiṣṭhann ātmānam antaro yamayati

"Entering their hearts, the Supreme Personality of Godhead controls all living entities."

eṣa eva sādhu karma kārayati

"The Lord engages the living entity in pious activities so he may be elevated."*

Here someone may object: So be it. However, if the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the actual performer of actions, then the orders and prohibitions of the scriptures are all meaningless. The scriptures can give orders and prohibitions only if the individual spirit soul is independent and thus has the power to make choices.

If this is said, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 40

kr̥ta-prayatnāpekṣas tu vihita-pratiśiddhāvaiarthyaādibhyaḥ

kr̥ta—done; prayatna—effort; āpekṣaḥ—relation; tu—but; vihita—ordered; pratiśiddha—forbidden; a—not; vaiarthya—meaninglessness; ādibhyaḥ—beginning.

But it is by effort because then orders and prohibitions are not without meaning.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to dispel doubt. The individual spirit soul performs pious and impious deeds. Taking into consideration the individual soul's

efforts, the Supreme Personality of Godhead gives him facility to act in a certain way. Therefore the previously stated objection is not valid.

The pious and impious deeds of the individual spirit soul are like different seeds that sprout into different kinds of plants. The Supreme Personality of Godhead is like the rain that falls on these seeds and makes them grow. Therefore in this situation is the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the instrument by which these seeds of karma bear fruit. The seeds of various trees, vines, and other plants are the specific cause of these plants, and the rain that makes them grow is the general cause. If no raincloud brings water there will not be any variety of sweet flowers or other plants. If there is no seed there will not any flowers or plants either. In this way the Supreme Personality of Godhead gives the results of the pious and impious deeds performed by the individual spirit soul. Even though dispatched by another, a person is still the performer of the actions he does. Therefore it cannot be said that the individual spirit soul does not perform actions.

Why is that? The sūtra explains: "Because then orders and prohibitions are not without meaning." The word "ādi" (beginning with) in this sūtra means that the Supreme Personality of Godhead gives mercy and punishment according to the pious and impious actions of the individual spirit souls. If that interpretation is accepted, then the orders and prohibitions of the scriptures are not without meaning. If the Supreme Personality of Godhead actually forces the individual spirit soul to act piously or impiously, and the soul is like a rock or a log and has no independence, then the orders of the scripture to perform pious deeds and avoid impious deeds are all worthless and should be rejected.

The scriptures say that when He is merciful the Supreme Personality of Godhead engages the individual spirit soul in pious activities so he may be elevated, and when He withdraws His mercy the Supreme Personality of Godhead engages the individual spirit soul in impious activities so he may go to hell. If this means that the individual living entity has no choice, and pious and impious deeds are forced on him by the Supreme Personality of Godhead, then the Supreme Personality of Godhead is cruel and unjust, a monster. Therefore it must be concluded that the individual spirit soul does have free will, and is responsible for his actions, although he does not have the power to transfer his desire and will into concrete action unless the Supreme Personality of Godhead permits. In this way everything is explained.

Adhikaraṇa 17

The Individual Spirit Soul Is Part and Parcel of the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Next, to corroborate the previous explanation the author of the sūtras explains that the individual spirit soul is part and parcel of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In the muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (3.1.1) it is said:

dvā suparṇā

"The soul and the Supersoul within the body are compared to two friendly birds sitting together."*

The first bird here is the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the second is the individual spirit soul.

Samśaya (doubt): Is the individual spirit soul in truth the Supreme Personality of Godhead, only seeming to be different because of the illusion of māyā, or is the the individual spirit soul part and parcel of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, different from the Lord, but related to Him as a ray of sunlight is related to the sun?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): What is the truth? The truth is the individual spirit soul covered by the illusion of māyā is in truth the same as the Supreme Personality of Godhead? The Brahma-bindu Upaniṣad (13) explains:

ghaṭa-samvṛtam ākāśam
nīyamāne ghaṭe yathā
gato liyeta nākāśam
tadvaj jīvo nabhopamaḥ

"The space within a jar is not moved when the jar is moved, nor is it destroyed when the jar is broken. The spirit soul is like that unbreakable space."

The Chāndogya Upaniṣad also (6.8.7) affirms:

tat tvam asi

"You are that."

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives his conclusion.

Sūtra 41

aṁśo nānā vyapadeśād anyathā cāpi dāsa-kitavāditvam adhīyate eke

aṁśaḥ—part; nānā—many; vyapadeśāt—because of the teaching; anyathā—otherwise; ca—and; api—also; dāsa—servant; kitava—gambler; ādi—beginning with; tvam—the state of being; adhīyate—is read; eke—some.

He is a part because of the description of being many, and also because some scriptures describe him as a servant, as a gambler, or as something else.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The individual spirit soul is a part and parcel of the Supreme Personality of Godhead as a ray of sunlight is part and parcel of the sun. The individual spirit soul is different from the Lord, dependent on the Lord, and related to the Lord. That is the meaning. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "Because of the description of being many." The Subala Upaniṣad explains:

udbhavaḥ sambhavo divyo deva eko nārāyaṇo mātā pitā bhrātā nivāsaḥ śaraṇam
suhṛd gatiṁ nārāyaṇaḥ

"Nārāyaṇa is the transcendental Supreme Personality of Godhead. Nārāyaṇa is the creator, destroyer, mother, father, brother, home, shelter, friend, and goal."

In Bhagavad-gītā (9.18) Lord Kṛṣṇa declares:

gatiṁ bhartā prabhuḥ sākṣī
nivāsaḥ śaraṇam suhṛt

"I am the goal, the sustainer, the master, the witness, the abode, the refuge, and the most dear friend. I am the creation and the annihilation, the basis of everything, the resting place, and the eternal seed."*

The words "nānā vyapadeśād" in this sūtra describe the many relationships that exist between the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the individual spirit soul, relationships like that between the creator and created, controller and controlled, shelter and person who takes shelter, master and servant, friend and friend, and goal and seeker. Some passages in the Atharva Veda declare that because the Supreme is all-pervading, the individual spirit souls and the Supreme are identical. The Atharva Veda declares:

brahma dāsā brahma dāsā brahma kitavāḥ

"These servants are the Supreme. These fishermen are the Supreme. These gamblers are the Supreme."

It is not possible that this passage intends to say that the individual spirit soul is actually not different from the Supreme. It is not possible that the Supreme is simultaneously both the creator and created, the pervader and pervaded, nor is it possible that supremely intelligent Lord becomes a servant or other lowly being. If it were true that the individual spirit souls are identical with the Supreme, then the scriptures' advice to renounce the world would become meaningless. Nor is it possible that the Supreme has become covered by the influence of illusion, for illusion has no power to bewilder the Lord. Nor is it possible that the individual spirit souls are parts of the Supreme like fragments cut with a chisel from a great stone, for that would contradict the scriptures' statements that the Supreme can neither be broken nor changed. Therefore the individual spirit soul is different from the Supreme, but related to Him as created to creator, and in other ways also. The individual spirit soul is thus a part and parcel of the Supreme. The truth is that the individual spirit soul is a potency of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is described in Viṣṇu Purāṇa (6.7.61):

viṣṇu-śaktiḥ parā proktā
kṣetrajñākhyā tathā parā

"Originally, Kṛṣṇa's energy is spiritual, and the energy known as the living entity is also spiritual."*

When it is said that the individual spirit soul is a part of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the word "part" is used in the same way as in the sentence, "The circle of Venus is a one-hundredth part of the moon's circle," or the same way as in the definition, "A part, although situated in a smaller area than the whole, is identical with the whole in substance." The use of the word "part" here is not different from that definition. Thus the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the master of all potencies, and the individual spirit soul is a part of the Lord's spiritual potency. This, by being a localized manifestation of one of the Lord's potencies, the individual spirit soul is a part of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. That is their relationship.

The example of the pot means that when the mistaken identification of the soul for the body is broken, the individual soul meets the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad's statement "tat tvam asi" (You are that) therefore means "You are dependent on the Supreme." The context of that passage supports this view. It does not support any other interpretation. Therefore the individual spirit soul and the Supreme Personality of Godhead are separate and

different. One is the controller, the other the controlled. One is all-pervading, the other atomic in size. This is directly seen in the scriptures. It is not possible to prove otherwise. In the next sūtra the author continues his explanation.

Sūtra 42

mantra-varṇāt

mantra—of the mantras; varṇāt—from the description.

Because of the description in the Vedic mantras.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Ṛg Veda (10.90.3) it is said:

pādo 'sya sarvā bhūtāni

"All living entities are part and parcel of the Supreme."

In this way the Vedic mantras declare that the individual spirit souls are part and parcel of the Supreme. The word "pāda" here means "part". No other meaning makes sense in this context. The word "sarvā bhūtāni" (all living entities) here is in the plural, whereas the word "aṁśaḥ" (part) in sūtra 41 is in the singular. The singular here is used in a generic sense to denote all spirit souls. This kind of usage is also seen in many other places.

Sūtra 43

api smaryate

api—also; smaryate—in the Smṛti-śāstra.

Also in the Smṛti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bhagavad-gītā (15.7) Lord Kṛṣṇa explains:

mamaivāṁśo jīva-loke
jīva-bhūtaḥ sanātanaḥ

"The living entities in this conditioned world are My eternal fragmental parts."*

By using the word "sanātana" (eternal), the Lord refutes the idea that the living entities referred to here are the temporary external bodies in which the eternal souls reside. In this way it is seen that the individual spirit souls are part and parcel of the Supreme and have an relationship with Him. the Supreme is the creator and dominant in other ways also, and the individual spirit souls are dependent on Him. The nature of the individual spirit souls is described in the following passage of Padma Purāṇa:

jñānāśrayo jñāna-guṇaś
cetanaḥ prakṛteḥ paraḥ
na jāto nirvikāraś ca
eka-rūpaḥ svarūpa-bhāk

"The individual spirit soul is the shelter of knowledge, has knowledge as one of his qualities, is consciousness, is beyond the world of matter, is never born, never changes, and has one form, a spiritual form.

aṇur nityo vyāpti-śīlaś
cid-ānandātmakas tathā
aham artho 'vyayaḥ sākṣī
bhinna-rūpaḥ sanātanaḥ

"The soul is atomic, eternal, is present by consciousness everywhere in the material body, is by nature full of spiritual bliss and knowledge, has a sense of individual identity, is unchanging, is a witness within the body, is eternal, and is different from the Supreme.

adāhyo 'cchedyo 'kledyo
'śoṣyo 'kṣara eva ca
evam-ādi-guṇair yuktaḥ
śeṣa-bhūtaḥ parasya vai

"The soul can never be burned, cut, moistened, withered, or killed. It has these and many more qualities. It is part and parcel of the Supreme.

ma-kareṇocyate jīvaḥ
kṣetra-jñāḥ paravān sadā
dāsa-bhūto harer eva
nānyasyaiva kadācana

"Thus the word `ma' refers to the individual spirit soul. The soul is the knower of the field of activities. The soul is spiritual. The soul is an eternal servant of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The soul is never the servant of anyone else.

The phrase "evam-ādi-guṇaiḥ" (with these and many more qualities) refers to the soul's other qualities, such as his ability to perform actions, to experience sensations, to attain enlightenment, and to enlighten others. The word "enlightenment" here has two features. In the first feature the soul itself attains enlightenment. In the second feature the soul brings enlightenment to others. That is the nature of the soul. A lamp sheds light on itself and on other objects also. A jar or similar object has no power to bring light. Although a lamp may shine, because it is inanimate matter it cannot benefit from its own light. The individual soul, however, can benefit from the light it brings. Because the soul can thus become illuminated, it is said that the soul is spiritual and full of knowledge.

Adhikaraṇa 18

The Lord's Incarnations Are Not Part and Parcel of the Lord, For They Are the Lord Himself

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Digressing, for the moment, from the main topic, the author of the sūtras next considers the nature of the Lord's incarnations. In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said:

eko vaśī sarva-gaḥ kṛṣṇa idya
eko 'pi san bahudhā yo 'vabhāti

"Lord Kṛṣṇa is the worshipable, all-pervading supreme controller, and although He is one, He manifests in many forms."

In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (1.2.3) it is said:

ekāneka-svarūpāya

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is one, although He has many forms."

Here it is said that the Lord is one because He remains one person, even though He appears in many forms, and He is also called many because of the great variety of these forms. That is the meaning.

Samśaya (doubt): Are the incarnations of the Lord, such as the incarnation Matsya, part and parcel of the Lord in the same way the individual spirit souls are, or are They different from the individual spirit souls?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): There is no difference between the individual spirit souls and the incarnations of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 44

prakāśādi-van naivam paraḥ

prakāśa—light; ādi—beginning with; vat—like; na—not; evam—thus; paraḥ—the Supreme.

The Supreme is not like light or other things.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Although the Lord's incarnations, such as Lord Matsya, are called "parts" of the Supreme, They are not like the individual spirit souls. Here the author of the sūtras gives an example: "The Supreme is not like light or other things." As the

sun and a firefly may both be called "light", but are in truth very different, and as nectar and wine may both be called "liquid", but in truth are very different, so the individual spirit souls and the incarnations of the Lord do not have a similar nature, but are very different.

Sūtra 45

smaranti ca

smaranti—the Smṛti-śāstras say; ca—and.

The Smṛti-śāstras also say it.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Varāha Purāṇa it is said:

svāmśaś cātha vibhinnāmśa
iti dvedhāmśa iṣyate
amśino yat tu sāmartyam
yat-svarūpam yathā sthitiḥ

"It is said that there are two kinds of parts and parcels of the Supreme: direct parts and separated parts. Direct parts have exactly the same nature as the Lord.

tad eva nāṇumātro 'pi
bhedaḥ svāmśamśino kvacit
vibhinnāmśo 'lpa-śaktiḥ syāt
kiñcit sāmartya-mātra-yuk

"Separated parts are different from the Lord. They are atomic in size and have very slight powers.

sarve sarva-guṇaiḥ pūrṇāḥ
sarva-doṣa-vivarjitāḥ

"All direct parts of the Lord are filled with all virtues and glories and free of all vices and defects."

In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (1.3.28) it is said:

ete cāmśa-kalāḥ pumsaḥ
kṛṣṇas tu bhagavān svayam

"All the above mentioned incarnations are either plenary portions or portions of the plenary portions of the Lord, but Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the original Personality of Godhead."*

Thus Lord Kṛṣṇa is the original Supreme Personality of Godhead and the various incarnations, such as Lord Matsya, are parts of Him, but they are not different from Lord Kṛṣṇa, as the individual spirit souls are. Lord Kṛṣṇa is like a vaidūrya stone, which manifests different colors from moment to moment. In this way Lord Kṛṣṇa appears in different forms.

In His various incarnations Lord Kṛṣṇa may display all or only some of His powers. That is the description of the scriptures. Lord Kṛṣṇa, the source of all incarnations, displays all of His six transcendental opulences in full. When the Lord does not display all His opulences in full, He appears as an amśa incarnation, and when He displays even fewer of His opulences, He appears as a kalā incarnation. In this circumstance He is like a great teacher, learned in the six sciences, who in certain circumstances teaches only a small portion of what he actually knows.

In the Puruṣa-bodhinī Upaniṣad it is said that Lord Kṛṣṇa appears with all His transcendental potencies, headed by Goddess Rādhā. In the Tenth Canto of Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam it is said that various transcendental qualities, such as being supreme over all, being filled with great love, being accompanied by loving associates, filling with wonder Brahmā, Śiva, and all the demigods, sages, and wise devotees, manifesting many pastimes, such as sweetly playing the flute, that fill everyone with wonder, displaying a great sweetness of transcendental handsomeness, and being very kind and merciful, are eternally manifested in Yaśodā's infant Kṛṣṇa. Lord Matsya and the other incarnations manifest some but not all of these qualities. Still, the incarnations of the Lord are not like the individual spirit souls, for the incarnations actually are the Lord Himself.

Now the author of the sūtras presents another argument.

Sūtra 46

anujñā-parihārau deha-sambandhāt jyotir-ādi-vat

anujñā—permission to act; parihārau—cessation from action; deha—of the

body; sambandhāt—from the contact; jyotiḥ—eye; ādi—beginning with; vat—like.

Bondage and liberation come from contact with the material body, like the eye and other things.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Even though they are parts and parcels of the Supreme, the individual spirit souls, because beginningless ignorance, and also because of contact with material bodies, are subject to material bondage and liberation. The incarnations of the Lord, such as Lord Matsya, however, are not subject to such things. This is the description of the Śruti-śāstra. In the Śruti-śāstra it is also said that the incarnations of the Lord do not have material bodies, but are directly the Lord Himself. That is the great difference between the individual spirit souls and the incarnations of the Lord.

The word "anujñā" here means "permission". It is by the Lord's permission that the individual spirit souls can perform pious and impious deeds, as the Kauśītaki Upaniṣad (3.8) explains:

eṣa eva sādhu karma kārayati

"The Lord engages the living entity in pious activities so he may be elevated."*

The word "parihāra" means "liberation". This is described in the Śruti-śāstra:

tam eva viditvāti mṛtyum eti

By understanding the Supreme Personality of Godhead one is able to cross beyond this world of death."

Next, speaking the words "jyotir-ādi-vat" (like the eye), the author of the sūtras gives an example to explain this. The eyes of the living entities are like small portions of the sun. However, the eyes depend on the sun for the power of sight, and if the sun does not give permission, in the form of the sunlight, the eyes cannot see. In this way the eyes are dependent on the sun. The sunlight on the sun-planet, however, is identical with the sun itself, and thus it makes no sense to say they are dependent on the sun. The difference between the individual spirit souls and the incarnations of the Lord is like that, the incarnations being like the sunlight and the souls being like the eyes.

Sūtra 47

asantateś cāvyatikaraḥ

asantateḥ—because of imperfection; ca—not; avyatikaraḥ—without bewilderment.

Because it is imperfect there can be no mistake.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because he is imperfect, the individual spirit soul cannot be mistaken for an incarnation of the Lord. The individual spirit souls are therefore not the same as or equal to the incarnations of the Lord, beginning with Lord Matsya, who are all perfect. In the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (5.9), the individual spirit soul is described in the following words:

bālāgra-śata-bāgasya

"If we divide the tip of a hair into one hundred parts and then take one part and divide this into another one hundred parts, that ten-thousandth part is the dimension of the living entity."*

Instead of being atomic and limited, as the individual spirit souls are, the Lord's incarnations, beginning with Lord Matsya, are perfect and complete in every way, as the Īśa Upaniṣad explains:

pūrnam adaḥ pūrṇam idam

"The Personality of Godhead is perfect and complete."*

In the following words the author of the sūtras shows the great fault in thinking the individual soul identical with the Supreme.

Sūtra 48

ābhāsa eva ca

ābhāsaḥ—fallacy; eva—indeed; ca—also.

It is also a fallacy.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this sūtra is refuted the idea that because they are both called "amśas", or parts of the Lord, therefore the individual spirit souls and the incarnations of the Lord are identical. This idea is based on the logical fallacy of sat-pratipakṣa (undistributed middle). Because of its imperfect reasoning, this idea is wrong.

The word "ca" (also) here hints that some examples may be given to show this. One example is that of earth and sky. Earth and sky are both substances, but that does not mean that they are identical. Existence and non-existence are both categories, but that does not mean they are equal. In the same way the individual spirit souls and the incarnations of the Supreme Personality of Godhead may both be parts of the Supreme, but that does not mean that they are equal.

Adhikaraṇa 19

The Individual Spirit Souls Are Not All Alike

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Concluding this digression, the author of the sūtras now returns to His original topic. In the Kaṭha Upaniṣad (2.5.13) it is said:

nityo nityānām cetanaś cetanānām
eko bahūnām yo vidadhāti kāmān

"The Supreme Lord is eternal and the living beings are eternal. The Supreme Lord is cognizant and the living beings are cognizant. The difference is that the Supreme Lord is supplying all the necessities of life for the many other living entities."*

Samśaya (doubt): In this way it is said that the individual spirit souls are eternal

and cognizant. Are the individual spirit souls all alike or are they not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The individual spirit souls are not different. They are all exactly alike.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 49

adr̥ṣṭānīyamāt

adr̥ṣṭa—of fate; anīyamāt—because of difference.

Because of different fates.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

As a frog jumps a long distance, the word "na" (not) should be inserted from sūtra 44. In this way this sūtra means "the individual spirit souls are not all alike. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "Even though the individual spirit souls have the same nature, they have different fates." Their fates are beginningless.

Here someone may object: Are the different fates not created because the individual spirit souls have different desires and different aversions?

The author of the sūtras says, "No it is not so," and gives the following explanation.

Sūtra 50

abhisandhy-ādiṣv api caivam

abhisandhy—inclinations; ādiṣu—beginning with; api—also; ca—and; evam—thus.

In this way there are different desires and other things.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The different natures of the individual spirit souls are to be explained in a different way. These differences exist because of different fates. The word "ca" (and) hints that these differences exist at every moment.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that these differences are created by differing environments, such as the environment of Svargaloka, the earth, or other places?

To this the author of the sūtras replies, "No. It is not so." He gives the following explanation.

Sūtra 51

pradeśād iti cen nāntar-bhāvāt

pradeśāt—from the environment; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; antar-bhāvāt—because of being understood.

If it is said that this is because of environment, then the answer is: No, because there is another reason.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The other reason mentioned here is the differing fates of the individual spirit souls. The differences here cannot be attributed to different environments, for souls in the same environment often manifest great differences.

Pada 4

Invocation

tvaj-jātāḥ kalitotpātāḥ
mat-prāṇāḥ santy amitra-bhit
etān śādhi tathā deva

yathā sat-patha-gāminah

O Supreme Personality of Godhead, O destroyer of enemies, my life-breaths, which are born from You, have left the path of virtue. O Lord, please bring them under control and push them on the path that is right.

Adhikaraṇa 1

The Prāṇas Are Manifested From the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Third Pada contradictory scriptural passages describing the elements were harmonized. In the Fourth Pada contradictory passages describing the prāṇas (life-force and senses) will be harmonized. The prāṇas are of two kinds: primary and secondary. The secondary prāṇas are the eleven senses, beginning with the eyes. The primary prāṇas are the five life-airs, beginning with apāna. First the secondary prāṇas will be examined. In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.1.3) it is said:

etasmā jāyate prāṇo manaḥ sarvendriyāṇi ca

"From this are born prāṇa, mind, and all the senses."

Samśaya (doubt): Is this description of the creation of the senses metaphorical, like the description of the creation of the individual souls, or literal, like the description of the creation of ether and the other elements?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): This is explained in the following words of the Śruti-śāstra:

asad vā idam agra āsīt tad āhuḥ kim tad āsīt iti ṛṣayo vāva te asad āsīt tad āhuḥ ke te ṛṣaya iti prāṇā vāva ṛṣayaḥ.

"He said: In the beginning was non-being. They said: What was that non-being? He said: The non-being was many sages. They said: Who were those sages? He said: Those sages were the prāṇas."

This passage from the Śruti-śāstra clearly shows that the the senses, which are

here called prāṇas or sages, existed before the creation of the material world. Therefore the senses are like the individual spirit souls (and the scriptures' descriptions of the creation of the senses are only allegories.)

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 1

tathā prāṇaḥ

tathā—so; prāṇaḥ—the prāṇas.

The prāṇas are like that.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

As ether and the other elements were manifested from the Supreme Personality of Godhead, so the prāṇas and the senses were also manifested from Him. That is the meaning here. In the beginning of creation the ingredients of the material world were merged together into one. Then the different ingredients were manifested. This is described in Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.1.3):

etasmā jāyate prāṇo manaḥ sarvendriyāṇi ca

"From this are born prāṇa, mind, and all the senses."

The creation of the material senses is not like the creation of the conscious individual spirit souls, because the souls are free from the six transformations that are always present in matter. When they describe the creation of the individual spirit souls, the words of the scriptures are all allegories, but when they describe the creation of the senses, the words of the scriptures are literal descriptions. This is so because the senses are by nature material. This being so, the words prāṇa and ṛṣi (sages) in this passage refer to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is so because both these words are names of the all-knowing Supreme Person.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that because the words "prāṇaḥ" and "ṛṣayaḥ" (sages) are both in the plural it is not possible that they can here be names of the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

In the following words the author of the sūtras answers this objection.

Sūtra 2

gauṇy asambhavāt

gauṇī—secondary meaning; asambhavāt—because of impossibility.

This must be a secondary use of the word, because the primary use is impossible.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The use of the plural in this passage from the Śruti-śāstra must be a secondary usage of the plural. Why is that? Because there are not many Gods, there is only one God, the plural cannot be used to describe Him. Still, the plural may be applied to Him to refer to His many different manifestations. Although the Supreme Lord is one, He appears in His many incarnations like an actor assuming different roles or a vaidūrya jewel displaying different colors. In this secondary sense the plural is appropriate in relation to Him. This is confirmed by the following words of the Śruti-śāstra:

ekaṁ santaṁ bahudhā dṛśyamānam

"Although He is one, the Supreme Personality of Godhead is seen to be many."

The Smṛti-śāstra also explains:

ekāneka-svarūpāya

"Although He is one, the Supreme Personality of Godhead appears in many forms."

Sūtra 3

tat prāk śruteś ca

tat—that; prāk—before; śruteḥ—from the Śruti-śāstra; ca—and.

Because the Śruti-śāstra declares that He existed before the creation.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because in the beginning of creation the varieties of material nature were not yet manifested, and thus the material world was all one, it is also not proper to accept the use of the plural here in a literal sense. This is so because the Śruti-śāstras declare that in the beginning of material creation only the Supreme Personality of Godhead existed. Therefore the plural here must be used in a secondary sense.

In the following words the author of the sūtras gives another reason why the word "prāṇa" should be interpreted as a name of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Sūtra 4

tat-pūrvakatvād vācaḥ

tat—that; pūrvakatvāt—because of being before; vācaḥ—speech.

Because speech existed before the material creation.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "vācaḥ" (speech) here means "the names of things other than the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the master of many spiritual potencies". This speech existed before the pradhāna, the mahat-tattva, and the other features of the material world were created. Because the names and forms of the various material features were not yet created, and because the material senses also were not yet created at that time in the beginning of creation, the word "prāṇa" here must be used as a name of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.7) explains:

tad dhedam tarhi

"In the beginning they were not manifested. Only later were the material forms and names manifested."

This explains that in the beginning of the material creation the material names and forms were not yet manifested. Thus at that time the material senses as well as the elements beginning with ether, were not yet manifested.

Adhikaraṇa 2

The Senses Are Eleven

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

After refuting this false idea about the senses, an idea that contradicts the descriptions in Śruti-śāstra, the author of the sūtras refutes a false idea about how many senses there are. In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.1.8) it is said:

sapta prāṇāḥ prabhavanti tasmāt
saptārciṣaḥ samadhiḥ sapta-homaḥ
sapteme lokā yeṣu sañcaranti
prāṇā guhāśayā nihitā sapta sapta

"From Him come the seven prāṇas, the seven arcis, the seven homas, and the seven lokas. These seven are placed in every heart."

However, in the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.9.4) it is said:

daśeme puruṣe prāṇā ātmaikadaśa

"In the living entity there are ten prāṇas. The soul is the eleventh."

Samśaya (doubt): Are the prāṇas seven or eleven?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The pūrvapakṣa speaks the following sūtra.

Sūtra 5

sapta-gateḥ viśeṣitvāc ca

sapta—of seven; gateḥ—because of going; viśeṣitvāt—because of the specific description; ca—also.

Because of the departure of seven and also because of a specific description.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The prāṇas are seven. Why is that? Because that is the opinion of scripture. In the Śruti-śāstra it is said:

saptānām eva jīvena saha sañcāra-rupāyā gateḥ

"Accompanied by the seven prāṇas, the soul leaves the body."

In the Kāṭha Upaniṣad (6.10) it is said:

yadā pañcāvatiṣṭhante
jñānāni manasā saha
buddhiś ca na viceṣṭeta
tām āhuḥ paramām gatim

"The sages say that the supreme goal is attained when the five knowers are at peace and the mind and intelligence are no longer active."

This passage describes the condition of the senses in the state of yogic trance. This passage describes five senses, which begin with the ears. To them are added the mind and intelligence. In this way the living entity has seven senses. The Śruti-śāstra also describes five working instruments, beginning with the voice and hands, but these cannot be called senses in the primary meaning of the word because these instruments do not accompany the soul when he leaves the material body and also because these instruments are less useful to the soul than the seven primary senses.

Siddhānta (conclusion): If this is said, the author of the sūtras replies with the following conclusion.

Sūtra 6

hastādayas tu sthite 'to naivam

hasta—the hands; ādayaḥ—beginning with; tu—but; sthite—situated; ataḥ—therefore; na—not; evam—like that.

But when he is situated in that way, the hands and other instruments are also present. Therefore it is not like that.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to begin the refutation of the Pūrvapakṣa's objection. Although they are not included among the seven, the instruments beginning with the hands are to be considered among the prāṇas. Why is that? Because as long as the soul is situated in the material body these instruments help in experiencing various things and in performing various tasks. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad it is said:

hastau vai grahaḥ sarva-karmaṇābhigraheṇa grhītāḥ hastābhyām karma karoti.

"The hands are a sense, for with the hands one grasps things and performs actions."

In this way there are more than seven senses. There are five knowledge-acquiring senses, five working senses, and the mind. In this way there are eleven senses. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.9.4) it is said:

ātmaikādaśa

"The ātmā is the eleventh sense."

The word "ātmā" here means "the mind". In this way it should be understood.

There are five objects of perception: sound, touch, form, taste, and smell. To perceive these objects there are five knowledge-acquiring senses: ears, skin, eyes, tongue, and nose. There are five kinds of action: speech, grasping, moving, excretion, and reproduction. To perform these actions there are five working senses: voice, hands, feet, anus, and genital.

To co-ordinate the actions of all these and to take consideration of the three

phases of time (past, present, and future), there is the mind. Sometimes the mind is considered to have four aspects. In this way the actions of the mind are: desiring, coming to conclusions, understanding one's identity, and thinking. To perform these actions the mind is divided into the heart (manah), intelligence (buddhi), false-ego (ahaṅkāra), and thinking (citta). In this way there are eleven senses.

Adhikaraṇa 3 **The Senses Are Atomic in Size**

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Next the author of the sūtras considers the question of the nature and size of the senses.

Samśaya (doubt): Are the senses all-pervading or are they atomic?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The senses must be all-pervading, for things can be seen or heard from far away.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives his conclusion.

Sūtra 7

aṇavaś ca

aṇavaḥ—atoms; ca—and.

They are also atoms.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" (also) is used here to indicate certainty. The eleven senses are atomic in size. This is so because the Śruti-śāstra declares that the senses leave the

material body. Things can be heard from far away and in other ways be perceived from far away because the quality, or power, of the senses extend beyond the senses themselves. As the individual spirit soul is all-pervading within the material body, from the head to the feet, so the senses can also act at a distance. In this way the theory of saṅkhya philosophers, that the senses are all-pervading, is refuted.

Adhikaraṇa 4 The Principal Prāṇa (the Life-Force) Has an Origin

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.1.3) it is said:

etasmā jāyate prāṇaḥ

"From Him the prāṇa (life-force) is born."

Here the word "prāṇa" means "the principal prāṇa".

Samśaya (doubt): Is the principal prāṇa (life-force) created in the same way the individual spirit soul is "created" or is this prāṇa created in the same way ether and the other elements are created?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The Śruti-śāstra declares:

naiṣa prāṇa udeti nāstam eti

"This prāṇa is never born and never dies."

The Smṛti-śāstra also declares:

yat-prāptir yat-parityāga
utpattir maraṇam tathā
tasyotpattir mṛtiś caiva
katham prāṇasya yujyate

"Birth and death come and go. How can birth and death affect the prāṇa?"

Therefore it is concluded that the principal prāṇa is "created" in the same way the individual spirit soul is "created".

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 8

śreṣṭhaś ca

śreṣṭhaś—the principal one; ca—also.

The principal one also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The principal prāṇa (life-force) is created in the same way ether and the other elements are created. This is confirmed in the words of the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.1.3):

jāyate prāṇaḥ

"The prāṇa was created."

In its pratijñā statement the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad declares:

sa idaṁ sarvaṁ asṛjata

"He created everything."

To avoid contradicting these words it must be accepted that the principal prāṇa was also created. For this reason the scriptural passages stating that the prāṇa was never created should be understood allegorically and not literally. One prāṇa is called the principal prāṇa because it maintains the material body. So its meaning can be carried into the next sūtra, this sūtra is given separately and not joined to the previous sūtra.

Adhikaraṇa 5 The Principal Prāṇa (Life-Force) Is Not Air

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the nature of the principal prāṇa (life-force) will be examined.

Samśaya (doubt): is the principal prāṇa air alone, the vibration of air, the activities of air, or a condition of air when it goes to another place? Which is it?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): It is the external element of air. This is confirmed in the following statement of Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.1.5):

yo 'yaṁ prāṇaḥ sa vāyuḥ

"The prāṇa is air."

Or, perhaps the principal prāṇa is the activities of air, the inhalation and exhalation of breath. In this way it is proved that the principal prāṇa is air.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 9

na vāyu-kriye pṛthag upadeśāt

na—not; vāyu—air; kriye—action; pṛthag—different; upadeśāt—because of the teaching.

It is neither air nor the activities of air, because the teaching is that it is different.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The principal prāṇa (life-force) is neither air nor the movements of air. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "Because the teaching is that it is different". The previously quoted passage of the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.1.3) said that both air and prāṇa are born from the Supreme. In this way it should be understood that air and prāṇa are different, for they are mentioned separately. If air and prāṇa were identical, then there would be no need to mention them separately in this passage. If prāṇa were the movement of air then there would also be no need to mention them both in this way. It is seen that the movements of fire and the other elements are not separately mentioned in this passage. The statement of the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad, that "Prāṇa is air" means that prāṇa is a specific kind of air, and that prāṇa is not a separate element, like fire and the other elements. That is the meaning here.

In the Kapila-sūtra (2.31) it is said:

sāmānya-karaṇa-vṛttiḥ prāṇādyā vāyavaḥ pañca

"The five airs, beginning with prāṇa, perform that actions of the senses in general."

Thus the saṅkhya philosophers claim that prāṇa performs the actions of all the senses. This cannot be, for it is not possible for the single prāṇa to perform all the actions of all the senses.

Adhikaraṇa 6

The Principal Prāṇa (Life-Force) Is An Instrument Used By the Soul

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad it is said:

supteṣu vāg-ādiṣu prāṇa eko jāgarti. prāṇa eko mṛtyunānāptaḥ. prāṇaḥ samvargo vāg-ādīn samvṛṅkte. prāṇa itarān prāṇān rakṣati māteva putrān.

"When speech and the other senses sleep, prāṇa alone remains awake. Prāṇa alone is untouched by death. Prāṇa controls speech and the other senses. As a mother protects her children, so one prāṇa protects the other prāṇas."

Samśaya (doubt): Is this principal prāṇa identical with the independent spirit soul residing in the material body or is this principal prāṇa an instrument that assists the spirit soul?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the Śruti-śāstra describes this prāṇa as having many powers and glories, therefore this principal prāṇa is the independent spirit soul.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 10

caḅṣur-ādi-vat tu tat saha śiṣṭhyādibhyaḥ

caḅṣuḥ—the eyes; ādi—beginning with; vat—like; tu—indeed; tat—that; saha—with; śiṣṭhyā—teaching; ādibhyaḥ—because of beginning with.

Indeed, it is like the eyes and other senses, because it is taught along with the senses.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here the word "tu" (indeed) is used to dispel doubt. The prāṇa (life-force) is an instrument used by the individual spirit soul. It is like the eyes or the other senses. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "Because it is taught along with the senses." The prāṇa is described along with the eyes and senses. Things of a like nature are generally described together. as example of that is the Bṛhadratha meters, which are described together. This is also confirmed by the use of the word "ādi" (beginning with) in the sūtra.

That the prāṇa is here grouped with the senses is seen in the following passage:

yatra vāyam mukhyaḥ prāṇaḥ sa evāyam madhyamaḥ prāṇaḥ

"There is a principle prāṇa and there is a secondary prāṇa."

In this way the idea that the prāṇa is the independent spirit soul is refuted.

Adhikaraṇa 7

The Principal Prāṇa (Life-Force) is the Primary Instrument of the Soul

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: Is it not so that if it is to be counted among the senses, the principal prāṇa must have a function to perform where it assists the soul? The principal prāṇa has no such function. Also, if the principal prāṇa is one of the senses, then the senses, beginning with the eyes, would be twelve in number.

In the following words the author of the sūtras answers this objection.

Sūtra 11

akaraṇatvāc ca na doṣas tathā hi darśayati

akaraṇatvāt—because of not having a specific function; ca—and; na—no; doṣaḥ—fault; tathā—so; hi—indeed; darśayati—shows.

Also, there is no fault in not having a function, for the scriptures show it.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" (also) is used to answer the previous objection. The word "karaṇa" here means "activity". It is not a defect on the part of the prāṇa that is has no specific function to assist the soul, for it does have an important function in that it is the support and the resting place of the physical senses. That is the meaning here. In the following passage, the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (5.1.1) shows this:

atha ha prāṇā aham śreyasi vyūdire. . . .

"The senses argued among themselves. Each one said: 'I am the best.' They then approached their father, Lord Brahmā, and asked him, 'O lord, who among us is the best?' Brahmā replied, 'He whose departure causes the greatest calamity for the body is the best.'

"Then the voice departed from the body and stayed away for an entire year. When he returned, he asked: 'How is it that you were able to live without me?' Although it could not speak, still the body could breathe with the prāṇa, see with the eyes, hear with the ears, and think with the mind. Then the voice again entered the body.

"Then the eyes departed from the body and stayed away for an entire year. When they returned, they asked: 'How is it that you were able to live without me?' Although it could not see, the body could breathe with the prāṇa, speak with the voice, hear with the ears, and think with the mind. Then the voice again entered the body.

"Then the ears departed from the body and stayed away for an entire year. When they returned, they asked: 'How is it that you were able to live without us?' Although it could not hear, still the body could breathe with the prāṇa, see with the eyes, speak with the voice, and think with the mind. Then the ears again entered the body.

"Then the mind departed from the body and stayed away for an entire year. When he returned, he asked: 'How is it that you were able to live without me?' Although it could not think, still the body could breathe with the prāṇa, see with the eyes, speak with the voice, and hear with the ears. Then the mind again entered the body.

"When the prāṇa was about to depart it began to uproot all the senses. It became like a spirited horse uprooting the posts to which it is tethered. Then the other senses appealed to the prāṇa, "Please do not go. Please stay with us. You are the best of all of us."

In this way it is seen that the principal prāṇa has an important function to perform in relation to the spirit soul. The soul is the enjoyer and the performer of actions. The soul is like a king, the senses his royal attendants, and the principal prāṇa his prime minister, who helps attain the king's objectives. In this way the prāṇa is the most important of the soul's instruments. However, the prāṇa is still not independent of the soul itself.

Adhikaraṇa 8

The Principal Prāṇa Has Five Functions

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.5.3) it is said:

sa eṣa vāyuḥ pañca-vidhaḥ prāṇo 'pāno vyāna udānaḥ samānaḥ

"The prāṇa is air. There are five prāṇas: prāṇa, apāna, vyāna, udāna, and samāna."

Samśaya (doubt): Are these five, beginning with apāna, different from prāṇa, or are they merely different functions of prāṇa?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because they have different names and functions, therefore they are different.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives his conclusion.

Sūtra 12

pañca-vṛttir mano-vad vyapadiśyate

pañca—five; vṛttiḥ—functions; manaḥ—the mind; vat—like; vyapadiśyate—is said.

Like the mind, it is said to have five functions.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The prāṇa is one, although it assumes five different functions when present in the different places, such as the heart, of the body. In this way the prāṇa is described. In this way these are different functions of prāṇa and not different prāṇas themselves. Because these functions are different, therefore different names are employed. Still, there is no difference in their natures. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.5.3) it is said:

prāṇo 'pāno vyāna udānaḥ samāna iti. etat sarvaṁ prāṇa eva.

"There are five prāṇas: prāṇa, apāna, vyāna, udāna, and samāna. These five are all one prāṇa."

In this way prāṇa is like the mind. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.5.3) it is said:

kāmaḥ saṅkalpo vikalpo vicikitsā śraddhā dhṛtir adhṛtir hrīr dhīr bhīr ity etat sarvaṁ mana eva.

"The mind's functions are: desire, determination, doubt, error, faith, steadfastness, unsteadiness, shame, intelligence, and fear. All these are mind."

All these have different functions and different names, but they are not different from mind itself. They are the various functions of the mind. In the yoga-śāstra, also, it is said that the mind has five functions. This is the meaning of the scriptures, either hinted at or explicitly shown in the texts.

Adhikaraṇa 9 **The Principal Prāṇa Is Atomic**

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Samśaya (doubt) Is the principal Prāṇa atomic or all-pervading?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.3.22) it is said:

sama ebhis tribhir lokaiḥ

"Prāṇa is equal to the three worlds."

This and other passages of Śruti-śāstra declare that prāṇa is all-pervading.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives his conclusion.

Sūtra 13

aṇuś ca

aṇuḥ—atomic; ca—also.

It is also atomic.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The principal prāṇa is also atomic in size. This is so because the Śruti-śāstras declare that the principal prāṇa leaves (the material body at the time of death). Scriptural passages describing the principal prāṇas as atomic should be understood to mean that living entities everywhere are dependent on the principal prāṇa.

Adhikaraṇa 10

The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the Moving Force Behind the Prāṇa

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad it is said:

supteṣu vāg-ādiṣu prāṇa eko jāgarti.

"When speech and the other senses sleep, prāṇa alone remains awake. Prāṇa alone is untouched by death. Prāṇa controls speech and the other senses. As a mother protects her children, so one prāṇa protects the other prāṇas."

In this way the function of the principal prāṇa is described.

The functions of the secondary prāṇas are described in the following passage:

sapteme lokā yeṣu sañcaranti

"The pāṇas move in seven realms."

Thus the secondary prāṇas move among the senses.

Samśaya (doubt): Do the secondary prāṇas move by their own power among the senses, or does something else create the movement of the prāṇas? Are the prāṇas moved by the demigods, the individual spirit soul, or the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Endowed with the power of action, the prāṇas move themselves. Or perhaps the demigods move them. In the Aitareya Upaniṣad (2.4) it is said:

agnir vāg bhūtvā mukhaṁ prāviṣad

"Becoming speech, Agnideva entered the mouth."

Or perhaps the individual spirit soul moves the prāṇas. This may be so because the prāṇas are instruments the soul uses to attain enjoyment.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 14

jyotir-ādy-adhiṣṭhānaṁ tu tad āmananāt

jyotiḥ—effulgence; ādy-adhiṣṭhānam—the supreme ruler; tu—indeed; tat—that; āmananāt—because of the description.

Indeed, light is the controller, because that is the description.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (indeed" is used here to dispel doubt. The word "jyotiḥ" (light) here means "the Supreme Personality of Godhead". He is the mover (adhiṣṭhānam) of the prāṇas. The affix lyuṭ in the word "adhiṣṭhānam" makes it mean "the mover". Why is the Supreme Personality of Godhead the mover of the prāṇas? The

sūtra explains: "Because that is the description". This means "Because it is understood that the Supreme Personality of Godhead, as the all-pervading Supersoul, moves the prāṇas and senses. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.7.16) it is said:

yah prāṇeṣu tiṣṭhan

"The Supersoul stays in the midst of the prāṇas and moves them."

That the demigods and the individual spirit soul may also move the prāṇas is not disputed here, but the prāṇas cannot move themselves, for they are only inert matter.

Hoping to enjoy, the individual spirit soul also moves the prāṇas. That is described in the next sūtra.

Sūtra 15

prāṇavatā śabdāt

prāṇavatā—by the person who possesses the prāṇas; śabdāt—because of the Śruti-śāstra.

By the person who possesses the prāṇas, because of the Śruti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "prāṇavatā" (the person who possesses the prāṇas) refers here to the individual spirit soul. Hoping to enjoy, the spirit soul moves the prāṇas and senses. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "śabdāt" (because of the Śruti-śāstra). In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (2.1.18) it is said:

sa yathā mahā-rājo jānapadān grhītvā sve janapade yathā-kāmaṁ parivartate evam evaiṣa etat prāṇān grhītvā sve śarīre yathā-kāmaṁ parivartate.

"As a great king rules the subjects in his kingdom, so the individual spirit soul rules the prāṇas in his body."

This is the gist of the matter: The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the supreme ruler of the prāṇas and the demigods and the individual spirit soul also rule the senses. The former (the demigods) rule the prāṇas and senses by enabling them to act, and the latter (the individual spirit souls) rule the prāṇas and senses with the hope of attaining enjoyment. By exerting their wills, the individual souls thus move the prāṇas.

There is no alternative to this description. This the author of the sūtras explains in the following words.

Sūtra 16

tasya ca nityatvāt

tasya—of this; ca—and; nityatvāt—because of eternity.

Because this is eternal.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because He has an eternal relationship with them, the all-powerful Supersoul is the actual controller and mover of them. He should be considered the primary mover and controller. This is confirmed in the words of the Antaryāmi-brāhmaṇa (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3.7).

Adhikaraṇa 11

The Principal Prāṇa Is Not a Sense

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this subject another doubt is raised.

Samśaya (doubt): Are the principal prāṇa and the other prāṇas also senses?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because they assist the individual spirit

soul, all the prāṇas are considered to be senses.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 17

ta indriyāṇi tad vyapadeśād anyatra śreṣṭhāt

te—they; indriyāṇi—senses; tat—that; vyapadeśāt—because of the description; anyatra—otherwise; śreṣṭhāt—from the best.

They are senses, for that is the description. Only the principal one is not.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

With the sole exception of the principal prāṇa, the prāṇas are all senses. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "For that is the description." In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.1.3) it is said:

etasmāj jāyate prāṇaḥ
manaḥ sarvendriyāṇi ca

"From the Supreme Personality of Godhead are born the principal prāṇa, the mind, and the senses."

In this way, with the sole exception of the principal prāṇa, the prāṇas are the senses, such as the ears and the others. In the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

indriyāṇi daśaikam ca

"There are eleven senses."

In another place in the Śruti-śāstra it is said:

prāṇo mukhya sa tv anindiriyam

"The principal prāṇa is not a sense."
Here someone may object: Is it not so that in the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.5.21) it is said:

hantasyaiva sarve rūpam asāmetyetasyaiva sarve rūpam abhavat.

"The senses then assumed the form of the principal prāṇa. They all assumed his form."

Because the secondary prāṇas are senses and because the secondary prāṇas are merely functions of the principal prāṇa, therefore the principal prāṇa is also a sense. How can you claim, then, that the principal prāṇa is not a sense?

To the this objection the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 18

bheda-śruteḥ

bheda—difference; śruteḥ—from Śruti-śāstra.

Because the Śruti-śāstra says it is different.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.1.3) it is said:

prāṇo manaḥ sarvendriyāṇi

"From the Supreme Personality of Godhead are born the principal prāṇa, the mind, and all the senses."

In this way, because it is mentioned apart from the senses in this passage, the principal prāṇa is clearly different from the senses. That is the meaning here.

Here someone may doubt: The mind is also mentioned apart from the senses in this passage. It must be that the mind is not a sense.

This doubt is answered by the following words of Bhagavad-gītā (15.7):

manaḥ ṣaṣṭhīndiyāni

"The mind is one of the six senses."

Lord Kṛṣṇa also declares (Bhagavad-gītā 10.22):

indriyāṇāṃ manaś cāsmi

"Of the senses I am the mind."

Sūtra 19

vailakṣaṇyāc ca

vailakṣaṇyāt—because of different qualities; ca—also.

Also because of different qualities.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

During sleep the principal prāṇa is active, but the ears and other senses are not. The principal prāṇa supports the body and senses, but the senses are only instruments for perception and work. In these ways the principal prāṇa and the senses have different qualities. Thus it is said that as the individual spirit souls are dependent on the Supreme Personality of Godhead, so the senses are dependent on the principal prāṇa.

Adhikaraṇa 12

The Forms of the Material World Are Created by the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The scriptures declare that the material elements, the senses, everything else in the material world, and the individual spirit souls also, are all manifested from the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Now we will consider the question: Who created the individual forms (vyāṣṭi) of this world?

After describing the creation of fire, water, and earth, the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.3.2-4) explains:

seyam devataikṣata hantāham imās tisro devatā anena jīvenātmanānupraviśya
nāma-rūpe vyākaravāṇi tāsām tri-vṛtam ekaikaṁ karavāṇīti. seyam devatemās tisro
devatā anena jīvenātmanānupraviśya nāma-rūpe vyākarot tāsām tri-vṛtam tri-vṛtam
ekaikām akarot.

"After creating the splendid elements of fire, water, and earth, the Supreme Personality of Godhead thought, 'Now I shall enter these three splendid elements with the individual souls and thus I shall create names and forms. One by one, I shall make them three.' Then the Supreme Personality of Godhead entered those three splendid elements with the individual souls, created names and forms, and, one by one, made the splendid elements into three."

Samśaya (doubt): Is this creation of names and forms the work of the Supreme Personality of Godhead or an individual spirit soul?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): It is the work of an individual spirit soul. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad the Lord says, "With an individual soul I shall create." The instrumental case here is not used in the sense of "with". When the meaning of an agent is possible in this case it is not reasonable to accept a meaning that carries the sense of a preposition. Neither is the meaning of "an instrument" possible here, for the Supreme Personality of Godhead can do anything simply by His will and therefore He has no need to employ an individual spirit soul to do anything. Neither can it be said that in this situation the entrance into the creation is done by an individual spirit soul and the creation of names and forms is done by the Supreme Personality of Godhead, for the use of the indeclineable past participle here indicates that the entrance and the act of creation were both performed by the same agent. Neither is the use of the first-person in the verb "vyākaravāṇi" (I shall create) inappropriate here, for it is like saying, "With a spy I will enter the enemy army and see it." Neither is all this merely my own idea, for the Śruti-śāstra declares:

viriñco vā idaṁ virecayati vidadhāti brahmā vāva viriñca etasmād dhīme rūpa-
nāmanī

"the demigod Brahmā is called viriñca because he organizes (virec) the material universe. From him have come the names and forms of the material universe."

The Smṛti-śāstra also declares:

nāma-rūpe ca bhūtānām

"The demigod Brahmā created the names and forms of the creatures in the universe."

Therefore the creation of names and forms was done by an individual spirit soul.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 20

saṁjñā-mūrti-klptiḥ ca tri-vṛt kurvata upadeśāt

saṁjñā—names; mūrti—forms; klptiḥ—creation; ca—and; tu—but; tri-vṛt—in three parts; kurvate—does; upadeśāt—from the teaching.

But the creation of names and forms in groups of three is done by the creator, for that is the teaching.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to begin the refutation of the opponent's argument. Here the word "saṁjñā-mūrti" means "names and forms" and the word "klptiḥ" means "creation". The words "tri-vṛt kurvataḥ" (done by the creator) indicate that this creation was done by the Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself and not by an individual spirit soul. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "upadeśāt" (because that is the teaching). Thus the scriptures affirm that this creation was done by the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Thus the creation of threes and the creation of names and forms were both done by the same creator. That is the meaning.

The creation of threes was effected in the following way:

trīṇy ekaikam dvidhā kuryāt
try-ardhāni vibhajed dvidhā
tat-tan-mukhyārdham utsṛjya

yojayec ca tri-rūpatā

"The creator divides in half each of the three elements. Three of these halves He then divides in half again. Then He joins the smaller halves to the larger halves. In this way the compound elements, made of three parts, are created."

This is like the process called pañcī-karaṇa. It cannot be said that this creation of threefold compound elements is within the power of the demigod Brahmā. That is so because Brahmā was born after the universal egg had been created from these threefold compound elements made of fire, water, and earth. This is corroborated by Manu-saṁhitā (1.9):

tasminn aṅḍe 'bhavad brahmā
sarva-loka-pitāmahaḥ

"Brahmā, the grandfather of all the worlds, was born in the egg of the universe.

Therefore the creation of names and forms and the creation of threefold compound elements were both done by the same creator. It should not be thought, because of the sequence apparently described in the text, that the creation of names and forms preceded the creation of threefold compound elements. The creation of threefold compound elements came first, and only after that creation the creation of name and forms was effected. The universal egg cannot be created by the elements of fire, water and earth before those elements are compounded in the three ways. That this is not possible is described in the following words of Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (2.5.32-33):

yadaite 'saṅgatā bhāvā
bhūtendriya-mano-guṇāḥ
yadāyatana-nirmāṇe
ne śekur brahma-vittama

"O Nārada, best of the transcendentalists, the forms of the body cannot take place as long as these created parts, namely the elements, senses, mind, and modes of nature, are not assembled.*

tadā saṁhatya canyonyam
bhagavac-chakti-coditāḥ
sad-sattvam upādāya
cobhayam sasṛjur hy adaḥ

"Thus when all these became assembled by the force of the energy of the

Supreme Personality of Godhead, this universe certainly came into being by accepting both the primary and secondary causes of creation."*

The process of pañcī-karaṇa is also described here. In this way the creation should be understood. In the process of pañcī-karaṇa each of the five elements is divided in half, half of the halves are again divided in half, and the smaller halves are then joined with the larger in compound elements.

In Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.5.1) it is said:

annam aśitaṁ tridhā vidhiyate

"When food is eaten it is transformed in three ways."

This transformation is completely different from the threefold combination of earth and the other elements previously described. Therefore this passage cannot be used to support the theory that the individual spirit soul is the creator of the names and forms of this world. The scriptural passage uses the phrase "ātmanā jīvena". By thus placing these two words in apposition, it is clear that the word "jīva" (individual soul) here means "by the Supreme Personality of Godhead, whose potency is the individual spirit souls". In a similar way the passage beginning with the words "virñco vā" is also explained.

Understood in this way the indeclineable past participle "praviśya" and the third-person verb following it can be understood in their primary meanings without any difficulty. In this way it is easily seen that the two actions described by the words "praviśya" and "vyākaravāṇi" are certainly performed by the same agent. Therefore it is certainly the Supreme Personality of Godhead who performed the act of creation described in the verb "vyākaravāṇi". This is corroborated by the following words of Taittirīya Araṇyaka (3.12.16):

sarvāṇi rūpāṇi vicitya dhīro
nāmāni kṛtvābhivadan yad āste

"The all-knowing Supreme Personality of Godhead created all forms and names."

Adhikaraṇa 13

The Vehicles of the Soul Are Made of Earth

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the nature of the material body, which is called by the name "mūrti" will be examined. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka (3.2.13) it is said that the material body is made of earth:

śarīram pṛthivīm apy eti

"The material body becomes earth."

However, in the Kauṇḍinya-śruti it is said that the material body is made of water:

adbhyo hīdam utpadyate āpo vāva māmsam asthi ca bhavanty āpaḥ śarīram āpa evedam sarvam.

"From water the material body is created. Water becomes transformed into flesh and bones. The entire body is water."

Another text of the Śruti-śāstra claims that the material body is made of fire:

saḥ agner deva-yonyāḥ

"The demigods' bodies are made of fire."

Samśaya (doubt): What is the truth here?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): One text says the material body is made of earth, another says it is made of water, and another that it is made of fire. Because the scriptures give these three differing explanations, the truth cannot be ascertained.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras give His conclusion.

māmsādi bhaumam yathā-śabdā itarayō ca

māmsa—flesh; ādi—beginning with; bhaumam—earth; yathā—as; śabdā—the Śruti-śāstra; itarayoh—of the other two; ca—also.

As the Śruti-śāstra says, the flesh and other ingredients are made of earth. It also so for the other two.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Flesh and other ingredients are made of earth. However, blood is made of water, and bones are made of fire. This is described in the Śruti-śāstra (yathā-śabdā). In the Garbha Upaniṣad it is said:

yat kaṭhiṇam sā pṛthivī yad dravam tad āpo yad uṣṇam tat tejaḥ

"What is hard in the body is made of earth, what is liquid is made of water, and what is hot is made of fire."

In this way it is proved that all material bodies are made of these three elements.

Here someone may object: If the material elements are all compounded of three elements, none of the elements pure, but all of them mixtures of elements, then why do the scriptures say, "This part of the body is made of fire, this part is made of water, and this part is made of earth."?

To this objection the author of the sūtras gives the following reply:

Sūtra 22

vaiśeṣāt tu tad-vādas tad-vādaḥ

vaiśeṣāt—because of the specific nature; tu—but; tat—of that; vādaḥ—statement; tat—of that; vādaḥ—statement.

Because of its specific nature, thus it is so said. Thus it is so said.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used to dispel doubt. Everywhere in the material world the elements are arranged in threefold compounds with one element predominating. The elements are therefore named according to the predominating element. The word "tad-vādaḥ" is repeated to indicate the end of the chapter.

Epilogue

vardhasva kalpāga samaṁ samantāt
kuruṣva tāpa-kṣatim āśritānām
tvad-aṅga-saṅkīrṇi-karāḥ parās tā
himsrā lasad-yukti-kuṭhārikābhiḥ

O tree that fulfills all desires, please extend yourself in all directions. To they who take shelter of you please give the shade that stops all troubles. The glistening axes of logic have now cut away the underbrush that choked you.

Chapter 3

Pada 1

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

na vinā sādhanair devo
jñāna-vairāgya-bhaktibhiḥ
dadāti sva-padaṁ śrīmān
atas tāni budhaḥ śrayet

The glorious Supreme Personality of Godhead does not give residence in His abode to they who do not follow the path of devotion, knowledge, and renunciation. Therefore the wise should take shelter of that path.

In the previous two chapters was explained the truth that the entire Vedānta philosophy describes the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is the only creator of the material world, completely faultless, a jewel mine of transcendental virtues,

eternal, full of knowledge and bliss, the supreme person, and meditated on by they who seek liberation. In those chapters all opposing views were refuted, and the real nature of the Supreme was described.

In this third chapter will be described the spiritual practices that should be followed in order to attain the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The most important of these are thirst to attain the Supreme Lord and a disinterest in what has no relation to the Lord. That is explained in the first two padas.

In the first pada, in order to show that one should renounce the world, the various defects of material existence are explained. In this connection the description of the soul's travels from one kind of material body to another kind of material body are quoted from the Pañcāgni-vidyā chapter of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad. In the second pada, in order to show that one should love the Supreme Lord, the Lord's many glories and virtues will be described. In the Pañcāgni-vidyā portion of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (Adhyāya 5, khaṇḍas 3-10) are described the individual souls departure for another world and return to this world.

Samśaya (doubt): When the individual soul goes to the next world does he take his subtle body with him or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The soul does not take the subtle body with him.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 1

tad-antara-pratipattau ramhati sampariṣvaktāḥ praśna-nirūpaṇābhyām

tat - of that; antara - of another; pratipattau - in the attainment; ramhati - goes; sampariṣvaktāḥ - embraced; praśna - from the questions; nirūpaṇābhyām - and answers.

In going to another it is embraced. This is so from the questions and answers.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here the word "tad" means "the body". That meaning is taken from the word "mūrti" in sūtra 2.4.20. When it leaves one gross material body and enters another, the soul takes the subtle body with it. How is that known? It is known from the questions beginning in Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5.3.3 and answers beginning in 5.4.1. Here is the gist of that passage.

A king named Pravāhaṇa, who was the ruler of Pañcāla-deśa, asked five

questions of a brāhmaṇa boy named Śvetaketu who had come to his court. These questions concerned: 1. the destination of they who perform pious deeds, 2. the way these persons return to the earth, 3. they who do not attain that world, 4. how the path to the devas and the path to the pitās are different paths, and 5. the question expressed in these words (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5.3.3):

vettha yathā pañcamyām āhutāv āpaḥ puruṣa-vacaso bhavanti

"Do you know why the fifth libation is called puruṣa?"

Unhappy because he did not know the answer to these questions, the boy approached his father, Gautama Muni, and expressed his sorrow. The father also did not know the answers and, wishing to learn them, approached Pravāhaṇa. Pravāhaṇa wished to give wealth to his guest, but Gautama begged from him the alms of the answers to the five questions.

Answering the last question first, Pravāhaṇa described (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5.4.1) the five fires: 1. heaven, 2. rain, 3. earth, 4. man, and 5. woman. Then he described the five libations for these fires: 1. śrāddha, 2. soma, 3. rain, 4. food, and 5. seed. The priests offering all these libations are the devas. The homa (yajña) here is the devas' throwing of the spirit soul, which is enveloped in its subtle body, up to the celestial worlds (dyuloka) so it may enjoy celestial pleasures.

The devas here are the senses of the soul who has passed through death. These devas offer śrāddha in the fire of the celestial world. That śrāddha becomes a celestial body named somarāja, a body suitable for enjoying celestial pleasures.

When the time of enjoyment is over the devas offer a yajña where this body is placed in the fire of parjanya and transformed into rain. The devas then offer a yajña where that rain is placed in the fire of earth and transformed into grains. The devas then offer a yajña where those grains are placed in the fire of a man's food and transformed into semen. The devas then offer a yajña where that semen is placed in the fire of a woman's womb and transformed into an unborn child. In that way the question was answered with the words (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5.9.1):

iti tu pañcamyām āhutāv āpaḥ puruṣa-vacaso bhavanti.

"Thus the fifth libation is called puruṣa."

In this sequence it is seen that in the fifth libation semen is offered in the fire of a woman's womb and the result is a material body, which is thus called puruṣa. That is the meaning. In this description it is thus seen that, accompanied by the subtle material body, the soul leaves one gross material body, goes to the celestial world, falls from there, and, still accompanied by the same subtle material body, again enters a woman's womb.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that the word āpaḥ" (water) is used here with the word "puruṣa". How, then, can it be that the soul is accompanied by all

the elements of the subtle material body.

In the following words the author of the sūtras answers this objection.

Sūtra 2

tri-ātmakatvāt tu bhūyastvāt

tri-ātmakatvāt - because of being threefold; tu - but; bhūyastvāt - because of being prominent.

But because of being threefold and because of being prominent.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to dispel doubt. The other elements go because the water here is threefold, a compound of three elements. Because the semen, which is the seed of the material body, is primarily water, therefore it is proper to call it water. In the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

tāpāpanodo bhūyastvam ambhaso vṛttayas tv imāḥ

"Because it has the power to remove heat, water is said to predominate."

In this way the water is prominent.

Sūtra 3

prāṇa-gateś ca

prāṇa - of the pranas; gateḥ - of the departure; ca - and.

Also because of the prāṇas' departure.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

When the soul enters another material body the prāṇas also come. This is described in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.2):

tam utkrāmantam prāṇo 'nūtkrāmati prāṇam anūtkrāmantam sarve prāṇā anūtkrānti.

"When the soul departs, the principal prāṇa follows. When the principal prāṇa

departs, the other prāṇas follow."

The prāṇas cannot exist without taking shelter of a maintainer. They take shelter of the elements of the subtle material body. Therefore it must be accepted that the subtle material body accompanies the soul. That is the meaning.

Sūtra 4

agny-ādi-gati-śruter iti cen na bhāktatvāt

agni - fire; ādi - beginning; gati - going; śruteḥ - from the Śruti-śāstra; iti - thus; cet - if; na - not; bhāktatvāt - because of being a metaphor.

If it is said that the Śruti-śāstras describe the departure of fire and other elements, then I reply: It is not so, because it is a metaphor only.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: Is it not so that in the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad it is said:

yasyāśya puruṣasya mṛtasyāgnim vāg apy eti vātāṁ prāṇāś cakṣur ādityāṁ manaś
candraṁ diśaḥ
śrotraṁ pṛthivīm śarīraṁ ākāśam ātmauśadhīr lomāni vanaspatīṅ keśā apsu
lohitāṁ ca retāś ca
nidhīyate.

"When a person dies his speaking power enters the fire, his breath enters the wind, his eyes enter the sun, his mind enters the moon, his ears enter the directions, his body enters the earth, his soul enters the ether, the hairs of his body enter the plants and herbs, the hairs of his head enter the trees, and his blood and semen enter the waters."

Therefore the speech and other faculties enter the fire and other objects. They cannot possibly accompany the departing soul. That is the verdict of the Śruti-śāstra.

If this is said, then I reply: No. It is not so. Why not? The sūtra explains: "bhāktatvāt" (because it is a metaphor only). It is not directly seen that "the hairs of the body enter the plants and herbs, and the hairs of the head enter the trees," as this passage declares. Therefore this passage's description of the entrance into fire and other elements is a metaphor only. Because all these are placed together in a single passage it is not possible to say one part is metaphor and another part is not metaphor. It is not seen that the bodily hairs jump from the body and enter the plants and herbs. Therefore at the time of death the voice and other faculties temporarily cease being useful to the soul, but they do not leave. They accompany

the soul. That is the conclusion of the Śruti-śāstra.

Sūtra 5

prathame 'śravaṇād iti cen na tā eva hy upapatteḥ

prathame - in the first; aśravaṇāt - because of not being described in the Śruti-śāstra; iti - thus; cet - if; na - not; tāḥ - they; eva - indeed; hy - indeed; upapatteḥ - because of being appropriate.

If it is said that in the beginning there is no description, then I reply. It is indeed that, because that is appropriate.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: If the five libations were all water, then it would be possible to say that in the fifth libation the soul departs accompanied by water. However, this is not so. It is not said that in the first libation water is offered into fire. There it is said that "śraddhā" is offered. It says:

tasminn agnau devāḥ śraddhām juhvati

"The devas offer a yajña, placing śraddhā in the fire."

The word "śraddhā" refers to a particular state of mind. It never means "water". The word "soma" and other words may be interpreted to mean "water", but is it not possible to interpret the word "śraddhā" to mean "water". Therefore the departing soul is not accompanied by water.

If this is said, then I reply: No. It is not so. The śraddhā offered into fire in the beginning here is indeed water. Why is that? The sutra explains: "upapatteḥ" (because it is appropriate). It is appropriate in the context of this question and answer. The question here is: "Do you know why the water in the fifth libation is called puruṣa?" From this it is seen that all the offerings into the fire here are water. Then, in the beginning of the reply it is said: Śraddhā is offered into the fire". If the word śraddhā here does not mean "water", then the answer does not properly reply to the question. That is the meaning. Water is offered in these five libations. Because water is clearly offered in the last four, it is appropriate that it also be offered in the first. It is seen that the offerings of soma, rain, and the others, are clearly all caused by śraddhā. Because the cause must be like the effect, therefore, the offering of śraddhā must also be water. Therefore the word śraddhā here means "water". The Śruti-śāstra (Taittirīya-saṁhitā 1.6.8.1) explains:

śraddhā vā āpaḥ

"The word śraddhā means water."

Therefore the word "śraddhā" here does not refer to a condition of the mind. The meaning of a condition of the mind is not appropriate in this context of offering yajñas. In this way it is shown that the departing soul is certainly accompanied by water.

Here someone may object: In this part of the Śruti-śāstra it said that the water departs, but it is not said that the soul departs. The soul is not mentioned in this passage.

To remove this doubt the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 6

aśrutatvād iti cen na iṣṭādi-kāriṇām pratīteḥ

aśrutatvāt - because of not being described in the Śruti-śāstra; iti - thus; cet - if; na - not; iṣṭādikāriṇām - by they who perform pious deeds; pratīteḥ - because of the understanding.

If it is said that this is not proved in the Śruti-śāstra, then I reply: No, because this is understood to be about they who perform pious deeds.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "aśrutatva" here means "unproved". The passage in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad describes the travel to the moon of they who perform pious deeds. The passage states (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5.10.3-4):

atha ya ime grāme iṣṭāpūrte dattam ity upāsate te dhūmam abhisamviśanti. . .
ākāśac candramasam eṣa somo rājā.

"They who perform pious deeds in their village enter the smoke, . . . and then they go from the sky to the moon planet, where they become the king of soma."

In this way they who perform pious deeds go to the moon and become known as Somarāja (the king of soma).

About the fire and Devaloka it is said (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5.4.2):

devaḥ śraddhām juhvati. tasyāḥ āhuteḥ somo rājā sambhavati.

"The devas offer śraddhā in sacrifice. From that offering he becomes a king of soma."

In this way śraddhā-śarīra (a body made of śraddhā) and somarāja (the king of soma) both refer to the same thing. They both mean "body" and in this context the word "body" means the individual spirit soul, because the soul takes shelter of a body. In this way it is understood that the departing soul is accompanied by water.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (5.10.4) it is said:

eṣa somo rājā devānām annam taṁ devā bhakṣayanti

"That king of soma is the devas' food. The devas eat it."

Because the Śruti-śāstra thus says that this king of soma is eaten by the devas it is not possible that the phrase "king of soma" here refers to the individual spirit soul, for no one can eat the soul.

If this is said, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 7

bhāktam vānātma-vittvāt tathā hi darśayati

bhāktam - metaphor; vā - or; an - not; ātma - the soul; vit - knowing; tvāt - because of the condition; tathā - so; hi - indeed; darśayati - shows.

Or it is a metaphor, because of ignorance of the Supersoul. This the Śruti-śāstra shows.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "vā" (or) is used here to dispel doubt. The word "somarāja" here refers to the individual spirit soul. The description that it is the devas' food is only a metaphor. The soul is said to be the devas' food because the soul serves the devas and thus pleases them. That is the meaning. They do this because they are ignorant of the Supersoul. The Śruti-śāstra shows that they who are ignorant of the Supersoul become servants of the devas. In Brhad-aranyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.10) it is said:

atha yo 'nyām devatām upāste anyo 'sāv anyo 'ham asmīti na sa veda yathā paśur eva sa devānām.

"A person who thinks, 'I am different from the demigods' worships the demigods. He becomes like an animal in the demigods' service."

Here is the meaning of this. It is not possible that the devas eat the individual souls. the meaning here is that the souls please the demigods and in this way become like food for them. They please the demigods by serving them. It is said:

viśo 'nnaṁ rājñāṁ paśavo 'nnaṁ viśāṁ

"The vaiśyas are the kṣatriyas' food, and the cows are the vaiśyas' food."

In this passage it is clear that the word "food" is not used literally. It is used to mean "servant". If the word [food" were used in the literal sense, then the rules of the jyotistoma and other yajnas would all be meaningless. If the devas ate whomever went to Candraloka, why would the souls be so eager to perform yajnas and go there? In this way it is proved that the departing soul is accompanied by water.

Adhikaraṇa 2

The Soul's Return to the Earth

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viśaya (Statement of the Subject): Following Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5.10.3, which describes how the soul that has performed pious deeds travels by the smoke and other pathways, attains Svargaloka, stays there for some time, and then again returns to the earth, is this passage (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5.10.5):

yāvat sampātum uṣitvāthaitam evādhvānaṁ punar nivartate.

"After staying there for some time his karma is exhausted and he again returns."

Samśaya (doubt): When it leaves Svargaloka, does the soul bring its past karma or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The soul stays in Svargaloka for as long as he has the results of past karma. This is described in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.6):

prāpyāntam karmaṇas tasya

"He stays there until he reaches the end of his karma."

This shows that the soul only falls when his past karma is completely exhausted. The word "sampāta" (karma) is derived from the verb "sambat" (to

ascend), as in the words "sapatanty anena svargam" (the instrument by which the souls ascend to Svargaloka). The word "anuśaya" (which also means karma) is derived from the verb śiṣ" (to remain) and means "that which remains after one has enjoyed". It means "that which remains and pushes the soul to experience certain results." In Svargaloka one uses up all his past karma, and therefore no further karma remains.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives his conclusion.

Sūtra 8

kṛtātyaye 'nuśayavān dṛṣṭa-smṛtibhyām

kṛta - of what is done; atyaye - at the end; anuśaya - karma; vān - possessing; dṛṣṭa - from the Śruti-śāstra; smṛtibhyām - from the Smṛti-śāstra.

At the end there is still karma, because of the statements of Śruti and Smṛti śāstras.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

When the good karma of pious deeds performed to enjoy in Candraloka is exhausted, the enjoyment ends and the soul attains a new body to enter flames of suffering. In this way, when his good karma is exhausted, he falls down. How is that known? The sūtra explains: "dṛṣṭa-smṛtibhyām" (by the statements of Śruti and Smṛti śāstras). The Śruti-śāstra (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5.10.7) explains:

tad ayaṁ ramaṇīya-caraṇābhyāso ha yat te ramaṇīyām yonim āpadyeran
brāhmaṇa-yonim vā kṣatriya-yonim vaiśya-yonim vā. atha ya iha kapūya-
caraṇābhyāso ha yat te kapūyām yonim āpadyeran śva-yonim vā śūkara-yonim vā
cāṇḍāla-yonim vā.

"When one acts piously, he attains a good birth. He is born as a brāhmaṇa or a kṣatriya or a vaiśya. When one acts sinfully, he attains a sinful birth. He is born as a dog, a pig, or an outcaste."

Here the words "ramaniya-caraṇa" means "pious deeds". This refers to pious karma remaining after one has enjoyed pious karmas. The word "abhyāsa" means "repeated practice". This word is formed from the verb "as", the preposition "abhi" and the affix "kṛip". The meaning of the word "ha" (indeed) is obvious. The word "yat" means "when". In this passage there are when-then clauses.

In the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

iha punar-bhave te ubhaya-śeṣābhyām niviśanti.

"Accompanied by the remnants of their good and bad karma, they again enter the world of repeated birth."

In this way it is clear that the soul falling from Svargaloka still has past karma. This does not contradict the description in Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5.10.5 because that passage described only the exhaustion of the specific karmas that brought the soul to Svargaloka and not the exhaustion of other karmas.

Now the author of the sūtras describes the method of the soul's descent.

Sūtra 9

yathetaṁ anevaṁ ca

yathā - as; itam - departed; an - not; evam - thus;ca - and.

Also, not as he went.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The soul, who still has karma, does not descend from Candraloka in the same way he rose to Candraloka. The words yathā itam" mean "as he arrived". The word "an-evam" means "in a different way". The soul descends by the path of smoke and the path of ether. These paths were also traveled in the ascent. However, in the descent there is no mention of the night or other paths used in the ascent. Also, in the descent there is mention of the cloud and other paths not used in the ascent. Therefore the descent is not like (anevam) the ascent.

Sūtra 10

caraṇād iti cen na tad-upalakṣaṇārtheti kārṣṇājiniḥ

caraṇāt - by conduct; iti - thus; cet - if; na - not;tad-upalakṣaṇa-arthā - that meaning; iti - thus; kārṣṇājiniḥ - Kārṣṇājini.

If it is said to be by conduct, then Kārṣṇājini replies: No. Here it has the same meaning.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: It is not so that the soul fallen from Svargaloka attains a new birth according to his past karma. The passage quoted here from the

Śruti-śāstra uses the word ramaṇīya-caraṇa" (good conduct). The word "caraṇa" means "conduct". It has not the same meaning as anuśaya" (karma). The difference of the two words is seen in the following statement of Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad:

yathācārī yathākārī tathā bhavati

"As one performed caraṇa, and as one performed karma, so one attains an appropriate birth."

To this I reply: There is no fault here to interpret the word "caraṇa" as a synonym of karma. Kārṣṇājini Muni affirms that in this passage of Chāndogya Upaniṣad (5.10.7) the word "caraṇa" means karma. This is also true because the Śruti-śāstras affirm that karma is the origin of conduct. That is the meaning.

Sūtra 11

ānarthakyam iti cen na tad-apekṣatvāt

ānarthakyam - meaninglessness; iti - thus; cet - of; na - not; tad-apekṣatvāt - because of being in relation to that.

If it is said that it has no meaning, then I reply: No. Because it is in relation to that.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: If karma is indeed the source of all that is good, then good conduct is useless and the rules of good conduct are also useless.

If this is said, then the author of the sūtras replies: No. It is not so. Why not? The sūtra explains: "Because good karma itself is created by good conduct." One cannot attain good karma without performing good conduct. The Smṛti-śāstra explains:

sandhyā-hīno 'śucir nityam anarhaḥ sarva-karmasu

"A person who is impure and does not chant the Gāyatrī prayer is not qualified to perform any pious karmas."

Therefore, Kārṣṇājini Muni explains, because good conduct is the cause of good karma, the word "caraṇa" in this passage means "karma".

Sūtra 12

sukṛta-duṣkṛte eveti tu bādariḥ

sukṛta—pious deeds; duṣkṛte—impious deeds; eva—indeed; iti—thus; tu—but; bādariḥ—Bādari.

But Bādari Muni indeed thinks it means pious and impious deeds.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to begin a refutation of the previous argument. Bādari Muni thinks the word "caraṇa" here means "pious and impious deeds". An example of this is the sentence:

puṇyam karmācarati

"He performs pious deeds"

In this sentence the verb "carati" is used to mean "performs karmas". If a word's primary meaning is possible, then it is not appropriate to accept the secondary meaning. Therefore the word "caraṇa" here means "karma", and any other interpretation of it is meaningless. "Caraṇa" (good conduct) is merely a specific kind of karma. Caraṇa and karma are thus different in the same way the Kurus and Pāṇavas are different. The word "eva" (indeed) hints that this is also the opinion of the author of the sūtras. Therefore, since "caraṇa" is a specific kind of karma, it is proved that the soul departing from Svargaloka is accompanied by the remainder of its karma.

Adhikaraṇa 3

Do the Impious Also Go to Candraloka?

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Thus it has been said that a person who performs pious deeds goes to Candraloka and then again returns with the remainder of his karma. Now will be discussed whether sinners who perform no pious deeds also go and return in the same way. In Ísa Upaniṣad (3) it is said:

āsūryā nāma te lokā
andhena tamasāvrtāḥ
tāms te pretyābhigacchanti
ye ke cātma-hano janāḥ

"The killer of the soul, whoever he may be, must enter into the planets known as the worlds of the faithless, full of darkness and ignorance."*

Samśaya (doubt): Do the sinners go to Candraloka or Yamaloka?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The opponent gives his opinion in the following sūtra.

Sūtra 13

aniṣṭādi-kāriṇām api ca śrutam

an—not; iṣṭa—pious deeds; ādi—beginning with; kāriṇām—of the performers; api—also; ca—and; śrutam—in the Śruti-śāstra.

The Śruti-śāstra declares that it is also so for they who do not perform iṣṭa or other pious deeds.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Śruti-śāstra declares that they who perform iṣṭa and other pious deeds, as well as they who do not perform iṣṭa and other pious deeds, both go to Candraloka. This is explained in the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad (1.2):

ye vai ke casmāl lokāt prayānti candramasam eva te sarve gacchanti

"All who leave this world go to Candraloka."

Since with these words the Śruti-śāstra declares that all, without distinction, go to Candraloka, then sinners are also included in that all. This being so, the words of Iśa Upaniṣad are only an empty threat to frighten the sinners from acting badly. In truth the pious and the sinner both attain the same result.

To this I reply: No. It is not so. The sinner does not enjoy happiness.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 14

samyamane tv anubhūyetaṣām ārohāvarohau tad-gati-darśanāt

samyamane—in Samyamani Puri; tv—but; anubhūya—experiencing; itaṣām—of others; āroha—ascent; avarohau—descent; tat—of them; gati—travel; darśanāt—by the Śruti-śāstra.

But the others go to and return from Samyamana-pura. the Śruti-śāstra describes this as their travels.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to begin the refutation of the Pūrvapakṣa. The word "itaṣām" (of the others) here means "of they who did not perform iṣṭa and other pious deeds". The word "samyamane" means "in the city of Yamarāja". That is where they go. There they are punished by Yamarāja and then sent back to the earth. Their departure and return is like that. Why do you say that? The sūtra explains: "tad-gati-darśanāt" (Because Śruti-śāstra describes this as their travels). In the Kaṭha Upaniṣad (1.2.6) Yamarāja explains:

na samparāyaḥ pratibhāti bālam
pramādyantaṁ vitta-mohena mūḍham
ayam loko nāsti para iti mānī
punaḥ punar vaśam āpadyate me

"The path to liberation does not appear before a childish fool intoxicated by the illusory wealth of this world. He who thinks, 'This is the only world. There is no world beyond this,' falls into my control again and again."

In this way the Śruti-śāstra explains that the sinners are punished by Yamarāja. That is the meaning.

Sūtra 15

smaranti ca

smaranti—the Smṛti-śāstra; ca—also.

The Smṛti-śāstras also affirm it.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (3.30.23) explains:

tatra tatra patan chrānto
mūrchitaḥ punar utthitaḥ
pathā pāpīyasā nītas
tarasā yama-sādanam

"While passing on that road to the abode of Yamarāja, he falls down in fatigue, and sometimes he becomes unconscious, but he is forced to rise again. In this way he is very quickly brought to the presence of Yamarāja."*

In the Smṛti-śāstra it is also said:

sarve caite vaśam yānti yamasya bhagavan.

"O Lord, all sinners come under Yamaraja's dominion."

In this way the sages and Smṛti-śāstras affirm that the sinners come under Yamarāja's control.

Sūtra 16

api sapta

api—also; sapta—seven.

There are seven and others also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Mahābhārata it is said:

rauravo 'tha mahāms caiva
vahnir vai taraṇī tathā
kumbhīpāka iti proktāny
anitya-narakāṇi tu

tamisras cāṇḍa-tāmisro
dvau nityau samprakīrtitau
iti sapta pradhānāni
balīyas tūttarottaram

"The temporary hells named 1. Raurava, 2. Mahān, 3. Vahni, 4. Vaitaraṇī, and 5. Kumbhīpāka, as well as the permanent hells named 6. Tamisra, and 7. Andha-tamisra, are said to be the seven most important hells, each one more horrible than the last."

Thus the Smṛti-śāstra explains that sinners are punished for their sins in these hells. These hells are the places where sinners go. The word "api" (also) is used to indicate that in the Fifth Canto of Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam other hells are also described.

Here someone may object: Does this (the description of Yamarāja's punishment of sinners) not contradict the scriptures' declaration that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the supreme controller of everything?

The author of the sūtras now answers this objection:

Sūtra 17

tatrāpi ca tad-vyāpārād avirodhaḥ

tatra—there; api—even; ca—also; tat—of Him; vyāpārāt—because of the activities; a—without; virodhaḥ—contradiction.

There is no contradiction, for He also acts there.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" (and) is here used for emphasis. Yamarāja and others punish sinners by the command of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This does not contradict the scriptures' description of the Lord's supremacy. That is the meaning. The Purāṇas affirm that, on the Supreme Lord's order, Yamarāja and others punish sinners.

Here someone may object: It must be that, after receiving punishment from Yamarāja, sinners also ascend to Candraloka. This must be so, for the Kauśītaki Upaniṣad affirms that all who leave this world travel to Candraloka.

To refute this misconception the author of the sūtras speaks the following words.

Sūtra 18

vidyā-karmaṇos tv iti prakṛtatvāt

vidyā—of knowledge; karmaṇoḥ—of action; tu—but; iti—thus; prakṛtatvāt—because of being the topics.

But because pious deeds and knowledge are the topics.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used to begin the answer to the previous objection. The word "na" (It is not so) is to be understood in this sūtra. Sinners do not go to

Candraloka. Why not? The sūtra explains that only they who perform pious deeds or are situated in true knowledge (vidyā-karmaṇoḥ) travel to the worlds of the devas and pitās. That is the description of the scriptures (prakṛtatvāt). In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (5.10.1) it is said that they who are situated in knowledge travel on the path to the devas. In Chāndogya Upaniṣad (5.10.3) it is said that they who perform pious deeds travel on the path to the pitās. Thus when it is said that all (sarve) go to Candraloka, the meaning is that all who have qualified themselves in these ways go to Candraloka.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that without first going to Candraloka it is not possible for sinners to attain a new material body? This is the reason: Because (without first going to Candraloka) it is not possible to offer the fifth libation (by which one attains a new body). Therefore, in order to attain a new material body, all must first go to Candraloka.

If this objection is raised, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 19

na tṛtiye tathopalabdheḥ

na—not; tṛtiye—in the third; tathā—so; upalabdheḥ—because of the perception.

Not so in the third, for it is so perceived.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the third place there is no need to offer the fifth libation to attain a new material body. Why not? The sūtra explains: "tathopalabdheḥ" (because it is so perceived). This means: "Because the Śruti-śāstra affirms that it is so." In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad the following question is posed:

yathāsau loko na sampūryate

"Do you know why the world never becomes filled?"

The answer is given (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5.10.8):

athaitayoḥ pathor na katareṇa ca tānīmāni kṣudrāṇy asakṛd avṛttīni bhūtāni jīvanti jāyasva mriyasvety etat tṛtīyaṁ sthānam. tenāsau loko na sampūryate.

"There are these two paths and there is also another path, where many tiny creatures live, and where they are ordered: 'Now you must be born.' and 'Now you must die.' It is because of this third place that the world never becomes filled."

Aside from the worlds of the devas and the worlds of the pitās, there is another, a third world, the home of tiny creatures like mosquitoes, insects, and worms, creatures who do not go to the higher worlds, but are simply again and again ordered: "Now you must be born." and "Now you must die." In this way they are born again and again and they die again and again. That is the meaning. Their abode is this third world. It is said that sinners take birth in the bodies of these insects and other lower creatures. Their place is the third world because it is different from the first and second worlds: Brahmaloaka and Dyuloka.

Because they have not attained true knowledge and thus become able to travel to the world of the devas, and because they have not performed pious deeds and thus become able to travel to the world of the pitās, they become tiny creatures like mosquitoes and insects and they stay in a third world. That is why the other worlds do not become filled to overflowing. These creatures neither rise to nor descend from the celestial worlds of Dyuloka, and for that reason Dyuloka does not become overfilled. They stay in a third world, where they do not offer the fifth oblation in order to attain a new body.

Sūtra 20

smaryate 'pi ca loke

smaryate—affirmed in the Śmṛti-śāstra; api—and; ca—also; loke—in the world.

The Smṛti-śāstras affirm that it is also in this world.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this world also some pious persons, Droṇa and Dhṛṣṭadyumna are two examples, also attain new bodies without offering a fifth oblation. This is described in the Smṛti-śāstras. The words "api ca" (and also) hint that there are other examples also.

Sūtra 21

darśanāc ca

darśanāt—from seeing; ca—also.

From seeing also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.3.1) it is said:

teṣāṁ khalv eṣāṁ bhūtānāṁ trīṇy eva bījāni bhavanti. aṇḍa-jaṁ jīva-jaṁ udbhij-
jaṁ.

"Living beings are born in one of three ways. Some are born from an egg, some are born live, and some are plants sprouting from a seed."

The Śruti-śāstra affirms that plants sprouting from a seed and tiny creatures born from perspiration take birth without the fifth oblation. They neither ascend to nor descend from Candraloka. They are born from water without the fifth oblation. This view is not contradicted by the scriptures.

Here someone may object: The passage you quoted from Chāndogya Upaniṣad mentioned three kinds of birth but did not mention birth from perspiration.

The author of the sūtras now gives his answer to this objection.

Sūtra 22

ṭṭīya-śabdāvarodhaḥ saṁśoka-jasya

ṭṭīya—śabda—word; avarodhaḥ—description; saṁśoka—from grief; jasya—born.

The grief-born is included in the third word.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The perspiration born creatures, here called grief-born, are included in the description of plants born from seeds. Because they are both born by bursting forth, one bursting from earth and the other bursting from water, they are considered in the same class. They differ in that one (the perspiration-born creatures) has the power to move about and the other (the plants) does not. In this way it is proved that they who do not perform pious deeds do not go to Candraloka.

Adhikaraṇa 4

The Soul Does Not Become Ether

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

It has already been shown that the soul who performs pious deeds goes, accompanied by his subtle material body, to Candraloka, and (after some time again) descends, accompanied by the remnant of his karma, (to the earth). The way this happens is described in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (5.10.5):

athaitam evādhvānam punar nivartante yathetam ākāśasm ākāśād vāyuḥ bhavati
vāyur bhūtvā dhūmo bhavati dhūmo bhūtvā abhram bhavaty abhram bhūtvā
megho bhavati megho bhūtvā pravarṣati

"He returns by this path. First he becomes ether. From ether he becomes air. Having become air he becomes smoke. Having become smoke he becomes mist. Having become mist he becomes a cloud. Having become a cloud, he becomes rain."

Samśaya (doubt): Is the descent literally like this, or is it not like this?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): This account of the descending soul becoming ether and other things is to be accepted literally. During its descent does the soul become completely identical with these various things, or does it become only similar to them? If the soul becomes only similar, then a secondary interpretation of the passage must be accepted. For this reason it should be understood that the soul becomes completely identical with these different things.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 23

tat-svābhāvyaṅpattir upapatteḥ

tat—of them; svābhāvya—similarity; āpattiḥ—attainment; upapatteḥ—because of being reasonable.

It is similar to them, for that is reasonable.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This passage should be interpreted to mean that the soul becomes similar to these things. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "upapatteḥ" (for that is reasonable). On Candraloka the soul attains a body suitable for enjoyment. However, when the time for enjoyment comes to an end, that body perishes in the fire of grief, just as mist perishes in the sunlight. Thus deprived of its external body, the soul becomes like ether. Then the soul comes under the control of air. Then the soul comes into contact with smoke and the other things. That is a reasonable explanation of these events. This is so because it is not possible for one thing to become another, and also because if it did indeed become ether or these other things, it would not be possible for the soul to continue its descent.

Adhikaraṇa 5

The Passage From Ether to Rain Is Quick

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Samśaya (doubt): Is the soul's descent from ether to rain accomplished quickly or slowly?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): No outside force pushes it, so the soul must

proceed very slowly.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 24

nāti-cireṇa viśeṣāt

na—not; ati—very; cireṇa—for long; viśeṣāt—because of something specific.

Not for very long, because of something specific.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The soul's descent from ether and the other things does not take a long time. Why is that? The sūtra explains: “viśeṣāt” (because of something specific). The specific thing here is a specific statement that the passage through rice and other grains is very difficult. Because this part of the passage is singled out as especially difficult it may be inferred that the other parts of the passage are quickly accomplished.

Adhikaraṇa 6

The Descending Soul Does Not Take Birth Among the Plants

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viśaya (statement): The passage after entering rain is described in the following statement of Śruti-śāstra:

ta iha vṛiḥi-yavā auṣadhi-vanaspatayas tila-māṣā jāyante

"The descending souls then take birth as rice, barley, plants, trees, sesame, and

beans."

Samśaya (doubt): Do the souls literally take birth as rice or these other species, or is this description metaphorical?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The text says "jāyante" (they take birth). This is should be taken literally.

Siddhānta: In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 25

anyādhiṣṭhite pūrvavad abhilāpāt

anya—by an other; adhiṣṭhite—occupied; pūrva—before; vat—like; abhilāpāt—because of the statement.

In what is occupied by another because of a statement like the previous.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because the bodies of the plants and other beings are already inhabited by other spirit souls, the description here is metaphorical. The descending souls are not born in those species to experience their karma. Why not? The sūtra explains: "pūrvavad abhilāpāt" (because of a statement like the previous). As it was previously said that the descending soul does not become ether, or the other things in its descent, but merely comes into contact with them, so the fallen soul merely comes into contact with the rice and other species. That is the meaning. As when it enters the ether the descending soul is not yet experiencing the specific results of various pious and impious deeds, so when it falls down in the rain the soul is also not yet experiencing the results of specific deeds. This the scriptures say. In Chāndogya Upaniṣad (5.10.7) it is said: "They who act piously attain an auspicious birth. They who do not act piously attain a birth that is not auspicious." Therefore the description here that the descending souls take birth in this way is metaphorical. It is not literal.

Sūtra 26

aśuddham iti cen na śabdāt

aśuddham—impure; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; śabdāt—because of Śruti-śāstra.

If it is said to be impure, then I reply: No, for that is the statement of the Śruti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: It is not at all logical to say that the scriptures' statement that the descending soul, accompanied by the remnant of his karma, takes birth in the body of a rice plant or similar species, is only a metaphor, and the soul does not really take birth in those species for the soul has no remaining karma to push it into that birth. The so-called pious deeds performed to attain residence in Svargaloka are actually impure. This is because the Agnisomīya-yajña and other yajñas like them involve violence to animals. The scriptures give the following prohibition:

mā himsyāt sarva-bhūtāni

"Never commit violence to anyone."*

Therefore, by performing these yajñas there is a pious portion, which sends the performer to Svargaloka, and also an impious portion, which forces him to take birth as a rice plant or similar species. In the Manu-saṁhitā (12.9) it is said:

śarīra-jair karma-doṣair
yāti sthāvaratām naraḥ

"A person who sins with his body becomes an unmoving plant."

Therefore the statement that the descending soul takes birth as a rice plant or similar being should be taken literally.

If this is said, then the sūtra replies: "na" (No. It is not so). Why not? The sūtra explains: "śabdāt" (Because that is the statement of the Śruti-śāstra). The Vedas order:

agnisomīyaṁ paśum ālabheta

"One should sacrifice an animal in an agnisomīya-yajña."

Because piety and impiety is known only from the Vedas' statements, the Vedas' order to commit violence must be understood to be actually kind and pious. Therefore the orders of the Vedas are never impure. The prohibitions: "Never commit violence to anyone" and "Violence is a sin" are the general rules decreed by the Vedas, and the statement: "One should sacrifice an animal in an agnisomīya-yajña" is an exception to that general rule. A general rule and a specific exception to that rule need not contradict each other. There is scope for each. For these reasons, therefore, the scriptures' description that the fallen soul takes birth as a rice plant or similar being is metaphorical and not literal.

What follows in this sequence is described in the next sūtra.

Sūtra 27

retaḥ-sig-yogo 'tha

retaḥ—semen; sik-sprinkling; yogaḥ—contact; atha—then.

Then there is contact with the male that sprinkles the semen.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

After entering the rice-plant or other plant, the fallen soul, accompanied by the remainder of his karma, enters the semen of a male. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (5.10.6) it is said:

yo yo 'nnam atti yo retaḥ siñcati tad bhūya eva bhavati

"A male eats that grain and then sprinkles semen. From that semen the fallen soul takes birth. He becomes just like his father."

The statement that the soul becomes just like the father should not be taken literally, for one thing cannot have exactly the same form as another. In truth, if the offspring were completely identical with the father, and there were no difference at all between them, then the soul would not actually attain a new material body. Therefore this statement should be taken metaphorically. As the soul merely comes into contact with the rice plant or other vegetation, so the soul comes into contact with the father. The soul does not become identical with the

father in all respects.

Sūtra 28

yoneḥ śarīram

yoneḥ—from the womb; śarīram—a body.

The body comes from the womb.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "yoneḥ" here is in the ablative case. The soul departs from its father's body and enters its mother's womb. In this way, so it may experience the fruits of its karma, the soul attains a new material body. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (5.10.7) it is said:

tad ya iha ramaṇīya-caraṇāḥ

"They who perform pious deeds attain an auspicious birth. They who sin attain an inauspicious birth."

In this way the soul's entrance into the series of things beginning with ether and the series of things beginning with a rice-plant or other vegetation is described. The conclusion is that a person who is actually intelligent will renounce this material world, a world filled with sorrows, and place all his thoughts on Lord Hari, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is filled with transcendental bliss.

Pada 2

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

*vittir viraktiś ca kṛtānjaliḥ puro
yasyāḥ parānanda-tanor vitiṣṇhate*

*siddhiś ca sevā-samayam pratīkṣate
bhaktiḥ pareśasya punātu sā jagat*

May devotion to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, devotion that is filled with transcendental bliss, devotion before whom knowledge and renunciation stand, their hands folded with respect, devotion that mystic power yearns to serve, purify the entire world.

Devotional service, by performing which one falls in love with the Supreme Personality of Godhead and attains His association, will be described in this pada. In order to strengthen the soul's love and devotion for the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the Lord's glorious creation of dreams and other states of being, the Lord's identity with His many incarnations, His appearance as the all-pervading Supersoul, His non-identity with His worshipers, who are still one with Him in quality, His being attained only by devotional service, His appearance in both spiritual and material worlds, His transcendental blissfulness, His coming before His devotees according to the devotees' love for Him, His supremacy over all, His supreme generosity, and a great host of the Lord's other virtues and glories will also be described here. When a person desires to love, the beloved's glories must be understood. Otherwise there can be no love. In the beginning of this pada will be described the Lord's creation of the world in a dream. the idea that someone other than the Supreme Lord had created the material world contradicts the scriptures' statement that the Lord is the creator of everything. If the Lord is the creator of only some parts of the world, then it is not possible for the devotee to have full love for Him. For this reason now will be shown the glory of the Lord as the creator of all.

Adhikaraṇa 1

The Supreme Personality of Godhead Creates Dreams

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.3.10) it is said:

*na tatra rathā na ratha-yogā na panthāno bhavanty atha rathān ratha-yogān pathaḥ
srjate. na tatrānandā mudaḥ pramudo bhavanty athānandān mudaḥ pramudaḥ srjate.
na tatra veśantāḥ puṣkarīnyaḥ sravantyāḥ srjate sa hi kartā.*

"In that place there are neither chariots nor animals yoked to chariots. He

creates the chariots and animals yoked to chariots. In that place there are neither happiness, nor pleasures, nor bliss. He creates the pleasures there. In that place there are neither streams nor ponds nor lotus flowers. He creates them. He is the creator."

Samśaya (doubt): Is the individual spirit soul or the Supersoul the creator of this dream world with chariots and other things?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The individual spirit soul is the creator. In Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.7.1) Prajāpati declares that by willing the individual soul has the power to create.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 1

sandhye sṛṣṇīr āha hi

sandhye - in the junction; sṛṣṇīr - creation; āha - says; hi - indeed.

Indeed, it says that in the junction there is creation.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "sandhya" (junction) here means "dream". In the Śruti-śāstra it is said:

sandhyam tṛtīyam svapna-sthānam

"The third state is sandhya, or dreaming."

Dreaming is called sandhya (junction) because it stands in the junction between wakefulness and dreamless sleep. The Supersoul creates the chariots and other things present in dreams. Why is that? The Śruti-śāstra explains:

sa hi kartā

"He is the creator."

Thus the Śruti-śāstra affirms that the chariots and other things present in dreams are created by Him. The meaning is this. To give the results of of very, very insignificant karmas, the Lord creates the chariots and other things present in dreams, things seen only by the dreaming person. The Lord, who has the inconceivable power to do anything by merely willing it be done, thus creates the things in dreams. In the Kaṭha Upaniṣad (4.4) it is said:

"A wise man, aware that whatever he sees in dreams or awake is all the Supreme Personality of Godhead and His potencies, never laments."

In the liberated state the individual spirit souls also have the power to do anything by merely willing it be done, but what they create with that power is not a dream.

Sūtra 2

nirmātāraṁ caike putrādayaś ca

nirmātāraṁ - the creator; ca - and; eke - some; putra - sons; ādayas - beginning with; ca - also.

Others that He is the creator. Sons and others also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Kaṭha Upaniṣad affirms that the Supersoul creates the objects of desire seen in dreams and other situations. It says (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 5.8):

ya eṣu supteṣu jāgarti kāmāṁ kāmāṁ puruṣo nirmimāṇa

"Remaining awake, the Supreme Personality of Godhead creates the objects of desire seen in dreams."

Here the word "kāma" refers to good sons and other blessings that the individual soul may desire. The word "kāma" is used in this way in Kaṭha Upaniṣad (1.1.25):

sarvān kāmān chandataḥ prārthayasva

"You may ask for whatever you wish."

In Kaṭha Upaniṣad (1.1.23) it is said:

śatāyusaḥ putra-pautrān vṛṇīṣva

"You may choose many sons and grandsons that live for a hundred years."

In the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

*etasmād eva putro jāyate. etasmād bhrātā. etasmād bhāryā. yad enam
svapnenābhīhanti.*

"From the Supreme Personality of Godhead a good son is born. From Him a brother appears. From Him a wife appears. From Him these things appear in a dream."

In the next passage the author of the sūtras describes the instrument the Supreme Personality of Godhead employs to create dreams.

Sūtra 3

māyā-mātram tu kārtsnyenānabhivyakta-svarūpatvāt

māyā - the māyā potency; mātram - only; tu - but; kārtsnyena - completely; an - not; abhivyakta - manifested; svarūpatvāt - because of the condition of having a form.

But it is the māyā potency only, because the forms are not completely manifested.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Lord's inconceivable māyā potency is the creator of what is seen in dreams. What is seen in dreams is not made of the five gross material elements, neither is it created by the demigod Brahmā. Why is that? The sūtra explains: kārtsnyenānabhivyakta-svarūpatvāt" (because the forms are not completely

manifested). This means: "because they are not seen by everyone". In this way it is proved that the Supersoul is the creator of what is seen in dreams.

Adhikaraṇa 2

Not All Dreams Are Illusions

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Samśaya (doubt): Are dreams reality or illusion?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): When a person wakes up he immediately knows that what he dreamed was an illusion. Therefore dreams are all illusions.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 4

sūcakaś ca hi śruter ācaḡṣate ca tad-vidaḡ

sūcakas - an indicator; ca - and; hi - indeed; śruter - of the Śruti-śāstra; ācaḡṣate - declare; ca - and; tad - that; vidaḡ - they who know.

It gives omens. The Śruti-śāstra and the experts affirm it.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Dreams show good and bad omens. They also reveal mantras and other things. Therefore dreams are reality. Why is it that dreams reveal these things? The sūtra explains: "śruteḡ" (the Śruti-śāstra affirms it). the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (5.2.9) affirms:

*yadā karmasu kāmyeṣu
striyaṃ svapne 'bhīpaśyati*

*samṛddhim tatra jānīyāt
tasmin svapna-nidarśane*

"If, when the auspicious rites are completed, one sees a woman in a dream, he should know that the rites were successful."

In the Kauṣītakī-brāhmaṇa it is said:

atha svapne puruṣaṁ kṛṣṇaṁ kṛṣṇa-dantaṁ paśyati sa enaṁ hanti

"If in a dream one sees a black man with black teeth, that man will kill him."

The word "tad-vidāḥ" here means "they who know how to interpret dreams". These persons affirm that dreams reveal omens of good and evil. For example a dream of riding on an elephant is a good omen, and a dream of riding on a donkey is an omen of misfortune. In dreams one may also receive prayers. the Smṛti-śāstra affirms:

*ādiṣṇavān yathā svapne
rāma-rakṣām imāṁ haraḥ
tathā likhitavān prātaḥ
prabuddho buddha-kaūśikaḥ*

"Then Lord Śiva appeared in a dream and taught him the Rāma-rakṣā prayer. Waking up in the morning, Buddha Kauśika at once wrote it down."

Therefore, because in dreams one sometimes receives omens, prayers, medicines, and other things, and because sometimes a person will actually appear in a dream, therefore sometimes dreams are as real as what is seen in the waking state. That is the conclusion of Śruti-śāstra.

Here someone may object: Is it not true that after waking up a person becomes convinced that what he saw in a dream was false. This proves that all dreams are unreal.

In the following words the author of the sūtras answers this objection.

Sūtra 5

parābhidhyānāt tu tirohitaṁ tato hy asya bandha-viparyayau

para - of the Supreme Personality of Godhead; abhidhyānāt - by the will; tu - indeed; tirohitam - withdrawn; tato - from Him; hi - indeed; asya - of him; bandha - bondage; viparyayau - release.

By the will of the Supreme Personality of Godhead it is withdrawn. Indeed, bondage and liberation also come from Him.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because they are created by the will of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, chariots and other things seen in a dream are not unreal. They are not like the illusion of silver seen on a seashell. the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the cause of bondage and liberation for the individual spirit soul. this is described in Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (6.16):

saṁsāra-mokṣa-sthiti-bandha-hetuḥ

"the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the master of this cosmic manifestation in regard to bondage to the conditional state of material existence and liberation from that bondage."*

the Lord brings liberation from the bondage of repeated birth and death. Therefore it is not surprising that He has the power to bring dreams to their end. That is the meaning. Therefore it should be understood that dreams are manifested by Him and withdrawn by Him also. In the Kūrma Purāṇa it is said:

*svapnādi-buddhi-kartā ca
tiraskartā sa eva tu
tad-icchayā yato hy asya
bandha-mokṣau pratiṣṅhitau*

"The Supreme Lord creates and ends dreams and other states of being. By His will both bondage and liberation are manifested."

Therefore, because they are created by the Supreme Personality of Godhead, dreams are real.

The Supreme Personality of Godhead Creates the Waking State

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be explained that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the creator of the waking state also. In the Kañha Upaniṣad (2.1.4) it is said:

*svapnāntaṁ jāgaritāntaṁ
cobhau yenānupaśyati
mahāntaṁ vibhum ātmānaṁ
matvā dhīro na śocati*

"Aware that the all-powerful Supreme Person creates all that is seen in both waking and dreaming states, a wise man never laments."

Saiṁśaya (doubt): Does the Supreme Personality of Godhead create the waking condition of the individual spirit souls, or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The waking state is not created by the Supreme Personality of Godhead, for it is seen that the waking state is under the control of time and other factors.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 6

deha-yogād vā so 'pi

deha - of the body; yogād - from contact; vā - or; so - that; api - even.

That also from contact with the body.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

As explained in Kañha Upaniṣad 2.1.4, the waking state, which occurs when the soul is in contact with the body, is manifested from the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is so because time and the other factors are only inert matter. The

word "api" (also) in this sūtra hints that the state of dreamless sleep and fainting are also created by the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is so because the Śruti-śāstra affirms that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is creator of everything.

Adhikaraṇa 4

The Supreme Personality of Godhead Is the Creator of Dreamless Sleep

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the condition of dreamless sleep will be considered. The Śruti-śāstra describes the state of dreamless sleep in the following passages. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.6.3) it is said:

āsu tadā nāḍīṣu supto bhavati

"Entering the nāḍīṣ, the soul sleeps."

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (2.1.19) it is said:

tābhiḥ praty avasṛpya purī-tati śete

"Entering the membrane surrounding the heart, the soul sleeps."

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (2.1.17) it is said:

ya eṣo 'ntar hṛdaya ākāśas tasmin śete

"Entering the sky of the heart, the soul sleeps."

Many other like verses may also be quoted. The "sky in the heart" here is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In this way the Śruti-śāstra explains that dreamless sleep is manifested when the soul enters the nāḍīṣ, the membrane surrounding the heart, and the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Saiṁśaya (doubt): Does the soul enter any one of these three places, or does the soul enter all of them?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The soul may enter any one of these places. This is so because these three places are equally able to be the place where the soul sleeps. The Nyāya-śāstra explains:

tulyārthas tu vikalperan

"A list of things equally suitable for a certain thing indicates the option of choosing from them."

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 7

tad-abhāvo nāḍīṣu tac chruter ātmani ca

tad - of that; abhāvo - the absence; nāḍīṣu - in the nadis; tat - that; śruter - from Śruti-śāstra; ātmani - in the Supreme Personality of Godhead; ca - also.

Its absence occurs in the nāḍīs and the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is so because of the Śruti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" (and) here hints the inclusion of the membrane surrounding the heart. The word "tad-abhāva" (its absence) means "the absence of wakefulness and dream". Thus it means "the state of dreamless sleep". Dreamless sleep occurs in the nāḍīs, the membrane surrounding the heart, and the Supreme Personality of Godhead collectively. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "tac chruteḥ" (This is so because of the Śruti-śāstra). Thus the Śruti-śāstra declares that they are all, taken collectively, the place of dreamless sleep. The idea that there is an option here, and that to perform the activity of deep sleep the soul chooses one of these places, is an idea that contradicts the statements of Śruti-śāstra. In the scriptures' description of dreamless sleep, it is seen that the nāḍīs and prāṇas are described together. In the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad (4.19) it is said:

tāsu tadā bhavati. yadā suptaḥ svapnam na kañcana paśyaty athāsmiṁ prāṇa evaikadhā bhavati.

"Then the soul enters the nāḍis. When sleeping, the soul does not see any dream. Then the soul become one with the prāṇas."

The explanation that the soul has an option of one of these three places does not apply here, for if that option were to apply, then these three places would have to be equally suitable for the action of dreamless sleep, but the truth is they are not. What occurs is the soul passes through the door of the nāḍis, enters the palace of the membrane surrounding the heart, and sleeps on the bed of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In this way all three places are involved in the activity of dreamless sleep, but the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the actual place where dreamless sleep occurs. the word "purītat" here means "the membrane surrounding the lotus of the heart".

Sūtra 8

ataḥ prabodho 'smāt

ataḥ - therefore; prabodho - waking; asmāt - from Him.

Therefore the waking state is from Him.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the actual place where dreamless sleep occurs and the nāḍis and other things mentioned here are merely doors through which the soul passes in order to rest on the Supreme Personality of Godhead, therefore the waking soul rises from the bed of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad it is said:

satas cāgatya na viduḥ sata āgacchamahe

"We had departed from the Supreme Personality of Godhead, although we could not understand that we had departed from the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

In this way the idea that sometimes the soul sleeps in the nāḍis, sometimes in the membrane surrounding the heart, and sometimes in the Supreme Personality

of Godhead, is disproved. It is not like that. Therefore the soul sleeps on the bed of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Adhikaraṇa 5

The Same Person Returns to the Body

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Chandogya Upaniṣad it is said:

sataṣ cāgatya na viduḥ

"We had departed from the Supreme Personality of Godhead, but we did not know we had departed from the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

Samśaya (doubt): Is the person awakening from the bed of the Supreme Personality of Godhead the same person who first went to sleep there, or is he a different person?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): It is not possible that the soul, having attained the Supreme Personality of Godhead, would again return to the same material body. Therefore it must be a different soul that awakens.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 9

sa eva tu karmānusmṛti-ṣabda-vidhibhyaḥ

sa—he; eva — indeed; tu—but; karma—karma; ānusmṛti—memory; ṣabda—of the Śruti-śāstra; vidhibhyaḥ—from the instructions.

It is he, because of the memory of karma and because of the teachings of Śruti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 10

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 11

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 12

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 13

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 14

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 15

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 16

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 17

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 18

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 19

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 20

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 21

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 22

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 23

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 24

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 25

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 26

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 27

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 28

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 29

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 30

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 31

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 32

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 33

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 34

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 35

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 36

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 37

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 38

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 39

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 40

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 41

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 42

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 43

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 44

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 45

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 46

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 47

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 48

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 49

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 50

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Sūtra 51

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Adhikaraṇa 11 The "Neti Neti" Text Explained

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: It is not true that the individual spirit soul is a separate conscious person in some ways like the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The individual soul is only a reflection of the Supreme. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (2.3.1) it is said:

dve vāva brahmaṇo rūpe mūrtam caivāmūrtam ca

"The Supreme has two forms: the subtle and the gross."

After dividing the five elements into two categories, the Upaniṣad declares that all are forms of the Supreme. Then the Upaniṣad (2.3.6) declares:

tasya haitasya puruṣasya rūpam yathā mahārajanam vāso yathā pāṇḍv-āvikaṁ
yathendragopo yathāgny-arcir yathā puṇḍarīkaṁ yathā sakṛd vidyutam sakṛd
vidyutaiva ha vā asya śrīr bhavati ya evam veda.

"That person's form is like gold, like white wool, like an indragopa, like a burning flame, like a white lotus, like a lightning flash. He who understands this becomes splendid like a lightning flash."

Then, having described this person splendid like gold, the Upaniṣad (2.3.6) declares:

athāta ādeśo neti neti. na hy etasmād iti. nety anyat param asti. atha nāmadheyam
satyasya satyam iti. prāṇa vai satyam teṣām eva satyam.

"This is the teaching: No. No. Not than Him. Nothing is greater than Him. Nothing is greater than Him. His name is the truth of the true. He is life. He is truth. He is truth."

The meaning of this passage is this: the Supreme is greater than all the subtle and gross things in the material world. No person or thing is greater than Him. That is the meaning of the words, "No. No." in this passage. The words "No. No." therefore mean "Not than the Supreme Personality of Godhead". The word "no" is repeated twice to mean, "the material elements and material desires are not greater than Him" or to mean, "inanimate matter and the conscious living beings are not greater than Him", or to mean "other groups of two are not greater than Him". Thus he speaks the teaching (ādeśa): "No" (na). In this way he says, "No person or thing is greater than the Supreme Personality of Godhead".

Here someone may object: Is it not so that this passage means, "As the material world does not exist in reality, so the Supreme Personality of Godhead also does not exist in reality? That is the meaning of the Upaniṣad's assertion "no". The form of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, which is eternal and spiritual, and which ends all illusions, is not different from the visible material world. This also means that the individual spirit soul is also not different from the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The spirit soul is a reflection of the Supreme. The individual spirit soul, who is atomic, and the Supreme, who is all-pervading, are not different. They are like the air in a pot and the air in the great sky. Therefore it is not correct to say that they are different.

If this objection is raised, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply:

Sūtra 22

prakṛtātvattvaṁ hi pratiśedhati tato bravīti ca bhūyaḥ

prakṛtā—the topic under discussion; etāvattvaṁ—being like that; hi—indeed; pratiśedhati—denies; tataḥ—then; bravīti—says; ca—and; bhūyaḥ—more.

The previous statement denies that He is like them. It affirms that He is greater.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This passage of Śruti-sāstra does not teach that the one Supreme has no qualities. It teaches only that the Supreme is not like other persons. It teaches that

the Supreme is superior to all others. In this way the Śruti-śāstra affirms that the Supreme is not like other persons or things. The Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad's (2.3.1) statement that the subtle and gross elements of the world are forms of the Supreme does not mean that the Supreme is like the things of this world. The forms of the Supreme are not material. Therefore it is said that the Supreme is superior to everything in the material world and therefore He has the name "the truth of the true". That is the teaching here. He is more than the forms of this world. Because His form has no limit, therefore the Upaniṣad declares, "No. No." that is the meaning here. The meaning is that the form of the Lord is not like the subtle and gross forms of the material world. He is not like them because His form is eternal and true, and therefore He has the name "the truth of the true". This is what the Śruti-śāstra teaches. Then the scriptures affirm "No person or thing is greater than Him". (na hy etasmāt). Because nothing is greater than Him, therefore He has the name "the truth of the true". That is why the text here says, "no". By this explanation of a small part of the Lord's nature, the Lord's nature as a whole may be understood.

Now the word "nāmadheyam" will be explained. The Lord's name here is "satyasya satyam" (the truth of the true). This name describes the form of the Supreme. Then the text declares that the Supreme is "prāṇa". Prāṇa" here means, "the life of all that live". In this way the Lord's forms are superior to all others. This proves that the Lord's form is better than all other forms, either spiritual or material. No other form is better than His. In the material world the material forms are of two kinds: subtle and gross. That the Supreme Lord's forms are not material is explained in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (2.3.6). Then the text declares that the Supreme is the truth of life. Because both the Lord and the individual spirit souls are not made of the material elements, which begin with ether, therefore they are both called truth. However, unlike the individual spirit souls, the Supreme is not subject to the different transformations of the material nature, which grant and remove true knowledge in different circumstances. Thus the individual spirit soul is certainly spiritual and conscious. However, the Supreme Personality of Godhead is superior to the individual souls for the Supreme Lord has limitless auspicious qualities. When they are understood, then devotion for the Lord naturally develops. Thus the Śruti-śāstra does not deny the existence of the Lord's form, for in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (2.3.6) the Lord's spiritual form was described. Only a madman would state one thing and then immediately contradict his own words. Therefore the author of the sūtras says that "the Supreme is not like that". The author does not say "the Lord has no form at all". Thus the proper explanation is given.

Adhikaraṇa 12 The Form of the Lord

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now it will be proved that the Supreme Lord's form is spiritual and not perceivable by the material senses. This must be so, for if the Lord were not spiritual, that is, if he were an ordinary, common, easily available material object, like a pot or something of that nature, then it is not possible that there should be love and devotion for Him. The Śruti-śāstra also affirms this, for it says:

sac-cid-ānanda-rūpāya

"I offer my respectful obeisances to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, whose form is eternal and full of knowledge and bliss."

Samśaya (doubt): Is the Supreme Lord's form spiritual, and thus beyond the understanding of the material senses, or is it material, and thus easily seen by the material senses?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The Lord's form must be material, for many demigods, demons, and human beings have certainly seen it.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 23

tad avyaktam āha hi

tat—that; avyaktam—unmanifest; āha—said; hi—indeed.

Scripture says it is unmanifest.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Lord can be seen only by spiritual senses. This is described in Kaṭha Upaniṣad (6.9):

na sadṛṣe tiṣṭhati rūpam asya na cakṣuṣā paśyati kaścanainam

"The Supreme Lord's form is not like that. Material eyes have never seen His form."

In Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.9.26) it is said:

agr̥hyo na hi gr̥hyate

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is not perceived by material senses."

In the Bhagavad-gīta (8.21) it is said:

avyakto 'kṣara ity uktas
tam āhuḥ paramām gatim

"They say He is unmanifest and infallible. They say He is the supreme destination."

Adhikaraṇa 13

The Supreme Personality of Godhead Can Be Seen

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be revealed the truth that although the Supreme Lord is spiritual by nature, still He can be seen by they who have love, devotion, and spiritual wisdom. If the Supreme Personality of Godhead were always invisible and never to be seen, then it would not be possible to have love and devotion for Him. In the Kaivalya Upaniṣad (2) it is said:

śraddhā-bhakti-dhyāna-yogād avaiti

"One who has faith and devotion, and who meditates on Him, can see the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

In this way it is explained that a faithful devotee who meditates on Lord Hari, attains the direct sight of Lord Hari.

Saiśaya (doubt): Is the Supreme Lord seen by the mind or by the eyes and other senses?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The Supreme Lord is seen by the mind. This is described in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.19):

manasaivānudraṣṭavyam

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is indeed seen by the mind."

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 24

api samrādhane pratyakṣānumānābhyām

api—certainly; samrādhane—in worship; pratyakṣa—by the Śruti-śāstra; anumānābhyām—by the Smṛti-śāstra.

Certainly it is in worship because of the Śruti-śāstra and Smṛti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "api" (certainly) is used here to mock the pūrvapakṣa (opponent). When one has sincere devotion (samrādhane) with one's eyes and other senses one can directly see the Lord. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "Because of the Śruti-śāstra and Smṛti-śāstra." In the Kaṭha Upaniṣad (2.4.1) it is said:

parāñci khāni vyatṛṇat svayambhūs
tasmāt parān paśyati nāntarātman
kaścid dhīraḥ pratyag ātmānam aikṣad
āvṛta-caḁsur amṛtatvam icchan

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead made the conditioned souls gaze at external things and not at what is within the heart. A rare saint who yearns for liberation will look inside his heart and see the Supreme Lord staying there."

In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (3.1.8) it is said:

jñāna-prasādena viśuddha-sattvas
tatas tu taṁ paśyati niṣkalam dhyāyamānaḥ

"In the course of his meditation a pure-hearted saint will become enlightened. Then he sees the perfect Supreme Lord directly."

In the Bhagavad-gītā (11.53-54) The Lord Himself declares:

nāhaṁ vedair na tapasā
na dānena na cejyayā
śakya evam-vidho draṣṭuṁ
dr̥ṣṭavān asi mām yathā

"The form you are seeing with your transcendental eyes cannot be understood simply by studying the Vedas, nor by undergoing serious penances, nor by charity, nor by worship. It is not by these means that one can see Me as I am.*

bhaktyā tv ananyayā śakya
aham evam-vidho 'rjuna
jñātuṁ draṣṭuṁ ca tattvena
praveṣṭuṁ ca parantapa

"My dear Arjuna, only by undivided devotional service can I be understood as I am, standing before you, and can thus be seen directly. Only in this way can you enter into the mysteries of My understanding."*

In this way it is proved that with the aid of devotional service one can see Lord Hari directly. Thus with the aid of the eyes and other senses one can perceive the Lord directly. Thus the Lord can be perceived by the senses. Thus the word "eva" (indeed) in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.19) does not hint that one cannot see the Lord with the aid of senses.

Sūtra 25

prakāśādi-vac cāvaiśeṣyāt

prakāśa—fire; ādi—beginning with; vat—like; ca—and; a—not; vaiśeṣyāt—with differences.

He is (not) like fire or other things, for He has no such different features.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "na" (not) should be taken from a previous sūtra (3.2.19) and placed here also.

Here someone may object: As fire has two forms: subtle and gross, the subtle form invisible and unmanifest, and the gross form visible and manifest, so does the Supreme Lord also have two forms in the same way.

If this objection is stated, then I reply: "No. It is not so." Why not? The sūtra explains: "Because He is not subtle and gross like fire". The Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.4.4) explains:

asthūlam anaṇv ahrasvam

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is neither subtle, nor gross, nor short, nor tall."

In the Garuḍa Purāṇa it is said:

sthūla-sūkṣma-viśeṣo 'tra
na kaścit parameśvare
sarvatraiva prakāśo 'sau
sarva-rūpeṣv ajo yataḥ

"Because He appears everywhere and in every form, the distinctions of subtle and gross do not apply to the unborn Supreme Personality of Godhead."

Here someone may object: Is it not so that the Supreme Lord does not always appear before the devotees when they worship Him with devotion. For this reason it must be true that the Lord does not always appear when He is worshiped with love.

Fearing that someone may doubt in this way, the author of the sūtras gives the following explanation.

Sūtra 26

prakāśaś ca karmany abhyāsāt

prakāśaḥ—appearance; ca—and; karmaṇi—in activity; abhyāsāt—by repetition.

And when the activity is repeated, then He appears.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" (and) is used here to dispel doubt. When activities like meditation and worship are repeated, then the Lord appears. In the Dhyāna-bindu Upaniṣad (18) it is said:

dhyāna-nirmathanābhyāsād
devaṁ paśyen nigūḍhavat

"By repeated meditation one is able to see the Supersoul hidden in the heart."

By repeated meditation one develops love for the Lord, and at that time one is able to see the Lord. However, in the Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇa it is said:

na tam ārādhayitvāpi
kaścid vyaktī-kariṣyati
nityāvyakto yato devaḥ
paramātmā sanātanaḥ

"No one, simply by engaging in worship, can force the Lord to become visible. To a person who tries to force Him in this way, the eternal Lord is always invisible."

The worship described here is worship performed without sincere love for the Supreme Lord.

Here someone may object: Is it not true that the Supreme Lord is present within everything? If He is present within, then it is a contradiction to say that He can come out. He remains within and He does not come out. Therefore the statement that the Supreme Lord comes out and becomes directly visible is a collection of meaningless words, words that contradict the truth that the Lord is always present

within everything.

If this objection is raised, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 27

ato 'nantena tathā hi liṅgam

ataḥ—therefore; anantena—by the infinite; tathā—so; hi—indeed; liṅgam—evidence.

It is so by the infinite. There is evidence.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

There is evidence to support both ideas: that the Supreme Lord is present within everything, and that the Supreme Lord becomes visible to they who meditate on Him. The unlimited Supreme Lord, pleased by His devotees' worship of Him, shows to them His own form. He does this by His inconceivable mercy. That should be accepted. How is this known? The sūtra explains: "There is evidence." In the Atharva Veda it is said:

vijñāna-ghanānanda-ghana-sac-cid-ānandaika-raso bhakti-yoge tiṣṭhati

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead, whose sweet form is eternal and full of bliss and knowledge, becomes visible when He is worshiped with devotion."

This means that by His mercy the Lord appears before they who worship Him with devotion. In the Nārāyaṇādhyātma it is said:

nityāvyaḅto 'pi bhagavān
īkṣate nija-śaktitaḅ
tām ṛte paramātmānam
kaḅ paśyetaḅ itaḅ prabhum

"Although He is always invisible, the Supreme Personality of Godhead becomes visible by His own power. Without first obtaining His mercy, who can see Him?"

This means that the Lord becomes visible by His own wish. The Supreme Lord Himself declares (Bhagavad-gītā 7.24):

avyaktam vyaktim āpannam
manyante mām abuddhayaḥ
param bhāvam ajānanto
mamāvyayam anuttamam

"Unintelligent men, who do not know Me perfectly, think that I, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Kṛṣṇa, was impersonal before and have now assumed this personality. Due to their small knowledge, they do not know My higher nature, which is imperishable and supreme."*

Because the Lord becomes visible in response to His devotees' love, that does not mean that He is not also all-pervading, present within everything. He does both these actions by the power of His own internal potency. However, to they who do not love Him, He presents only a reflection or a shadow of Himself. The Lord Himself affirms (Bhagavad-gītā 7.25):

nāham prakāśaḥ sarvasya
yogamāyā-samāvṛtaḥ

"I am never manifest to the foolish and unintelligent. For them I am covered by My internal potency."*

Therefore, even though He is full of transcendental bliss and other auspicious qualities, He appears terrible and ferocious to they who have no love for Him. Therefore to they who do not love Him He remains invisible.

Adhikaraṇa 14

The Lord's Qualities Are Not Different From His Self

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be proved the truth that the Lord's qualities are not different from His self. If the Lord's qualities were different from His self, then His qualities would be secondary and unimportant, and thus love for the Lord, love inspired by those

qualities, would also become secondary and unimportant. However, love for the Lord is not secondary and unimportant. It is clearly seen that love for the Lord is of the greatest importance. The Lord's qualities are described in the Śruti-śāstra:

vijñānam ānandaṁ brahma

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is full of knowledge and bliss."

yaḥ sarva-jñāḥ sarva-vid

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is all-knowing."

ānandaṁ brahmaṇo vidvān

"A wise man knows that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is full of bliss."

Samśaya (doubt): Is the worshipable Supreme Truth the actual qualities of bliss and knowledge themselves, and thus impersonal, or is the Supreme Truth a person who possesses the qualities of bliss and knowledge?"

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because both ideas are described in the scriptures it is not possible to come to a final conclusion.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 28

ubhaya-vyapadeśāt tv ahi-kuṇḍala-vat

ubhaya—of both; vyapadeśāt—because of the description; tu—indeed; ahi—the snake; kuṇḍala—and the coils; vat—like.

Because indeed there is description of both, He is like a snake and its coils.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the qualities of knowledge and bliss themselves, and He is also a person who possesses the qualities of knowledge and bliss. He is like a snake and its coils. As a snake both is and possesses its coils, so the Supreme Personality of Godhead both is and possesses His qualities. How is this known? The sūtra explains: "Because there is description of both." The Śruti-sāstra describes both. That is the meaning. The word "tu" (indeed) here hints that the passages of the Śruti-sāstra have a single meaning. The meaning here is that the Lord is inconceivable. The Lord is not divided. It is not that these two kinds of explanations of the scriptures mean that one part of the Lord has one nature and another part of Him has a different nature. He is not divided into parts in that way.

Sūtra 29

prakāśāśrayavad vā tejastvāt

prakāśa—of light; āśraya—the shelter; vat—like; vā—or; tejastvāt—because of being splendid.

Or, because He is effulgent He is like an abode of light.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because the Supreme Personality of Godhead is effulgent, that is to say because He is full of consciousness, therefore He is the abode of light. That is the conclusion. As the effulgent sun is the abode of light, so the all-knowing Supreme Personality of Godhead is the abode of knowledge. That is the meaning. The word "tejaḥ" is defined to mean either "the destroyer of ignorance" or "the destroyer of darkness".

Sūtra 30

pūrvavad vā

pūrva—past; vat—as; vā—or.

Or, as the past.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

As it is said that time both possesses the past and also is the past itself, so the Supreme both possesses knowledge and bliss and also is knowledge and bliss. Thus the Supreme is both the quality and the possessor of the quality. In the Brahma Purāṇa it is said:

ānandena tv abhinnena
vyavahāraḥ prakāśavat
pūrvavad vā yathā kālaḥ
svāvecchedakatām vrajet

"As the sun is not different from its light or time is not different from its quality of the past, so the Supreme is not different from His bliss."

In this series of analogies (sūtras 28-30) each analogy is more subtle than the one before it.

Sūtra 31

pratiṣedhāc ca

pratiṣedhāt—because of denial; ca—also.

Also because it is denied.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" (also) is used here for emphasis. In the Kaṭha Upaniṣad (2.4.11 and 14) it is said:

manasaivedam āptavyam
neha nānāsti kiñcana
mrtyoḥ sa mrtyum āpnoti
ya iha nāneva paśyati

"A pure heart can understand that the Lord and His attributes are not different. He who sees them as different travels from death to death."

yathodakam durge vr̥ṣṭam
parvateṣu vidhāvati
evāṁ dharmān pṛthak paśyaṁs
tān evānuvidhāvati

"One who thinks the Lord and His attributes are different falls into hell as rainwater glides down a mountain peak."

In the Nārada-pañcarātra it is said:

nirdoṣa-pūrṇa-guṇa-vigraha ātma-tantro
nīścetanātmaka-śarīra-guṇaiś ca hīnaḥ
ānanda-mātra-kara-pāda-mukhodarādiḥ
sarvatra ca svagata-bheda-vivarjitātmā

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is independent, faultless, filled with virtues, not residing in a material body, untouched by the modes of nature or a material body fashioned of inanimate matter, but still possessing a face, belly, hands, feet and other features of a spiritual body filled with bliss. He is not different from His various limbs, features, and qualities."

Because in this way the scriptures deny that the Lord is different from His attributes, therefore the Lord is not different from His attributes. Therefore the word "bhagavān" (the all-opulent Supreme Lord) is defined in terms of the Lord's knowledge and other attributes. In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa it is said:

jñāna-śakti-balaiśvarya-
vīrya-tejāmsy aśeṣataḥ
bhagavac-chabda-vācyāni
vinā heyair guṇādibhiḥ

"The word `bhagavān' means `He who has all knowledge, strength, wealth, power, heroism, and splendor, but no faults'."

Although the Lord and His attributes are actually one, they are spoken of as being two in the same way that a body of water and its waves are spoken of as being two. The Lord is blissful. He is also bliss itself. Therefore His form is full of bliss. Because the Lord's activities are eternal, therefore the Lord's form is also eternal. However, for the sake of ordinary dealings a pretended distinction is made

between the Lord and His attributes, even though there is in truth no distinction at all. If this is not done then it would not be possible to speak sentences like, "Existence exists," "Time is always," and "Space is everywhere," statements that are useful in ordinary discourse. Nor are statements like "Existence exists" foolish illusions. They are meaningful statements, as the sentence "The jar exists" is a meaningful statement. These statements are not metaphors like the sentence "Devadatta is a lion", for the statement "Existence does not exist" can never be truthfully said. Nor do these statements hint that attributes do not exist, for in the previously stated example of water flowing from a mountain peak there are certainly attributes. However, the idea that the Supreme Lord is different from His attributes is certainly denied here. In this way the Supreme Personality of Godhead is not different from the attributes He possesses.

Adhikaraṇa 15

The Supreme Personality of Godhead Experiences the Highest Bliss

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be described the truth that the bliss and other attributes of the Lord are all of the highest nature. If the bliss and other attributes of the individual spirit souls were equal to the bliss and attributes of the Lord, love and devotion for the Lord would not be possible.

Viṣaya (the subject to be discussed): Now will be discussed the texts that describe these attributes of the Lord.

Samśaya (doubt): Are the bliss and other attributes of the Supreme Lord greater than the bliss and other attributes of the individual spirit souls, or are they not greater than them?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the bliss of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is described in the same terms used to describe the ordinary blisses of the material world, therefore the Lord's bliss is not greater. After all, when one speaks the word "jar" one doesn't mean something greater than a jar.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 32

param ataḥ setūnmāna-sambandha-bheda-vyapadeśebhyaḥ

param—greater; ataḥ—than this; setu—of a bridge; unmāna—immeasurable; sambandha—relationship; bheda—difference; vyapadeśebhyaḥ—from the descriptions.

It is greater because of the statements about a bridge, immeasurability, a relationship, and a difference.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The bliss and other attributes of the Supreme Personality of Godhead are greater than the bliss and attributes of the individual spirit souls. Why is that? The sūtra declares: "because of the statements about a bridge, immeasurability, a relationship, and a difference." The statement about a bridge is given in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.4.1), where the bliss of the Supreme Lord is described in these words:

eṣa setur vidhṛtiḥ

"It is the highest bridge."

The statement about immeasurability is given in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.4.1):

yato vāco nivartante

"Unable to describe the immeasurable bliss of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, words return and become silent."

The statement about a relationship is given in the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.3.32):

etasyaivānandasyānyāni bhūtāni mātram upajīvanti

"The bliss of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the highest. All others experience only a small portion of that bliss."

The statement about a difference is given in the following words:

anyaj jñānam tu jīvanām
anyaj jñānam parasya ca
nityānandāvyayam pūrṇam
param jñānam vidhiyate

"The knowledge possessed by the individual spirit souls is one thing and the knowledge possessed by the Supreme Personality of Godhead is another. The perfect, complete, blissful, and immutable knowledge possessed by the Supreme Personality of Godhead is higher."

The bliss and other attributes described in these statements are not at all like the ordinary bliss and other attributes found in this world.

Here someone may object: Still, what is described with the word "jar" cannot really be different from a jar.

To answer this objection the author of the sūtras speaks the following words.

Sūtra 33

sāmānyāt tu

sāmānyāt—because of resemblance; tu—but.

But because of a common quality.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to dispel doubt. As the word "jar" is used to describe many different kinds of jars, which all have a single quality of "jarness" in common, so the word "bliss" describes many different kinds of ordinary and extraordinary blisses, which all have a single quality of "blissness" in common. However the different kinds of bliss and other attributes are not alike in all respects. Therefore it is said:

para-jñānamayo 'sadbhir

nāma-jāty-ādibhir vibhuḥ
na yogavān na yukto 'bhūn
naiva pāṛthiva yokṣyati

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead has the highest transcendental knowledge. He never is, was, or will be touched by the temporary names and forms of the material world."

It this way it is demonstrated that the knowledge possessed by the Supreme Personality of Godhead is superior to the knowledge possessed by the individual spirit souls.

Here someone may object: If the Supreme Personality of Godhead is actually superior to the individual spirit souls and to the inanimate material world, then why does the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (3.14.1) declare:

sarvaṁ khalv idaṁ brahma taj jalān iti śānta upāsīta

"Everything is the Supreme. Everything is manifested from Him. A peaceful sage should worship Him."

In the following words the author of the sūtras answers this objection.

Sūtra 34

buddhy-arthāḥ pāda-vat

buddhi—of understanding; arthāḥ—for the purpose; pāda—foot; vat—like.

It is for understanding, like the word "foot".

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This teaching is meant to increase understanding. The understanding here is that everything belongs to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is like the explanation of the word "foot" in the scriptures. In the Ṛg Veda (10.90.3) it is said:

pādo 'sya viśvā bhūtāni

"The entire material universe is His one foot."

By understanding that the entire material universe is a single foot of the Supreme, a person no longer hates anyone, and then his heart becomes devoted to the Lord. This does not mean, however, that one should become attracted to everything, for that would bewilder the intelligence.

Adhikaraṇa 16 The Supreme Is Not Devoid of Variety

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be explained the truth that because there is a great variety of kinds of love and devotion for Him, worshipable Lord Hari assumes a great variety of forms. If this were not so then many kinds of love for the Lord would be thwarted. These many forms of the Lord are all beginningless and eternal. In the Śruti-śāstra it is said:

eko 'pi san bahudhā yo 'vabhāti

"Although He is one, He appears in many forms."

Thus the one Supreme Personality of Godhead appears eternally in many different places.

Samśaya (doubt): Are there varieties of greater and lesser in these forms, or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because these forms are all equally the Supreme Lord, therefore they are all the same and they are not different.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

sthāna-viśeṣāt prakāśādi-vat

sthāna—of places; viśeṣāt—from the variety; prakāśa—light; ādi—beginning with; vat—like.

Like light and other things, so He also is different in different places.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Although the Supreme Personality of Godhead is one, nevertheless, in different places and before different devotees He manifests different kinds of opulence, power, and sweetness. In this way, in the presence of devotees in the various mellows, such as the mellows of peacefulness, servitude, and friendship, the Lord manifests many different kinds of forms. He does this in the same way as light or other things also manifest many different kinds of forms. As the light of a lamp appears clear or red when reflected from crystals or rubies set in a temple's walls, and as sound, although originally one, appears different when sounded by a conchshell, mṛdaṅga, flute, or other musical instrument, so the Supreme Personality of Godhead manifest sweetness and other attributes according to the different circumstances. That is the meaning. When the Lord manifests His great opulence, He is worshiped by the rules and regulations of vidhi-bhakti. That manifestation is compared to the light reflected from crystal. When the Lord manifests His great sweetness, He is worshiped by the spontaneous love of ruci-bhakti. That manifestation is compared to the light reflected from rubies. In this way the Lord's many manifestations in different abodes and in relation to the different kinds of devotion of different kinds of devotees, are basically of these two kinds (opulence and sweetness).

Sūtra 36

upapateṣ ca

upapateḥ—because of reasonableness; ca—also.

Also because it is reasonable.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This is also described in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (3.14.1), which explains:

"As one has faith in the Lord, so one is rewarded."

It is not otherwise. As there are different kinds of love for the one Supreme Lord, so the one Lord expands into many different forms.

Adhikaraṇa 17 **The Lord is the Highest**

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be explained the truth that the Supreme Lord is the highest. If anyone were superior to the Supreme Lord, then it would not be possible to develop love and devotion to Him. Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (3.4) clearly states that the Lord is the greatest. However, Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (3.10) describes something superior to the Supreme Lord.

Saiṁśaya (doubt): Is there a person or thing greater than the worshipable Supreme Lord, or is there not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): There is something greater than the Supreme Lord. This is clearly described in Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (3.10).

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 37

tathānya-pratiṣedhāt

tathā—so; anya—of another; pratiṣedhāt—because of the denial.

It is so, for another is denied.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Nothing is greater than the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "for another is denied." In the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (3.9) it is said:

yasmāt paraṁ nāparam asti kiñcid
yasmān nāṇīyo na jyāyo 'sti kiñcit

"There is no truth superior to that Supreme Person because He is the supermost. He is smaller than the smallest, and He is greater than the greatest."*

In this way the scriptures deny the existence of anything greater than the Supreme Lord. That is the meaning here. In Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (3.8) it is said:

vedāham etaṁ puruṣam mahantam
āditya-varṇaṁ tamaśaḥ parastāt
tam eva viditvāti mṛtyum eti
nānyaḥ panthāḥ vidyate 'yanāya

"I know that Supreme Personality of Godhead who is transcendental to all material conditions of darkness. Only he who knows Him can transcend the bonds of birth and death. There is no way for liberation other than knowledge of that Supreme Person."*

After thus teaching that no path but knowledge of the Supreme Person leads to liberation, the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (3.9) explains:

yasmāt paraṁ nāparam asti

"There is no truth superior to that Supreme Person."

In this way is proved that there is no truth superior to the Supreme Lord. In Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (3.10) it is said:

tato yad uttarataram
tad arūpam anāmayam
ya etad vidur amṛtās te bhavanty
athetare duḥkham evāpi yānti

"They who know that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is greater than the greatest, and has no material body and no faults, become immortal. They who do not know Him suffer."

In this way the scriptures declare that there is no truth superior to the Lord. In this way the false idea of our opponent is disproved. In Bhagavad-gītā (7.7), the Supreme Lord Himself declares:

mattaḥ parataram nānyat
kiñcid asti dhanañjaya

"O conqueror of wealth, there is no truth superior to Me."*

Adhikaraṇa 18 The Lord is All-pervading

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now, to show that the object of worship is always nearby, the truth that the Supreme Lord is all-pervading will be described. Otherwise, if the Supreme Lord were not always nearby, then there would not be enthusiasm to love the Lord, and love for the Lord would become slackened. In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said:

eko vaśī sarva-gaḥ kṛṣṇa īḍyaḥ

"Lord Kṛṣṇa, the supreme controller and the supreme object of worship, is present everywhere."

Samśaya (doubt): Is Lord Hari, the supreme object of meditation, all-pervading, or does He stay only in one place?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the Lord is of moderate height, and because He stays aloof from the material world, the Lord cannot be everywhere and does not go to every place. Therefore the Lord is not all-pervading.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives

His conclusion.

Sūtra 38

anena sarvagatatvam āyāma-śabdādibhyaḥ

anena—by Him; sarva—everywhere; gata—going; tvam—the state of being; āyāma—all-pervasiveness; śabda—Śruti-śāstra; ādibhyaḥ—beginning with.

He is everywhere, for the Śruti-śāstra and other scriptures declare that He is all-pervading.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Even though His form is of a moderate height, the Supreme Personality of Godhead is all-pervading. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "the Śruti-śāstra and other scriptures declare that He is all-pervading." Here the word "āyāma" means "all-pervading". The word "ādi" (beginning with) here means "because He has inconceivable potencies".

In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said:

eko vaśī sarva-gaḥ kṛṣṇa īdyāḥ

"Lord Kṛṣṇa, the supreme controller and the supreme object of worship, is present everywhere."

In the Taittirīya Aranyaka it is said:

yac ca kiñcij jagat sarvaṁ
dṛśyate śrūyate 'pi vā
antar bahiś ca tat sarvaṁ
vyāpya nārāyaṇaḥ sthitaḥ

"Lord Nārāyaṇa is present everywhere. He is within and without everything. He is within everything that has ever been seen or heard."

In this way it is declared that, even though He has a form of moderate height, the Supreme Personality of Godhead is certainly all-pervading. Because of His inconceivable potencies the Lord is greater than all and present everywhere, even

though His form is of a moderate height. In Bhagavad-gītā (9.4 and 5), the Supreme Lord Himself declares:

mayā tatam idaṁ sarvaṁ
jagad avyakta-mūrtinā
mat-sthāni sarva-bhūtāni
na cāhaṁ teṣv avasthitaḥ

na ca mat-sthāni bhūtāni
paśya me yogam aiśvaram

"By Me, in My unmanifested form, this entire universe is pervaded. All beings are in Me, but I am not in them. And yet everything that is created does not rest in Me. Behold My mystic opulence!"*

Because the Supreme Lord is different from matter does not mean that He cannot be all-pervading within the material world, for the Śruti-śāstra clearly declares that He is certainly present within and without. The scriptures also affirm that as oil is present in sesame seeds and as butter is present in yogurt, so the Supreme Lord is present everywhere. In this way it is proved that worshipable Lord Hari is present everywhere. This is clearly shown in His Dāmodara pastime. Even though He was a small child, still He displayed His power of being all-pervading.

Adhikaraṇa 19 **The Supreme Lord Awards the Fruits of Action**

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be described the truth that the Supreme Lord awards all the fruits of action. Otherwise, if He did not award the fruits of action, or if He awarded only some of the fruits of action, because of His miserliness it would be difficult to develop love for Him. In the Praśna Upaniṣad (3.7) it is said:

puṇyena puṇyaṁ lokāṁ nayati

"The Supreme Lord takes the pious to the world of the pious."

Samśaya (doubt): Are the pious results that begin with entrance into Svargaloka attained by performing yajñas and other pious deeds, or are they attained by the sanction given by the Lord?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): These results are caused by performance of yajñas and other pious deeds. The Supreme Lord has nothing to do with it.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 39

phalam ata upapatteḥ

phalam—fruit; ataḥ—from Him; upapatteḥ—because it is reasonable.

The result is from Him, for that is reasonable.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The attainment of Svargaloka and other pious benefits, benefits attained by performing yajñas and other pious deeds, are actually awarded by the Supreme Lord Himself. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "for that is reasonable." In this way it is shown that the eternal, all-knowing, all-powerful, and supremely generous Lord, when He is worshiped by the performance of yajñas and other pious deeds, after some time has elapsed grants the rewards of these pious deeds. The deeds themselves, which are only inert matter and which perish in a moment as soon as they are performed, do not grant these rewards. That is the meaning.

In the next sūtra the author gives the proof of this.

Sūtra 40

śrutatvāc ca

śrutatvāt—because of being described in the Śruti-śāstra; ca—also.

Also because it is affirmed by the Śruti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.9.28) it is said:

vijñānam ānandaṁ brahma rātir dātuḥ parāyaṇam

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is full of knowledge and bliss. It is He who gives the fruits of actions to they who perform yajñas."

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.24) it is also said:

sa vā eṣa mahān aja ātmā annādo vasu-dānaḥ

"The unborn Supreme Personality of Godhead gives the fruits of work."

These two passages explain that the Supreme Lord gives the fruits of action. The word "dātuḥ" means "of the performer of yajña", and "rātīḥ" means "the giver of the results".

Sūtra 41

dharmaṁ jaiminir ata eva

dharmam—piety; jaiminiḥ—Jaimini; ataḥ—from Him; eva—indeed.

Jaimini affirms that piety comes from Him.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Jaimini holds that piety comes from the Supreme Lord. The pious deed that gives an auspicious result itself comes from the Supreme Lord. In the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad (3.8) it is said:

eṣa eva sādhu karma kārayati

"The Lord engages the living entity in pious activities."*

According to Jaimini, the Supreme Lord does not give the results of actions, either directly or indirectly. The Lord creates only the actions themselves and the results are given by the actions.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that actions are over in a moment, whereas there is often a great lapse of time before actions bear their karmic result? If the actions quickly cease to exist they cannot create the karmic results, for something that has ceased to exist cannot create something new.

To this objection Jaimini may reply: No. It is not so. Even though the action itself comes to an end, it leaves behind a potential result. Only when this result is fulfilled is the action actually completed. Even if there is a considerable lapse of time, the action itself gives the result to the person, a result appropriate to that particular action. Thus actions are the givers of results.

In the following words Śrīla Vyāsadeva, the author of the sūtras, gives His opinion.

Sūtra 42

pūrvam tu bādarāyaṇo hetu-vyapadeśāt

pūrvam—previous; tu—but; bādarāyaṇaḥ—Vyāsadeva; hetu—of the cause; vyapadeśāt—from the description.

But Vyāsadeva holds the previous view, for the Lord is described as the cause.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here the word "tu" (but) is employed to dispel doubt. Vyāsadeva holds the previous view, that the Supreme Personality of Godhead awards the fruits of action. Why so? The sūtra explains: "for the Lord is described as the cause". In the Praśna Upaniṣad (3.7) it is said:

puṇyena puṇyam lokam nayati pāpena pāpam

"The Supreme Lord takes the pious to the world of the pious and the sinful to the world of the sinful."

In this way the scriptures teach that the Supreme Lord awards the results of action. That is the meaning. Because they already have ceased to exist, the actions themselves cannot be the cause of the karmic results. Also, it is the Supreme Lord Himself who is the creator of karma, for the scriptures say:

dravyam karma ca kālāś ca

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is creator of matter, karma, and time.

In this way it is proved that the Lord is the creator of karma. The idea that actions leave behind a potential result is a lame and foolish idea. Actions are inanimate and unconscious. They are like a block of wood or a stone, and therefore they have no power to award the results of actions. Also, the Śruti-śāstra never describes them as awarding the results of actions.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that the demigods are worshiped in the performance of yajñas and it is the demigods themselves who give the results of these yajñas.

If this is said, then I reply: It is by the sanction of the Supreme Lord that the demigods are able to give these results. This is clearly described in the Antaryāmi Brāhmaṇa. Therefore the Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself awards the results of actions. The lotus-eyed Supreme Lord Himself affirms this in the following words (Bhagavad-gītā 7.21-22):

yo yo yaṁ yaṁ tanuṁ bhaktam
śraddhayārcitum icchati
tasya tasyācalām śraddhām
tām eva vidadhāmy aham

"I am in everyone's heart as the Supersoul. As soon as one desires to worship some demigod, I make his faith steady so he can devote himself to that particular deity.*

sa tayā śraddhayā yuktaś
tasyārādhanam ihate
labhate ca tataḥ kāmān
mayaiva vihitān hi tān

"Endowed with such a faith, he endeavors to worship a particular demigod and obtain his desires. But in actuality these benefits are bestowed by Me alone."*

In this way worshiped by the performance of yajña, the Supreme Lord Himself gives the auspicious results to the worshiper. When He is thus pleased by devotion, the Supreme Lord will give everything, even Himself to His devotee. This will be described later on with quotes from the Śruti-śāstra.

Thus, in these two padas has been seen: 1. the fault of the material world, which is an abode of many sufferings, beginning with repeated birth and death, 2. the faultless glories of the Lord, 3. the Lord's being the controller of all, 4. the Lord's form of pure spirit, and 5. the Lord's being not different from His attributes. By hearing of these things one develops a great thirst to attain the Lord's association and a great disgust for all that is far from the Lord. In this way one comes to attain the Lord. That is what was revealed in these two padas.

Pada 3

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

parayā nirasya māyāṁ guṇa-
karmādīni yo bhajati nityam
devaś caitanya-tanur manasi
mamāsau parisphuratu kṛṣṇaḥ

May Lord Kṛṣṇa, who with the aid of His transcendental potency pushes aside the influence of māyā, who has a host of transcendental virtues eternally, who enjoys eternal transcendental pastimes, and who has now appeared as Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu, appear in my heart.

In this pada will be revealed the way of worshiping the Lord's transcendental attributes. As in a vaidūrya jewel many splendid colors are always manifest, so in the Supreme Personality of Godhead many different transcendental forms, all perfect and without beginning, are also manifest eternally. Understanding that the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is supremely perfect, complete, and pure, has many different forms, a devotee becomes attracted to one of the Lord's forms and directs his worship to that form. If the various scriptures describe transcendental virtues present in that form of the Lord, all those virtues may also be ascribed to that single chosen form. Thus a person who worships the Supreme Personality of Godhead as present in His powers and opulences, such as the mind and the other powers of the world, should review the scriptures' descriptions of the various qualities of these forms, but not of other forms of the Lord.

Others, however, speak in the following way: The one Supreme Personality of Godhead assumes different forms as an actor assumes different roles on the stage. In this way the Lord has many different names and abodes. For this reason all the qualities and pastimes of the different forms of the Lord, as described in the scriptures, may be ascribed to any one of the Lord's forms.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that many of the qualities of many of the Lord's forms, qualities described in the scriptures, cannot be properly ascribed to all of the Lord's forms? Is it not so that sweetness, opulence, peacefulness, austerity, ferociousness, and other qualities may be mutually contradictory, and it may also be contradictory to ascribe the features of having a horn, tail, mane, tusk, or other features appropriate to the Lord's forms like Varāha and others to the Lord's humanlike forms, which carry a flute, conchshell, bow, arrows, and other paraphernalia? Therefore in the Mahābhārata it is said:

yo 'nyathā santam ātmānam
anyathā pratipadyate
kiṁ tena na kṛtaṁ pāpaṁ
caureṇātmāpahāriṇā

"A person who ascribes to the Supreme Lord qualities that the Lord does not actually possess is a thief who robs himself. Does he not sin with his words?"

Therefore, because of both the injunction of Smṛti-śāstra and the experience of the wise sages, one should not ascribe the qualities of one of Lord's forms to another of the Lord's forms.

If this is said, then the following reply may be given: The qualities of one of Lord's forms may be ascribed to another of the Lord's forms only when the qualities are appropriate to that particular form. Ascribing the qualities of one of Lord's forms to another of the Lord's forms is of two kinds: 1. cintana, and 2. dhī-mātra. They who perform this first kind of meditation are called sva-niṣṭha, and they who perform the second kind of meditation are called ekāntī. In the next pada three kinds of wise devotees, headed by the sva-niṣṭha devotees, will be described. The sva-niṣṭha devotees have equal love for all the Lord's forms. They see all the qualities of all the Lord's forms present equally in each of the Lord's forms. They do not see anything improper in ascribing many contradictory qualities to each of the Lord's forms. They consider that the Lord by His great potency may possess many mutually contradictory qualities, just as a vaidūrya jewel may display many different colors.

The ekāntī devotees, who are divided into two groups: pariniṣṭhita and nirapekṣa, do not have equal love for all the Lord's forms. They meditate only on the qualities of one form the Lord, the form they have chosen. They see the qualities of this form alone. Even though they are well aware of the Lord's other forms, they do not meditate or gaze upon them. On His part, the Lord generally does not reveal His other forms to these devotees. This will be revealed in another adhikaraṇa. As for the passage quoted from the Mahābhārata, its true meaning is

that it is a rebuke hurled at the impersonalists, who claim that the Supreme is consciousness and nothing else. The truth that the Supreme certainly does have qualities, and therefore the Lord's qualities should be sought out by they who seek liberation, is described in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.1.1-6). It is also said, in thw Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.4.1):

ānandaṁ brahmaṇo vidvān
na bibheti kutaścana

"He who knows that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is full of bliss never fears anything."

This means that they who understand the qualities of the Supreme become free of fear. In this way the scriptures affirm that the Supreme certainly does have qualities. The impersonalists claim that the Lord's qualities are either falsely ascribed to Him or else are accepted only because of the material traditions of this world. However, because many of these qualities are present in the Lord alone and no one else, it cannot be said that these qualities are falsely ascribed to the Lord, and because the revelation of scripture does not describe them as such, it also cannot be said that the qualities of the Lord are accepted only because of the material traditions of this world. They who claim that the qualities of the Lord are imagined to facilitate worship of the Lord, as in the statement, "Imagining the goddess of speech to be a cow, one should worship her", are all fools. Their idea is destroyed by the simple statement of the scriptures:

satyam etyopāsita

"Approaching the Supreme Reality, one should worship Him."

Even the impersonalists, in their commentaries on sūtras 3.3.12 and 3.3.38, affirm that the Supreme is bliss and there is no difference between the individual souls and the Supreme. In this way they accept the idea that the qualities of the worshipable Supreme are real and not metaphors. When the scriptures say that the Supreme has no qualities (nirguṇa), the intention is that He has no material qualities. Because it is clearly stated that the Lord is not different from His qualities, this objection of the impersonalists should not be taken seriously. For the purpose of meditation the Lord's qualities should be understood to be of two kinds: aṅgi-niṣṭha (general qualities) and aṅga-niṣṭha (features of the Lord's form). It is said that one may collect from all the different parts of the Vedas descriptions of the Lord's qualities.

Adhikaraṇa 1 The Lord Should Be Sought

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya (the subject to be discussed): To understand the Lord's qualities one should search all the texts of the Vedas.

Samśaya (doubt): Should one learn about the Supreme by studying the branch (śākha) of Vedic texts in one's own community, or should one study all the branches of the Vedas?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because all the branches of the Vedas are different, one should study only one's own branch of the Vedas.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion:

Sūtra 1

sarva-vedānta-pratyayaṁ codanādy-aviśeṣāt

sarva—all; veda—Vedas; anta—end; pratyayaṁ—meaning; codana—injunctions; ādi—beginning with; aviśeṣāt—because of not being different.

Because the Vedic injunctions and all other sources of real knowledge are not genuinely different, therefore knowledge of Him is the conclusion of all the Vedas.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "anta" (end) here means "conclusion". The word "anta" is also used in this way in Bhagavad-gītā (2.16):

ubhayor api dr̥ṣṭo 'ntaḥ

"This they have concluded by studying the nature of both."*

Thus knowledge of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the final conclusion taught by all the Vedas. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "because the Vedic injunctions and all other sources of real knowledge are not genuinely different." The "other sources of real knowledge" here refers to logic. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.7) it is said:

ātmety evopāsīta

"One should worship the Supreme."

These words, as well as the promptings of logic, confirm the truth that these statements and many others like them in passages of all the Vedas, all describe the same Supreme Lord. The same Supreme Lord is described in the same way in the Kaṇva, Madhyandina, and other recensions of the Vedas.

Here someone may object: In one part of the Vedas (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3.9.28) it is said:

vijñānam ānandam brahma

"The Supreme is knowledge and bliss."

However, in another part of the Vedas (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 1.1.9) it is said:

yaḥ sarva-jñāḥ sarva-vit

"The Supreme knows everything."

Because in this way each branch of the Vedas speaks differently of the Supreme, they do not all describe the same object as the Supreme.

If this is said, the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 2

bhedād iti cen naikasyām api

bhedāt—because of difference; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; ekasyām—in one; api—also.

If it is said, "because they are different," then I reply, "It is not so, for it is also in one".

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

It is not so. That is so because these differences are seen even within the same branch of the Vedas. An example of this is the Taittirīya Upaniṣad, which gives the following two statements.

satyaṁ jñānam anantaṁ brahma

"The limitless Supreme is both knowledge and truth."

ānando brahma

"The Supreme is bliss."

In this way the many different branches of the Vedas describe the same form of the Supreme Lord. They do not contradict each other at all.

Sūtra 3

svādhyāyasya tathātvena hi samācāre 'dhikārāc ca

svādhyāyasya—of Vedic study; tathātvena—by being so; hi—indeed; samācāre—in Vedic rituals; adhikārāt—because of being qualified; ca—also.

Because of being qualified to study the Vedas and to perform rituals.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Taittirīya Aranyaka (2.15) it is said:

svādhyāyo 'dhyetavyaḥ

"One should study the Vedas."

In this way one is ordered to study all the Vedas. In the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

vedaḥ kṛtsno 'dhigantavyaḥ sa-rahasyo dvijanmanā

"A brāhmaṇa should study the entire Veda, including even its confidential portions."

The word "samācāre" in this sūtra means "because all are qualified to perform all pious rituals". The Smṛti-śāstra confirms this in the following words:

sarva-vedokta-mārgena
karma kurvīta nityaśaḥ
ānando hi phalaṁ yasmāc
chākhā-bhedo hy aśakti-jaḥ

sarva-karma-kṛtau yasmād
aśaktāḥ sarva-jantavaḥ
śākhā-bhedam karma-bhedam
vyāsaś tasmād acikṣpad

"Following the path of all the Vedas, one should regularly perform pious rituals. Bliss is the result attained by this. The Veda was divided into different branches because the people were not able to perform all the pious deeds described in the Veda. That is why Vyāsa divided the Veda into many branches and the one collection of pious rituals into many collections."

Therefore, if a person is able to do so, he may understand the Supreme by performing all the spiritual practices described in all the branches of the Vedas. In the next sūtra the author gives an example of indirect reasoning leading to the same conclusion.

Sūtra 4

sava-vac ca tan niyamaḥ

sava—yajñas; vac—like; ca—and; tat—that; niyamaḥ—rule.

That rule is like the yajñas.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The "savās" here are the seven yajñas beginning with the saurya-yajña and ending with the śataudana-yajña which, because they are performed with only one fire, may be performed only by the followers of the Atharva Veda. The worship of the Supreme Lord, however, can be performed by the followers of all the Vedas.

The word "salila-vat" (like water) is an alternate reading of the first word in this sūtra. If this reading is accepted, then the sūtra means, "As all waters flow, without restriction, into the sea, so all the statements of the Vedas describe, as much as they have the power, the Supreme Personality of Godhead." In the Agni Purāṇa it is said:

yathā nadīnām salilam
śaktyā sāgaratām vrajet
evam sarvāṇi vākyaṇi
pum-śaktyā brahma-vittaye

"As the water of rivers, as far as it has the power, always enters the sea, so all words, as far as their speaker has the power, should be employed to understand the Supreme Lord."

Sūtra 5

darśayati ca

darśayati—reveals; ca—also.

It also reveals it.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Kaṭha Upaniṣad (1.2.15) it is said:

sarve vedā yat-padam āmananti

"All the Vedas describe the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

This means that the Supreme Lord is known by all the Vedas, or, in other words, the Vedas reveal the truth of Lord Hari. The word "ca" (and) in this sūtra hints, "as far as one has the power". They who have the power may worship the Supreme Lord by performing the pious rituals described in all the branches of the Vedas. They who do not have the power must worship the Supreme Lord by performing the pious rituals described in their own community's branch of the Vedas. The conclusion is that the Supreme Lord is the final object of knowledge sought by all the branches of the Vedas. This truth was also described in the very beginning of Vedānta-sūtra (1.1.4):

tat tu samanvayāt

"But that (Lord Viṣṇu is the sole topic of discussion in the Vedas) is confirmed by all scriptures."

This truth is thus repeated here in the discussion of the properness of studying the different qualities of the Supreme Lord. Because this repetition strengthens the argument here, there is no fault in it.

Adhikaraṇa 2

The Lord's Qualities Are Described in Many Scriptures

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the author of the sūtras will show that the many qualities of the Lord may be understood by studying all the Vedas. For example, in the Atharva Veda's Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.8), the Supreme Lord is described as a cowherd boy dark like a tamāla tree, dressed in yellow garments, decorated with a Kaustubha jewel, wearing a peacock-feather, playing graceful melodies on a flute, and surrounded by gopas, gopīs, and surabhi cows. There He is the Deity of Gokula. In the Rāma-tāpanī Upaniṣad, however, He is described as the Lord whose left side is decorated by Jānakī-devī, holding a bow, the killer of Rāvaṇa and a host of demons, and the king of Ayodhyā. In the Rāma-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said:

prakṛtyā sahitaḥ śyāmaḥ
pīta-vāsā jaṭā-dharaḥ
dvi-bhujāḥ kuṇḍalī ratna-
mālī dhīro dhanur-dharaḥ

"Decorated with earrings and a jewel necklace, His complexion dark, His garments yellow, and the hair on His head matted, saintly, two-armed Lord Rāma is accompanied by Goddess Sitā."

In the scriptures the Lord's form as Nṛsimha is described as having a frightening face and filling His enemies with fear. The word "bhīṣaṇa" (frightening), which occurs in Lord Nṛsimha's mantra, is explained in the following words of the Nṛsimha-tāpanī Upaniṣad:

atha kasmād ucyate bhīṣaṇam iti. yasmād yasya rūpaṁ dṛṣṭvā sarve lokāḥ sarve devāḥ sarvaṇi bhūtāni bhītyā palāyante svayaṁ yataḥ kutaścīn na bibhēti. bhīṣāsmād vātaḥ pavate bhīṣodeti sūryaḥ. bhīṣāsmād agniś cendraś ca mṛtyur dhāvati pañcamaḥ.

"Why is the Lord called frightening? Because when all the demigods, all the worlds, and all living entities see His form, they all flee in fear. He fears no one. Out of fear of Him the wind blows and the sun rises. Out of fear of Him fire, the moon, and death all flee."

The Lord's form as Trivikrama is described in the Ṛg Veda (1.154.1):

viṣṇor nu kaṁ vīryāṇi prāvocaṁ
yaḥ pārthivāni vimame rajāmsi
yo askambhayad uttaraṁ sadhasthaṁ
vicakramāṇas tredhorugāya

"How can I describe all the glories and powers of Lord Viṣṇu, who created the heaven and earth, established the worlds above and below, and with three steps passed over all the worlds?"

Therefore, like the yajñas, which are different because they are offered to different demigods, so the method of worship to be offered to the different forms of the Supreme Lord are all different because the qualities of the Lord's different forms are different.

Samśaya (doubt): Should the Śruti-śāstra's description of the Lord's qualities in one kind of worship be added in another kind of worship, or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The Śruti-śāstra's description of the Lord's qualities in one passage should be heard. One should not mix that description with other descriptions of the Lord in other passages.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 6

upasaṁhāro 'rthābhedād vidhi-śeṣa-vat samāne ca

upasaṁhāraḥ—combination; artha—of meaning; abhedāt—because of non-difference; vidhi—of duties; śeṣa—remainder; vat-like; samāne—in being the same; ca—also.

In what is common there may be combination, for the meaning is not different. This is like what is appropriate for the rules and regulations.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" (and) is used here for limitation. When the method of worship is the same, when the pure Supreme Personality of Godhead is the object of worship, and when the Lord's form is the same, then the qualities described in different places may be combined together. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "for the meaning is not different." This means "because the worshipable qualities of the Supreme Lord are in all respects not different, that is because they are one, or harmonious. Here the sūtra gives an example: "This is like what is appropriate for the rules and regulations." Descriptions of the rules for performing a yajña may be collected from different passages because the ritual of a yajña is everywhere the same. In the Atharva Veda's Rāma-tāpanīa Upaniṣad it is said:

yo vai śrī-rāmacandraḥ sa bhagavān ye matsya-kūrmādy-avatārā bhūr bhuvaḥ svas
tasmai namo namaḥ.

"Bhūḥ Bhuvaḥ Svaḥ. Obeisances to Śrī Rāmacandra, the Supreme Lord who descends in a host of incarnations, such as Lord Matsya and Lord Kūrma."

In this passage the forms of Lord Matsya and other incarnations are brought into a meditation on Lord Rāmacandra.

In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said:

eko 'pi san bahudhā yo 'vabhāti

"Although He is one, He appears in many forms."

In this passage the forms of Lord Rāmacandra and other incarnations are brought into a meditation on Lord Kṛṣṇa.

In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam it is said of Lord Kṛṣṇa:

namas te raghu-varyāya
rāvaṇāntakarāya ca

"Obeisances to You, the best of the Raghus and the killer of Rāvaṇa."

Many other passages may be quoted to show meditations where descriptions of different forms of the Lord are brought together.

Here someone may object: In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.7) it is said:

atmety evopāsīta

"One should worship the Supreme."

Therefore one should worship the Lord alone and not bring other forms into one's method of worship.

If this is said, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 7

anyathātvam śabdād iti cen nāviśeṣāt

anyathātvam—otherwise; śabdāt—because of the Śruti-śāstra; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; aviśeṣāt—because of the lack of something specific.

If someone says, "It is otherwise because of the Śruti-śāstra", then I reply, "It is

not so, for there is nothing specific".

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

If someone claims that Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.7) refutes the idea of thus bringing together the Lord's qualities, then I reply: No. It is not so. Why not? The sūtra explains: "for there is nothing specific". This means that no scriptural passage declares, "the Lord's qualities should not be worshiped together." The word "eva" (indeed) in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.7) means that one should not worship what is not the Supreme Lord. It does not mean that the Lord's qualities can not be worshiped together. If it is said, "The king alone is seen", that does not mean that the king's royal parasol and other royal paraphernalia were absent. It is said:

tasmād yathā-śakti-guṇāś cintyāḥ

"Therefore, as far as one is able, one should meditate on the Lord's various transcendental qualities."

In this way it is proved that one may bring together the various qualities of the Lord.

As a vaidūrya jewel manifests many different colors, so the Supreme Lord manifests many different forms. Each of these forms is the same perfect, complete, and pure Supreme Lord. In some forms the Lord displays all His qualities, and other forms the Lord does not display all His qualities. Therefore a wise devotee may meditate on all the Lord qualities, as described in the scriptures, as being present in the particular form of the Lord that is chosen for worship.

Adhikaraṇa 3

The Ekāntī Devotees Do Not Meditate On All the Lord's Qualities

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Although they are learned in the many branches of the Vedas, still the ekāntī devotees meditate only the Lord's qualities as revealed in their own Upaniṣads, which they have carefully studied. Even though they are aware of other qualities, they do not meditate on them. In this way there is an exception to what was previously described.

Viṣaya (the subject matter): The subject matter here is a passage of Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad.

Samśaya (doubt): In the worship performed by the ekāntī devotees, should all the qualities of the Supreme Lord be brought together or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the Lord's qualities are to be praised, the ekāntī devotees should meditate in this way, if they are able.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 8

na vā prakaraṇa-bhedāt parovarīyastvādi-vat

na—not; vā—or; prakaraṇa—of devotion; bheda—because of differences; parovarīyastva—greater than the greatest; ādi—beginning with; vat—like.

Certainly not. Because of the differences in devotion. Like the Parovarīya and others.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "vā" (or) is used in the sense of "certainly". The ekāntī devotees do not bring the qualities of the Lord's other forms into the specific form they have selected to worship. In this way the ekāntī devotees who are exclusively devoted to Lord Kṛṣṇa do not think of Lord Nṛsimha's mane, teeth, fearsomeness, and other qualities as present in Lord Kṛṣṇa. In the same way the ekāntī devotees who are exclusively devoted to Lord Nṛsimha do not think of Lord Kṛṣṇa's flute, stick, peacock-feather, and other qualities as present in Lord Nṛsimha. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "prakaraṇa-bhedāt" (because of the differences in devotion). The word "prakaraṇa" here means "the most exalted (pra) activity (karaṇa)." Therefore the word "prakaraṇa" here refers to devotional service. The word "bheda" here means "because of the differences".

Because it is more intense and deep, the devotion of the ekāntī devotees is more exalted than the devotion of the svanīṣṭha devotees. Here the author of the sūtras gives an example. He says: "Like the Parovarīya and others." This means that the ekāntī devotees who are exclusively devoted to the Lord's form as the Hiraṇya Puruṣa in the sun planet do not ascribe to their object of worship the qualities of the Lord's form as Parovarīya, a form worshiped by the worshipers of Udgītha. The

word Parovarīya means "greater than the greatest". The example here is of the worshipers of Ugītha in relation to Parovarīya.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that the ekāntīs and svaniṣṭhas are both called devotees of the Lord and therefore they must both meditate on all the Lord's qualities just as they who call themselves brāhmaṇas must all meditate on the Gāyatrī-mantra?

If this is said, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 9

samjñātaś cet tad uktam asti tu tad api

samjñātaḥ—by the name; cet—if; tat—that; uktam—spoken; asti—is; tu—but; tat—that; api—also.

If it is because of the name, then I reply, "But it was already said. That also."

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is employed here to dispel doubt. If it is said that all who worship the Supreme must meditate on all His qualities, then the answer was already given in the previous sūtra. The answer is, "Certainly not. Because of the differences in devotion." Although they are certainly included in the general category of the Lord's devotees, the ekāntīs are the best of the devotees, and therefore they do not meditate on all the qualities of the Lord. If it were otherwise then they would not be the best of the devotees. Because the ekāntī devotees are passionately devoted to one particular form of the Lord, they are superior to the svaniṣṭha devotees who are in a general way devoted to all the forms of the Lord. Also, even the svaniṣṭha devotees are not able to meditate on every single one of the Lord's qualities. In the Ṛg Veda (1.154.1) it is said:

viṣṇor nu kaṁ vīryāṇi prāvocaṁ

"How can I describe all the glories and powers of Lord Viṣṇu?"

In the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

nāntam guṇānām aguṇasya jagmur
yogeśvarā ye bhava-pādma-mukhyāḥ

"Even Brahmā, Śiva, the demigods, and the masters of yoga could not find the end of the transcendental qualities of the Lord, who is beyond the touch of the modes of matter."

The sūtra explains, "asti" (it is that), which here means, "the idea that all devotees are exactly alike because they all bear the name 'devotee' is the logical fallacy called 'hetor anvaya-vyabhicāra'." As the worshipers of the Parovārīya form of the Lord and the worshipers of the Hiraṇmaya form of the Lord have different conceptions of the Lord, even though both are considered worshipers of the Udgītha, in the same way the svaiṣṭha and ekāntī devotees also have different conceptions of the Lord, the svaiṣṭha devotees meditating on all the Lord's qualities and the ekāntī devotees meditating only on the qualities of the particular form of the Lord they have chosen to worship. That is the conclusion of these two adhikaraṇas.

Adhikaraṇa 4 The Lord's Childhood and Youth

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the author begins a discussion of bringing together in meditation the Lord's qualities in His childhood and other ages. In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said:

kṛṣṇāya devakī-nandanāya om̐ tat sat. bhūr bhuvah svas tasmai vai namo namaḥ.

"Om̐ Tat Sat. Bhūr Bhuvah Svah. Obeisances to Lord Kṛṣṇa, the son of Devakī."

The author of Nāma-kaumudī defines the name Kṛṣṇa in the following way:

kṛṣṇa-śabdā tu tamāla-nīla-tviṣi yaśodā-stanandhaye rūḍhiḥ

"The word Kṛṣṇa means: Yaśoda's infant son, who is dark like a tamāla tree."

In the Rāma-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said:

om̐ cin-maye 'smin mahā-viṣṇau
jāte dāśarathe harau
raghoḥ kule 'khilam̐ rāti
rājate yo mahī-sthitaḥ

"Om̐. Born as Daśaratha's son in King Raghu's dynasty, the spiritual Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is known as Maḥa-Viṣṇu and Hari, was splendidly manifested on the earth. He delighted everyone."

In this way the Śruti-śāstra describes the qualities of the Supreme Lord in His childhood and other ages. Many similar descriptions are also found in the Smṛti-śāstra.

Samśaya (Doubt): Should one meditate on these descriptions of the Lord in His childhood and other ages, or should one not meditate on them?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): One should not meditate on the form of the Lord in His different ages, for then the Lord's form would be sometimes large and sometimes small. This would contradict the Śruti-śāstra's advice that in one's meditation the features of the Lord should be harmonious.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 10

vyāpteś ca samañjasam

vyāpṭeḥ—because of being all-pervading; ca—also; samañjasam—proper.

It is proper because He is all-pervading and for other reasons also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

It is proper to meditate on the Lord in His childhood and other ages because the Lord is all-pervading and because the Lord is not limited to His features in His different ages. In sūtra 3.2.38 the Lord's all-pervasiveness was confirmed. The

Lord's so-called "birth" is not in reality a change of condition for Him. In the Puruṣa-sūkta prayer it is said:

ajāyamāno bahudhā vijāyate

"Although He is never born, the Lord takes birth again and again in many different forms."

Therefore the word "birth" here means "the appearance of the Supreme Lord, who never really takes birth." The word "ca" (also) in this sūtra means, "also because He is the reservoir of transcendental mellows." This is confirmed in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.7.1):

raso vai saḥ

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the reservoir of transcendental mellows."*

By His inconceivable potency, the Supreme Lord appears in a particular form appropriate to the mellows and pastimes His devotees desire. This is perfectly proper. The Lord has numberless devotees, beginning with the liberated souls. This is described in the Ṛg Veda (1.22.20):

tad viṣṇoḥ paramaṁ padam
sadā paśyanti sūrayaḥ

"The wise and learned devotees always see the supreme abode of Lord Viṣṇu."*

The Supreme Lord, who is always one, simultaneously appears in His different ages before His different devotees. Something similar is seen in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (5.2.1-3), where the syllable "da" was interpreted in three ways by the demigods, human beings, and demons. In this way, because the Supreme Lord is all-pervading and because the Lord always remains one, one should certainly meditate on the Lord's pastimes of childhood and other ages.

Adhikaraṇa 5

The Lord's Activities Are Eternal

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the Supreme Lord is by nature eternal, it may be said that His activities performed with His associates in His childhood and other ages are also eternal. In this way His many different activities, from beginning to end, may all be considered to be eternal. However, it is illogical to say that there can be an eternal previous action that is followed by another action. If the previous action is followed by a subsequent action, then the eternality of the previous action is destroyed. If one action is eternal then any subsequent action must be performed by a different person. To say that the subsequent action is performed by the same person contradicts both scripture and direct experience. Every action has a beginning and an end. Without beginning and end no action can be brought to completion, and without such beginnings and ends there can be no experience of the nectar of transcendental mellows (rasa). For these reasons, how can it be possible that the Lord's activities are eternal? If the Lord's activities were eternal they would be still and unchanging, like a painted picture. If it is said that the same actions are repeated again and again and in that way they are eternal, then I say that there are bound to be times when the beginning of the action is different, and thus the subsequent actions will become changed, and the action would then not be repeated in the same way as before. Therefore, how can it be that the activities of the Lord are eternal? Therefore it should not be accepted that the activities of the Lord are eternal.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His reply to this idea.

Sūtra 11

sarvābhedād anyatreṃe

sarva—all; abhedāt—because of non-difference; anyatra—in another place; ime—they.

Because of complete non-difference they are in another place.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Both Lord Hari and His associates are the same persons in both previous and subsequent actions. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "sarvābhedād" (because of

complete non-difference). This means that because there is no difference in Their personalities, the same Lord Hari and the same associates present in the previous actions are also present in the subsequent actions. That Lord Hari remains one even though He expands into many forms is confirmed in the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad in these words:

eko 'pi san bahudhā yo 'vabhāti

"Although He is one, the Supreme Lord appears in many forms."

Also, in the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

ekāneka-svarūpāya

"Although He is one, the Supreme Lord appears in many forms."

This is also true of the Lord's liberated associates, who remain one even though they appear in many forms. In the Bhūma-vidyā (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 7.26.2) this is said of the liberated souls. In the Smṛti-śāstra this is also said in the description of the Lord's marriage with many princesses and in other pastimes also. In this way the Lord and the liberated souls can, retaining Their identities, expand themselves to be present eternally in different places in time. The sentence "It was twice-cooked" is understood by an intelligent person to mean that one thing was cooked twice, not that two separate foods were separately cooked. In the same way the sentence, "He called out the word 'cow' twice," means that one cow was addressed twice, not that two cows were addressed. In this way Lord Hari, His eternal associates, and His transcendental abodes all retain their identities even though they are manifested in many different places and perform activities that are all eternal even though their activities have a beginning and an end. In this way it is said that a wonderful variety of transcendental mellows are manifested by this sequence of eternal events. It is not that these ideas do not have their root in the descriptions of scripture. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.8.3) it is said:

yad bhūtaṁ bhavaḥ ca bhaviṣyac ca

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead exists in the past, present, and future."

In the Atharva Veda it is said:

eko devo nitya-lilānuraktaḥ

"The one Supreme Personality of Godhead is eternally engaged in many, many transcendental forms in relationships with His unalloyed devotees."*

The Supreme Lord Himself affirms (Bhagavad-gītā 4.9):

janma karma ca me divyam

"One who knows the transcendental nature of My appearance and activities does not, upon leaving the body, take his birth again in this material world, but attains My eternal abode, O Arjuna."*

Only a person who has attained the Supreme Lord's mercy can understand and accept all of this, as the Supreme Lord Himself declares (Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 2.9.32):

yāvān ahaṁ yathā-bhāvo
yad-rūpa-guṇa-karmakaḥ
tathaiva tattva-vijñānam
astu te mad-anugrahāt

"All of Me, namely My actual eternal form and My transcendental existence, color, qualities, and activities, let all be awakened within you by factual realization, out of My causeless mercy."*

In this way it is proved that the Lord's activities are eternal. However, only the actions that the Lord performs with the help of His spiritual potency are eternal, and the actions that the Lord performs with the help of His material potencies and material time are not eternal, for if the Lord's creation of the material universes were eternal then the eventual dissolution of the universes could not occur.

Adhikaraṇa 6 Meditation on the Lord's Qualities

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the author of the sūtras discusses the following point. In the Vedānta scriptures the Lord's blissfulness and other transcendental qualities are all

described.

Samśaya (doubt): Should all the qualities of the Lord be combined together in the devotees' meditation, or should they not be combined in that way?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The qualities of the Lord should not be combined in meditation, for there is not evidence to say that this should be done. Because it is not said in scripture that all the qualities of the Lord should be combined in meditation, therefore they should not be so combined.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 12

ānandādayaḥ pradhānasya

ānanda—bliss; ādayaḥ—beginning with; pradhānasya—of the Supreme.

Of the Supreme those qualities that begin with bliss.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The transcendental qualities of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, such as His bliss and knowledge, and His paternal affection for they who take shelter of Him, are all described in the Śruti-śāstra. These qualities should all be combined in the devotees' meditation, for all together they increase the devotees' thirst to attain the Lord.

Adhikaraṇa 7

The Supreme Lord Is Full of Bliss

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya (the subject to be discussed): In the Śruti-śāstra it is said that the blissful Supreme Personality of Godhead has a head and other limbs that are composed of transcendental pleasure. In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.5.1) it is said:

tasya priyam eva śiraḥ

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is like a bird whose head is composed of transcendental pleasure."

Samśaya (doubt): Are the qualities of the Supreme Lord to be remembered in every meditation, or are they not to be remembered in every meditation?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): It has already been explained that the Lord's bliss and other qualities should be brought together when there is meditation on the Lord. Because the Lord's pleasure, as described here in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad, is not really different from the Lord's bliss mentioned before, therefore it should be included in all meditations on the Lord.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 13

priya-śiraṣtvādy-aprāptir upacayāpacayau hi bhede

priya—pleasure; śiraḥ—the head; tva—the state of being; ādi—beginning with; aprāptiḥ—non-attainment; upacaya—increase; apacayau—and decrease; hi—indeed; bhede—in the difference.

There is not attainment of the qualities that begin with His head consisting of pleasure. In the difference there is increase and decrease.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The truth that the Lord's head is composed of pleasure, as well as other qualities of the Lord, are not to be employed in every meditation without exception. Lord Viṣṇu, who is full of transcendental bliss, has the shape of a human being, not the shape of a bird (as described in this passage of Taittirīya Upaniṣad).

Furthermore, the bird described in this passage of Taittirīya Upaniṣad is

composed of happiness and joy that increase and decrease. Thus there is a difference. The Lord is not like that. His happiness never increase or decreases. Thus the qualities described in this passage of Taittirīya Upaniṣad should not be included in every meditation on the Lord.

Sūtra 14

itare tv artha-sāmānyāt

itare—others; tu—but; artha—of result; sāmānyāt—because of equality.

But others because of the sameness of the result.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

However other passages of Taittirīya Upaniṣad, such as 2.5.1 (tasmād vā etasmāt. . . The Supersoul is full of bliss. From Him this world has come.), 2.6.2 (so 'kāmayata. . . The Supreme Personality of Godhead desired: I shall become many. I shall father many children.), and 2.8.1 (bhīṣmāt. . . Out of fear of the Supreme Lord the wind blows and the sun rises.), which appear both before and after Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.5.1, and which describe the Supreme Personality of Godhead's all-pervasiveness, spiritual bliss, creation of the material universes, supreme power and opulence, and many other of the blissful Supreme Lord's transcendental qualities, may be included in the devotees' meditations. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "artha-sāmānyāt" (because of the sameness of the result).

Meditation on the Lord's qualities, such as His supreme power, His opulences, His friendliness to all, His being the shelter of all, and His granting liberation, qualities described in the Vedānta scriptures, brings liberation as its result. Therefore one should meditate on these qualities of the Lord.

Here someone may ask: Why is the Supreme Personality of Godhead described as a bird in Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.5.1? In the Kaṭha Upaniṣad it is said:

ātmānam rathinam viddhi

"Know that the soul is the chariot driver."

In this way the soul is described as the chariot driver and the material body is described as the chariot. The purpose of this little parable in the Kaṭha Upaniṣad is to teach that the devotees should diligently control their senses. However, in this

parable of the bird in Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.5.1 no purpose is anywhere to be seen. What is the purpose then? The Vedas do not speak parables without a purpose behind them.

Fearing that someone may speak these words, the author of the sūtras next proceeds to explain the meaning of this parable of the bird.

Sūtra 15

ādhyānāya prayojanābhāvāt

ādhyānāya—for meditation; prayojana—other purpose; abhāvāt—because of the absence.

Because of the absence of another purpose, it is for meditation.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This sūtra means, "This parable is meant for meditation. This is so because of the absence of another purpose." The word "ādhyāna" here means "meditation". This is the meaning. In Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.1.2) it is said:

brahma-vid āpnoti param

"One who knows the Supreme attains the Supreme."

The Supreme is manifested in two ways: 1. in His original form, and 2. in the forms of His pastime incarnations. In His original form the Lord has the names Nārāyaṇa, Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, and Aniruddha.

They whose intelligence is firmly anchored in the world of matter find it very difficult to meditate on the Lord, who is spiritual, blissful, and all-pervading. Therefore, in order that the conditioned souls may more easily understand the Lord, the Taittirīya Upaniṣad describes the blissful Lord in this parable of "a bird whose head is pleasure". In this way the conditioned souls attain elevated spiritual intelligence and are able to meditate on the Supreme directly.

Meditation on the annamaya-puruṣa feature of the Lord is given in Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.1.2. Meditations on the prāṇamaya, manomaya, and vijñānamaya-puruṣas are given in Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.2.1, and meditation on the Ananadamaya-puruṣa feature of the Lord is given in Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.5.1. These five aspects of the Supreme need not always been included in every

meditation on the Supreme.

Here someone may object: The Supreme is one. There is no basis for your statement that the Supreme is five.

To this objection the answer is given: In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said:

eko 'pi san bahudhā vibhāti

"Although He is one, the Supreme Lord appears in many forms."

In the Śruti-śāstra it is said:

ekaṁ santam bahudhā dṛśyamānam

"Although He is one, the Supreme Personality of Godhead is seen to be many."

In the Catur-veda-śikhā it is said:

sa śiraḥ sa dakṣiṇaḥ pakṣaḥ sa uttara-pakṣaḥ sa ātmā sa pucchaḥ

"He is the head. He is the right wing. He is the left wing. He is the Self. He is the tail."

In the Bṛhat-saṁhitā it is said:

śiro nārāyaṇaḥ pakṣo
dakṣiṇaḥ savya eva ca
pradyumnaś cāniruddhaś ca
san deho vāsudevakaḥ

nārāyaṇo 'tha san deho
vāsudevaḥ śiro 'pi vā
pucchaṁ saṅkarsaṇaḥ prokta
eka eva ca pañcadhā

aṅgāṅgitvena bhagavān
krīḍate puruṣottamaḥ
aiśvaryaṁ na virodhaś ca
cintyas tasmin janārdane
atarkye hi kutas tarkas

tv apramaye kutaḥ pramā

"Nārāyaṇa is the head. Pradyumna and Aniruddha are the right and left wings. Vāsudeva is the torso. Or, Nārāyaṇa is the torso, and Vāsudeva is the head. Saṅkaraṣaṇa is the tail. In this way the one Supreme Personality of Godhead is manifested in five ways. In this way the Supreme Personality of Godhead enjoys pastimes as both the limbs and the possessor of the limbs. The Lord's power and opulence have no limit. He is inconceivable. How can mere logic grasp Him? He is immeasurable. How can He be measured?"

Sūtra 16

ātma-śabdāc ca

ātma—ātmā; śabdāt—from the Śruti-śāstra; ca—also.

Also because the Śruti-śāstra employs the word “ātmā”.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.5.1 the bird is described as “ātmā” (the Supreme). For this reason the bird here cannot be an ordinary bird with wings, a tail, and other like features. The bird here is a parable.

Sūtra 17

ātma-gṛhītir itara-vad uttarāt

ātma—ātmā; gṛhītiḥ—understanding; itara—others; vat—like; uttarāt—from the following.

"Atmā" here means "consciousness". Because of the following it is like the others.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.2.3) it is said:

anyo 'ntara ātmā vā prāṇamayah

"The ātmā within is the prāṇamaya."

The word "ātmā" is used to mean dull matter and it is also used to mean the individual spirit souls. In Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.5.1) it is said:

anyo 'ntara ātmānandamayah

"The ātmā within is the Anandamaya."

Since the word "ātmā" is thus used for these different puruṣas, how can it be said that the word "ātmā" means the all-pervading, all-knowing Supreme Personality of Godhead?

To this I reply: The word "ātmā" here means "the all-pervading, all-knowing Supreme Personality of Godhead." This is so because this word is used in that way in many other passages of scripture. For example, in the Śruti-śāstra it is said:

ātmā vā idam eka evāgra āsīt

"In the beginning only the Supreme Personality of Godhead (ātmā) existed."

Why does the word "ātmā" here refer to the Supreme Personality of Godhead? The sūtra explains: "uttarāt" (because of the following). This description of the bird is followed by these words (Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.6.2):

so 'kāmayata bahu syām

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead desired: I shall become many."

Thus this passage, which follows the parable of the bird, proves that ānandamaya bird in that passage is certainly the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In this way it cannot be that the bird in that parable is not the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Therefore the purpose of that parable is to assist the meditation on the Supreme Lord. This must be so, for that is the appropriate explanation.

Sūtra 18

anvayād iti cet syād avadhāraṇāt

anvayāt—because of the connotation; iti—thus; cet—if; syāt—may be; avadhāraṇāt—because of the understanding.

If it is said, "This inference cannot be made," then I reply, "It is right, for that is the understanding here".

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: It is not possible to conclude, merely on the strength of the following passages, that the word "ātma" here refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. After all, in the previous passages the word "ātmā" referred to inanimate matter as well as the individual spirit souls.

If this is said, then the sūtra replies: "syāt" (It is right.) This means: It is right that the word "ātmā" here refers to the all-pervading, all-knowing Supreme Personality of Godhead. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "avadhāraṇāt" (for that is the understanding here). In the previous passages the word "ātmā" clearly referred to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. There it was said (Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.5.1):

tasmād vā etasmād ātmanaḥ

"The Supersoul is full of bliss. From Him this world has come."

To interpret the word "ātmā" in any other way would do violence to the meditation described in this passage about the Anandamaya-puruṣa. In this passage, passing over the prāṇamaya-puruṣa and the other puruṣas, one comes to rest at the description of the Anandamaya-puruṣa, who is certainly the Supreme Personality of Godhead. As one may point to the star Arundhatī by first pointing to other stars as reference points, so the description of these other ātmās is meant to lead the reader to the Anandamaya-puruṣa, who is the Supreme. Thus the passages that precede and follow the parable of the bird clearly show that the ātmā here is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Thus it is proved without doubt.

Adhikaraṇa 8 The Supreme Personality of Godhead Is the Father

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here the author of the sūtras begins his description of other qualities of the the Supreme Lord, such as the Lord's being the father of all.

Viṣaya (the subject to be discussed): In the Śruti-sāstra it is said:

mātā pitā bhrātā nivāsaḥ śaraṇam suhr̥d gatiṁ nārāyaṇaḥ

"Lord Nārāyaṇa is our mother, father, brother, home, shelter, friend, and goal."

In the Jitānta-stotra, Chapter One, it is said:

pitā mātā suhr̥d bandhur
bhrātā putras tvam eva me
vidyā dhanam ca kāmāś ca
nānyat kiñcit tvaya vinā

"O Supreme Lord, You are my father, mother, friend, kinsman, brother, son, knowledge, wealth, and desire. I have nothing else but You."

In the Jitānta-stotra, in the middle and end, it is said:

janma-prabhṛti dāso 'smi
śiṣyo 'smi tanayo 'smi te
tvaṁ ca svāmī gurur mātā
pitā ca mama mādhava

"O Lord Mādhava, from the time of my birth I have been Your servant, disciple, and son. You are my master, guru, mother, and father."

Samśaya (doubt): Should the devotees meditate on the Lord as their father, son, friend, and master, or should they not meditate in that way?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The Śruti-śāstra explains:

ātmety evopāsīta

"One should worship the Supreme Lord."

That is how one should meditate on the Lord. One should not meditate on Him as one's father or in these other ways.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 19

kāryākhyānād apūrvam

kārya—result; ākhyānāt—because of the statement; a—like; pūrvam—what was before.

Because of the description of the result it is like the former.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here the word "pūrvam" means "the previous qualities, such as being full of bliss". The word "apūrvam" means "the qualities, such as being the father, that are like these previous qualities". The devotees should meditate on these qualities. Why? The sūtra explains: "kāryākhyānād" (Because of the description of the result). The result here is the result attained by worshiping the Lord with love. This is explained in Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (5.14):

bhāva-grahyam anīḍākhyam

"The spiritual Supreme Personality of Godhead is attained only by love."

The Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself declares (Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 3.25.38):

yeṣāṃ ahaṃ priya ātmā sutaś ca

sakhā guruḥ suhrdo daivam iṣtam

"Because the devotees accept Me as their friend, their relative, their son, preceptor, benefactor, and Supreme Deity, they cannot be deprived of their possessions at any time."*

Therefore, as the devotees meditate on the Lord as full of transcendental bliss, so they should also meditate on Him as their father or other relative. The idea that the Śruti-śāstra's declaration "ātmety evopāsīta" (One should worship the Supreme Lord) means that one should not think of the Lord as one's father has already been refuted in this book.

Adhikaraṇa 9

One Should Meditate on the Transcendental Form of the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya (the subject to be discussed): Now begins a discussion of the truth that one should meditate on the Supreme as having a form. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.7) it is said:

ātmety evopāsīta"

"One should worship the Supreme Lord."
In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.15) it is also said:

ātmānam eva lokam upāsīta

"Everyone should worship the Supreme Lord."

In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.8-10) it is said:

tad u hovāca hairaṇyo gopa-veśam abhrābham taruṇam kalpa-drumāśritam. tad iha ślokā bhavanti. sat-puṇḍarīka. . .

"Brahmā said: The Supreme Personality of Godhead is a cowherd boy. His complexion is like a monsoon cloud. He stays under a desire tree. The following verses describe Him: His eyes are like lotus flowers. . . "

After thus describing the form of the Supreme Lord, the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.10) concludes:

cintayamś cetasā kṛṣṇam
mukto bhavati saṁsṛteḥ.

"Meditating on Lord Kṛṣṇa in this way, a person becomes free from the cycle of repeated birth and death."

Samśaya (doubt): Does one attain liberation by worshiping the Lord in His formless feature or by worshiping the Lord in His feature with a form?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): One should worship the Lord in His formless feature. Only in that way will one attain liberation. Only by meditating on the Lord with undivided attention does one attain liberation. Because in the form of the Lord there are eyes and many other different limbs and features of the Lord it is not possible to give undivided attention to any of them, and therefore it is not possible to attain liberation by meditating on the form of the Lord.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 20

samāna evaṁ cābhedāt

samānaḥ—equal sentiment; evaṁ—thus; ca—although; abhedāt—because of not being different.

Although it is not divided in that way, because of non-difference.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" here means "although". Although the Lord's eyes and other bodily features and limbs are all different, still they leave the same impression on

the mind. The features of the Lord are like golden statues, which although present in a great variety of forms, still, because they are all made of gold, leave the same impression on the mind. Why is that? the sūtra explains: "abhedāt" (because of non-difference). This means, "because the Lord's eyes and other features and limbs are not different from His soul or self". For this reason, by worshiping the form of the Supreme Lord one attains liberation. If this were not so then the description in Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.10), "cintayaṁś cetasā kṛṣṇaṁ mukto bhavati saṁsṛteḥ" (Meditating on the form of Lord Kṛṣṇa in this way, a person becomes free from the cycle of repeated birth and death.) would not be true. In the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

satya-jñānānantānanda-mātraika-rasa-mūrtayah

"The forms of the Supreme Lord are undivided. They are all full of eternity, knowledge, infinity, and bliss."

In this way it is said that although the Lord's forms present a very wonderful variety, still They are all one in essence. Although this truth was also described in sūtra 3.2.14, the merciful teacher of Vedānta repeats the same teaching so this very difficult topic may be clearly understood.

In this section the truth that one should meditate on all the qualities of the different forms of the Lord has been explained. Now will be considered the nature of the qualities the Lord manifests in His āveśa incarnations, where He gives special powers to certain individual souls. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.1.1 and 3) it is said:

adhīhi bhagavan iti hopasasāda sanat-kumāraṁ naradaś taṁ hovāca. . . taṁ mām bhagavān śokasya pāraṁ tārayatu.

"Nārada approached Sanat-kumāra and said, 'O master, please teach me. . . O master, please take me across this ocean of grief'."

Sanat-kumāra and some other individual spirit souls are śakty-āveśa-avatāras of the Lord. This means that the Lord has empowered them with knowledge or certain other virtues. That is why Sanat-kumāra is here addressed as "bhagavān" (master).

Samśaya (doubt): Should one meditate on these great devotees as having all the transcendental qualities of the Supreme Lord or should one not meditate on them in that way?

The author of the sūtras here considers this question. First He gives the positive view.

Sūtra 21

sambandhād evam anyatrāpi

sambandhāt—because of the touch; evam—thus; anyatra—in others; api—also.

Because of His touch it is like this in others also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

All the qualities of the Lord are present in the four Kumāras and the other śakty-āveśa-avatāras. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "sambandhāt" (because of His touch). As fire transforms an iron rod, so the touch of the Supreme Lord transforms these great devotees.

Now the author of the sūtras gives the negative view.

Sūtra 22

na vāviśeṣāt

na—not; vā—or; aviśeṣāt—because of non-difference.

Or not, because of non-difference.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

One should not meditate on all the qualities of the Supreme Lord being present in the śakty-āveśa-avatāras. Why not? The sūtra explains: "aviśeṣāt" (because of non-difference). This means that even though the Lord has given them special powers, they remain individual spirit souls. They are not fundamentally different from other individual spirit souls. The word "vā" (or) here hints that because they are very dear to the Lord, these souls should be treated with great respect.

Sūtra 23

darśayati ca

darśayati—reveals; ca—and.

It also reveals it.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This truth is revealed in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.1.3), for Nārada Muni, who is here seeking the truth, is himself a śakty-āveśa-avatāra. In this way it is clear that all the qualities of the Lord are not present in the śakty-āveśa-avatāras.

Sūtra 24

sambhṛti-dyu-vyāpty api cātaḥ

sambhṛti—maintenance; dyu—in the sky; vyāpti—spreading; api—also; ca—and; ataḥ—thus.

Therefore maintenance and being present everywhere in the sky also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this sūtra the words "sambhṛti" and "dyu-vyāpti" are brought together in a samāhāra-samāsa. These two qualities should not be attributed to the śakty-āveśa-avatāras. The reason has been given in the previous sūtra. The reason is the śakty-āveśa-avatāras are individual spirit souls (jīvas). In the Eṇāyanīya recension of the Vedas it is said (Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa 2.4.7.10):

brahma jyeṣṭhā vīryā sambhṛtāni brahmāgre jyeṣṭham divam ātatāna. brahma bhūtānām prathamam tu jajñe. tenārhati brahmaṇā spardhitum kaḥ.

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead possesses all powers. The Supreme

Personality of Godhead is present everywhere in the great sky. The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the first of persons. Who can rival the Supreme Personality of Godhead?"

In these words the glories of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, beginning with His maintenance of all and His being present everywhere in the great sky, are described. These qualities cannot be ascribed to the individual spirit souls, for they are qualities of the Supreme Personality of Godhead alone.

Now the author of the sūtras gives another reason why these qualities cannot be ascribed to the individual spirit souls.

Sūtra 25

puruṣa-vidyāyām iva cetareṣām anāmnānāt

puruṣa—of the Supreme Personality of Godhead; vidyāyām—in the knowledge (the Puruṣa-sūkta prayers); iva—like; ca—also; itareṣām—of others; anāmnānāt—because of not being mentioned.

It is taught of the Supreme Personality of Godhead in the Puruṣa-sūkta prayers, and it is not mentioned of others.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the descriptions of the four Kumāras and other śakty-āveśa-avatāras there is no description of their being the creator and controller of all or of having other qualities that belong to the Supreme Lord alone. For this reason all the qualities of the Supreme Lord should not be ascribed to them. Giving an example of the difference between the individual souls and the Supreme Lord, the sūtra explains: "puruṣa-vidyāyām" (It is taught of the Supreme Personality of Godhead in the Puruṣa-sūkta prayers). The word "ca" (and) here hints, "and in the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad and other scriptures also". These qualities of the Lord are mentioned in the descriptions of the Lord in these places but they are not mentioned in the descriptions of Kumāras and other śakty-āveśa-avatāras.

The śakty-āveśa-avatāras may be compared to iron rods heated by a fire. As iron rods heated by a fire have two natures, so the śakty-āveśa-avatāras may have two natures also. One nature is like the heat generated by the fire. That nature is the specific qualities with which the Lord has empowered the śakty-āveśa-avatāra. They who meditate on these qualities in the śakty-āveśa-avatāra may thus meditate on all the qualities of the Supreme Lord. The other nature is like the iron rod itself. That is the nature of the individual spirit soul who is empowered to be a śakty-

āveśa-avatāra. They who meditate on his qualities may not ascribe to him all the qualities of the Supreme. However, they may meditate on the śakty-āveśa-avatāra's possessing the qualities of a great devotee, such as his being very dear to the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Because He dearly loves them, the Lord accepts the śakty-āveśa-avatāra devotees as His personal associates. That is why in the Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam and other scriptures these great devotees are respectfully addressed as "bhagavān" (lord). However, because they are individual spirit souls, the śakty-āveśa-avatāras are all humble and lowly in comparison to the Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself. This is the proper understanding of their nature.

Adhikaraṇa 10

The Ferocity of the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

It has been said that one should meditate on the Supreme, especially by thinking of the Lord's qualities as described in one's own branch of the Vedas. However, it is said that they who desire liberation should not meditate on certain of the Lord's qualities. In the Atharva Veda (8.3.4 and 17) it is said:

agne tvam yātudhānasya bhindi

"O fiery Lord, please cut Yātudhāna into pieces!"

and

taṁ pratyañcam arciṣā bidhya marma

"O Lord, with Your flames please break open Yātudhāna's heart!"

Samśaya (doubt): Should one meditate on the Lord as one who cuts others to pieces, or should one not meditate on Him in this way?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the Lord becomes violent only to stop the demons, therefore it is proper to meditate on the Lord in this way.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 26

vedhādy artha-bhedāt

vedha—cutting into pieces; ādi—beginning with; artha—of result; bhedāt—because of difference.

(Not) cutting into pieces and other violent acts because of a different result.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "na" (not) should be understood in this sūtra. One should not meditate on the Lord as the punisher who cuts others into pieces and performs other violent acts. Why not? The sūtra explains: "atha-bhedāt" (because of a different result). The word "artha" here means "result". The saintly devotees renounce violence and other negative qualities. That is the meaning here. The Lord Himself declares (Bhagavad-gītā 8.8):

amānitvam adambitvam
ahimsā kṣāntir arjavam

"Humility, pridelessness, nonviolence, tolerance, and simplicity, . . . all these I declare to be knowledge."*

Also, in Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam the Lord says:

nivṛttaṁ karma seveta
pravṛttaṁ mat-paras tyajet

"My devotee should renounce materialism and cultivate renunciation."

Adhikaraṇa 11 Meditation on the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya (the subject to be discussed): In the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (1.11) it is said:

jñātvā devaṁ sarva-pāśāpahāniḥ
kṣīṇaḥ kleśair janma-mṛtyu-prahāniḥ
tasyābhidyānāt tṛtīyaṁ deha-bhede
viśvaiśvaryaṁ kevala āpta-kāmaḥ

"By understanding the Supreme Personality of Godhead, a person becomes free from all material bondage, his sufferings perish, and he escapes the cycle of repeated birth and death. By meditating on the Supreme Lord, when one is finally separated from the material body he enters the opulent spiritual world and attains a spiritual body where all his desires are fulfilled."

This verse means that by understanding the Supreme Personality of Godhead a person cuts the ropes of false possessiveness that make him think that his body, house, and other things are all his property. Here the scripture glorifies knowledge of the Lord, saying that knowledge destroys the sufferings of repeated birth and death. By understanding the Lord and always meditating on Him, a person becomes free of both gross and subtle material bodies, travels beyond Candraloka and Brahmaloḥka, and enters the third realm, the realm of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. What is that realm of the Lord like? The scripture explains: it is "viśvaiśvarya" (full of spiritual opulences), it is "kevala" (untouched by matter), and it is "āpta-kāma" (all desires are fulfilled there). Here it is clearly said that this abode is attained by understanding the truth of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, truth taught in the revealed scriptures.

Samśaya (doubt): Is meditation mandatory or optional?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Meditation is mandatory, for it increases faith and thus fixes the mind on the Lord.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 27

hānau tūpāyana-śabda-śeṣatvāt kuśācchanda-stuty-upagānavat tad uktam

hānau—in destruction; tu—indeed; upāyana—approaching; śabda—statement; śeṣatvāt—because of being a supplement; kuśa—kuśa grass; ācchanda—according to desire; stuti—prayer; upagāna—song; vat—like; tat—that; uktam—said.

But in liberation because of approaching, because of the Śruti-śāstra, and because of the means to the end it is like voluntary kuśa grass, prayers and hymns. This is said.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to begin the refutation of the opponent's argument. When, by understanding the truth of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, a person becomes free from the ropes of matter, such a wise devotee falls in love with the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In that condition he spontaneously meditates on the qualities of the Lord as they are described in the revealed scriptures. He does this as a person voluntarily takes kuśa grass, recites prayers, and sings hymns. As a student, when his daily studies are completed, may of his own accord take kuśa grass in his hand and then recite prayers and sing hymns, so the liberated souls of their own accord meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

This is hinted by the use of the word "abhidhyāna". The reason for this is given in the word "upāyana" (he has approached the Supreme Lord). The word "upāyana" means that he loves the Lord and he has approached the Lord. The word "śabda" means "words of instruction". The word "śeṣatvāt" means "because all these words are the means to attain a specific end". This is described in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.21):

tam eva dhīraḥ. . . .

"A wise man, aware of the Lord's true nature, should engage his intelligence in the Lord's service. He should not meditate on other things. He should not waste many words speaking of other things."

In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (3.9.41) the Lord Himself says:

pūrtena tapasā yajñair

dānair yogaih samādhinā
brāhmaṇaṁ niḥśreyasaṁ puṁsāṁ
mat-prītiḥ tattvavin-matam

"It is the opinion of expert transcendentalists that the ultimate goal of performing all traditional good works, penances, sacrifices, charities, mystic activities, trances, etc., is to invoke My satisfaction."*

For this reason the liberated souls of their own accord meditate on the Lord. That is the meaning. It is very difficult to understand the truth by studying the difficult Vedas and following the difficult path of logic, for there are many branches of the Vedas and many complicated arguments in logic. One whose heart is softened with love for the blissful Supreme Lord is not attracted to follow the path of the Vedas or the path of logic, for these paths only make the heart harder and harder. There are times, however, where these two paths can be employed to increase one's love and devotion to the Lord.

In the following words the author of the sūtras gives the reason and evidence for all of this.

Sūtra 28

sāmparāye tartavyābhāvāt tathā hy anye

sāmparāye—in love for the Supreme Personality of Godhead; tartavya—of bondage; abhāvāt—because of the non-existence; tathā—so; hi—indeed; anye—others.

When there is love for the Supreme Personality of Godhead, because of the absence of bondage. So the others indeed.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "sāmparāya" here means "the Supreme Personality of Godhead" because all truths meet in Him. "Sāmparāya" is therefore said to mean "love for the Supreme Personality of Godhead". This word is formed by adding the affix "aṅ" (Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī 4.4.21). For one who loves the Lord meditation on the Lord is spontaneous and not ordered by rules. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "tartavyābhāvāt" (because of the absence of bondage). This means, "because there is nothing to cross beyond" or "because there are no ropes of bondage that must be severed". The Vājasaneyīs (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.21) explain:

tam eva dhīro vijñāya prajñām kurvīta brāhmaṇaḥ. nānudhyāyed bahūn śabdān
vāco viglāpanam hi tat.

"A wise man, aware of the Lord's true nature, should engage his intelligence in the Lord's service. He should not meditate on other things. He should not waste many words speaking of other things."

The Lord Himself explains (Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 11.20.31):

tasmād mad-bhakti-yuktasya
yogino vai mad-ātmanaḥ
na jñānam na ca vairāgyam
prāyaḥ śreyo bhaved iha

"For one who is fully engaged in My devotional service, whose mind is fixed on me in bhakti-yoga, the path of speculative knowledge and dry renunciation is not very beneficial."*

Adhikaraṇa 12 The Way to Attain Liberation

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Thus it has been explained that one should worship and meditate on the Lord as a person who possesses qualities. Now will be described two different ways to worship the Lord. In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said:

tad u hovāca hairaṇyo gopa-veśam abhrābham. . .

"Brahmā said: The Supreme Lord appears like a cowherd boy, and His complexion is like a monsoon cloud."

In the Rāma-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said:

prakṛtyā sahitaḥ śyāmaḥ. . .

"Decorated with earrings and a jewel necklace, His complexion dark, His garments yellow, and the hair on His head matted, saintly, two-armed Lord Rāma is accompanied by Goddess Sitā."

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.22) it is said:

sa vā ayam ātmā sarvasya vaśī sarvasyeśānḥ.

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the master and controller of all."

By meditating on the Lord's sweetness one attains the Lord. This method is called ruci-bhakti (the path of spontaneous love). By meditating on the Lord's glory and opulence one also attains the Lord. This method is called vidhi-bhakti (the path of following rules and regulations).

Samśaya (doubt): Of these two kinds of meditation which is the best?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the result of both these kinds of meditation is uncertain, one should not desire to perform either of them.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 29

chandata ubhayāvirodhāt

chandataḥ—by the will; ubhaya—of both; avirodhāt—because there is no contradiction.

By His will (it is not so), for in these two there is no contradiction.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

As a frog jumps from far away, so the word "na" (not) should be brought to this sūtra from sūtra 22. The word "chandataḥ" here means, "by the Supreme

Lord's will the way of devotion is divided into two paths". How is that? The sūtra explains: "ubhayāvirodhāt" (for in these two there is no contradiction). This means that the descriptions of these two paths do not exclude each other. This is the meaning. The beginningless and eternally perfect way of devotion flows like a heavenly Ganges river from the Lord's personal associates to the newest beginners in devotional service. Lord Hari wishes that all the spirit souls in the material universes associate with His devotees and voluntarily follow the path of devotion to Him. By following that path they can attain Him. To attain this end one should seek the mercy of a kind madhyama-adhikārī devotee. The madhyama-adhikārī devotee is described in the following words:

īśvare tad-adhīneṣu
bālīṣeṣu dviṣatsu ca
prema-maitrī-krpāpekṣā
yaḥ karoti sa madhyamaḥ

"A person who loves the Supreme Lord, befriends the devotees, is merciful to the people in general, and ignores the demons, is a madhyama-adhikārī devotee of the Lord."

In this way it is clearly shown that Lord Hari is not cruel, unfair, or unkind.

Sūtra 30

gater arthavattvam ubhayathānyathā hi virodhaḥ

gateḥ—of the goal; arthavattvam—attainment; ubhayathā—on both; anyathā—otherwise; hi—indeed; virodhaḥ—contradiction.

In both ways the goal is attained, for otherwise there would certainly be a contradiction.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Both paths lead to the goal. By the path of meditating on the Lord's sweetness and also by the path of meditating on the Lord's glory and opulence, one may attain the goal. The word "artha" here means "the goal of life". The attainment of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the highest goal of life. That is the meaning. To say this is not so is to contradict the scriptural texts that describe these two paths. The word "hi" (certainly) in this sūtra is evidence that both paths

are equal. One cannot quote sūtra 3.3.6 to say that the methods of these two paths should be combined. These two paths are like the path of the ekāntī devotees, who do not wish to see in the Lord qualities other than those manifested by the Lord's form they have chosen to worship. This will be described in sūtra 3.3.56.

Adhikaraṇa 13 The Path of Spontaneous Love

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viśaya (the subject to be discussed): Here the author of the sūtras proves that ruci-bhakti (the path of spontaneous love) is the best.

Samśaya (doubt): Who is best: one who follows the path of spontaneous love (ruci-bhakti) or one who follows the path of following rules and regulations (vidhi-bhakti)?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because he carefully follows all the rules, one on the path of vidhi-bhakti is the best.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 31

upapannas tal-lakṣaṇārthopalabdher lokavat

upapannaḥ—best; tat—of that; lakṣaṇa—characteristic; artha—of the goal; upalabdheḥ—because of attainment; loka—in the world; vat—like.

It is best, because of attainment of the goal that is He who has that nature, as in the world.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

A person who worships Lord Hari by following the path of ruci-bhakti is the best, or is the one who has attained the goal of life. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "tal-lakṣaṇārthopalabdheḥ" (for it brings the goal that is He who has that nature). The phrase "He who has that nature" here means, "He who loves His devotees". This refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead when He manifests His quality of sweetness. Here the word "upalabdheḥ" means "because of independently attaining".

Then the author clarifies this by giving an example: "lokavat" (as in the world). The Lord is like a great king who himself comes under the control of an expert and devoted servant. This nature of the Lord does not in any way diminish His supreme independence. This is so because the Lord's being controlled by the love of His devotees is actually a great virtue on His part. This is the meaning.

The Supreme Personality of Godhead is attracted by the love of His devotees, and He reveals His own sweetness to the devotees that love Him. Seeing His sweetness, the devotees love Him all the more, and they respond by offering themselves to the Lord. The Lord accepts this offering, and by doing that, He sells Himself to His devotees in exchange for their love.

In this way the Lord makes His devotees very exalted and important so they can directly associate with the Lord. Without this it would not be possible for the devotees to see the Lord and associate with Him. Śrīmān Śukadeva Gosvāmī explains (Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 10.9.21):

nāyaṁ sukhāpo bhagavān
dehinām gopikā-sutaḥ
jñāninām cātma-bhūtānām
yathā bhaktimatām iha

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead, Kṛṣṇa, the son of mother Yaśodā, is accessible to devotees engaged in spontaneous loving service, but He is not as easily accessible to mental speculators, to those striving for self-realization by severe austerities and penances, or to those who consider the body the same as the self."*

Although the Lord is controlled by all His devotees, He especially places Himself under the control of the devotees filled with spontaneous love for Him. Therefore the path of spontaneous love (ruci-bhakti) is the best of all paths and the devotees who follow this path are the best of all devotees.

Adhikaraṇa 14
The Methods of Devotional Service

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya (the subject to be discussed): Now the author of the sūtras shows that there are two kinds of devotional service, one kind having a single part, and another kind having many parts. In the first chapter of the Atharva Veda's Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad the eighteen-syllable mantra is described. There it is said (1.6):

yo dhyāyati rasayati bhajati so 'mr̥to bhavati

"One who meditates on the Supreme Personality of Godhead, glorifies Him, and worships Him, becomes liberated."

Samśaya (doubt): Can one attain liberation by performing only one of these three, or must one perform them all?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The Upaniṣad names all three of them, and, after naming them, says that then one becomes liberated. Therefore one must perform all three in order to become liberated.

Siddhānta (conclusion): in the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 32

anīyamaḥ sarveṣāṃ avirodhāc chabdānumānābhyām

anīyamaḥ—without a rule; sarveṣāṃ—of all; avirodhāt—because there is no contradiction; śabda—Śruti-śāstra; anumānābhyām—and Smṛti-śāstra.

There is no rule for them all, for there is no contradiction with the Śruti-śāstra and Smṛti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

No rule declares that meditation, glorification, and worship must all be performed in order to attain liberation. Any one of them is sufficient for liberation. Why is that? The sūtra declares: "śabdānumānābhyām". This means "for there is no contradiction with the Śruti-śāstra and Smṛti-śāstra". Later in the Gopāla-tāpanī

Upaniṣad (1.10) it is said:

cintayamś cetasā kṛṣṇam
mukto bhavati saṁsṛteḥ

"By meditating on Lord Kṛṣṇa a person becomes liberated from the cycle of repeated birth and death."

In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.12) it is also said

pañca-padaṁ pañcāṅgaṁ japan dyāvābhūmī sūryācandramasau sāgnī

"By chanting these five names one attains the Supreme Personality of Godhead, whose potencies are manifested as the heavenly planets, the earth, the sun, the moon, and fire."

In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (12.3.51) it is said:

kīrtanād eva kṛṣṇasya
mukta-saṅgaḥ paraṁ vrajet

"Simply by chanting the Hare Kṛṣṇa mahā-mantra one can become free from material bondage and be promoted to the transcendental kingdom."*

It is also said:

eko 'pi kṛṣṇāya kṛtaḥ pramāṇo
daśāśvamedhāvabhṛthair na tulyaḥ
daśāśvamedhī punar eti janma
kṛṣṇa-pramāṇī na punar-bhavāya

"Ten aśvamedhāvabhṛthas are not equal to once bowing down before Lord Kṛṣṇa. One who performs ten aśvamedhas again takes birth. One who bows before Lord Kṛṣṇa never takes birth again."

These passages do not in any way oppose the statement of Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad 1.6. If this were so then each scriptural statement affirming that liberation is attained by performing a certain kind of devotional service would have to be rejected. Therefore the statement of Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.6), "He becomes liberated" must be considered to be connected individually to each of the

statements, "He who meditates on the Supreme Personality of Godhead," "He who glorifies the Supreme Personality of Godhead", and "He who worships the Supreme Personality of Godhead".

The meaning here is, "If even only one of the many kinds activities of devotional service brings liberation, then how much more effectively will the performance of many kinds of activities in devotional service bring one to liberation?" This is a hint pointing to the nine activities of devotional service, beginning with hearing and chanting about the Lord.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that the Śruti-sāstras teach that liberation is attained by meditation alone? In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.5.6 and 2.4.5) it is said:

ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ

"In a trance of meditation one should gaze on the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

Therefore how can it be said that liberation is attained by other methods, such as chanting the glories of the Lord?

To this I reply: Chanting the glories of the Lord and the other activities of devotional service are woven together with meditation on the Lord. They are not separate. Therefore when one chants the Lord's glories or performs other activities of devotional service, meditation on the Lord is also present, and when one meditates on the Lord, chanting the Lord's glories and the other activities of devotional service are also present.

Here someone may object: It is not correct to say that one can attain liberation simply by understanding the truth about the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Although they are perfect in knowledge of the Lord, Brahmā, Śiva, Indra, and the other demigods still remain in the material world. Indeed it is even seen that sometimes they oppose the Lord's desires.

If this is said, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 33

yāvad-adhikāram avasthitir ādhikārikāṇām

yāvat—as long as; adhikāram—the post; avasthitiḥ—the situation; ādhikārikāṇām—of they who hold the posts.

The office-holders stay for the duration of their terms in office.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

We do not say that everyone who has perfect knowledge of the Supreme Personality of Godhead at once attains liberation. However, their accumulated past karma is all destroyed by their knowledge of the Lord, and their present actions also bear no karmic result. When the term of life in their present body is exhausted, then they will attain liberation. Because they hold posts in the management of the universe, Brahmā and the other demigods do not become liberated until their terms of office expire. This is so even though their past and present karmic reactions are already destroyed.

When their terms of office expire, then they become liberated and enter the supreme abode of the Lord. This should be understood. The demigod Indra and the others like him that have relatively short terms of office go, at the end of their terms, to the demigod Brahmā, whose term of office is much longer. When Brahmā attains liberation they all attain liberation with him. The author of the sūtras will describe this later in this book (4.3.10).

As for the demigods opposing the Lord's desires, they do this only in conformance with His wish, and in order to assist the Lord's pastimes. These demigods may appear to be materialists engaged in sense gratification, but that is only a false show. In truth they are transcendentalists fixed in knowledge of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Therefore, when their terms of office expire, they all attain liberation. Of this there is no doubt.

Adhikaraṇa 15

Meditation on the Qualities of the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya (the subject to be discussed): Now will be discussed the truth that qualities such as being neither great nor small should be attributed to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.8.8) it is said:

etad vai tad akṣaram gārgi brāhmaṇā abhivadanty asthūlam aṇava-hrasvam

"O Gārgī, the brāhmaṇas say that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is neither great nor small, tall nor short."

It is also said:

atha parā yayā tad akṣaram adhigamyate yat tad adreśyam agrahyam agotram
avarṇam acakṣuḥ-śrotram

"Please know that the Supreme never wanes nor does He ever die. The Supreme is never seen nor is He ever grasped. He is never born in any family. He cannot be described in words. The eyes and the ears cannot know Him."

Samśaya (doubt): Should these qualities of the Lord, where He is considered imperishable and neither great nor small be included in every meditation on Him, or should they not be included in every meditation on Him?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): In sūtra 3.3.20 it was said:

samāna evaṁ cābhedāt

"Although it is not divided in that way, because of non-difference."

These words are understood to mean that the Supreme certainly does have a form. However the previous description (of the Lord as being imperishable and neither great nor small) cannot be considered to be a description of a being with form.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 34

akṣara-dhiyām tv avarodhaḥ sāmānya-tad-bhāvābhyām aupasada-vat tad uktam

akṣara—imperishable; dhiyām—in the idea; tu—but; avarodhaḥ—acceptance; sāmānya—equality; tat—of Him; bhāvābhyām—with the qualities; aupasada—The Aupasat mantra; vat—like; tat—that; uktam—spoken.

But because He has the same qualities the idea of imperishability should be accepted, as in the Aupasat mantra. This has been explained.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) here begins the refutation of the opponent's argument. The idea that the imperishable Lord is neither great nor small should be included in all meditations on Him. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "Because He has the same qualities." The Kāṭha Upaniṣad (1.2.15) explains:

sarve vedā yat-padam āmananti

"All the Vedas glorify the Supreme."

The worshipable Supreme is always the same. Therefore these features are present even though He has a form. Therefore the qualities like being neither great nor small are also present in the Lord's form. This is the meaning. Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (1.11) affirms that by understanding the Supreme Personality of Godhead one attains liberation. The knowledge here is knowledge of the Supreme as an extraordinary being, not as an ordinary being. To posit anything else is illogical and an insult to the Supreme. Therefore the qualities like being neither great nor small should be included with the qualities like being all-pervading, all-knowing, and full of bliss. In this way there is the knowledge that the Supreme is an extraordinary being. From this it may be inferred that the Supreme is different from all other persons. In this way it is proved that the form of the Supreme is free from anything that is bad or to be rejected. In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (8.3.24) it is said:

sa vai na devāsura-martya-tiryāṅ
na strī na ṣaṅḍo na pumān na jantuḥ
nāyaṅ guṇaḥ karma na san na cāsan
niṣedha-śeṣo jayatād aśeṣaḥ

"He neither demigod nor demon, neither human nor bird nor beast. He is not woman, man, nor neuter, nor is He an animal. He is not a material quality, a fruitive activity, a manifestation or nonmanifestation. He is the last word in the discrimination of 'not this, not this,' and He is unlimited. All glories to the Supreme Personality of Godhead."*

Prayed to with these words, which describe a being neither great nor small, the Supreme Personality of Godhead personally appeared in His transcendental form, a form that must be the same as the being described in these prayers. That appearance is described in Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (8.3.30):

harir āvirāsīt

"Then the Supreme Personality of Godhead personally appeared."

In this passage Gajendra prayed to the Lord, addressing Him in a certain way, and the Lord reciprocated by appearing in the form that was described in the prayers. If those prayers were not appropriate to the form of the Lord, then the Lord would have appeared only as a vague impersonal knowledge in Gajendra's heart. In this way the idea that the Supreme Lord is a material demigod or some other kind of material being is clearly disproved. However, the Lord does appear in a form like that of a demigod or a human being, but these are His own forms and they are not material.

With the words "aupāsada-vat" the sūtra gives an example to show that secondary features inevitably follow primary features. The word "upāsāt" here refers to a specific mantra in a specific Vedic ritual. When it is chanted in the Jamadagnya ceremony where pūrodasa cakes are offered with the mantra "agner vai hotram", the upāsāt mantra is chanted in the Sāma Veda style. However, when it is chanted in a Yajur Veda ceremony, the upāsāt mantra is chanted in the Yajur Veda style. In this way the secondary nature follows the primary nature. Thus the secondary qualities of the Lord must be understood according to His primary qualities. This is described in the Vidhi-khaṇḍa in the following words:

guṇa-mukhya-vyatikrame tad-arthatvān mukhyena veda-saṁyogaḥ

"When primary and secondary meanings are in conflict the primary meaning should be accepted."

Here someone may object: The nature of the Lord's form is described in the following words:

sarva-karmā sarva-gandhaḥ

"The Supreme does everything. The Supreme possesses all fragrances."

For this reason all meditations on the Lord should include a meditation on His doing everything and possessing all fragrances."

If this is said then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

iyat āmananāt

iyat—this; āmananāt—by the description.

It follows the description.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "iyat" means "in that way". In that way one should always meditate on the qualities of the Supreme Lord's transcendental form. In what way? The sūtra explains: "āmananāt" (following the description). This means, "following the description of the Lord's primary qualities". On the Lord's primary qualities are compulsory in meditation on Him. Therefore it is not necessary that in every meditation on the Lord one must meditate on His doing everything or possessing all fragrances.

Adhikaraṇa 16

The Lord's Transcendental Abode

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now it will be explained that one should meditate on the transcendental abode of the Lord. In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.2.7) it is said:

yaḥ sarva-jñāḥ sarva-vid yasyaiṣa mahimā bhuvī sambabhūva divye pure hy eṣa samvyomny ātmā pratiṣṭhitaḥ.

"The all-knowing Supreme Personality of Godhead, whose greatness is seen everywhere in the world, resides in His own effulgent city in the spiritual sky."

However, it is also said (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 2.2.10):

brahmaivedam viśvam idaṁ variṣṭham

"the Supreme Personality of Godhead is present everywhere in the material world."

Samśaya (doubt): Is the description of the Lord's city in the spiritual sky merely an allegory to describe the Lord's glories, or is there in truth such a city with many wonderful palaces, gateways, surrounding walls, and other like features?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): What is the answer? The answer is that these words are an allegory to describe the Supreme Lord's glory. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.24.1) it is said:

sa bhagavaḥ kasmin pratiṣṭhita iti. sva-mahimni.

"Where does the Supreme Personality of Godhead reside? He resides in His own glory."

In this way the Śruti-śāstra describes the Lord's glory. Therefore the spiritual sky described before is in truth the Lord's glory. It is not any other thing. Therefore it is not possible that the Supreme Lord has an abode in a specific place. This is confirmed by the passage beginning with the words "brahmaiva".

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 36

antarā bhūta-grāma-vat svātmanaḥ

antarā—within; bhūta—made of material elements; grāma—city; vat—like; svātmanaḥ—of Himself.

Within it is like a material city to His own.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

To His own that place in the spiritual sky is like a great city. The phrase "to His own" means "to His own devotee". In the Śruti-śāstra (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 3.2.3 and Kaṭha Upaniṣad 1.2.23) it is said:

yam evaiṣa vṛnute tena labhyaḥ

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is attained only by one whom He Himself chooses."*

Although everything in that city is perfectly spiritual, still it appears like a city made of earth and the other material elements. The word "vat" (like) used in the sūtra refutes the idea that this city is actually material in nature. The sūtra says that it is "svātmanaḥ" (manifested from Himself). In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.2.11) it is said:

brahmaivedam amṛtam purastāt paścāc ca. brahma dakṣiṇataś cottareṇādhaś
cordhvaṁ praṣṭam. brahmaivedaṁ viśvam idaṁ variṣṭham.

"The Supreme is eternal. He is in the east and the west. He is in the south and the north. He is below and He is above. He is everywhere in the universe. He is the greatest."

As the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is full of transcendental knowledge and bliss, has a wonderful variety of features, such as His hands, feet, nails, and hair, so the Lord's transcendental abode, which is manifested from His own personal form, also has a wonderful variety of features, such as the different forms in its land and water. Even though they are all spirit and nothing else, still they manifest a great variety, like a peacock feather or other colorful object.

Sūtra 37

anyathā bhedānupapattir iti cen nopadeśāntara-vat

anyathā—otherwise; bheda—difference; anupapattiḥ—non-attainment; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; upadeśa—teaching; antara—another; vat—like.

If it is said, "It is otherwise, for there is no difference", then I reply: No. It is not so. For it is like other teachings.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

If it is said, "It is otherwise, for if there is no difference between them, then

there must be no difference between the creator of the abode and the abode itself," then the sūtra replies. "No. This is not a fault". Why is that? The sūtra replies, "upadeśāntara-vat" (for it is like other teachings). In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad it is said:

ānandaṁ brahmaṇo vidvān

"A wise man knows the bliss of the Supreme".

In this and other teachings it is said that even though the Supreme is one with His attributes, still He is also different from them. That is the meaning.

(Note: Here the opponent claims that because the Lord is not different from His transcendental abode, therefore it is not possible for the Lord to dwell in that abode, for He is not different from it. This is refuted by the scriptures' assertion that the Lord is also different from His attributes, including His transcendental abode.)

Sūtra 38

vyatihāro viśiṁṣanti hitara-vat

vyatihāro-changeable; viśiṁṣanti—distinguish; hi—indeed; itara—others; vat—like.

Like others, they say they are interchangeable.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.15) it is said:

ātmānam eva lokam upāsīta

"One should worship the Supreme Personality of Godhead as identical with His spiritual abode."

This passage of the Śruti-śāstra clearly shows that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is identical with His spiritual abode and the spiritual abode is identical

with the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In this way it is proved that they are mutually identical. The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the same as His spiritual abode, and the spiritual abode is the same as the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad, in the passage beginning “sat-puṇḍarīka-nayanam”, as well as in the passage beginning "sākṣāt prakṛti-paro 'yam ātmā gopālah", the Śruti-śāstra clearly explains that the form of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is identical with the Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself, and the Supreme Personality of Godhead is identical with His own form. Thus the Supreme Personality of Godhead, whose form is full of knowledge and bliss, manifests Himself, by the agency of His inconceivable potency, as His own spiritual world, which He reveals only to His devotee and to no one else. In this way it is proved that as one meditates on the Supreme Personality of Godhead, so one should also meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead's spiritual abode.

Adhikaraṇa 17

The Qualities of the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

To confirm what has already been said, the following explanation is now begun. Many texts that describe the specific features and qualities of the Lord are the subjects of discussion (viṣaya) here.

Samśaya (doubt): Are the features and qualities of the Lord spiritual realities or are they material illusions?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): In Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.19) it is said:

neha nānāsti kiñcana

"Variety is not present in the Supreme."

In Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (2.3.6) it is said:

athāta ādeśo neti neti

"This is the teaching: It is not this. It is not this."

In this way the Śruti-śāstra teaches that the Supreme has neither features nor qualities.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 39

saiva hi satyādayaḥ

sā—she; eva—indeed; hi—indeed; satya—truth; ādayaḥ—beginning with.

Indeed, she is those that begin with truth.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (6.8) it is said:

parāśya śaktiḥ

"The Supreme has a potency that is spiritual."

In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (6.7.61) it is said:

viṣṇu-śaktiḥ parā

"Lord Viṣṇu has a potency that is spiritual."

This potency is clearly different from the illusory material potency (māyā). As heat is to fire, so this personal, spiritual potency is to the Lord. This potency is called parā śakti (spiritual potency) or svarūpa śakti (the Lord's personal potency).

Because this spiritual potency manifests itself as the truthfulness and other qualities of the Lord, these qualities are not material or illusory. They are the actual qualities of the Lord. Two arguments proving that the Lord's truthfulness and other qualities are manifestations of this spiritual potency will be given later.

The "neti neti" passage quoted by the pūrvapakṣa has already been refuted in sūtra 3.2.22.

The word "ādi" (beginning with) should be understood to imply the Lord's other qualities, such as His purity, mercy, forgiveness, omniscience, omnipotence, bliss, handsomeness, and many others. That is why Parāśara Muni defines the word "bhagavān" as "The Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is supremely pure, filled with spiritual good qualities, and the master of great potencies". Then Parāśara Muni explains that the Lord has many transcendental qualities, such as His being the maintainer of all, the master of all, the master of all opulences, possessing all intelligence, and many other qualities also. In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (6.5.72-75) Parāśara Muni says:

śuddhe mahā-vibhūty-ākhye
pare brahmaṇi śabdyate
maitreya bhagavac-chabdaḥ
sarva-kāraṇa-kāraṇe

"O Maitreya, the word `bhagavān' means `The Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is supremely pure, who is the cause of all causes, and who is the master of great potencies.'

sambharteti tathā bhartā
bha-kāro 'rtha-dvayānvitaḥ
netā gamayitā sraṣṭā
ga-kārārthas tathā mune

"The syllable `bha' means `the maintainer of all' or `the protector of all'. O sage, the syllable `ga' means `the leader', `the savior', or `the creator'.

aiśvaryasya samagrasya
vīryasya yaśasaḥ sriyaḥ
jñāna-vairāgyayos cāpi
ṣaṅṅām bhaga itīṅgaṇaḥ

"Full wealth, strength, fame, beauty, knowledge, and renunciation: these are the six opulences of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.*

vasanti yatra bhūtāni
bhūtātmany akhilātmani
sa ca bhūteṣv aśeṣeṣu
vakārārthas tato 'vyayaḥ

jñāna-sakti-balaiśvarya. . .

"The syllable `va' means `the Supreme Personality of Godhead, in whom everything abode, and who Himself abides in all beings.' Therefore the word `bhagavān' means `The Supreme Personality of Godhead, who has all knowledge, power, and opulences'."

Therefore the Supreme Personality of Godhead's truthfulness and other qualities are not different from Him. In this way it is proved that one should meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead as being not different from His qualities.

Adhikaraṇa 18 **The Goddess of Fortune**

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be explained the truth that the goddess of fortune is the best of the Lord's qualities. In the Śukla Yajur-Veda (31.22) it is said:

śrīś ca te lakṣmīś ca patnyau

"O Supreme Personality of Godhead, Śrī and Lakṣmī are Your wives."

Some say that Śrī is Ramā-devī and Lakṣmī is Bhāgavatī Sampat. Others say that Śrī is Vāg-devī and Lakṣmī is Ramā-devī. In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (.141) it is said:

kamalā-pataye namaḥ

"Obeisances to Lord Kṛṣṇa, the goddess of fortune's husband."

In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.42) it is also said:

ramā-mānasa-hamsāya

govindāya namo namaḥ

"Obeisances to Lord Kṛṣṇa, who is the pleasure of the cows, the land, and the senses, and who is a swan swimming in the Mānasa lake of the goddess of fortune's thoughts."

In the Rāma-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said:

ramādhārāya rāmāya

"Obeisances to Lord Rāma, on whom the goddess of fortune rests."

Samśaya (doubt): Is the goddess of fortune material, and therefore not eternal, or is she spiritual, and therefore eternal?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): In Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (2.3.6) it is said:

athāta ādeśo neti neti

"This is the teaching: It is not this. It is not this."

These words show that the Supreme has no qualities and therefore it is not possible that, ultimately, the goddess of fortune can be His wife. The goddess of fortune is a material illusion, a manifestation of the material mode of pure goodness.. Therefore the goddess of fortune is material and not eternal.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 40

kāmādītaratra tatra cāya-tanādibhyaḥ

kāma—desires; ādi—beginning with; itaratra—in other places; tatra—there; ca—also; āya—all-pervasiveness; tana—giving bliss and liberation; ādibhyaḥ—beginning with

Because She is all-pervading, the giver of bliss, and the giver of liberation, and

because She has many other virtues, She is the source of what is to be desired, both there and in other places also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The words "sā eva" (she indeed) are understood from the previous sūtra. The "she" here is the transcendental goddess of fortune, who in both the spiritual sky (tatra), which is untouched by matter, and also in the world of the five material elements (itaratra), fulfills the desires of her master. She is the eternal goddess of fortune. The word "kāma" here means "the desire for amorous pastimes". The word "ādi" (beginning with) here means "personal service and other activities appropriate for these pastimes.

In this way the goddess of fortune is transcendental. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "āya-tanādibhyaḥ". The word "āya" means "all-pervading". The word "tana" means "giving liberation and bliss to the devotees". In these two ways she is like the Lord Himself, who possesses truthfulness and a host of other virtues.

The word "ādi" (beginning with) here hints that she is spiritual in nature. The statement of Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (6.8) also affirms that she is spiritual. In this way she is spiritual and all-pervading. She has knowledge, compassion, and a host of other virtues, and she is also a giver of liberation. In these ways the goddess of fortune is not different from the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa it is said:

nityaiva sā jagan-mātā
viṣṇoḥ śrīr anapāyini
yathā sarva-gato viṣṇus
tathaveyaṁ dvijottama

"The goddess of fortune is the eternal companion of Lord Viṣṇu. She is the mother of the universe. O best of the brāhmaṇas, as Lord Viṣṇu is all-pervading, so is she also."

It is also said in the scriptures:

ātma-vidyā ca devi tvam
vimukti-phala-dāyini

"O goddess of fortune, You are the Lord's spiritual knowledge. You are the giver of liberation."

If the goddess of fortune were not spiritual it would be improper to ascribe these two qualities (all-pervasiveness and giving liberation) to her. That the

goddess of fortune is spiritual is described in the following words of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa:

procyate parameśo yo
yaḥ śuddho 'py upacārataḥ
prasīdatu sa no viṣṇur
ātmā yaḥ sarva-dehinām

"May supremely pure Lord Viṣṇu, who is the master of the spiritual goddess of fortune and the Supersoul of all living entities, be merciful to us."

The word "para-mā" in this verse means "the spiritual (para) goddess of fortune (mā)". Because the goddess of fortune has been described as being all-pervading and having other spiritual attributes, it is not possible that she is material. In this way it is proved that the goddess of fortune is not material. For these reasons the goddess of fortune is spiritual and eternal.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that if the goddess of fortune is the spiritual potency of the Lord, (which is not different from the Lord), then it is not possible for her to have devotion for the Lord? After all, it is not possible for a person to have devotion to himself.

If this objection is raised, then the author of the sūtras replies in the following words.

Sūtra 41

ādarād alopaḥ

ādarāt—because of devotion; alopaḥ—non-ending.

Because of devotion it does not cease.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Although in truth the goddess of fortune is not different from the Lord, still, because the Lord is a jewel mine of wonderful qualities, and also because He is the root of the goddess of fortune's existence, the love and devotion that the goddess bears for Him never ceases. The branch never ceases to love the tree, nor the moonlight the moon. Her love and devotion for the Lord is described in many

places in the Śruti-śāstra. In the Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (10.29.37) it is said:

śrīr yat-padāmbuja-rajaś cakame tulasyā
labdhvāpi vakṣasi padam kila bhṛtya-juṣṭam

"Dear Kṛṣṇa, the lotus feet of the goddess of fortune are always worshiped by the demigods, although she is always resting on Your chest in the Vaikuṅṭha planets. She underwent great austerity and penance to have some shelter at Your lotus feet, which are always covered by tulasī leaves."*

Here someone may object: Is it not true that amorous love is possible only when there are two: the lover and the beloved? If there is no difference between the lover and the beloved, then love is not possible between them.

If this is said, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 42

upasthite 'tas tad-vacanāt

upasthite—being near; ataḥ—thus; tat—of that; vacanāt—from the statement.

It is in His presence. It is so because of the statement.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "upasthite" means "nearness". even though the Lord's potency and the Lord Himself, the shelter of that potency, are one, still, because the Lord is the best of males and His potency is the jewel of young girls, when They are together there is naturally the perfection of blissful amorous pastimes. How is that known? The sūtra explains: "tad-vacanāt" (because of the statement). In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (2.25) it is said:

yo ha vai kāmēna kāmān kāmāyate sa kāmī bhavati. yo ha vai tv akāmēna kāmān kāmāyate so 'kāmī bhavati.

"He who lusts after pleasures is lusty. He who enjoys without material lust is not lusty."

In these words the amorous pastimes of the Lord are described. The word "a-kāmena" here means "with something that bears certainly similarities to lust". This thing with some similarities to material lust is the Lord's pure spiritual love. That is the meaning. With spiritual love He enjoys the goddess of fortune, who is actually Himself. In this way He finds pleasure and fulfillment. For this there is no fault on His part. By touching the goddess of fortune, who is actually Himself, the Lord enjoys transcendental bliss. It is like a person gazing at his own handsomeness (in a mirror). That is what is said here.

Different from His spiritual potency (parā śakti) is the potency of the Lord's form (svarūpa-śakti). The Śruti-śāstras and other scriptures explain that through the svarūpa-śakti the Supreme Lord manifests as the best of males, and through the parā śakti the Lord manifests His various transcendental qualities. It is through the parā śakti that the Lord manifests His knowledge, bliss, mercy, opulence, power, sweetness, and other qualities.

It is also through the parā śakti that the Vedic scriptures are manifested. In the same way is manifested the earth and other places. manifesting as the Lord's pleasure potency (hlādinī śakti), the parā śakti appears as Śrī Rādhā, the jewel of teenage girls.

Although the Lord and His parā śakti are not different, still, for enjoying different pastimes, They are manifested as different. In this way the Lord's desires are perfectly and completely fulfilled.

These manifestations of the parā śakti, beginning with the manifestation of the Lord's qualities, are not manifested only recently. They are beginningless and eternal. They will never cease to exist. Therefore the devotees should meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead as accompanied by the goddess of fortune.

Adhikaraṇa 19

The Many Forms of the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.54) it is said:

tasmāt eva kṛṣṇaḥ paro devas taṁ dhyāyet taṁ raset taṁ bhajet taṁ yajet. iti. om̐ tat sat.

"Therefore, Lord Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. One should meditate on Him, glorify Him, serve Him, and worship Him. Om̐ Tat Sat."

Samśaya (doubt): Must one always worship Lord Hari as Kṛṣṇa or is it possible to worship Him in another form also?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because this passage ends the Upaniṣad the proper interpretation is the worship of Lord Hari must always be directed to the form of Lord Kṛṣṇa alone.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 43

tan nirdharaṇāniyamas tad dṛṣṭaiḥ pṛthag hy apratibandhaḥ phalam

tat—of that; nirdharaṇa—of determination; a—not; niyamaḥ—rule; tat—that; dṛṣṭaiḥ—by what is seen; pṛthak—distinct; hi—indeed; a—not; pratibandhaḥ—obstruction; phalam—fruit.

There is no restriction in that regard. It is different because of what is seen. Non-obstruction is the result.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

There is no rule that says one must worship Lord Hari in His form as Kṛṣṇa only and not in His form of Lord Balarāma or any of His other forms. Even when He is a tiny infant as Yaśodā's breast, Lord Kṛṣṇa is always all-pervading, all-knowing, and full of bliss. How is that known? The sūtra explains: "tad-dṛṣṭaiḥ" (Because of what is seen). In Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (2.48) it is said:

yatrāsau samsthitaḥ kṛṣṇas
tribhiḥ śaktyā samāhitaḥ
rāmāniruddha-pradyumnai
rukmiṇyā sahito vibhuḥ

catuḥ-śabdo bhaved eko
hy omkāras hy amśakaiḥ kṛtaḥ

"Lord Kṛṣṇa, accompanied by His three potencies and by Balarāma, Aniruddha, Pradyumna, and Rukminī, stays in delightful Mathurā Purī. These four names are

identical with the name Om."

Lord Balarāma and the other incarnations are all forms of Lord Kṛṣṇa and so They also should be worshiped. That is the meaning.

Here someone may object: If that is so then the phrase "kṛṣṇa eva" (Kṛṣṇa indeed), emphasizing Lord Kṛṣṇa would become meaningless.

To this objection the sūtra replies: "pṛthak" (it is different). This means, "the result is different". What is that different result? the sūtra explains: "apratibandhaḥ" (non-obstruction is the result). This means, "the removal of the obstructions to the worship of Lord Kṛṣṇa, obstructions caused by thinking any other form is the highest form of the Lord." Therefore, if one is able and if one is so inclined, he may worship other forms of the Lord, which are all non-different from Lord Kṛṣṇa.

Adhikaraṇa 20 The Spiritual Master

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be explained the truth that Lord Kṛṣṇa is attained by one who approaches a genuine spiritual master. In its description of transcendental knowledge, the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (6.23) explains:

yasya deve parā bhaktir
yathā deve tathā gurau
tasyaite kathitā hy arthāḥ
prakāśante mahātmanaḥ

"Only to those great souls who have implicit faith in both the Lord and the spiritual master are all the imports of Vedic knowledge automatically revealed."*

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.14.2) it is said:

ācāryavān puruṣo veda

"One who approaches a bona fide spiritual master can understand everything about spiritual realization."*

In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (1.2.12) it is said:

tad-vijñānārthaṁ sa gurum evābhigacchet

"To learn the transcendental subject matter, one must approach a spiritual master."*

Samśaya (doubt): is the result obtained merely by hearing the scriptures from the spiritual master, or must that hearing be accompanied by the attainment of the spiritual master's mercy?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The result is obtained merely by hearing the scriptures. Why would one need to attain the spiritual master's mercy?

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 44

pradāna-vad eva tad uktam

pradāna—gift; vat—like; eva—indeed; tat—that; uktam—said.

It is like a gift. That is said.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

When the spiritual master is pleased with a person that person is able to hear the scriptures and follow the path of spiritual advancement. In this way one attains the Lord. By merely hearing the scriptures and following the spiritual path one will not be able to attain the Lord. Therefore it is said that the spiritual master's mercy is essential. The prefix "pra" in this sūtra hints at the word "prasāda" (mercy). The lotus-eyed Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself explains in the Bhagavad-gītā (13.8);

ācāryopasaṇāṁ śaucam

"Knowledge means to approach a bona fide spiritual master and become pure."

In this way the scriptures explain that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is attained by the mercy of the spiritual master.

Adhikaraṇa 21 **The Spiritual Master's Mercy**

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Saiṁśaya (doubt): Which is more important: one's own efforts or the spiritual master's mercy?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): If one does not endeavor on one's own part, then the spiritual master's mercy will not be effective. Therefore one's own effort is more important.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 45

liṅga-bhūyastvāt tad dhi balīyas tad api

liṅga—of indications; bhūyastvāt—because of an abundance; tat—that; hi—indeed; balīyaḥ—more powerful; tat—that; api—also.

Because of many symptoms it is more powerful. That also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Even though some demigods assuming the forms of a bull and other creatures had already taught him the truth of the Supreme, the disciple Satyakāma nevertheless requested his spiritual master (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 4.9.2):

bhagavāns tv eva me kāmam brūyāt

"O master, please teach me the truth."

In the same way Upakośala (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 4.10.1-4.14.3), even though he had already attained spiritual knowledge from the sacred fires, nevertheless approached his spiritual master for instruction. In these two passages of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad it is clearly seen that the mercy of the spiritual master is the most important.

Here someone may say: If that is so, then what is the need of doing anything at all? One should not think in that way. One should still study the scriptures and follow the spiritual path. In the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (6.23) it is said:

yasya deve parā bhaktiḥ

"One should engage in devotional service to the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

In the Śruti-śāstra it is said:

śrotavyaḥ mantavyaḥ

"One should meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead and hear His glories."

In the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

guru-prasādo balavān
na tasmād balavattaram
tathāpi śravaṇādīś ca
kartavyo mokṣa-siddhaye

"The spiritual master's mercy is most important. Nothing is more important. Still, in order to attain liberation one should certainly hear the glories of the Supreme Personality of Godhead and serve Him in many ways."

Adhikaraṇa 22

The Supreme Personality of Godhead and the Individual Spirit Soul Are Not Identical

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this way it is proved that by attaining the spiritual master's mercy and by worshipping the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who has the most glorious transcendental qualities, one attains the desired result. Now an apparent contradiction will be resolved.

In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad the sages ask Brahmā questions beginning with, "Who is the supreme object of worship?" Brahmā answers that Lord Kṛṣṇa is the supreme object of worship, and devotional service is the way to attain Him. However, in the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (2.49) it is also said:

tasmād eva paro rajasa iti so 'ham ity avadhārya gopālo 'ham iti bhāvayet. sa mokṣam aśnute sa brahmatvam adhigacchati sa brahma-vid bhavati.

"One should think, 'I am the Supreme Lord beyond the passions of the material world'. One should think, 'I am Lord Gopāla'. In this way one attains liberation. In this way one attains the state of being the Supreme Lord. In this way one understands the Supreme."

The words "so 'ham" (I am He) clearly show the idea that the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the individual spirit souls are not different.

Samśaya (doubt): Do the words "so 'ham" (I am He) here teach the doctrine that the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the individual spirit souls are identical, or do they teach some aspect of the doctrine of devotional service, a doctrine already been described in this book?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The natural meaning of the words here is that the doctrine of oneness is the way to liberation.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

pūrva-vikalpaḥ prakaraṇāt syāt kriyā-mānasa-vat

pūrva—previous; vikalpaḥ—concept; prakaraṇāt—from the context; syāt—may be; kriyā—actions; mānasa—mind; vat—like.

Because of the context it is like what goes before. It is like the thoughts and deeds.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The declaration "so 'ham" (I am He) in the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad should be understood according to the passages that precede it. Why is that? The sūtra declares: “prakaraṇāt” (because of the context). In the beginning of Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.14) it is said:

bhaktir asya bhajanam tad ihāmūtropādhi-nairāśyenāmusmin manaḥ kalpanam etad eva naiṣkarmyam.

"Without any desire for material benefit in this life or the next one should engage in devotional service to Lord Kṛṣṇa. That will bring freedom from the bonds of karma."

Devotional service is also described at the end of the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad in these words:

sac-cid-ānandaika-rase bhakti-yoge tiṣṭhati.

"One should engage in devotional service, which is eternal and full of knowledge and bliss."

The middle portion of the Upaniṣad cannot deal with a topic different from what is discussed in the beginning and end. Here the sūtra gives an example: "kriyā-mānasa-vat" (It is like the thoughts and deeds). The deeds here are the activities of devotional service, which begin with worship of the Lord. The thoughts here are meditation on the Lord.

Devotional service was described in the beginning and end of the Upaniṣad. Therefore the declaration "so 'ham" (I am He) should be understood as a description of some feature of the same devotional service already described in the preceding passages.

Pushed by intense love or fear, a person may sometimes call out, "I am he!" In

this way a person may sometimes call out, "I am Kṛṣṇa!" or "I am that lion!"

In beginning of the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.2) the question is asked:

kaḥ paramo devaḥ

"Who is the Supreme Personality of Godhead?"

In that passage the sages asked Brahmā about the identity of Supreme, who is the supreme object of worship, the deliverer from the world of repeated birth and death, the shelter of all, the first cause of all causes. Brahmā replied:

śrī-kṛṣṇo vai paramam daivatam

"Lord Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

Then, to help enable meditation on the Lord, Brahmā described Lord Kṛṣṇa's various qualities. Then Brahmā says (Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad 1.6):

yo dhyāyati. . .

"One who meditates on Lord Kṛṣṇa, glorifies Him, and worships Him, becomes liberated. He becomes liberated."

Thus Brahmā shows that by meditating on Lord Kṛṣṇa, chanting mantras glorifying Lord Kṛṣṇa, and engaging in other activities of devotional service, one becomes liberated from the world of birth and death. The again it is said (Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad 1.7):

te hocuḥ kim tad-rūpam

"The sages said: What is His form?"

This question is about devotional service and the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is worshiped in devotional service. Brahmā answered this question in these words (1.8):

tad u hovāca hairaṅyo gopa-veśam abhrābham

"Brahmā said: He is a cowherd boy. He is dark like a monsoon cloud."

Then, after describing Lord Kṛṣṇa's form, Brahmā describes the mantra to be chanted. He says (1.11):

ramyaṁ punā rasanam

"Lord Kṛṣṇa's mantra should be chanted repeatedly."

Then Brahmā describes devotional service in these words (1.14):

bhaktir asya bhajanam

"One should engage in devotional service to Lord Kṛṣṇa."

Then Brahmā describes the mantra one should chant in order to see Lord Kṛṣṇa's form. Brahmā says (1.24):

omkāreṅāntaritam yo japati. . .

"To one who chants this mantra beginning with Om, Lord Kṛṣṇa reveals His own transcendental form."

Then, in Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad 1.38 (tam ekaṁ govindam), Brahmā describes Lord Kṛṣṇa's transcendental form, which is full of knowledge and bliss. Finally Brahmā concludes (1.54):

tasmāc chrī-kṛṣṇa eva paro devaḥ

"Therefore Lord Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

In the second chapter of Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said that the gopīs, after enjoying pastimes with Lord Kṛṣṇa, and after asking Him questions, and after attaining His permission, presented a great feast before the sage Durvāsā. Pleased, the sage blessed them. When they asked him about Lord Kṛṣṇa, the sage described to them (in the passage beginning with the word "Śrī Kṛṣṇaḥ") the extraordinary nature of Lord Kṛṣṇa's pastimes. He told them that Lord Kṛṣṇa is the first cause of all causes, that He is conquered by the pure love of His devotees, that He is dear to His devotees, and many other glories of Lord Kṛṣṇa. Then (in the passage beginning with the words "sā hovāca"), Durvāsā is asked about Lord Kṛṣṇa's birth,

activities, mantra, and abode. In the passage beginning with the words "sa hovāca tām" the sage answered the question by recounting a conversation of Brahmā and Lord Nārāyaṇa. In that account he explained that Lord Kṛṣṇa is perfect and complete and he also explained that Lord Kṛṣṇa is the savior from the world of birth and death. Then, in the passage beginning with the words "vanair anekair ullahat", Brahmā described the Lord's spiritual abode named Mathurā, which is protected by the Lord's cakṛa and which is splendid with many forests. At this point the "so 'ham" passage occurs (Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (2.49):

tasmād eva paro rajasa iti so 'ham

"One should think, 'I am the Supreme Lord beyond the passions of the material world'."

In this way it is said that the condition of thinking oneself non-different from the Lord is the cause of liberation. Because devotional service was described previously in this Upaniṣad as the cause of liberation, the oneness with the Lord here must be a certain feature of that devotional service. It must be a symptom of ecstatic love, like the shedding of many tears or other symptoms of ecstatic love. The passages "aham asmi" (I am He), "brahmāham asmi" (I am the Supreme), and other similar passages in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad and other scriptures, passages declaring the oneness of the individual soul and the Supreme, should all be taken in this way, as expressions of persons overwhelmed with ecstatic love, expressions that are actually proof that the individual souls and the Supreme are indeed different persons and are not at all identical. This truth has already been explained in this book.

In the following sūtra will be presented further proof that the words "so 'ham" (I am He) are indeed a symptom of devotional love and do not at all mean that the individual souls and the Supreme are identical.

Sūtra 47

atideśāc ca

atideśāt—by comparison; ca—and.

Also by comparison.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (2.63) Lord Nārāyaṇa tells Brahmā:

yathā tvaṁ saha putraiḥ ca
yathā rudro gānaiḥ saha
yathā śriyābhiyukto 'ham
tathā bhakto mama priyaḥ

"Anyone who becomes My sincere devotee becomes very dear to Me. As dear as you and your sons are, as dear as Lord Śiva and his associates, as dear as the goddess of fortune."

In this verse it is seen that as Brahmā is accompanied by his sons, so Lord Kṛṣṇa is always accompanied by His devotees. The word "ca" (and) is explained in the following words of Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (2.91), where the Supreme Personality of Godhead declares:

dhyāyen mama priyo nityam
sa mokṣam adhigacchati
sa mukto bhavati tasmai
svātmānam ca dadāmi vai

"One who meditates on Me is eternally dear to Me. He attains liberation. He becomes liberated. I give Myself to him."

In these words the Lord declares that the devotees are eternally dear to Him and He also declares that he gives Himself as a gift to His devotees. If the individual souls and the Supreme Lord are ultimately one, these two statements cannot be at all possible. Therefore the scriptures' statement "so 'ham" (I am He) should be understood as the description of a specific symptom of ecstatic love. This statement ("so 'ham"), when found in the Rāma-tāpanī Upaniṣad and other Upaniṣads should also be explained in this way.

In conclusion, it is said that one attains liberation by the mercy of the spiritual master and by devotional service to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. There is no fault with that statement.

Adhikaraṇa 23
Spiritual Knowledge Brings Liberation

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

True knowledge is defined as the scriptures' description of devotional service. That knowledge leads to liberation. Here begins an elaborate description of that truth. In the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (3.8) it is said:

tam eva viditvāti mṛtyum eti
nānyaḥ panthā nvidyate 'yanāya

"I know the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is transcendental to all material conceptions of darkness. Only he who knows Him can transcend the bonds of birth and death. There is no way for liberation other than this knowledge of that Supreme Person."*

In the Puruṣa-sūkta prayers of the Ṛg Veda it is said:

tam eva vidvān amṛta iha bhavati

"A person who knows the Supreme attains liberation."

Samśaya (doubt) Is liberation caused by the performance of Vedic rituals (karma), by spiritual knowledge (vidyā), or by rituals and knowledge together?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): How is liberation attained? It is attained by performing Vedic rituals. This is proved in sūtras 3.4.2-7. Or, if there must be some knowledge, then Vedic rituals and knowledge should be combined together to bring liberation. In the Śruti-śāstra it is said:

tad-dhetor na tu tayor ekataram taṁ vidyā-karmaṇī

"Vedic rituals and spiritual knowledge must be combined together to bring liberation. Either of them alone is not enough."

It is also said:

ubhābhyām eva pakṣābhyām
yathā khe pakṣiṇo gatiḥ
tathaiva karma-jñānābhyām
mukto bhavati mānavaḥ

"As a bird needs two wings to fly in the sky, so a man needs both Vedic rituals and spiritual knowledge to attain liberation."

Or, perhaps spiritual knowledge alone is in truth the cause of liberation. After all, the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (3.8) declares:

tam eva viditvāti mṛtyum eti

"Only one who knows the Supreme Personality of Godhead can transcend the bonds of birth and death."

After all is said and done it is not possible to reach a final conclusion in this matter.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 48

vidyaiva tu tan-nirdharaṇāt

vidyā—knowledge; eva—indeed; tu—certainly; tat—of that; nirdharaṇāt—because of the conclusion.

It is knowledge indeed, for that is the conclusion.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (indeed) is used here to dispel doubt. Spiritual knowledge, and not Vedic ritual, is the cause of liberation. Neither is it necessary that spiritual knowledge be combined with the performance of Vedic rituals in order to bring liberation. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "tan-nirdharaṇāt" (for that is the conclusion). The conclusion is given in Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 3.8. The word "vidyā" (knowledge) here means "the knowledge that leads to devotional service". In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.21) it is said:

vijñāya prajñām kurvīta

"One should understand the Supreme, and thus become wise."

The "wisdom" here is clearly devotional service. In the Smṛti-śāstra the word "vidyā" is used in both these senses. One example is in the following words:

vidyā-kuṭhāreṇa śitena dhīraḥ

"With the sharpened ax of knowledge a wise person cuts asunder the darkness of ignorance."

Another example is in Bhagavad-gītā (9.2):

rāja-vidyā rāja-guhyam

"This knowledge is the king of education, the most secret of all secrets."*

The word "vidyā" may be interpreted in two ways. It is like the words "kaurava" and "mīmāṃsā". The former may mean either "the Pāṇḍavas" or "the sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra", and the latter may mean either "the knowers of Vedic rituals" or "the knowers of the Supreme".

Liberation is thus attained by knowledge, knowledge here being the direct perception of the Lord standing outside the heart. The author of the sūtras declares this in the following words.

Sūtra 49

darśanāc ca

darśanāt—by seeing; ca—also.

Also by seeing.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.2.8) it is said:

bidyate hr̥daya-granthiś
chidyante sarva-saṁśayāḥ
kṣīyante cāsyā karmāṇi
tasmin dṛṣṭe parāvare

"Thus the knot in the heart is pierced, and all misgivings are cut to pieces. The chain of fruitive actions is terminated when one sees the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

The meaning here is that one becomes liberated by seeing the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Here someone may object: Do the scriptures not say, "One attains liberation by performing Vedic rituals"? Do the scriptures not say, "One attains liberation by performing Vedic rituals and attaining spiritual knowledge"? These words of yours contradict the scriptures.

If this is said then the author of the sūtras give the following reply.

Sūtra 50

śruty-ādi-baliyastvāc ca na bādhaḥ

śruti—the Śruti-śāstras; ādi—beginning with; baliyastvāt—because of being stronger; ca—and; na—not; bādhaḥ—refutation.

Also, it is not refuted, for the authority of the Śruti-śāstras and other scriptures is greater.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Śruti-śāstra's declaration, "liberation is attained by transcendental knowledge" cannot be refuted by our opponent's two scripture quotes. Why is that? The sūtra declares: "śruty-ādi-baliyastvāt" (for the authority of the Śruti-śāstras and other scriptures is greater). This means, "for the authority of Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 3.8 and other passages of the Śruti-śāstras and other scriptures is greater". The word "ādi" (beginning with) here means that there are also passages where this truth is hinted or explained indirectly. In the scriptures it is said:

indro 'śvamedhāc chatam iṣṭvāpi rājā
brahmāṇam īdyaṁ samuvācopasannaḥ
na karmabhir na dhanair nāpi cānyaiḥ
paśyet sukham tena tattvam bravīhi

"After performing a hundred aśvamedha-yajñas, King Indra approached the demigod Brahmā and said, 'Neither Vedic rituals, nor giving charity, nor any other thing has made me happy. Please tell me how I may see happiness.' "

In the scriptures it is also said:

nāsty akṛtaḥ kṛtena

"He who was never born is not attained by Vedic rituals."

As for the six sūtras (3.4.2-7) quoted by the opponent, the author of the sūtras Himself will refute them in sūtras 3.4.8-14. The word "ādi" (beginning with) means that many other scriptural passages may also be quoted. The word "ca" (also) again means that many more statements of scripture may be quoted to prove that spiritual knowledge uproots all past karmic reactions. The passage beginning with the words "tam vidyā" and the other passages quoted by our opponent will all be refuted in sūtra 3.4.11 by the author of the sūtras Himself. In this way it has been proved that spiritual knowledge is the true cause of liberation.

Adhikaraṇa 24 Worshiping the Saintly Devotees

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be discussed the truth that liberation is attained by worshiping the saintly devotees. In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (1.11.2) it is said:

atithi-devo bhava

"Treat a guest as if he were a visiting demigod."

Saiṁśaya (doubt): Is the worship of saintly devotees a cause of liberation or is it not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Liberation is already available by the mercy of the spiritual master and the worship of the Supreme Lord. What need is there to worship the saintly devotees?

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 51

anubandhādibhyaḥ

anubandha—repeated instructions; ādibhyaḥ—beginning with.

Because of many instructions.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "anubandha" here means, "because of many instructions declaring that one should worship the saintly devotees". The Taittirīya Upaniṣad's phrase, "treat him as if he were a visiting demigod" means "worship him". This is so because by the mercy of great devotees one attains liberation. If this were not so then the Taittirīya Upaniṣad would not have spoken in this way. Many great sages who know the truth have also taught this in the Smṛti-śāstra. In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (5.12.12), Jaḍa Bharata explains:

rahūgaṇaitat tapasā na yāti
na cejyayā nirvapaṇād grhād vā
na cchandasā naiva jalāgni-sūryair
vinā mahat-pāda-rajo-'bhiṣekam

"My dear King Rahūgaṇa, unless one has the opportunity to smear his entire body with the dust of the lotus feet of great devotees, one cannot realize the Absolute Truth. One cannot realize the Absolute Truth simply by observing celibacy (brahmacarya), strictly following the rules and regulations of householder life, leaving home as vanaprastha, accepting sannyāsa, or undergoing severe penances in winter by keeping oneself submerged in water or surrounding oneself in summer by fire and the scorching heat of the sun. There are many other

processes to understand the Absolute Truth, but the Absolute Truth is only revealed to one who has attained the mercy of a great devotee."*

In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (11.12.1-2), Lord Kṛṣṇa Himself explains:

na rodhayati mām yogo
na saṅkhyam dharmā uddhava
na svādhyāyas tapas tyāgo
neṣṭa-pūrtam na dakṣiṇā

vratāni yajñās chandāmsi
tīrthāni niyamā yamāḥ
yathāvarundhe sat-saṅgaḥ
sarva-saṅgāpaho hi mām

"My dear Uddhava, neither through aṣṭāṅga-yoga (the mystic yoga to control the senses), nor through impersonal monism or an analytical study of the Absolute Truth, nor through study of the Vedas, nor through practice of austerities, nor through charity, nor through acceptance of sannyāsa, nor through many pious deeds, nor through giving dakṣiṇā, nor through following vows, nor through performing many yajñas, nor through chanting Vedic hymns, nor through visiting holy places, nor through controlling the senses can one bring Me under his control as much as one can by associating with saintly devotees. Their association frees one from the touch of matter."

Here Lord Kṛṣṇa personally teaches the importance of associating with saintly devotees. The Lord here teaches a great secret of how to engage in devotional service. The word "ādi" in this sūtra indicates that one should also visit holy places of pilgrimage and one should avoid they who commit blasphemy. In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (1.2.16) it is said:

śuśrūṣoḥ śraddadhānasya
vāsudeva-kathā-ruciḥ
syān mahat-sevayā viprāḥ
puṇya-tīrtha-niṣevanāt

"O twice-born sages, by serving those devotees who are completely freed from all vice, great service is done. By such service one gains affinity for hearing the message of Vāsudeva."*

In the Padma Purāṇa it is said:

harir eva sadārādhyah

sarva-deveśvareśvaraḥ
itare brahma-rudrādya
nāvajñeyā kadācana

"Lord Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the master of all the demigods, and He should always be worshiped. Still, one should never disrespect Brahmā, Śiva, and the other demigods."

Here someone may object: The mercy of the spiritual master and the association of saintly devotees are both attained by the mercy of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Therefore the real cause of liberation is His mercy. even good fortune does not happen independently. That also is caused by the Lord's mercy. Indeed, all actions are caused by the Lord's mercy, as was explained in sūtra 2.3.39. Therefore it is not right to say that liberation is caused by the mercy of the spiritual master or by any cause other than the mercy of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

To this objection I reply: Even though they are themselves caused by the Lord Himself, still the spiritual master's mercy and the other causes like it are also causes of liberation in their own right. This was already explained in the passage beginning with sūtra 2.3.40. The truth is that the Supreme Personality of Godhead becomes conquered by His devotees and He gives them the power to grant His own mercy to others. In this way the devotees are independent agents who can deliver the Lord's mercy to others. When the devotees give their mercy to someone, then the Supreme Lord also gives His mercy to that person. In this way all seeming contradictions and the different passages of the scriptures are all resolved.

Adhikaraṇa 25

The Liberated Souls Have Different Relationships with the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (3.14.1) it is said:

atha khalu kratumayaḥ puruṣo yathā kratuḥ asmil loke puruṣo bhavati tathetaḥ
pretya bhavati sa kratuḥ kurvīta.

"Man is meant to worship the Supreme Lord. As one worships the Lord in this life, so one will attain Him after death. Therefore one should worship the Lord."

Samśaya (doubt): The worship of the Supreme Lord is naturally accompanied by the worship of the spiritual master and the saintly devotees. This worship is of many kinds, some higher and some lower. Does the higher or lower level of one's worship lead to a higher or lower result, or does it not lead to a higher or lower result?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (3.1.3) it is said:

nirañjanaḥ param samyam upaiti

"Liberated souls are all equal."

In this way the Śruti-sāstra affirms that different levels of worship do not lead to different results. Travelers who enter a city by different paths do not enter different cities. They enter the same city. In the same way, although they have attained Him by different paths, the liberated souls see the same Supreme Lord.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 52

prajñāntara-prthaktva-vad dṛṣṭiś ca tad uktam

prajñā—knowledge; antara—other; prthaktva—variety; vat—possessing; dṛṣṭiḥ—sight; ca—and; tat—that; uktam—said.

As there are differences of knowledge, so also there are differences in sight. That is stated.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.21) it is said:

vijñāya prajñām kurvīta

"One should understand the Supreme, and thus attain wisdom."

Here are the words "understanding" and "wisdom". The meaning of the first is straightforward, but the second really means devotional service to the Lord. As there are thus different kinds of knowledge so also the devotees see the Lord in different ways.

The sūtra explains: "tad uktam" (that is stated). These words mean, "it is stated that according to the devotees' different kinds of worship different higher and lower results are obtained". Thus according to the way the Lord was worshiped the devotees see the Lord in different ways. This is reflected in their liberation. The sameness described above means that the liberated souls see the same Supreme Lord.

Here someone may object: That may be. However, you say that without knowledge one cannot see the Lord and without first seeing the Lord one cannot attain liberation. Both statements are illogical. When the Supreme Lord was personally present on the earth many persons who had no knowledge nevertheless saw Him and many who saw Him did not attain liberation.

To this objection the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 53

na sāmānyād apy upalabdher mṛtyu-van na hi lokāpattiḥ

na—not; sāmānyāt—ordinary; apy—even; upalabdheḥ—of perception; mṛtyu—death; vat—like; na—not; hi—indeed; loka—of the world; āpattiḥ—attainment.

Not by ordinary vision, as not by death. Indeed not. There is attainment of that world.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "api" (also) is here used for emphasis. As merely dying does not bring liberation, in the same way ordinary seeing of the Lord also does not bring liberation. What then is the result obtained by ordinary seeing of the Lord? The sūtra explains: "lokāpattiḥ" (there is attainment of that world). This is like The Vidyādhara Sudarśana and the king Nrga, who both attained ordinary sight of the Lord and from that attained the higher material worlds.

Here someone may object: Did they did not attain liberation? If this is said, then the sūtra replies, "na hi" (indeed not). They did not. They attained a higher

world. That is the meaning. In the Nārāyaṇa Tantra it is said:

sāmānya-darśanāl lokā
muktir yogyātma-darśanāt

"By seeing the Supreme Lord with ordinary vision one attains the higher material worlds. By seeing the Lord with spiritual vision one attains liberation."

This is the meaning here. There are two ways of seeing. One is covered by matter and the other is not covered by matter. The first way of seeing the Supreme Personality of Godhead is attained by many pious deeds. It brings one to Svargaloka and the other higher material planets.

The second way of seeing the Supreme Personality of Godhead is attained by understanding the truth of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This way of seeing destroys the subtle material body (of mind, intelligence and false ego), gives one a spiritual body filled with bliss, and makes one a dear associate of the Lord. In this way it brings liberation. In this way everything is explained.

The sages say that they who are killed by the Lord see the Lord at the moment of their death and in this way they also become liberated. This occurs because the splendor of the Lord's cakṛa or other weapon destroys their subtle material body (of mind, intelligence, and false ego). It should be understood that by seeing the Lord these persons attain love for Him. To say otherwise would contradict many statements of the scriptures.

Adhikaraṇa 26 How to Attain Liberation

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This section is begun to give firm proof that by seeing the Lord with eyes of spiritual knowledge, one attains liberation. In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (3.2.3) and Kaṭha Upaniṣad (1.2.23) it is said:

nāyam ātmā pravacanena labhyo
na medhayā na bahunā śrutena
yam evaiṣa vṛṇute tena labhyas
tasyaiṣa ātmā vivṛṇute tanuṁ svām

"The Supreme Lord is not attained by expert explanations, by vast intelligence, or even by much hearing. He is attained only by one who He Himself chooses. To such a person He manifests His own form."*

Samśaya (doubt): Does the Lord appear before a person only because the Lord chooses to appear or does He appear because of a specific person's devotion to Him and renunciation of the material world?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): the Lord appears only because He chooses to appear, for that is what the scripture says.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 54

pareṇa ca śabdasya tādvidhyam bhūyastvāt tv anubandhaḥ

pareṇa—by what follows; ca—also; śabdasya—of the word; tādvidhyam—being like that; bhūyastvāt—because of being more important; tu—indeed; anubandhaḥ—what corresponds.

According to what follows, it is the same. It is because of being more important.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The statement here that the Lord appears before one whom He chooses is actually the same as the statement that the Lord is attained by devotional service. This is clearly stated in the verse that immediately follows this statement. Therefore the meaning is not that the Lord appears only because He chooses to appear. Here is the verse that immediately follows (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 3.2.4):

nāyam ātmā bala-hīnena labhyo
na ca pramādāt tapaso vāpy aliṅgāt
etair upāyair yatate yas tu vidvān
tasyaiṣa ātmā viśate brahma-dhāma

"The Supreme Lord is not attained by one who has no spiritual strength, who is wild or careless, or whose austerities are not appropriate. The Lord appears before

a person who strives by right means to attain Him. Such a person enters the spiritual world."

The "right means" are described in the beginning of this verse. They are spiritual strength, sober carefulness, and appropriate austerities. The word "spiritual strength" here means "devotional service". The Supreme Lord Himself explains:

vaṣe kurvanti mām bhaktāḥ
sat-striyaḥ sat-patiṁ yathā

"As faithful wives control their saintly husband, so My devotees bring Me under their control."

In the Bhagavad-gītā (8.22), it is said:

puruṣaḥ sa paraḥ pārtha
bhaktyā labhyaṣ tv ananyayā

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is greater than all, is attainable by unalloyed devotion."*

Here is the verse immediately following the "nāyam ātmā pravacanena" verse when it appears in the Katha Upaniṣad (1.2.24):

nāvirato duṣcaritāt
nāśānto nāsamāhitaḥ
nāśānta-mānaso vāpi
prajñānenainam āpnuyāt

"Neither a person who has not abandoned sins, nor a person who is not peaceful, nor a person who does not strive to attain Him, nor a person who does not control his mind can, even though he may be very intelligent and learned, attain the Supreme Lord."

A person who controls his senses, acts in a saintly manner, and meditates on Lord Hari becomes able to see Lord Hari directly. Therefore one should engage in the activities of devotional service. In this way the first and second statement together mean that the Supreme Lord chooses to reveal Himself to they who engage in His devotional service.

The first statement is that the Lord chooses who will attain Him. The Lord chooses they who please Him and are dear to Him. He does not choose they who

do not please Him. He is pleased by they who engage in His devotional service. He is not pleased by they who do not engage in devotional service. He personally explains (Bhagavad-gītā 7.17):

teṣāṁ jñānī nitya-yukta
eka-bhaktir viśiṣyate
priyo hi jñānino 'tyartham
ahaṁ sa ca mama priyaḥ

"Of these, the one who is in full knowledge and who is always engaged in pure devotional service is the best. For I am very dear to him, and he is dear to Me."*

In the Kaivalya Upaniṣad (2) it is said:

śraddhā-bhakti-dhyāna-yogād avehi

"With devotion, meditation, and faith one should try to understand the Supreme."

If it were not true (that the Lord reveals Himself to they who love and serve Him, and if instead it were true that He reveals Himself only on a whim to people chosen at random, and if He thus did not care for the love and devotion of they who serve Him), then one might justly become angry with the Lord and claim that He is unfair.

Here someone may object: If this is so then why does the scripture explain that the Lord reveals Himself to they whom He chooses? To this objection the sūtra replies: "bhūyastvāt" (because of being more important). The word "tu" (indeed) in the sūtra is used for emphasis. The meaning here is that the Lord's choosing is the most important aspect in His directly appearing before a person. Actually the Lord's choosing is the last of a chain of causes.

Here is the sequence of events: First there is association with saintly devotees and service to them. By that service one learns the truth of the Supreme Lord and also about one's own self. Then one becomes disinterested in whatever has no relation to the Lord. Then one develops devotion and love for the Lord. That love pleases the Lord and makes one dear to the Lord. Then the Lord chooses to reveal Himself to that person.

Adhikaraṇa 27

The Supreme Lord Resides in the Bodies of the Conditioned Souls

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

They who with the mellows of servitude, friendship, or other mellows, from the beginning worship the Supreme Personality of Godhead who always stays in the spiritual sky, will attain that spiritual sky and there they will directly see their Lord. It is seen that some others, who are situated in the mellows of neutrality (śānta-rasa), worship the Supreme Lord as present in their bellies and in other parts of their bodies.

Viṣaya (the subject to be discussed) Many statements in the scriptures describe this worship of the Supreme Personality of Godhead as present in the devotee's stomach and other bodily organs.

Samśaya (doubt): Should one worship Lord Hari as present in one's belly and other bodily organs, or should one not worship Him in this way?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): One should not worship Lord Hari as present in one's belly and other bodily organs, for these things are all material. However one should worship the Lord as eternally present in the spiritual sky.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 55

eka ātmanah śarīre bhāvāt

eke—some; ātmanah—of the Supreme Personality of Godhead; śarīre—in the body; bhāvāt—because of existence.

Some because of the Lord's existence in the body.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here the word "eke" (some) means "some followers of the Vedas". The word "śarīre" means, "in the body", that is, "in the belly, the heart, and the brahma-randhra". The word "ātmanah" means "of Lord Viṣṇu". The phrase "the worship of Lord Viṣṇu should be performed" is understood here. Why is that? The sūtra

explains, "bhāvāt", which means "because He exists there". In the Nyāya-śāstra it is said:

akke cen madhu vindeta
kim artham parvataṁ vrajet

"If one finds honey in a nearby tree, why should one search for honey in a faraway mountain?"

The meaning here is that when the Lord is pleased (when one worships Him as present in the devotee's body) and He will give the devotee residence in His own abode. In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (10.87.18) it is said:

udaram upāsate ya ṛṣi-vartmasu kūrpa-drśaḥ
parisara-paddhatim hṛdayam āruṇayo daharam
tata udagād ananta tava dhāma śiraḥ paramam
punar iha yat sametya na patanti kṛtānta-mukhe

"Among the followers of the methods set forth by great sages, those with less refined vision worship the Supreme as present in the region of the abdomen, while the Aruṇis worship Him as present in the heart, in the subtle center from which all the prāṇic channels emanate. From there, O unlimited Lord, these worshipers raise their consciousness upward to the top of the head, where they can perceive You directly. Then, passing through the top of the head toward the supreme destination, they reach that place from which they will never again fall to this world, into the mouth of death. ***"

Adhikaraṇa 28 Different Mellows in the Spiritual World

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In Chāndogya Upanisad 3.14.1 and in other places in the scriptures, the worship of the Lord in sweetness (mādhurya) and the worship of the Lord in opulence (aiśvarya) have been described. Also it has been shown that the living entities, by engaging in devotional service and associating with saintly devotees, by the Lord's will attain Him as he appears in a specific form with specific qualities, a

form chosen by the devotee. In this way it is shown that these two features of the Lord (sweetness and opulence) are not incompatible with each other.

Samśaya (doubt): When the devotee worships the Lord as having certain qualities, does the devotee attain a form of the Lord having those qualities alone or does he attain a form of the Lord having other qualities also.

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Whether the devotee meditates on the Lord in sweetness or opulence, the devotee will meet a form of the Lord who has all the qualities of both sweetness and opulence. This is so because whether meditated on in sweetness or opulence, the Lord remains one person.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 56

vyatirekas tad-bhāva-bhāvitvān na tūpalabdhi-vat

vyatirekaḥ—difference; tat—of that; bhāva—of the nature; bhāvitvāt—because of the being; na—not; tu—indeed; upalabdhi—of the understanding; vat—like.

Not different, because of the nature of the meditation. Indeed, it is like knowledge.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (indeed) is used here to dispel doubt. The sūtra declares that other qualities are not manifested. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "tad-bhāva-bhāvitvāt", which means, "because of the nature of the qualities that were the object of meditation". This means that when one attains the Lord, the Lord appears in the same form as was the object of the devotee's meditation. The word "upalabdhi-vat" means "like knowledge". This means, "One meets a form of the Lord like the form one knew in his meditation on the Lord."

Even though the meditator is aware that the Lord has many other qualities, still when the devotee meets the Lord the Lord will manifest only the qualities that were included in the devotee's meditation and not the Lord's other qualities. In this way the description in Chāndogya Upaniṣad 3.14.1 is not contradicted.

In the following sūtra the author gives an example to show that the devotee meets a form of the Lord corresponding to what had been the object of the devotee's meditation.

Sūtra 57

aṅgāvabaddhas tu na śākhāsu hi prativedam

aṅga—parts; avabaddhaḥ—connected; tu—indeed; na—not; śākhāsu—in the branches; hi—indeed; prativedam—according to the Vedas.

Indeed, each has his part according to the different branches of the Vedas.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The performer of a yajña assigns different priests to perform the different parts of the yajña. The priests are thus named according to the function they fulfill in the yajña.

The performer of the yajña thus tells the priests, “You become the adhvaryu priest. You become the hotā priest. You become the udgātā priest.” In this way a certain priest, even though he is expert in performing all the different functions, accepts the limited role in the yajña. He does not perform all the functions in the yajña. It is not possible for him to perform all the functions in all the different branches of the Vedas.

The duties are distributed among the different Vedas. The hotā priest chants mantras of the Ṛg Veda, the adhvaryu priest chants mantras of the Yajur Veda, the udgātā priest chants mantras of the Sāma Veda, and the brahmā priest chants mantras of the Atharva Veda.

In this way, according to the wish of the person performing the yajña, the different priests accept different roles in the yajña and different priestly rewards (dakṣiṇā) also. In the same way, according to the wish of the Supreme Lord, the individual living entities accept different roles in their service to the Lord and they also meet the Lord in different ways according to the roles they play.

Now, to explain the mellows of mixed emotions, which were displayed by Uddhava and others, and which are less pleasing, the author of the sūtras gives another example.

Sūtra 58

mantrādi-vad vāvirodhaḥ

mantra—mantras; ādi—beginning; vat—like; vā—or; avirodhaḥ—not a contradiction.

Or, there is no conflict, as in the case of mantras and other things.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

the Lord's desire here is to increase devotion of various kinds. It is like mantras. As one mantra may be used in many rituals, another mantra may be limited to two rituals, and another mantra used in one ritual only, so the Lord engages (His devotees to worship Him some in many ways and some in one way only).

The word "ādi" (beginning with) in this sūtra means "time and action". As at any given time some trees may be sprouting leaves and flowers and other trees may be shedding their leaves, and as at any given time one person may be an infant, and another a teenager, so (at any given time the different devotees may serve the Lord in many different ways, each person acting differently according to the Lord's wish).

The sūtra explains, "vāirodhaḥ" (thus there is no conflict). Thus after liberation a person will attain the same relationship with the Lord that the person desired while worshiping Him before the person became liberated. In this way it is proved that qualities the Lord manifests to the liberated soul are not different from the qualities the soul meditated on before attaining liberation.

Adhikaraṇa 29

The Different Features of the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Viṣaya (the subject to be discussed) Now the following texts from the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad will be considered:

eko 'pi san bahudhā yo 'vabhāti

"Although He is one, Lord Kṛṣṇa appears in many forms."

ekam santam bahudhā dṛśyamānam

"Although He is one, the Supreme Personality of Godhead appears to be many."

atha kasmād ucyate brahma

"Why is He called the Supreme?"

He Supreme Personality of Godhead has many very different forms. In this way He is like a vaidūrya jewel. Although He is one He has many different forms and many different qualities.

Samśaya (doubt): Should one meditate on the fact that the Supreme Personality of Godhead has many different forms and many different qualities, or should one not meditate on this fact?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The Lord's blissfulness and other like qualities should always be the object of meditation (as was explained in sūtra 3.3.12). However, the plurality of forms contradicts the Lord's oneness. Therefore the Lord's plurality of forms should not be an object of meditation.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 59

bhūmnaḥ kratu-vaj jāyastvaṁ tathā hi darśayati

bhūmnaḥ—of the plurality; kratu—yajña; vat—like; jāyastvaṁ—pre-eminence; tathā—si; hi—indeed; darśayati—shows.

Like a yajña, plurality is most important. So, indeed, it reveals.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Lord's plurality of forms is His most important feature. As yajñas should always be performed, so the Lord's plurality of forms should always be an object of meditation, for this plurality is an essential feature of the Lord.

As in an agniṣṭoma-yajña, from its beginning until the avabhṛta ceremony at its end, it remains always a yajña, in the same way among all the qualities of the Lord,

His plurality of forms is always present and of prime importance. The evidence for this is given in this sūtra in the words, "tathā hi darśayati" (So, indeed, the scriptures reveal). In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.23.1) it is said:

bhūmaiva sukham nālpe sukham asti

"The bliss of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is in His abundant variety. His bliss is not present in a lack of variety."

Thus the Lord's bliss and other qualities are present in great abundance and great variety. They should be meditated on in this way. The scriptures reveal this of them. The word "darśayati" in this sūtra means, "they teach this in every circumstance". Without accepting the Lord's plurality of forms it is not possible to accept that His actions are all eternal.

Adhikaraṇa 30

Different Meditations on the Lord's Different Forms

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Saiṁśaya (doubt): Are these many forms of the Lord worshiped in one way only or are there many ways to worship them?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the object of worship certainly remains one, there must be only way way to worship Him.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 60

nānā śabdādi-bhedāt

nānā—variety; śabda—words; ādi—beginning; bheda—because of the difference.

They are different because of different words and other things.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

There are different kinds of worship for the different forms of the Lord. For each form there is a different kind of worship. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "śabdādi-bhedāt" (because of different words and other things). This means, "because the names of Lord Nṛsiṃha and the Lord's other forms are different, the mantras for worshiping these forms are different, the forms themselves are different, and Their activities are also different". In the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

kṛtaṁ tretā dvāparaṁ ca
kalir ity eṣu keśavaḥ
nānā-varṇābhidhākāro
nānaiva vidhinejyate

"In the Satya, Tretā, Dvāpara, and Kali yugas, Lord Kṛṣṇa appears in different forms with different colors and different names, forms that are worshiped in different ways."

In this way it is proved that the Lord's different forms are worshiped in different ways.

Adhikaraṇa 31

The Steadfast Worship of the Lord

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

That the forms of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, beginning with the form of Lord Nṛsiṃha, should be worshiped in ways that are different for each form has thus been described.

Samśaya (doubt): Must the worshipers of these various forms meditate on all the Lord's forms together, or is such meditation only optional?

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives

His conclusion.

Sūtra 61

vikalpo 'viśiṣṭha-phalatvāt

vikalpaḥ—option; aviśiṣṭha—not better; phalatvāt—because of the result.

It is optional, for a better result is not obtained.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

They have an option. One should worship the Supreme Lord according to the truths taught by a particular community of saintly devotees. One should remain steadfast in that form of worship and not leave it. Why is that? The sūtra explains: “aviśiṣṭha-phalatvāt” (for a better result is not obtained). This means that of all the ways to worship the Lord no one way is better than the others. They are all equal. They are all said to bring the same result, which is that liberation where one directly associates with the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

If by following one such method of worship one attains perfection, what is the need of accepting another method of worship? The lesson taught in the sūtra that begins with the words "tad viduṣām" should not be forgotten. Therefore, in order to give more evidence to the truth that the ekānti devotees are the best, this instruction is repeated. There is no fault in this.

Adhikaraṇa 32

Worshipping the Lord To Attain a Specific Benediction

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The different kinds of worship of the Lord's different forms, such as the form of Lord Nṛsimha and the other forms, all bring liberation as their result. Therefore these activities of worship should be regularly performed by the ekānti devotees. However, in the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad and other scriptures are also described other kinds of worship of the Lord, kinds of worship meant for attaining fame,

followers, victory, wealth, and other like benedictions.

Samśaya (doubt): May one choose any form of the Lord for such worship, or must one direct this kind of worship to one's chosen deity alone?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the worship of any form of the Lord brings the same result as the worship of any other form of the Lord, one should direct this worship to one's chosen Deity alone, as was previously explained.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 62

kāmyās tu yathā-kāmaṁ samuccīyeran na vā pūrva-hetv-abhāvāt

kāmyāḥ—for the objects of desire; tu—but; yathā—as; kāmaṁ—desire; samuccīyeran—may collect; na—not; vā—or; pūrva—previous; hetu—reason; abhāvāt—because of the non-existence.

For attaining a desire one may accept another or not, as one wishes, for the previous reason is now absent.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

To fulfill desires other than direct association with the Supreme Lord, desires like the attainment of fame in this world, one may worship any form of the Lord, as one wishes, or one need not (worship another form of the Lord, and may instead to continue to worship one's own chosen Deity). Why is that? The sūtra explains: "pūrva-hetv-abhāvāt" (for the previous reason is now absent). This is so because the result to be obtained is different. When there is a desire to attain these various material benediction, then one may worship any form of the Lord. When one does not desire these material benefits, one may not adopt the worship of forms of the Lord other than one's chosen Deity.

The meaning here is that if one who desires liberation also desires some material benediction, then he should worship Lord Hari alone in order to attain it. He should not worship the demigods to attain his desire. This is explained by Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (2.3.10) in the following words:

akāmaḥ sarva-kāmo vā

mokṣa-kāma udāra-dhīḥ
tīvreṇa bhakti-yogena
yajeta puruṣam param

"A person who has broader intelligence, whether he be full of all material desire, or desiring liberation, must by all means worship the supreme whole, the Personality of Godhead."*

Thus have been explained the various kinds of worship of the Lord, kinds of worship beginning with the chanting of the ten-syllable mantra. As explained before, this worship should be directed to one's chosen Deity.

Adhikaraṇa 33

Meditation on the Form of the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the previous passages meditation on the Lord's qualities and virtues has been described. Now will be described meditation on the Lord's bodily limbs and features. In Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.38), the demigod Brahmā explains:

tam ekaṁ govindaṁ sac-cid-ānanda-vigrahaṁ pañca-padaṁ vṛndāvana-sura-
bhūruha-talāsīnaṁ satataṁ sa-marud-gaṇo 'ham paramayā stutyā toṣayāmi.

"With eloquent prayers I and the Maruts please Lord Govinda, whose form is eternal and full of knowledge and bliss, who stays under a desire tree in Vṛndāvana, and who is this five-word mantra."

In the verse that follow Brahmā speaks prayers describing the gentle smile, merciful glance, and other features on the Supreme Lord's face, eyes, and other parts of the body.

Samśaya (doubt): Are the gentle smile and other features on the Lord's face and the other parts of His body to be meditated on or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because by meditating on the Lord's general qualities and virtues one attains the goal of life, and because that goal thus attained is so great and exalted, there is no need to meditate on the features of the Lord's

body.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 63

aṅgeṣu yathāśraya-bhāvaḥ

aṅgeṣu—on the limbs; yathā—as; āśraya—shelter; bhāvaḥ—nature.

Appropriate meditation on the limbs.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

One should appropriately meditate on the Lord's mouth and the other parts of His body. This means that one should meditate on the qualities that have taken shelter of the parts of the Lord's body. Thus, on the Lord's mouth there are a gentle smile and sweet words, on His eyes there is a merciful glance, and on the other parts of His body there are other features.

Sūtra 64

śiṣṭaiś ca

śiṣṭaiḥ—by the disciples; ca—and.

Also by the disciples.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.51) it is said:

atha haivaṁ stutibhir ārādhayāmi tathā yūyaṁ pañca-padam japantaḥ kṛṣṇaṁ
dhyāyantaḥ samsṛtiṁ tariṣyatha.

"Brahmā said: As I worship Him, so should you. Chanting this five word mantra, and meditating on Lord Kṛṣṇa, you will transcend the world of birth and death."

In this way Brahmā teaches his disciples to meditate on the qualities present in Lord Kṛṣṇa's form. That is the meaning.

Here someone may object: In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (1.6.7) it is said:

yathā kapyāsam puṇḍarīkam evam akṣiṇī

"The Supreme Lord's eyes are like lotus flowers."

Here there is no mention of the Lord's merciful glance or His other features.

If this is said, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 65

samāhārāt

samāhārāt—because of being collective.

Because of being together.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "na" (it is not so) should be added here from three sūtras previous. The word applies to both sūtras. In this passage of Chāndogya Upaniṣad many other features of the Lord's body are implied. This passage does not mean that the Lord has only lotus eyes and no other bodily features.

Here someone may object: The idea that one should meditate on the parts of the Lord's body as having only certain attributes and not others is wrong. I refute it with the following words.

Sūtra 66

guṇa-sādhāraṇya-śruteś ca

guṇa—of qualities; sādhāraṇya—commonness; śruteḥ—from the Śruti-śāstra; ca—also.

Also because the Śruti-śāstra declares that the qualities are held in common.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In Bhagavad-gītā (13.14) it is said:

sarvataḥ pāṇi-pādam tat

"Everywhere are His hands and legs."*

This passage shows that one should meditate on the parts of the Lord's body as all having the same qualities in common. In Brahma-saṁhitā (5.32) it is said:

aṅgāni yasya sakalendriya-vrttimanti
paśyanti pānti kalayanti tathā jaganti

"Each of the limbs of the Lord's transcendental figure possesses in Himself the full-fledged functions of all organs and eternally sees, maintains, and manifests the infinite universes, both spiritual and mundane."**

In this way the scriptures declare that each part of the Lord's body has all the qualities of all the other parts.

In the following words the author of the sūtras refutes this idea.

Sūtra 67

na vā tat-saha-bhāvāśruteḥ

na—not; vā—or; tat—that; saha—together; bhāva—being; a—not; śruteḥ—from the Śruti-śāstra.

Or not, for the Śruti-śāstra does not declare that they have the same nature.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "vā" (or) is used here for emphasis. One should not meditate on the different parts of the Lord's body as all having the same features in common. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "tat-saha-bhāvāśruteḥ" (for the Śruti-śāstra does not declare that they have the same nature). This means that the Śruti-śāstra does not declare that the qualities of one part of the body are present in the other parts. Also, one should not meditate on the parts of the Lord's body as having the same qualities as the other parts. The descriptions in Bhagavad-gītā 13.14 and other passages in the scriptures should be understood to mean that the Supreme Personality of Godhead, being all-powerful, can do anything with any part of His body. That is the meaning.

Sūtra 68

darśanāc ca

darśanāt—from seeing; ca—also.

By seeing also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Therefore the Lord's gentle smile should be understood to be present in His face and His other qualities to be present in the other parts of His body, each in its appropriate place. In this way it is both seen and described.

Pada 4

Adhikaraṇa 1

Transcendental Knowledge

Invocation by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

śraddhāveśa-manyāstrte sac-chamādyair
vairāgyodvitti-simhāsanādhye
dharma-prākārāñcite sarva-dātrī
preṣṭhā viṣṇor bhāti vidyeśvarīyam

In the temple of faith, which is surrounded by the great walls of religion, sitting on the throne of renunciation and surrounded by courtiers of self-control and other virtues, transcendental knowledge, which is very dear to Lord Viṣṇu, shines with great splendor.

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the previous pada the various aspects of transcendental knowledge, which were there called meditation, worship, and other names, were revealed. In this pada will be revealed the truths that transcendental knowledge is independent of Vedic rituals, that Vedic rituals are merely one subordinate aspect of transcendental knowledge, that persons who have attained transcendental knowledge are divided into three classes, and other truths that are like these. According to their different kinds of faith there are three kinds of seekers of transcendental knowledge. They are described as follows.

1. They who, desiring to see the wonders of the higher planets, faithfully perform the duties of varṇāśrama-dharma, are called saniṣṭha. 2. They who, desiring to enjoy the things of this world, faithfully perform the duties of varṇāśrama-dharma, are called pariniṣṭhita. They who are in these two classes are all followers of varṇāśrama-dharma. 3. Others, purified by truthfulness, austerity, japa, and other spiritual practices, have no material desire, are called nirapekṣa. They are in this class are not followers of varṇāśrama-dharma. In this way there are three kinds of seekers of transcendental knowledge.

Viṣaya (the subject to be discussed): First will be explained the truth that transcendental knowledge is independent of other things. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.1.3) it is said:

tarati śokam ātma-vit

"One who knows the Supreme crosses beyond grief."

In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.1.1) it is said:

brahma-vid āpnoti param

"One who knows the Supreme enters the spiritual abode."

In the Kaṭha Upaniṣad (1.2.16) it is said:

etad dhy evākṣaram jñātvā yo yadīcchati tasya tat

"By understanding the immortal one attains whatever he desires."

Samśaya (doubt): Does transcendental bring only liberation, or can it also bring elevation to the higher material planets?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): A person wise with transcendental knowledge has no material desires. For this reason transcendental knowledge brings only liberation.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives his conclusion.

Sūtra 1

puruṣārtho 'taḥ śabdād iti bādarāyaṇaḥ

puruṣārthaḥ—the four goals of life; ataḥ—from this; śabdāt—from the Śruti-śāstra; iti—thus; bādarāyaṇaḥ—Vyāsa.

The fulfillment of human aspirations comes from it, for this is said in the Śruti-śāstra. That is Vyāsa's opinion.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

All the goals of human life are attained by transcendental knowledge. That is the opinion of Lord Vyāsa. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "śabdaāt" (for this is said in the Śruti-śāstra). These scriptural texts have been quoted in the previous

paragraphs. Pleased by His devotee's attainment of transcendental knowledge, the Supreme Personality of Godhead gives Himself to His devotee. Pleased by His devotee's attainment of transcendental knowledge, which is like a companion to the rituals of the Vedas, the Supreme Personality of Godhead also fulfills the material desires of they, like of Kardama Muni and others, who have such desires.

In the next sūtra Jaimini Muni raises an objection.

Adhikaraṇa 2 **Knowledge alone cannot give liberation**

Sūtra 2

śeṣatvāt puruṣārtha-vādo yathānyeṣv iti jaiminiḥ

śeṣatvāt—because of being subordinate; puruṣa—of the people; artha-vādaḥ—words; yathā—as; anyeṣu—in others; iti—thus; jaiminiḥ—Jaimini.

Because it is subordinate, the words about human aspirations are only words of praise, like praises of other things also. That is Jaimini's opinion.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Knowing the relationship between himself, the worshiper, and the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the object of worship, the individual living entity voluntarily engages in the activities of worship that have already been described here. As a result of these activities the individual living entity becomes free of sin and attains liberation by entering the spiritual world. Some examples of words of exaggerated praise are given in the following words of the Jaimini-sūtra:

yasya paṇamayī juhur bhavati na sa pāpaṁ ślokaṁ śṛṇoti yadāṅkte cakṣur eva
bhratṛvyasya vṛṅkte

"He whose sacrificial ladle is made of paṇa never hears sinful words. He whose eyes are anointed is protected from his enemies.

yat-prayājānuyajā ijjante varma vā etad yajñasya

"He who makes the prayājā and anuyājā offerings is protected by an armor of yajña."

Jaimini gives this description of these words of praise:

dravya-saṁskāra-karmasu parārthatvāt phala-śrutir artha-vādaḥ syāt

"Because they are actually meant to describe other things, the description of benefits obtained from sacrificial paraphernalia and sacrificial actions are in truth only empty praises."

The Śruti-śāstra explains that a householder who throughout his entire life is self-controlled and virtuous and who regularly performs yajñas and other spiritual duties, at the end attains the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is described in the following words of Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.15.1):

ācārya-kulād vedam adhītya yatha-vidhānam guroḥ karmātiśeṣeṇābhisamāvṛtya
kuṭumbe śucau deśe svādhyāyam adhiyāno dharmikān vidadhātmani sarvendriyāṇi
sampratiṣṭhāpyāhiṁsān sarva-bhūtāny anyatra tīrthebhyaḥ sa khalv evaṁ vartayan
yāvad āyusaṁ brahmalokam abhisampadyate na ca punar āvartate.

"From the ācāryas one should learn the Vedas. One should perform his duties and also offer dakṣiṇā to his spiritual master. Then one should accept household life, live in a pure way, study the Vedas, perform his religious duties, engage all his senses in the Supreme Lord's service, not harm any living being, and go on pilgrimage to holy places. A person who passes his life in this way goes to the spiritual world. He does not return to this world of repeated birth and death."

In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (3.8.9) it is said:

varṇāśramācāravatā
puruṣeṇa paraḥ pumān
viṣṇur ārādhyate panthā
nānyat tat-toṣa-kāraṇam

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead, Lord Viṣṇu, is worshiped by the proper execution of prescribed duties in the system of varṇa and āśrama. There is no other way to satisfy the Supreme Personality of Godhead. One must be situated in the institution of the four varṇas and āśramas."*

Many other scriptural passages may also be quoted to prove this point. Scriptural passages that encourage renunciation of Vedic rituals and pious deeds are meant for they who are crippled and thus unable to perform these deeds.

In the next sūtra Jaimini affirms that transcendental knowledge is a subordinate aspect of Vedic rituals and pious deeds.

Sūtra 3

ācāra-darśanāt

ācāra—of deeds; darśanāt—because of seeing.

Because such deeds are seen.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.1.1) it is said:

janako vaideho bahu-dakṣiṇena yajñeneje

"Janaka, the king of Videha, performed a great yajña and gave very opulent dakṣiṇā."

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (5.11.5) it is said:

yakṣamāno ha vai bhagavanto 'ham asmi

"The saintly king said: Soon I shall perform a great yajña."

In this way it is seen that even great saints learned in transcendental knowledge still had to perform Vedic yajñas. Therefore transcendental knowledge alone is not sufficient to bring the perfection of life. Here the adage, "If honey is found in a tree in one's own courtyard, why should one travel over mountains searching for it?" is appropriate.

Sūtra 4

tac chruteḥ

tat—that; chruteḥ—because of the Śruti-śāstra.

It is so because of the Śruti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (1.1.8) it is said:

yad eva vidyayā karoti śraddhayopaniṣadā tad eva vīryavattaram bhavati

"When one worships the Lord with transcendental knowledge, with faith, and with the teachings of the Upaniṣads, his worship becomes very powerful and effective."

Because it is here said "with transcendental knowledge", the subordinate nature of that knowledge is clearly seen.

Sūtra 5

samanvārambhaṇāt

samanvārambhaṇāt—because of being together.

Because of being together.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.2) it is said:

taṁ vidyā-karmaṇī samanvārabhete pūrva-prajñā ca

"At the time of death a person's knowledge, deeds, and concept of life combine to determine his future."

This passage shows that knowledge and pious deeds both together determine the soul's future.

Sūtra 6

tadvato vidhānāt

tadvataḥ—like that; vidhānāt—because of the rule.

Because of a rule like that.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Taittirīya-saṁhitā it is said:

brahmiṣṭho brahmā darśa-paurṇamāsayos tam vṛṇīte

"To perform the darśa and paurṇamāsa rites, he chooses a priest learned in the science of the Supreme."

Thus it is clearly seen that transcendental knowledge is only a subordinate part of the Vedic rituals, for such knowledge only qualifies one to be a priest.

Sūtra 7

niyamāc ca

niyamāt—because of a rule; ca—also.

Also because of a rule.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Iṣopaniṣad (mantra 2) it is said:

kurvann eveha karmāṇi
jīviṣec chatam samāḥ
evam tvayi nānyatheto 'sti
na karma lipyate nare

"One may aspire to live for hundreds of years if he continuously goes on working in that way, for that sort of work will not bind him to the law of karma. There is no alternative to this way for man."*

This verse gives the order that even a man wise with transcendental knowledge should perform Vedic yajñas and pious deeds for as long as he lives. This verse clearly refutes the statements that encourage the renunciation of Vedic rituals or that claim that one has the option to perform or renounce Vedic rituals. This is so because scriptural statements encouraging renunciation are meant for those who are crippled or otherwise unable to perform Vedic rituals. In the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa it is said:

vīrahā vā eṣa devānām yo 'gnim udvāsayate

"He who does not offer oblations in the sacred fire for the demigods becomes sinful like a man who kills his own children."

In this way renunciation of Vedic rituals is forbidden.

In these words the idea that because it is a subordinate part of Vedic rituals, transcendental knowledge is not independent is giving spiritual benefit is advanced. The author of the sūtras refutes this idea in the following words.

Adhikaraṇa 3 The Superiority of Transcendental Knowledge

Sūtra 8

adhikopadeśāt tu bādarāyaṇasyaivam tad-darśanāt

adhika—more; upadeśāt—because of the teaching; tu—but; bādarāyaṇasya—of Vyāsa; evam—thus tat—of that; darśanāt—because of the revelation of scripture.

But because Vyāsa teaches that it is more important and also because of the scriptures' revelation.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to begin the refutation of the pūrvapakṣa. The truth is that transcendental knowledge is more important than Vedic rituals. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "upadeśāt tu bādarāyaṇasyaivam" (because Vyāsa teaches that it is more important). Vyāsa's opinion here cannot be uprooted, for the sūtra explains: "tad-darśanāt" (also because of the scriptures' revelation). In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.22) it is said:

tam etaṁ vedānuvacanena brāhmaṇā vividiśanti brahmacaryeṇa tapasā śraddhayā
yajñenānāśakena caitam eva veditvā munir bhavaty evam eva pravrajino lokam
abhīpsantaḥ pravrajanti.

"By Vedic study, celibacy, austerity, faith, yajña, and fasting, the brāhmaṇas strive to understand Him. One who understands Him becomes wise. Desiring to travel to His transcendental world, the brāhmaṇas become wandering sannyāsīs."

This passage shows that Vedic rituals bring the result of transcendental knowledge, and when that knowledge is attained, the Vedic rituals are abandoned. Because the method of attainment (Vedic rituals) here is abandoned at a certain stage, therefore the result (transcendental knowledge) these methods bring is more important than the methods themselves.

Here someone may object: It is seen than many saints who are most wise with transcendental knowledge still perform Vedic rituals. Therefore transcendental knowledge and Vedic rituals are both equally important.

In the following words the author of the sūtras refutes this idea.

tulyam tu darśanam

tulyam—equal; tu—but; darśanam—scriptural; revelation.

But the same thing is seen in the scriptures.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) here is used to begin the refutation of the idea that transcendental knowledge is an inferior by-product of the performance of Vedic rituals. The sūtra explains that there is equal scriptural evidence to show that transcendental knowledge is not subordinate to Vedic rituals. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad it is said:

etad dha sma vai vidvāmsa āhur ṛsayah kārāyeyāḥ kim arthā vayam adhyeṣyāmahe
kim arthā vyaṁ yakṣāmahe etad dha sma vai pūrve vidvāmsa 'gni-hotraṁ
juhavāṁ cakrire etaṁ vai tam ātmānaṁ viditvā brāhmaṇaḥ putra-pauṣyāś ca
viteṣaṇāyāś ca lokaiṣaṇāyāś ca vyutthāya bhikṣā-caryaṁ caranti.

"The wise sages asked, 'Why do we study the Vedas? Why do we perform yajñas?' Then the sages stopped performing agnihotra-yajñas. Learning the truth about the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the brāhmaṇas renounced all desire to attain sons, grandsons, wealth, or anything else in this world. They became sannyāsī beggars traveling here and there."

In many places the scriptures describe many great souls learned with transcendental knowledge who renounced all Vedic rituals. These statements of scripture do not contradict the descriptions of great souls performing Vedic rituals, for many great souls performed Vedic rituals, either to purify themselves or to set a good example for the world to follow.

In the next sūtra Vyāsa refutes the argument given in sūtra 4.

Sūtra 10

asārvatrikī

asārvatrikī—not universal.

It is not universal.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The passage (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 1.1.8) referred to in sūtra 4 does not have all transcendental as its scope. It refers the udgītha-vidyā. Therefore all transcendental knowledge is not a subordinate aspect of Vedic rituals.

(In the next sūtra Vyāsa refutes the argument given in sūtra 5.)

Sūtra 11

vibhāgaḥ śata-vat

vibhāgaḥ—division; śata—a hundred; vat—like.

The distribution is like a hundred.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The results of Vedic yajñas and transcendental knowledge, as described in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.2 (quoted in sūtra 5), are actually different. Transcendental knowledge brings one result and Vedic yajñas bring a different result. In this sūtra the example of a hundred is given. A cow and a goat may be purchased for a hundred coins. The cow cost ninety coins and the goat cost ten coins. The cost was not equally divided with each costing fifty coins. In the same way transcendental and Vedic yajñas (combine to determine the future of the individual soul) but they do not have the same influence in determining it.

In the next sūtra Vyāsa refutes the argument given in sūtra 6.

Sūtra 12

adhyayana-mātra-vataḥ

adhyayana—study; mātra—only; vataḥ—of one who possesses.

Of one who has merely studied.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The passage (from the Taittirīya-saṁhitā, quoted in sūtra 6) states that a person who has studied the Vedas should be chosen as a priest. It does not mean that the priest must be advanced in transcendental knowledge of the Supreme Personality of Godhead and therefore transcendental knowledge is a subordinate part of the Vedic rituals. The word "brahmiṣṭha" in that passage means, "one who is learned in the Vedas". It does not mean "one who is wise with transcendental knowledge of the Supreme Personality of Godhead", for the Śruti-śāstras declare that a person fixed in transcendental knowledge of the Supreme renounces Vedic rituals. Therefore a person who properly studies the Vedas, does not misinterpret its words, and does not desire to gain anything material as a result of his study, is said to be "brahmiṣṭha" (learned in the Vedas). The affix "iṣṭha" has that meaning here. Some claim that the word means that the priest must be a knower of the Supreme and therefore this passage is meant to praise the glories of Vedic yajñas.

Here someone may object: One who has simply studied is not qualified to perform Vedic yajñas. One must have knowledge also. Studying the Vedas does not mean simply reading them. It means understanding them. Because the Upaniṣads are parts of the Vedas, it must be understood that one who understands the Vedas understands the transcendental knowledge of the Supreme Personality of Godhead also. In this way it is proved that transcendental knowledge of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is only one subordinate aspect of the Vedic yajñas.

If this objection is raised, then I reply: One is not situated in transcendental knowledge merely by understanding the meanings of the words in the Vedas, but only when one directly sees the Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself. Merely by understanding the meaning of the sentence, "Honey is sweet" one does not have direct perception of its sweetness. If this were so then merely by understanding these words one would be able to taste honey. Of course one does not taste honey in this way. Once, when asked, Nārada Muni declared that, even though he knew the Ṛg Veda and many other scriptures, still he did not understand the Supreme. He said:

so 'ham mantra-vid evāsmi nātma-vit

"I know many mantras, but I do not know the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

Therefore, worship of the Lord is something different from mere academic knowledge of the Vedas. Therefore genuine transcendental knowledge means direct perception of the Lord, a perception attained by engaging in devotional service. This knowledge brings with it the attainment of the real goal of human life. In the Taittirīya Aranyaka (Mahā-Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad 10.6, and Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 3.2.6) it is said:

vedānta-vijñāna-suniścītārthāḥ
sannyāsa-yogāt yatayaḥ suddhatvāḥ
te brahmaloke tu parānta-kāle
parāmṛtāt parimucyanti sarve

"Wise with the knowledge taught in the Vedas, renounced, and pure in heart, the great souls go to Brahmaloaka. When the time comes for the universe's end, they all become liberated and go to the spiritual world."

Therefore renunciation of the world and academic knowledge of the Vedas are both subordinate parts of transcendental knowledge of the Supreme. In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (1.2.12) it is said:

tac-chraddadhānā manayo
jñāna-vairāgya-yuktayā
paśyanty ātmani cātmanam
bhaktyā śruta-grhītayā

"The seriously inquisitive student or sage, well equipped with knowledge and detachment, realizes the Absolute Truth by rendering devotional service in terms of what he has heard from the Vedānta-śruti."*

Here someone may object: The activities of devotional service employ the body, words, and mind. In the trance of meditation it is possible to directly see the Supreme Lord with the mind, but how is it possible to directly see the Lord when the body and words are engaged in worship, japa, or other similar activities?

If this objection is raised, then I reply: Devotional service is naturally filled with transcendental knowledge and bliss. In the Śruti-śāstra it is said:

sac-cid-ānandaika-rase bhakti-yoge tiṣṭhati

"Devotional service is eternal and full of transcendental knowledge and bliss."

If this were not so then devotees would not have the power to conquer the

Supreme Lord and bring Him under their control. The activities of devotional service invoke the appearance of the Lord, who comes in His spiritual and blissful form, with the graceful hair on His head and the other features of His body. In the nyāya-śāstra it is said:

śrutes tu śabda-mūlatvāt

In this way it is shown that the Supreme extraordinary, inconceivable, and beyond the limits imposed by the material world. He cannot be understood by material logic.

Sūtra 13

nāviśeṣāt

na—not; aviśeṣāt—because of being not specific.

No. For it is not specific.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The Śruti-śāstra does not order that a person wise with transcendental knowledge of Supreme must perform Vedic rituals throughout his entire life. Why is that? The sūtra explains: "aviśeṣāt" (for it is not specifically stated). In the Mahā-Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad of the Taittirīya Araṇyaka 10.5 it is said:

na karmaṇā na prajayā dhanena tyāgenaike amṛtatvam ānaśuḥ

"By performing Vedic rituals, fathering good children, or giving wealth in charity one does not attain liberation. It is by renunciation that one attains liberation."

In this way there is no specific order that one must always perform Vedic rituals. The Śruti-śāstra gives different instructions about Vedic rituals (sometimes encouraging and sometimes discouraging them) because these instructions are intended for different āśramas.

After thus refuting these objections, the author of the sūtras proceeds to

explain the real purpose of the Śruti-sāstra's description of Vedic rituals.

Sūtra 14

stutaye 'numatir vā

stutaye—for praise; anumatiḥ—permission; vā—or.

Or, the permission is for praise.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "vā" (or) is used here for emphasis. Iśopaniṣad's (mantra 2) permission that one may perform Vedic rituals throughout one's entire life is given so that one may glorify transcendental knowledge. This passage praises transcendental knowledge, for it is a person who has transcendental knowledge who may thus perform Vedic rituals throughout his life and not be touched by karmic reactions. Iśopaniṣad (mantra 2) explains:

evam tvayi nānyatheto 'sti

"that sort of work will not bind him to the law of karma. There is no alternative to this way for man."*

In this way is refuted the idea that transcendental knowledge is a subordinate aspect of Vedic rituals.

Adhikaraṇa 4

The Glories of Transcendental Knowledge

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now that the independence of transcendental knowledge has been explained,

the great glory of transcendental knowledge will be described. In the Vājasaneyī śruti (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.23) it is said:

eṣa nityo mahimā brāhmaṇasya na karmaṇā vardhate no kanīyān

"Karma can neither lessen nor increase the eternal glory of one who understands the Supreme."

Samśaya (doubt): Do they who are situated in transcendental knowledge have the right to act in any way they please or do they not have that right?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): By abandoning prescribed duties one commits a sin. Therefore a person in transcendental knowledge does not have the right to act as he pleases.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 15

kāma-kāreṇa caike

kāma—desire; kāreṇa—by doing; ca—and; eke—some.

Also, some say he may act as he pleases.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

To show mercy to the people of the world a person situated in transcendental knowledge may sometimes voluntarily perform Vedic rituals even though he gains no personal benefit by performing them and neither is he faulted if he does not perform them. His glory is eternal, as is explained in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.23 (quoted in the previous purport). Therefore a person situated in transcendental knowledge can act as he likes and he is never touched by sin.

Here the word "brāhmaṇa" means "he who has directly seen the Supreme Personality of Godhead". Such a person does not become virtuous by performing Vedic rituals, and neither does he do anything wrong by failing to perform them.

As a lotus leaf is untouched by water, so he is untouched by the good karma generated by Vedic rituals. As a handful of straw is at once consumed by a blazing fire, so all his sins are at once burned to ashes. All of this shows the great power of

transcendental knowledge. This is further explained in the following sūtra.

Sūtra 16

upamardam ca

upamardam—destruction; ca—also.

Destruction also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad it is said:

bhidyate hṛdaya-ganthiś
chidyante sarva-saṁśayāḥ
kṣīyante cāśya karmāṇi
tasmin dr̥ṣṭe parāvare

"The knot in the heart is pierced, and all misgivings are cut to pieces. The chain of fruitive actions is terminated when one sees* the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

In Bhagavad-gītā (4.37) the Supreme Personality of Godhead explains:

yathaidhāmsi samiddho 'gnir
bhasmasāt kurute 'rjuna
jñānāgniḥ sarva-karmāṇi
bhasmasāt kurute 'rjuna

"As blazing fire turns firewood to ashes, O Arjuna, so does the fire of knowledge burn to ashes all reactions to material activities."*

These verses show that transcendental knowledge destroys the reactions of past fruitive deeds. Because transcendental knowledge thus destroys all karmic reactions, whether partially experienced or waiting to be experienced in the future, a person situated in transcendental knowledge is not at fault of he renounced the fruitive actions of Vedic rituals. This is not very surprising.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that past karmic reactions are destroyed only by experiencing them?

If this is said, then I reply: Although transcendental knowledge has the power to burn away all past karmic reactions, by the Lord's desire, in order to preserve the appearance of the ordinary workings of karma, transcendental knowledge does not completely burn away all the karmic reactions created in the present body. In this way the karma of a person situated in transcendental knowledge is like a cloth that has been singed by fire. That is what is meant by the scriptures' statement that karmic reactions are destroyed only by experiencing them,. This will be further explained in sūtra 4.1.15.

Sūtra 17

ūrdhva-retaḥsu ca śabde hi

ūrdhva—up; retaḥsu—semen; ca—and; śabde—in the Śruti-śāstra; hi—indeed.

In the Śruti-śāstras indeed among the celibates.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The pariniṣṭhita devotees and especially the sannyāsīs and other celibates advanced in transcendental knowledge are especially free to act as they like. This truth explained in the Śruti-śāstra again confirms the truth that transcendental knowledge is independent of the Vedic rituals. The scriptural passage referred to in this sūtra is from the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.5.1) and is given below:

tasmād brāhmaṇaḥ pāṇḍityaṁ nirvidya bālyena tiṣṭhāset. bālyam ca pāṇḍityaṁ ca nirvidyātha munir amaunaṁ ca maunaṁ ca nirvidyātha brāhmaṇaḥ kena syād yena syāt tenedṛśaḥ.

"A brāhmaṇa should then renounce scholarship and become like a child. Then he should renounce both scholarship and childlike simplicity and become a silent sage. Then he should renounce the stance of either being or not being a silent sage. Then he becomes a brāhmaṇa, a person who directly sees the Supreme Personality of Godhead. When he attains this stage he may act in whatever way he likes."

In Bhagavad-gītā (3.25) the Supreme Personality of Godhead explains:

saktāḥ karmaṇy avidvaṁso
yathā kurvanti bhārata
kuryād vidvāṁs tathāsaktaś
cikīrṣur loka-saṅgraham

"As the ignorant perform their duties with attachment to results, the learned may similarly act, but without attachment, for the sake of leading people on the right path."*

In the next sūtra Jaimini Muni gives a different opinion.

Sūtra 18

parāmarśam jaiminir acodanā cāpavadati hi

parāmarśam—favorable idea; jaiminiḥ—Jaimini; acodanā—not ordering; ca—and; apavadati—criticizes; hi—because.

Jaimini favors it. It is not ordered, and because indeed it is forbidden.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

A person situated in transcendental knowledge has the freedom to perform prescribed Vedic rituals and duties in whatever way he likes. That is the meaning of the Śruti-śāstra's explanation that he may act as he likes.

The word "hi" here means "because". The word parāmarśam" means that the Śruti-śāstra orders that even one situated in transcendental knowledge must perform Vedic rituals, and the word "apavadati" means that the Śruti-śāstra forbids that he stop performing Vedic rituals. The word "acodanā" means that a person situated in transcendental knowledge may renounce those activities not prescribed by the scriptures. That is the meaning here.

Ísopaniṣad mantra 2 and the passage from Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa (quoted in the purport of sūtra 7) both forbid the renunciation of Vedic rituals. They do not say that one should renounce Vedic rituals.

Therefore there is a contradiction, with some texts encouraging performance of Vedic rituals and some encouraging renunciation of Vedic rituals. It is not that the texts encouraging renunciation are wrong. These texts are intended for persons who are crippled, mute, or in some other way unable to perform Vedic rituals. Therefore even they who are situated in transcendental knowledge should continue to perform Vedic rituals.

The words "kena syāt" in the passage from the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.5.1, quoted in the previous purport) mean, "a person situated in transcendental knowledge must perform Vedic rituals, but he has some freedom to perform them in the way that pleases him". It does not mean that he has the right to renounce Vedic rituals altogether. This is the opinion of Jaimini.

Thus Jaimini believes that this passage orders the performance of Vedic rituals. In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His opinion, which is that the person situated in transcendental knowledge really does have the right to act in any way he likes.

Sūtra 19

anuṣṭheyam bādarāyaṇaḥ sām̐ya-śruteḥ

anuṣṭheyam—what should be practiced; bādarāyaṇaḥ—Vyāsa; sām̐ya—equality; śruteḥ—from the Śruti-śāstra.

Vyāsa says it may be done because the Śruti-śāstra describes equality.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The words "anuṣṭheyam bādarāyaṇaḥ" here mean, "Vyāsa thinks that a person situated in transcendental knowledge may perform Vedic rituals, or not, as he chooses". Why is that? The sūtra explains: "sām̐ya-śruteḥ" (because the Śruti-śāstra declares that whether he performs these rituals or not it is the same).

The words "When he attains this stage he may act in whatever way he likes," of Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3.5.1 (quoted in the purport of sūtra 17) mean that a person situated in transcendental knowledge may act in any way, but the result he obtains is always the same. Jaimini's opinion is that this description of the actions of a person situated in transcendental knowledge are only words of empty praise, for one must perform Vedic rituals completely in order to get a good result. If a person renounces some part of the Vedic rituals he is not equal to a person who performs all rituals perfectly.

Vedic rituals should be performed by a svaniṣṭha devotee. The statement that a person who neglects Vedic rituals becomes sinful like a person who kills his own children (Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa quoted in the purport of sūtra 7) applies only to a person who is not situated in transcendental knowledge. In this way the seeming contradictions are reconciled. Jaimini's theory that all scriptural passages encouraging renunciation are intended for they who are crippled or somehow unable to perform Vedic rituals is refuted by the passage of Mahā-Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad quoted in the purport of sūtra 13.

Sūtra 20

vidhir vā dhāraṇa-vat

vidhiḥ—rules; vā—or; dhāraṇa—studying; vat—like.

Or, the rule may be like studying..

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The words "vidhir vā" mean that the statement "He may act in whatever way he likes," of Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3.5.1 (quoted in the purport of sūtra 17) refers only to a person situated in transcendental knowledge. The sūtra explains, "dhāraṇa-vat" (it is like studying). This means that as the three higher castes are eligible to study the Vedas, and others are not eligible, in the same way only a self-realized pariniṣṭhita devotee situated in transcendental knowledge is allowed to act in whatever way he likes". Others are not allowed. In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam the Supreme Personality of Godhead explains:

śaucam ācamanaṁ snānaṁ
na tu codanayācaret
anyāṁś ca niyamān jñānī
yathāhaṁ līlayeśvaraḥ

"As I, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, voluntarily enjoy transcendental pastimes, so the person situated in transcendental knowledge performs snāna, ācamana, śauca, and follows a host of other rules voluntarily, and not because he is ordered to do so."

In the next sūtra an objection is raised and then answered.

Sūtra 21

stuti-mātram upādānād iti cen nāpūrvatvāt

stuti—praise; mātram—only; upādānāt—because of reference; iti—thus; cet—

if; na—not; āpūrvatvāt—because of newness.

If it is said to be merely empty praise, then I say no, for it is something new.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here the objector says: These words are merely empty praise. They do not speak what is really true. As a lover tells the beloved, "You are free to do anything you like", but does not really mean that the beloved can do exactly anything, in the same way it is said that the person situated in transcendental knowledge may do whatever he likes.

If this is said, then the sūtra replies, "na" (No. It is not so). Why not? The sūtra explains, "āpūrvatvāt" (for it is something new). Because the statement that a person who directly sees the Supreme Personality of Godhead may perform Vedic rituals as he wishes is a new teaching it cannot be mere empty praise of something already described. That is the meaning.

Sūtra 22

bhāva-śabdāc ca

bhāva—love; śabdāt—because of the Śruti-śāstra; ca—also.

Also because the Śruti-śāstra describes love.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (3.1.4) it is said:

prāṇo hy eṣa sarva-bhūtair vibhāti
vijānan vidvān bhavate nāti-vādī
ātma-kṛīḍa ātma-ratiḥ kriyāvān
eṣa brahma-vidān variṣṭhaḥ

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the life of all. He is the Supersoul splendidly manifest in all living beings. One who knows Him becomes wise. That

person turns from the logicians' debates. He meditates on the Lord's pastimes. He loves the Lord. He serves the Lord. He is the best of transcendentalists."

This verse clearly describes the devotees' love for the Lord. The word "ratiḥ" here means "love". The words "bhāva", "rati", "prema" all mean "love". A pariniṣṭhita devotee who has fallen in love with the Supreme Lord has not the time to perform Vedic rituals very completely, although for the sake of the people in general he may sometimes perform them to a certain extent. In this way it is seen that transcendental knowledge is independent of Vedic rituals.

Fearing that another objection may be raised, the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 23

pāriplavārthā iti cen na viśeṣitatvāt

pāriplava—restlessness; arthāḥ—meanings; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; viśeṣitatvāt—because of being specific.

If it is said that they are pāriplava stories, then I reply no, for those are specific.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.5.1) it is said:

atha ha yājñavalkyasya dve bhārye babhuvatur maitreyī ca kātyāyanī ca

"Yājñavalkya had two wives: Maitreyī and Kātyāyanī."

In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (3.1) it is said:

bhṛgur vai vāruṇir varuṇaṁ pitaram upasasāra adhihi bhagavo brahmeti

"Bhṛgu approached his father, Varuṇa, and asked, O master, please teach me about the Supreme."

In the Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad (3.1) it is said:

pratardano ha vai daivodāsir indrasya priyaṃ dhāmopajagāma

"Divodāsa's son Pratardana approached King Indra's abode."

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (.4.1.1) it is said:

jānaśrutir ha pautrāyaṇaḥ śraddhodayo bahudāyī bahupākya āsa

"Jānaśruti Pautrāyaṇa was very faithful and generous."

In these and other stories the Śruti-śāstra teaches the science of transcendental knowledge. Here someone may doubt: are these stories meant to teach transcendental knowledge or are they merely pāriplava stories recited at a rājasūya-yajña to appease the restless mind? Someone may claim that these are merely pāriplava stories to appease the mind. After all, the Śruti-śāstra declares:

sarvāṅy ākhyānāni pāriplave śamsanti

"All are pāriplava stories meant to appease the restless mind."

In pāriplava stories the literary skill is most important and any philosophical instructions are all secondary. Therefore the Vedic rituals are what is really important and the transcendental knowledge contained in the stories of the Upaniṣads is not very important.

If this is said, then the sūtra declares, "na" (No. It is not so). Why not? The sūtra explains, "viśeṣitatvāt" (for they are specific). Only certain specific stories are pāriplavas.

It is said that on the first day of the yajña the story of Vivasvān's son King Manu should be recited, on the second day the story of Vivasvān's son King Indra should be recited, on the third day the story of Vivasvān's son King Yama should be recited. In this way only certain specific stories are employed for pāriplava. If all stories were equally appropriate for pāriplava, then it would make no sense to assign specific stories to specific days.

When the scripture says "all" stories should be recited as pāriplava, the meaning is all stories in the chapter of pāriplavas should be recited. Therefore the conclusion is that the Upaniṣad stories that teach transcendental knowledge are not pāriplava stories.

Sūtra 24

tathā caika-vākyatopabandhāt

tathā—so; ca—and; eka—one; vākyatā—statement; upabandhāt—because of the connection.

It is also so because of the unity of the statements.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because they are not pāriplava stories, it should be understood that the stories of the Upaniṣads are meant to teach transcendental knowledge. Why is that? The sūtra explains, “eka-vākyatopabandhāt” (because of the unity of the statements). Thus in the story beginning with the description of Yājñavalkya and his wives it is said (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.22):

ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ śrotavyaḥ

"One should hear of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. One should gaze upon Him."

In this way it is seen that because of their context these stories are meant to teach transcendental knowledge. As the story beginning with the words "so 'rodīt" is a story meant to teach Vedic rituals and is not a pāriplava story, so the stories of the Upaniṣads are meant to teach transcendental knowledge. That is the meaning.

Because it teaches the supreme goal of life, transcendental knowledge is independent of Vedic rituals. Great saints therefore strive to attain transcendental knowledge. The stories of the Upaniṣads give concrete examples of the truths of transcendental knowledge. For example, they will give concrete examples to show the truth of the Śruti-śāstras' statement (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.14.2):

ācāryavān puruṣo veda

"One who approaches a bona fide spiritual master can understand everything about spiritual realization."*

In this way also it is seen that transcendental knowledge is independent of Vedic rituals.

Sūtra 25

ata eva cāgnīndhanādy-anapekṣā

ataḥ eva—therefore; ca—also; agni—fire; indhana—igniting; ādi—beginning with; anapekṣā—no need.

Therefore also there is no need to light the fire or perform other duties.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because it is thus independent of Vedic rituals, transcendental knowledge does not need the help of the lighting of the sacred fire or the other activities of those rituals to give its result. Thus the idea that transcendental knowledge and the performance of Vedic rituals must be combined in order to bring liberation is refuted.

Adhikaraṇa 5

The Person Qualified To Attain Transcendental Knowledge

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be described the characteristics of a person qualified to learn transcendental knowledge. In Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.22) it is said:

tam etaṁ vedānuvacanena vividiṣanti yajñena dānena tapasānaśakena

"By study of the Vedas, by yajña, by charity, by austerity, and by fasting the brāhmaṇas strive to understand the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

In Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.23) it is said:

tasmād evam-vic chānto danta uparatas titikṣuḥ śraddhā-vitto bhūtvātmany
evātmānaṁ paśyet

"A person who is wise, peaceful, self-controlled, free from material desires, tolerant, and forgiving, and whose wealth is faith, is able to see the Supreme Personality of Godhead present as the Supersoul in his heart."

In this way it is seen that there are two lists of qualifications to understand the Supreme Personality of Godhead. One list begins with Vedic yajñas and the other with peacefulness.

Samśaya (doubt): Are both sets of qualifications necessary or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.14.2) it is said:

ācāryavān puruṣo veda

"One who approaches a bona fide spiritual master can understand everything about spiritual realization."*

Therefore to attain transcendental knowledge one need only find a spiritual master. Nothing else is required.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives his conclusion.

Sūtra 26

sarvāpekṣā ca yajñādi-śrutir aśva-vat

sarva—of all; apekṣā—need; ca—also; yajña—yajnas; ādi—beginning; śrutiḥ—the Śruti-śāstra; aśva—horse; vat—like.

Also, all are needed. The Śruti-śāstra mentions yajñas and other things. They are like a horse.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Although transcendental knowledge does not need anything else to bring its results, still yajñas and all kinds of pious deeds are needed in order to attain transcendental knowledge. That is the meaning. Why is that? The sūtra explains, “yajñādi-śrutiḥ” (The Śruti-śāstra mentions yajñas and other things). The two passages from Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.22 and 23) quoted at the beginning of this adhikaraṇa give two lists of qualifications for one who would seek transcendental knowledge, one list beginning with performance of yajñas and the other list with peacefulness.

The sūtra then gives an example: "aśva-vat" (they are like a horse). To travel somewhere a horse is needed, but someone who has already attained his destination no longer has need of a horse.

Here someone may object: If transcendental knowledge may be attained by one who has the qualifications of the first list, which begins with yajñas, then what is the need of attaining the qualifications of the second list, which begins with peacefulness and self control?

If this question is raised, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 27

śama-damādy-upetas tu syāt tathāpi tu tad-vidhes tad-aṅgatayā teṣām
avaśyānuṣṭheyatvāt

śama—peacefulness; dama—self-control; ādi—beginning with; upetaḥ—possessing; tu—indeed; syāt—should be; tathāpi—nevertheless; tu—but; tat—of them; vidheḥ—because of the rule; tat—of that; aṅgatayā—because of being parts; teṣām—of them; avaśya—needed; anuṣṭheyatvāt—because they should be practiced.

But one must nevertheless certainly have peacefulness, self control, and other virtues, for that is the rule. Because they are parts they must be attained.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The two appearances of the word "tu" have the meanings of giving certainty (certainly) and dispelling doubt (but). Although the qualifications of the first list, which begins with yajñas are sufficient for attaining transcendental knowledge, nevertheless a person who seeks transcendental knowledge should also attain the qualifications of the second list, which begins with peacefulness.

Why is that? The sūtra explains, "tad-vidhes tad-aṅgatayā" (for that is the rule.

Because they are parts they must be attained). This means that peacefulness and the other virtues mentioned here are parts of transcendental knowledge and therefore they must also be attained.

The qualities given in both lists must be attained. The qualities on the first list, which begins with yajñās, are external qualities, and those on the second list, which begins with peacefulness, are internal qualities. In this way they are distinguished. The word "ādi" (beginning with) here means that truthfulness and many other qualities are also to be added to these lists.

Adhikaraṇa 6

A Person Situated in Transcendental Knowledge Is Not Free To Sin

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be explained the truth that a person situated in transcendental knowledge should not commit forbidden acts. In the Śruti-śāstra it is said:

yadi ha vā apy evam-vin nikhilam bhakṣayītaivam eva sa bhavati

"If a person situated in transcendental knowledge eats anything impure he remains pure nevertheless."

Samśaya (doubt): Do these words order a person situated in transcendental knowledge that he must eat any and all foods, or do they merely give permission that he may eat any food he wishes?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): No argument has the power to refute that this is an order. The person situated in transcendental knowledge is therefore ordered that must eat any and all foods.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 28

sarvānnānumatiś ca prāṇātyaye tad-darśanāt

sarva—all; anna—food; anumatiḥ—permission; ca—and; prāṇa—of life; atyaye—at the end; tat—that; darśanāt—because of revelation of Śruti-śāstra.

Also, permission to eat all foods is given when life is in danger, for that is the revelation of scripture.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" (also) is used here for emphasis. When proper foods are not available and there is danger that life may come to an end, then permission is given to eat any and all foods. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "tad darśanāt" (for that is the revelation of scripture). In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (1.10.1-4) it is said:

maṭaci-hateṣu kuruṣvāṭikyā saha jāyayoṣastir ha cākrāyaṇa ibhya-grāme
pradrāṇaka uvāsa. sa hebhyam kulmāṣān khadantaṁ vibhikṣe taṁ hovāca. neto
'nye vidyante yac ca ye ma imā upanihitā iti. eteṣāṁ me dehīti hovāca tān asmaī
pradadau hantānupānam ity ucchiṣṭaṁ vai me pītaṁ syād iti hovāca. na svidete 'py
ucchiṣṭa iti na va ajīviṣyāmimān akhadann iti hovāca kāmo me uda-pānam iti.

"A poor man named Uṣasti Cākrāyaṇa lived with his wife Aṭiki in the village of Ibhya-grāma in the country of the Kurus. One year there was a famine and the crops were destroyed by hailstones. Uṣasti begged food from a rich man who was eating beans. The rich man said, 'All I have is these beans. I have nothing else.' The poor man said, 'Please give me that.' So the rich man give his remnants to him. Then the rich man said, 'Here is something to drink.' The poor man replied, 'You have already drunk some of that and therefore I should not drink it.' The rich man said, 'Is it not that I have also eaten some of these beans?' The poor man replied, 'Without eating these beans I would not be able to remain alive, but drinking water I do not need. I can drink any time I wish.'

The truth is thus seen in this story of Cākrāyaṇa. In order to save his live the saintly sage named Cākrāyaṇa ate the remnants of beans eaten by a rich man, but, fearing that he was accepting the remnants of another, he was not willing to drink the water offered by the rich man, for he could easily obtain water whenever he wished. On the following day the sage ate the leftovers of those beans, thus eating his own remnants. This story is also recounted in other places in the scriptures.

abādhāc ca

abādhāt—because of being no impediment; ca—also.

Also because there is no impediment.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In times of emergency one has permission to eat any food, and such eating does not contaminate the heart and the mind. The sūtra explains that this eating does not present an impediment to attaining transcendental knowledge.

Sūtra 30

api smaryate

api—also; smaryate—in the Smṛti-śāstra.

Also in the Smṛti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In Manu-saṁhitā (10.104) it is said:

jīvitātyayam āpanno
yo 'nnam atti yatas tataḥ
lipyate na sa pāpena
padma-patram ivāmbhasā

"One who in an emergency, in order to save his life, eats whatever is available is not touched by sin. He is like a lotus leaf untouched by water."

Only in an emergency, and not at other times, is one allowed to eat anything that is available. Therefore the meaning here is that the person situated in transcendental knowledge has permission to eat any food in certain circumstances, not that he is ordered that he must eat any food. The scriptures clearly forbid the eating of impure foods when there is no emergency.

Sūtra 31

śabdaś cāto 'kāma-cāre

śabdaḥ—Śruti-śāstra; ca—and; ataḥ—therefore; a—not; kāma—desire; cāre—acting.

Scripture says it should not be done by one's own wish.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Thus when there is an emergency one has permission to eat any food, but otherwise, during ordinary times, a person situated in transcendental knowledge will not of his own wish disobey the orders of the scriptures. In Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.26.2) it is said:

āhāra-śuddhau sattva-śuddhiḥ sattva-śuddhau dhruvā smṛtiḥ smṛti-lambhe sarva-granthinām vipramokṣaḥ

"By performance of yajña one's eatables become sanctified, and by eating sanctified foodstuffs, one's very existence becomes purified. By the purification of existence finer tissues in the memory become sanctified, and when memory is sanctified one can think of the path of liberation."*

In this way the Chāndogya Upaniṣad forbids acting whimsically and doing whatever one wishes. Thus, although in times of emergency one has permission to eat any foods, in ordinary times one must follow the rules given in the scriptures.

Adhikaraṇa 7

The Svaniṣṭha Devotee and Varṇāśrama-dharma

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the beginning of this pada three kinds of devotees, beginning with the svaiṣṭha devotee, were described. Now will be considered the following question: Should they who have attained transcendental knowledge continue to perform the duties of varṇāśrama-dharma? First we will consider the situation of the svaiṣṭha devotees. In the Kauṣārava-śruti it is said:

paśyann apīmam ātmānam
kuryāt karmāvicārayan
yadātmanaḥ su-niyatam
ānandotkarṣam āpnuyāt

"Even when one directly sees the Supreme Personality of Godhead one should continue to perform Vedic rituals, for in this way one attains great bliss."

Samśaya (doubt): Should a svaiṣṭha devotee who has attained transcendental knowledge still perform Vedic rituals or should he not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The purpose of Vedic rituals is to attain transcendental knowledge. When the end is attained the means may be abandoned. For this reason there is no reason that he must continue to perform Vedic rituals.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His opinion.

Sūtra 32

vihitatvād āśrama-karmāpi

vihitatvāt—because of being ordered; āśrama—of the asramas; karma—the duties; api—also.

The duties of the āśramas also, for they are ordered.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "api" (also) here means that the duties of the varṇas are also included. This means that the prescribed duties of varṇāśrama-dharma should be performed. Why is that? They should be performed in order to increase

transcendental knowledge. This is so because it is the order of the scriptures.

Here someone may object: Here it is said that Vedic rituals should continue to be performed even after one has attained transcendental knowledge. How can this not mean that transcendental knowledge and Vedic rituals must both be performed together to bring the desired result?

If this is said, the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 33

sahakāritvena ca

sahakāritvena—as helpful; ca—also.

Also, as helpful.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Vedic rituals should be performed, not because they are in themselves the cause of liberation, but because they are helpful in attaining transcendental knowledge. Transcendental knowledge is the real cause of liberation, as is explained in Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (3.8).

In the beginning the svaiṣṭha devotee performs his prescribed duties of Vedic rituals in order to please the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In that way he attains transcendental knowledge. Then, although in this way he has already attained transcendental knowledge, in order to increase that transcendental knowledge, he continues to perform these prescribed duties of Vedic rituals. Transcendental knowledge does not cause the cessation of Vedic rituals, for the two of them are not opposed to each other.

Generally a person performs Vedic rituals in order to attain a great wonder of delights in Svargaloka and other heavenly places. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.15) it is said:

na hāsya karma kṣiyate

"the pious deeds of a person situated in transcendental knowledge never perish."

The svaiṣṭha devotee does not perform Vedic rituals to experience various

delights in Svargaloka. He has no such desire. The svaniṣṭha devotee situated in transcendental knowledge goes to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and in the course of his going he may pass through Svargaloka and the other heavenly planets. It is like a person who, while walking to a village, touches some grass on the way.

With the help of her assistant, who is Vedic rituals, transcendental knowledge presents the experience of Svargaloka before the svaniṣṭha devotee who yearns to attain the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Then transcendental knowledge personally carries the devotee to the abode of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is explained in Kaṭha Upaniṣad 2.3.17. The desire in the devotee's heart is also explained in this way.

Also, transcendental knowledge may carry the devotee to Svargaloka only to test whether the devotee has actually renounced all material desires. The Śruti-śāstra describes this in the passage beginning with the words, "sarvaṁ ha paśyaḥ paśyati". This does not mean that they who are not svaniṣṭha devotees do not go to Svargaloka.

For the svaniṣṭha devotee transcendental knowledge destroys all karmic reactions, except for the past and present lives' karma that specifically brings elevation to Svargaloka. For the pariniṣṭhita devotee transcendental knowledge destroys all karmic reactions, except for the past lives' karma that specifically brings elevation to Svargaloka. For the nirapekṣa devotee transcendental knowledge destroys all karmic reactions from all past and present lives. In this way it is proved that transcendental knowledge is independent of Vedic rituals. Vedic rituals act as assistants to transcendental knowledge.

Adhikaraṇa 8

The Pariniṣṭhita Devotee May Renounce Ordinary Duties

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the situation of the pariniṣṭhita devotees will be examined. In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (3.1.4) it is said:

ātma-kriḍa ātma-ratiḥ kriyāvān

"He meditates on the Lord's pastimes. He loves the Lord. He serves the Lord. He performs his prescribed duties. He is the best of transcendentalists."

Thus for the sake of the people in general the pariniṣṭhita devotee should

perform the duties of varṇāśrama and out of love for the Supreme Lord the pariniṣṭhita devotee should engage in the various activities of devotional service, which begin with hearing of the Lord's glories.

Samśaya (doubt): Should the pariniṣṭhita devotee perform his varṇāśrama and devotional duties simultaneously, or should he perform one first and then the other?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): the simultaneous performance being impossible, and the abandonment of prescribed duties being sinful, there is no certain and definite rule as to the performance of these duties.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 34

sarvathāpi tatra cobhaya-liṅgāt

sarvathā—in all circumstances; api—indeed; tatra—there; ca—and; ubhaya—of both; liṅgāt—because of the signs.

Also, indeed, it is in all circumstances because of signs from both.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "api" (indeed) is used here for emphasis. The word "sarvathā" means, "in all circumstances, even if one must abandon one's varṇāśrama duties". This means that the pariniṣṭhita devotee should always engage in devotional service to the Supreme Lord. In his spare time, perhaps, the devotee may perform a little something of his varṇāśrama duties. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "ubhaya-liṅgāt" (because of two signs). The sign from the Śruti-śāstra is this (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 2.2.5):

tam evaikam jānatha

"Place your thoughts on the Supreme Lord alone."

The sign from the Smṛti-śāstra comes from the Supreme Lord Himself (Bhagavad-gītā 9.13-14):

mahātmānas tu mām pārtha
daivīm prakṛtim āśritāḥ
bhajanty ananya-manaso
jñātvā bhūtādim avyayam

"O son of Pṛthā, those who are not deluded, the great souls, are under the protection of the divine nature. They are fully engaged in devotional service because they know Me as the Supreme Personality of Godhead, original and inexhaustible.*

satatam kīrtayanto mām
yatantaś ca dṛḍha-vratāḥ
namasyantaś ca mām bhaktyā
nitya-yuktā upāsate

"Always chanting My glories, endeavoring with great determination, and bowing down before Me, these great souls perpetually worship Me with devotion."*

In the following words the author of the sūtras confirms this with more evidence.

Sūtra 35

anabhibhavam ca darśayati

anabhibhavam—not defeated; ca—and; darśayati—reveals.

It reveals that he is not defeated.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.23) it is said:

sarvaṁ pāpmānaṁ tarati. naiva pāpmā tarati. sarvaṁ pāpmānaṁ tapati. naiva pāpmā tapati.

"He defeats all sins. Sins do not defeat him. He burns away all sins. Sins do not burn him."

If, absorbed in chanting the glories of the Supreme Lord, a pariniṣṭhita devotee neglects his varṇāśrama duties, that neglect is not a sin on his part. That is why the sūtra declares, "It reveals that he is not defeated." The meaning here is that it is right for a devotee to neglect the duties of varṇāśrama-dharma in favor of the duties of devotional service to the Supreme Lord.

In Viṣṇu Purāṇa 3.8.9 (quoted at the end of the sūtra 2 purport) it is the devotee's worship, not his performance of varṇāśrama duties, that satisfies the Lord. In a preceding passage of Viṣṇu Purāṇa (2.13.9-11) are these words of King Bharata, who had faith in devotional service alone:

yajñeśācyuta govinda
mādhavānanta keśava
kṛṣṇa viṣṇo hṛṣīkeśety
āha rājā sa kevalam

"Again and again King Bharata would chant the Lord's holy names: O Yajñeśa, O Acyuta, O Govinda, O Mādhava, O Ananta. O Keśava, O Kṛṣṇa, O Viṣṇu, O Hṛṣīkeśa!

nānyaj jagāda maitreya
kiñcit svapnāntareṣv api
etat paraṁ tad-arthaṁ ca
vinā nānyad acintayat

"O Maitreya, awake or asleep the king would not say anything else. He would not think of anything but the Lord and His service.

samit-puṣpa-kuśādānam
cakre deva-kriyā-kṛte
nānyāni cakre karmāṇi
niḥsaṅgo yoga-tāpasah

"Practicing austere yoga, he stayed alone. He gathered firewood, flowers, and kuśa grass for the worship of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. He did not perform any other duties or rituals."

Adhikaraṇa 9 The Nirapekṣa Devotee

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Thus 1. the way that transcendental knowledge is manifested among they who are within the varṇāśrama institution and 2. the results that knowledge brings to such persons has been shown. Now will be shown the way these two are manifested among the nirapekṣa devotees, who are above the varṇāśrama institution. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.4.1) is the following passage about Gārgī, who was enlightened with transcendental knowledge and above the varṇāśrama institution:

atha vācaknavy uvāca brāhmaṇā bhagavanto hantāham enaṁ yājñavalkyaṁ dvau praśnau prakṣyāmi

"Gārgī said: O exalted brāhmaṇas, now I will place two questions before Yājñavalkya."

Samśaya (doubt): Is it possible that transcendental knowledge may be present in they who do not take part in the varṇāśrama institution, or is it not possible?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): transcendental knowledge is never manifested to they who are outside of the Vedas and the varṇāśrama institution.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 36

antarā cāpi tu tad dṛṣṭaiḥ

antarā—outside; ca—and; api—indeed; tu—but; tat—that; dṛṣṭaiḥ—by what is seen.

But certainly outside also, because of what is seen.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to begin the refutation of the idea that Vedic rituals are mandatory. The word "ca" (also) is used here to present the final conclusion. The word "antarā" here refers to those persons who, although in this life not following varṇāśrama-dharma, in their past lives practiced truthfulness, austerity, japa, and other pious deeds, and therefore in this life were born both pure and renounced. It is said that in such persons transcendental knowledge is manifested. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "tad dṛṣṭaiḥ" (because of what is seen). This means that the scriptures show Gārgī as an example of such a person. The meaning is this: They who in their previous life properly performed their duties but died before they could reap the result of their actions, in the next life are born very pure in heart because of their previous pious deeds. The contact of sincere devotees quickly turns them into great renounced saints.

In the next sūtra the author explains that the association of devotees is very powerful. By that association one becomes free from material desires and attains transcendental knowledge.

Sūtra 37

api smaryate

api—also; smaryate—in the Smṛti-śāstra.

Also in the Smṛti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (2.2.37) it is said:

pibanti ye bhagavata ātmanaḥ satām
kathāmṛtaṁ śravaṇa-puṭeṣu sambhṛtam
punaṅti te viṣaya-vidūṣitāśayam
vrajanti tac-caraṇa-saroruhāntikam

"Those who drink through aural reception, fully filled with the nectarean

message of Lord Kṛṣṇa, the beloved of the devotees, purify the polluted aim of life known as material enjoyment and thus go back to Godhead, to the lotus feet of Him (the Personality of Godhead)."*

In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (5.12.12) it is said:

"My dear King Rahūgaṇa, unless one has the opportunity to smear his entire body with the dust of the lotus feet of great devotees, one cannot realize the Absolute Truth simply by observing celibacy (brahmacarya), strictly following the rules and regulations of householder life, leaving home as vanaprastha, accepting sannyasa, or undergoing severe penances in winter by keeping oneself submerged in water or surrounding oneself in summer by fire and the scorching heat of the sun. There are many other processes to understand the Absolute Truth, but the Absolute Truth is only revealed to one who has attained the mercy of a great devotee."*

In this sūtra the word "api" (also) is used in the sense of joining things together.

Sūtra 38

viśeṣānugrahaś ca

viśeṣa—special; anugrahaḥ—mercy; ca—also.

Special mercy also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In Bhagavad-gītā (10.9-10), the Supreme Personality of Godhead personally declares:

mac-cittā mad-gata-prāṇā
bodhayantaḥ parasparam
kathayantaś ca mām nityam
tuṣyanti ca ramanti ca

"The thoughts of My pure devotees dwell in Me, their lives are fully devoted to My service, and they derive great satisfaction and bliss from always enlightening

one another and conversing about Me.*

teṣāṁ satata-yuktānāṁ
bhajatām prīti-purvakam
dadāmi buddhi-yogaṁ taṁ
yena mām upayānti te

"To those who are constantly devoted to serving Me with love, I give the understanding by which they can come to Me."*

To such devotees it is seen that the Lord gives special mercy. By engaging in devotional service in this way one attains renunciation of the world.

Adhikaraṇa 10 **Renunciation**

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The situation of Yājñavalkya and others who are within varṇāśrama, as well as the situation of Gārgī and others who are not within varṇāśrama have been seen here.

Samśaya (doubt): Who are better: they who are within varṇāśrama or they who are not within it?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because they perform the duties of Vedas and āśrama and also worship the Supreme Personality of Godhead, they who are within varṇāśrama are better.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 39

atas tv itarat jyāyo liṅgāc ca

ataḥ—from that; tv—indeed; itarat—the other; jyāyaḥ—better; liṅgāt—by the sign; ca—indeed.

But indeed the others are better, for there is a sign.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to dispel doubt. The word "ca" (indeed) is used here for emphasis. The word "itarat" (the others) here refers to they who are other than the followers of varṇāśrama, namely they who do not follow varṇāśrama. The word "jyāyaḥ" means "their method of attaining transcendental knowledge is better". Why is that? The sūtra explains, "liṅgāt" (for there is a sign). The sign here is the Śruti-śāstra's explanation that Gārgī was very wise with transcendental knowledge.

This is the meaning: The scriptures prescribe the duties of the āśramas in order to restrict the seemingly beginningless materialistic desires of the conditioned souls. Therefore the purpose of varṇāśrama is not to give facility for material desires, but rather gradually to restrict them. At a certain stage, however, the duties of varṇāśrama become obstacles to attaining love for the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

They who have become free of material desires and who place their love in the Supreme Personality of Godhead alone gain no benefit from the duties of varṇāśrama. Therefore they who have risen above varṇāśrama are better. In the Jābāla Upaniṣad it is said that one may progress through the āśramas one after another, or, if like Sāmvartaka Muni and others, one becomes completely devoted to the Supreme Personality of Godhead alone one may renounce everything and accept sannyāsa at once, at any time. The scriptural injunction, "a brāhmaṇa should not pass even one day outside of the duties of varṇāśrama," is meant only for ordinary people.

Here someone may object: That may be. Still, the sannyāsīs, who are outside of the varṇāśrama-dharma and who are solely devoted to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, are not better, for they may fall down and again become materialistic. When a sannyāsī falls down and again accepts the life of a householder, his action is condemned by the scriptures. Also, one who accepts sannyāsa, but then again faithfully accepts the glorious varṇāśrama-dharma, must tend to so many varṇāśrama duties that the single-pointed service to the Lord that was the advantage of sannyāsa life becomes lost for him. On the other hand, they who accept the duties of varṇāśrama gradually make more and more progress in spiritual life.

If this is said, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 40

tad-bhūtasya tu nātad-bhāvo jaiminer api niyamātad-rūpābhāvebhyaḥ

tat—that; bhūtasya—become; tu—but; na—not; a—not; tat—that; bhāvaḥ—being; jaimineḥ—if Jaimini Muni; api—even; niyama—rule; a—not; tat—that; rūpa—form; a—not; bhāvebhyaḥ—because of being.

But one who becomes that does not cease to be that, even according to Jaimini. This is because of restraint, not being like that, and cessation.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to dispel doubt. One who becomes that, that is to say one who becomes a genuine nirapekṣa sannyāsī sincerely devoted to the Supreme Lord, never ceases to be that, that is to say he never falls from his devotion to the Lord. That is the opinion of Jaimini, and it is also the opinion of Me, Vyāsa. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "niyamātad-rūpābhāvebhyaḥ" (because of restraint, not being like that, and cessation). The word "niyama" here means "because they thirst to attain the Supreme Personality of Godhead, their senses are naturally controlled." The word "rūpa" here means "desire". Because they have no desire but to attain the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Gārgī and other renunciants decline to accept the order of householder life or any of the other orders of varṇāśrama-dharma. That is the meaning here. In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 7.15.35) it is said:

kāmādibhir anāviddham
praśāntākhila-vṛtti yat
cittam brahma-sukha-sprṣtam
naivottiṣṭheta karhicit

"When one's consciousness is uncontaminated by material lusty desires, it becomes calm and peaceful in all activities, for one is situated in eternal blissful life. Once situated on that platform, one does not return to materialistic duties."*

Even Jaimini, who considers Vedic rituals most important, admits that the Śruti-śāstra declares this of the nirapekṣa devotees. The conclusion therefore is that the sincere renunciant must have performed all other duties in his previous births. That is why he is now pure in heart and free from the need to perform them any longer.

In the next sūtra will be shown the truth that the nirapekṣa devotee is better than the svaṇiṣṭha devotee.

Here someone may object: Is it not so that the scriptural text beginning with the words "sarvaṃ paśyaḥ paśyati" shows that transcendental knowledge brings even the nirapekṣa devotee to Svargaloka and the other higher material realms, and that when they enter the realms of Indra and the other demigods the devotees become attached to the material enjoyments there, and thus their unalloyed devotion to the Supreme Personality of Godhead becomes broken?

Fearing that someone might raise this objection, the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 41

na cādhikārikam api patanānumānāt tad-ayogāt

na—not; ca—also; adhikārikam—status; api—also; patana—falling; anumānāt—from the inference; tat—of that; a—not; yogāt—from contact.

And not that status even, for fear of falling and for lack of interest.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" (and) is used here for emphasis. The word "api" (even) is used here to include all the pleasures present in the material world". The word "adhikāri" means "the posts of Indra and the other demigods". The nirapekṣa devotee does not desire their posts. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "patanānumānāt" (for fear of falling). This is explained in Bhagavad-gītā (8.16), where Lord Kṛṣṇa explains:

ābrahma-bhuvanāl loke
punar āvartino 'rjuna

"From the highest planet in the material world down to the lowest, all are places of misery wherein repeated birth and death take place."*

Also, the nirapekṣa devotees have no desire to enjoy the material pleasures of the higher planets. Descriptions of these truths can also be found in many places in the Smṛti-śāstra. Thus, even though the glory of transcendental knowledge may

carry him to the realms of Indra and the other demigods, because he has no desire to enjoy the material pleasures available in those worlds, the nirapekṣa devotee finds that his unalloyed love and devotion for the Supreme Lord remains unbroken.

In the next sūtra the author shows that the nirapekṣa devotees are superior to the pariniṣṭhita devotees also.

Sūtra 42

upa-pūrvakam api tv eke bhāvam aśana-vat tad uktam

upa—with the prefix "upa"; pūrvakam—beginning (upāsana, or devotional service); api—even; tu—but; eke—some; bhāvam—devotion; aśana—food; vat—like; tat—that; uktam—spoken.

But some even that which begins with "upa". The perfect stage of devotion is like food. This is said.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "api" (even) is used for emphasis. The word "tu" (but) is used to begin the refutation of the opponent's idea. The word "eke" (some) means "the followers of the Atharva Veda". The nirapekṣa devotees desire to engage in devotional service. The word "upa-pūrvam" (the word that begins with "upa") here means "upāsana" (devotional service). The word "bhāva" here means "the perfect stage of devotion". That perfect stage is like food (aśana-vat) for the nirapekṣa devotees. This the scriptures say. In Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.14) it is said:

bhaktir asya bhajanam tad ihāmutra

"Devotional service to Lord Kṛṣṇa is performed when the heart no longer desires any material benefit to be obtained in this life or the next."

In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is also said:

sac-cid-ānandaika-rase bhakti-yoge tiṣṭhati

"Devotional service is eternal and full of knowledge and bliss."

Wherever they may go, the devotees worship Lord Hari. This is evidence that the devotees are always happy. The Śruti-śāstra declares:

so 'śnute sarvān kāmān

"The devotee enjoys. All his desires are fulfilled."

Thus, even though he may be residing in the material world, the devotee experiences bliss equal to the bliss of the spiritual world. Many quotes to corroborate this may be found by searching the Smṛti-śāstra.

In the next sūtra the author shows us another reason why the nirapekṣa devotees, even without endeavoring to attain them, easily attain sālōkya (residing on the same planet with the Lord) and sāmīpya (staying near to the Lord) liberation.

Sūtra 43

bahis tūbhayathā smṛter ācārāc ca

bahiḥ—outside; tu—indeed; ubhayathā—both ways; smṛteḥ—because of Smṛti-śāstra; ācārāt—because of conduct; ca—also.

Certainly outside in two ways because of Smṛti-śāstra and conduct.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (certainly) is used here for emphasis. The word "bahiḥ" (outside) here means that although the nirapekṣa devotees seem to reside within the confines of the material world, in truth they are really outside that world. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "ubhayathā" (in two ways). In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam it is said:

visṛjati hṛdayaṁ na yasya sākṣād
dharir avasābhihito 'py aghaughā-nāśaḥ
praṇaya-rasanayā dhṛtānghri-padmaḥ

sa bhavati bhāgavata-pradhāna uktaḥ

"the Supreme Personality of Godhead is so kind to the conditioned souls that if they call upon Him by speaking His holy name, even unintentionally or unwillingly, the Lord is inclined to destroy innumerable sinful reactions in their hearts. Therefore, when a devotee who has taken shelter of the Lord's lotus feet chants the holy name of Kṛṣṇa with genuine love, the Supreme Personality of Godhead can never give up the heart of such a devotee. One who has thus captured the Supreme Lord within his heart is to be known as bhāgavata-pradhāna, the most exalted devotee of the Lord."***

The word "ācārāt" (because of conduct) here means that the relationship of the Supreme Personality of Godhead and His devotees is like that of a master and servant or like a jewel set in gold. This is explained in the Smṛti-śāstras. In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (11.14.16) the Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself declares:

nirapekṣam munim śāntam
nirvairam sama-darśanam
anuvrajāmy aham nityam
pūyetye aṅghri-reṇubhiḥ

"With the dust of My devotees' lotus feet I desire to purify the material worlds, which are situated within Me. Thus, I always follow the footsteps of My pure devotees, who are free from all personal desire, rapt in thought of My pastimes, peaceful, without any feelings of enmity, and of equal disposition everywhere."***

In these two ways it is shown that the Lord and His devotees are always together, whether they are within the material world, or outside the boundaries of the material world. Thus enmity to the Lord is the cause of repeated birth and death in the material world, and destruction of those feelings of enmity to the Lord is the cause of spiritual perfection.

Adhikaraṇa 11

The Supreme Personality of Godhead Protects and Maintains the Nirapekṣa Devotee

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the previous passages the nirapekṣa devotees disinterest in the pleasures available in Brahmāloka and the other higher worlds was described. Now will be described the nirapekṣa devotees' disinterest in the pleasures presently available in this world. In the Taittirīya Aranyaka (3.14.1) it is said:

bhartā san bhriyamāṇam bibharti

"The Supreme Lord maintains His devotees."

Samśaya (doubt): Does the Supreme Personality of Godhead personally maintain the nirapekṣa devotees, or must the devotees struggle to maintain themselves?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The Lord does not maintain His devotees. The devotees must struggle to maintain themselves.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 44

svāminaḥ phala-śruter ity ātreyaḥ

svāminaḥ—from the Lord; phala—result; śruteḥ—from the Śruti-śāstra; iti—thus; ātreyaḥ—Dattātreya Muni.

From the Lord come results, for that is heard in the Śruti-śāstra. That is Dattātreya's opinion.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The bodily needs of the devotee are supplied by the Supreme Personality of Godhead (svāminaḥ). Why is that? The sūtra explains, "phala-śruteḥ" (for that is heard in the Śruti-śāstra). In Taittirīya Aranyaka (3.14.1) the Supreme Personality of Godhead is described as the maintainer of the devotees. This is also the opinion of Dattātreya Muni. In Bhagavad-gītā (9.22), Lord Kṛṣṇa Himself declares:

ananyāś cintayanto mām
ye janāḥ paryupāsate

teṣāṁ nityābhīyuktānāṁ
yoga-kṣemāṁ vahāmy aham

"But those who always worship Me with exclusive devotion, meditating on My transcendental form, to them I carry what they lack, and I preserve what they have."*

In the Padma Purāṇa it is said:

darśana-dhyāna-samsparśair
matsya-kūrma-vihaṅgamāḥ
svāny apatyāni puṣṇanti
tathāham api padmaja

"By vision, by meditation, and by touch only do the fish, the tortoise, and the birds maintain their offspring. So do I also, O Padmaja."*

The devotees do not wish to trouble the Lord for their maintenance. Still, because the Lord's every desire is automatically fulfilled, He maintains His devotees without any trouble on His part. Thus, when the devotees serve the Lord they are automatically maintained by the Lord. This is explained in Taittirīya Araṇyaka (3.14.1).

In the next sūtra the author gives an example to show that the Lord is determined to maintain His devotees.

Sūtra 45

ārtvijyam ity auḍulomis tasmai hi parikrīyate

ārtvijyam—the ṛtvik priest's work; ity—thus; auḍulomiḥ—Auḍulomi; tasmai—for that; hi—indeed; parikrīyate—is purchased.

Auḍulomi says He is like a ṛtvik priest. He sells Himself for that.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "iti" is used in the sense of similarity. Thus the Supreme Personality of Godhead acts like a ṛtvik priest, for the Lord maintains the nirapekṣa devotees. Because He has been purchased by their devotional service, the Lord fulfills the bodily needs of His devotees. In the Viṣṇu-dharma it is said:

tulasī-dala-mātreṇa
jalasya culukena ca
vikrīṇīte svam ātmānam
bhaktebhyo bhakta-vatsalaḥ

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead, who dearly loves His devotees, sells Himself to them in exchange for a tulasī leaf and palmful of water."

The ṛtvik priests are purchased for a certain task by the yajamāna's payment of dakṣiṇā. Being an impersonalist, Auḍulomi equates devotional service with buying and selling. For these reasons the nirapekṣas are the best of the devotees.

Sūtra 46

śruteś ca

śruteḥ—from the Śruti-śāstra; ca—also.

From the Śruti-śāstra also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the performance of yajña the ṛtvik priest gives his blessing to the performer of the yajña (yajamāna). In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (1.7.8-9) it is also said:

tasmād u haivam-vid udgātā brūyāt kaṁ te kāmam āgāyāni

"Then the learned udgātā priest says: Of what desire shall I sing?"

In this way the ṛtvik priest gives the result of the yajña to the yajamāna. As the ṛtvik priest thus maintains the yajamāna, so the Supreme Personality of Godhead maintains His devotee.

Adhikaraṇa 12

Meditation on the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the author of the sūtras will reveal the activities of the devotees after they have attained transcendental knowledge of the Lord. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.23) it is said:

tasmād evam-vic chānto dantaḥ. . . ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ

"One who knows the Supreme Personality of Godhead becomes peaceful and self-controlled. . . Then he gazes on the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

Samśaya (doubt): here it is said that one who desires to attain the Supreme Personality of Godhead should also attain a long list of virtues, beginning with being peaceful and culminating in being rapt in meditation on the Lord. Must the nirapekṣa devotee develop all these virtues, or may he merely become rapt in meditation on the Lord's form, qualities, and pastimes?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Although one may have attained transcendental knowledge, that knowledge does not become stable without the development of peacefulness and a host of other virtues. Therefore the devotee should endeavor to attain all these virtues.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 47

sahakāry-antara-vidhiḥ pakṣeṇa tṛtīyam tadvato vidhy-ādi-vat

sahakāri—helping; antara—another; vidhiḥ—rule; pakṣeṇa—in one sense; tṛtīyam—the third; tadvataḥ—like that; vidhi—rule; ādi—beginning; vat—like.

Different from the helpful rules is the third. It is like the rules and other things.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The "sahakāry-antara" (helpful rules) here are the two sets of virtues: 1. those beginning with peacefulness, and 2. those beginning with Vedic yajñas. These two sets of virtues have already been discussed (in the purport of sūtra 3.4.26). These rules (vidhiḥ) are here considered in a new and different way. These rules must be observed by the followers (pakṣeṇa) of varṇāśrama-dharma, but they need not be observed by they who are not followers of varṇāśrama-dharma, for such persons already possess these virtues naturally. Therefore these persons are ordered to meditate on the Lord's form, qualities, and pastimes.

Then the sūtra explains, "ṛtīyam tadvataḥ" (there is a third thing like that). Desiring only to attain the Lord's mercy, the nirapekṣa devotee engages his mind in thinking about the Lord. That is the "third rule" (ṛtīyam). This is described in the following statement of Śruti-śāstra:

manasaivedam āptavyam

"Engaging his mind in thinking of Him, the devotee attains the Lord."

Hearing about the Lord is done with the body and chanting mantras glorifying the Lord is done with the voice. Meditating on the Lord is done with the mind. Thus meditation is the third of these three processes.

To show that meditation must be performed the sūtra gives the example of rules and other things (vidhy-ādi-vat). As the followers of varṇāśrama must perform sandhyā-upāsana and other rituals, so the nirapekṣa devotees who have attained transcendental knowledge should meditate on the Supreme Lord's form, qualities, and pastimes.

This does not mean that the nirapekṣa devotees should not perform japa, worship, and other spiritual activities, for by meditating on the Lord one also engages in these other activities. However, for the nirapekṣa devotee, meditation on the Lord is most important. In this way three kinds of devotees situated in transcendental knowledge have been described.

Adhikaraṇa 13 **The Different Aśramas**

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

That transcendental knowledge is attained by three kinds of devotees, beginning with the svaiṣṭha devotees, has already been explained. Now will be

explained the way to make that transcendental knowledge very steady and secure. At the end of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.15.1) it is said:

ācārya-kulād vedam adhītya yatha-vidhānam guroḥ karmātiśeṣeṇābhisamāvṛtya
kuṭumbe śucau deśe svādhyāyam adhiyāno dharmikān vidadhātmani sarvendriyāṇi
sampratiṣṭhāpyāhimsān sarva-bhūtāny anyatra tīrthebhyaḥ sa khalv evaṁ vartayan
yāvad āyuṣaṁ brahmalokam abhisampadyate na ca punar āvartate.

"From the ācāryas one should learn the Vedas. One should perform his duties and also offer dakṣiṇā to his spiritual master. Then one should accept household life, live in a pure way, study the Vedas, perform his religious duties, engage all his senses in the Supreme Lord's service, not harm any living being, and go on pilgrimage to holy places. A person who passes his life in this way goes to the spiritual world. He does not return to this world of repeated birth and death."

Samśaya (doubt): Are they who are not in the gṛhastha-āśrama able attain transcendental knowledge, or are they not able to attain it?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Here and there the scriptures may say that the sannyāsīs are able to attain transcendental knowledge, but this is only flattery, only empty words of praise. These passages merely mean that one should renounce everything for the sake of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The conclusion is that in order to attain the Supreme Personality of Godhead one must accept the gṛhastha-āśrama. That is the teaching of the scriptures.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 48

kṛtsna-bhāvāt tu gṛhiṇopasamhāraḥ

kṛtsna—of all; bhāvāt—because of the existence; tu—but; gṛhiṇā—by the gṛhastha; upasamhāraḥ—the goal.

But because of all the goal is by a gṛhastha.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to dispel doubt. This passage from the

scriptures declares that the goal is attained by a gr̥hastha not because only they can attain liberation but because everything else (kṛtsna-bhāvāt) is contained in gr̥hastha life. This means that all the duties of all the āśramas are in some way included in the duties of gr̥hastha life. Therefore the duties of other āśramas, such as non-violence and sense-control, are duties for the gr̥hasthas also. In fact no duty in any other āśrama is incompatible with gr̥hastha life. In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa it is said:

bhikṣā-bhujaś ca ye kecit
pārivraḍ brahmacāriṇaḥ
te 'py atraiva pratiṣṭhante
gārhashtyaṁ tena vai param

"Sannyāsīs, brahmacārīs, and all others who eat the food of begging depend on the gr̥hasthas. Therefore the gr̥hastha-āśrama is the best of āśramas."

Because the Śruti-śāstras declare that the followers of the other āśramas may also attain liberation, if it is said that the followers of the gr̥hastha-āśrama attain the goal of life it is because that āśrama contains the duties of all the other āśramas. This is explained in the following sūtra.

Sūtra 49

mauna-vad itareṣām apy upadeśāt

mauna—silence; vat—like; itareṣām—of others; api—also; upadeśāt—from the teaching.

Because there is teaching of others like a silent sage.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The words "mauna-vat" here refer to the spiritual perfection already described. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (2.23.1) it is said:

trayo dharma-skandhā yajño 'dhyayanam dānam iti prathamas tapa eva dvitīyo
brahmacaryācārya-kula-vāsī tṛtīyo 'tyantam ātmānam ācārya-kule 'vasādayan sarva
ete punya-lokā bhavanti brahma-saṁstho 'mṛtatvam eti

"Religious life has three branches. The first branch is yajña, Vedic study, and charity. The second branch is austerity. The third branch is living as a brahmacārī in the home of the spiritual master. By staying as a brahmacārī in the home of the spiritual master, everyone becomes saintly and pious. However, only he who takes shelter of the Supreme Lord becomes immortal."

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.22) it is said:

etam eva veditvā munir bhavaty etam eva pravrajino lokam abhīpsantaḥ pravrajanti

"One who understands the Supreme Personality of Godhead becomes wise. Desiring to travel to His transcendental world, the brāhmaṇas become wandering sannyāsīs."

In this way it is seen that the scriptures teach that the wandering sannyāsīs, the naiṣṭhika-brahmacārīs, and the followers of the other āśramas, all can attain liberation. This is described in this sūtra by the words, "itareṣām apy upadeśāt". The word "itareṣām" is in the plural because the duties of the different āśramas are very many. The four āśramas are described in the following words of the Jābāla Upaniṣad:

brahmacaryam samāpya gṛhī bhavet. gṛhī bhūtvā vanī bhavet. vanī bhutvā pravrajat. yadi vetarathā brahmacaryād eva pravrajed gṛhād vā vanād vā. atha punar avratī vā vratī snātako vāsntako votsannāgnir anagniko vā yad ahar eva virajyet tad ahar eva pravrajat.

"When one completes his studies as a brahmacārī, a man should become a gṛhastha. After he has been a gṛhastha he may become a vānaprastha. After he has been a vānaprastha he may become a wandering sannyāsī. Or, leaving brahmacārī life he may at once become a wandering sannyāsī. Or, leaving gṛhastha life he may directly become a sannyāsī. Or, leaving vānaprastha life he may become a sannyāsī. They who have followed vows or not followed vows, become a snātaka or not become a snātaka, carefully kept the sacred fire, or not kept

In the Jābāla Upaniṣad passage beginning with the words "paramahamsānām", the nirapekṣa devotees are specifically described. When the gṛhasthas are singled out it is because the duties of the other āśramas are all contained in the gṛhastha-āśrama. Still, the Upaniṣad clearly says, "On the day one turns with distaste from the world, on that day one should become a wandering sannyāsī." This means that when one sincerely renounces the world one should at once accept sannyāsa. In this way the idea that the gṛhastha-āśrama is the only proper āśrama is refuted. Whether one still has material desires or one has lost all taste for material things determines whether one should accept the gṛhastha-āśrama or the sannyāsa-āśrama. Still, when a person has peacefulness, self-control, tolerance, and other

virtues, he may be within the varṇāśrama-dharma, or he may be above varṇāśrama-dharma, he will certainly attain transcendental knowledge. This has been clearly explained.

Adhikaraṇa 14 The Secret of Transcendental Knowledge

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now it will be said that transcendental knowledge is a great secret. In Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (6.22) it is said:

vedānte paramam guhyam
purā-kalpe pracoditam
nāpraśāntāya dātavyam
nāputrāyāśiṣyāya vā

"This, the supreme secret of Vedic literature, should not be spoken to one who is not peaceful or in control of his senses, nor to one who is not a dutiful son or an obedient disciple."

Saiṅśaya (doubt): Should transcendental knowledge be taught to everyone or should it not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Out of compassion the teacher does not distinguish between who is fit and who is not fit to receive transcendental knowledge. He reveals the truth to all.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 50

anāviṣkurvann anvayāt

anāviṣkurvan—*not manifesting*; anvayāt—*because of tradition*.

He does not reveal, because of the disciplic succession.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here the word "anāviṣkurvan" means, "he does not teach the transcendental knowledge". Why is that? The sūtra explains: "anvayāt" (because of the disciplic succession). This is declared in the previous quote from the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad. The lotus-eyed Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself declares it in these words (Bhagavad-gītā 18.67):

idaṁ te nātapaskāya
nābhaktāya kadācana
na cāśuśrūṣave vācyam
na ca mām yo 'bhyasūyati

"This confidential knowledge may never be explained to those who are not austere, or devoted, or engaged in devotional service, nor to one who is envious of Me."*

When it is given to they who are fit to receive it, transcendental knowledge bears fruit, but when it is given to they who are not fit to receive it, it does not bear fruit. This is explained in Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (6.23):

yasya deve parā bhaktiḥ. . .

"Only unto those great souls who have implicit faith in both the Lord and the spiritual master are all the imports of Vedic knowledge automatically revealed."*

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.7.1-8.15.1) the story of how Indra and Virocana were both taught transcendental knowledge. However, because Virocana was not a fit student, he could not understand it. Therefore transcendental knowledge should be taught to they who are able to understand it. It should not be taught to they who are not able. They who are faithful and accept the scriptures are able to understand.

Attaining Transcendental Knowledge in This Lifetime

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be considered the time when transcendental knowledge is manifested.

Viṣaya (the subject to be discussed): The stories of Naciketa, Jābāla, and Vāmadeva will be discussed here.

Samśaya (doubt): Is transcendental knowledge manifested in this life or the next?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): It is manifested in the very lifetime that one strives to attain it. This is because a person striving for knowledge thinks, "Let me attain it in this lifetime."

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 51

aihikam aprastuta-pratibandhe tad darśanāt

aihikam—in the present life; aprastuta—not manifested; pratibandhe—impediment; tat—that; darśanāt—from seeing.

In the absence of obstacles it is in this life. That is so because of scriptural revelation.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

When there is no obstacle, transcendental knowledge is manifested in this lifetime. When there is an obstacle it is manifested in another lifetime. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "tad darśanāt" (That is so because of scriptural revelation). In Kaṭha Upaniṣad (2.3.18) it is said:

mṛtyu-proktām naciketo 'tha labdhvā
vidyām etām yoga-vidhiṁ ca kṛtsnam

brahma-prāpto virajo 'bhūd vimṛtyur
anyo 'py evaṁ yo vidadhyātmam eva

"Learning from Yamarāja the truth of transcendental knowledge and yoga practice, Naciketa attained the Supreme Personality of Godhead. He became free of the contamination of material life. He became free from death. Anyone else who truly knows the Supreme Personality of Godhead also becomes like Naciketa."

This text shows that transcendental knowledge can be manifested in one lifetime. Sometimes, however, a person strives for transcendental knowledge but attains it only in another lifetime. An example of this is seen in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.10). When the obstacles are not great and the endeavor is very powerful, one can attain transcendental knowledge in one lifetime. Naciketa and the king of Sauvīra are examples of this. But when the obstacles are very powerful, then transcendental knowledge may have to wait for another birth, even though one may have performed great yajñas and austerities, given charity, and developed peacefulness, self-control, and a host of other virtues. This is confirmed in the following words of Bhagavad-gītā (6.37-45):

"Arjuna said: O Kṛṣṇa, what is the destination of the unsuccessful transcendentalist, who in the beginning takes to the process of self-realization with faith but who later desists due to worldly-mindedness and thus does not attain perfection in mysticism?*

"O mighty-armed Kṛṣṇa, does not such a man, who is bewildered from the path of transcendence, fall away from both spiritual and material success and perish like a riven cloud, with no position in any sphere?*

"This is my doubt, O Kṛṣṇa, and I ask You to dispel it completely. But for You, no one is to be found who can destroy this doubt.*

"The Supreme Personality of Godhead said: Son of Pṛthā, a transcendentalist engaged in auspicious activities does not meet with destruction either in this world or in the spiritual world. One who does good, My friend, is never overcome by evil.*

"The unsuccessful yogī, after many, many years of enjoyment on the planets of the pious living entities, is born into a family of righteous people, or into a family of rich aristocracy.*

"Or (if unsuccessful after long practice of yoga) he takes his birth in a family of transcendentalists who are surely great in wisdom. Certainly, such a birth is rare in this world.*

"On taking such a birth, he revives the divine consciousness of his previous life, and he tries to make further progress in order to achieve complete success, O son of Kuru.*

"By virtue of the divine consciousness of his previous life, he automatically becomes attracted to the yogic principles, even without seeing them. Such an inquisitive transcendentalist stands always above the ritualistic principles of the scriptures.*

"And when the yogī engages himself with sincere endeavor in making further

progress, being washed of all contaminations, then ultimately, achieving perfection after many, many births of practice, he attains the supreme goal."*

Therefore it is not an unfailing rule that one always attains transcendental knowledge in one lifetime. A wise man agrees, "I may attain transcendental knowledge in this lifetime or in another lifetime." That is the description in the scriptures. Therefore one may attain transcendental knowledge in this lifetime or in another lifetime. If there are obstacles, that knowledge may have to wait for another lifetime.

Adhikaraṇa 16 Transcendental Knowledge and Liberation

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be shown the truth that liberation inevitably follows the attainment of transcendental knowledge. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.17) it is said:

tam eva vidvān amṛta iha bhavati

"He who understands the Supreme Personality of Godhead becomes immortal."

In the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (3.8) it is said:

tam eva viditvāti mṛtyum eti

"Only he who knows the Supreme Personality of Godhead can transcend the bonds of birth and death."*

Samśaya (doubt): Does a person situated in transcendental knowledge attain liberation when he leaves his material body, or must he take another birth and then become liberated?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the effect must follow the cause, such a person attains liberation the moment he leaves his material body.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives

His conclusion.

Sūtra 52

evam mukti-phalāniyamas tad-avasthāvadhr̥tes tad-avasthāvadhr̥teḥ

evam—thus; mukti—of liberation; phala—the result; a—not; niyamaḥ—rule; tat—of that; avasthā—state of being; avadh̥rteḥ—because of the determination.

In the same way there is no specific rule about liberation, for it depends on the circumstances.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

As there is no rule about transcendental knowledge, so there is no rule that a person situated in transcendental knowledge and striving for liberation must attain liberation in the same lifetime. When there are no longer any obstacles, then a person situated in transcendental knowledge attains liberation when he dies. This means when there are no longer any past karmic reactions. When there are no karmic reactions remaining, then one attains liberation at the moment of death. When there are karmic reactions remaining one does not attain liberation at the moment of death. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "tad-avasthāvadhr̥teḥ" (for it depends on the circumstances). In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.14.2) it is said:

ācāryavān puruṣo veda tasya tāvad eva ciram yāvan na vimokṣye atha sampatsye

"One who approaches a bona fide spiritual master can understand everything about spiritual realization.* When his past karmic reactions are exhausted he at once attains liberation."

In this way the Chāndogya Upaniṣad affirms that one attains liberation when his past karmic reactions are exhausted. In the Nārāyaṇādhyātma it is said:

vidvān amṛtam āpnoti
nātra kāryā vicāraṇā
avasannaṁ yadārabdham
karma tatraiva gacchati
na ced bahūni janmāni
prāpyaivānte na samśayaḥ

"A person situated in transcendental knowledge attains liberation. Of this there is no doubt. But if his past karmic reactions are not destroyed, many births may pass before he finally attains liberation at the end. Of this there is no doubt."

Although transcendental knowledge certainly destroys all past karmic reactions, still, by the Supreme Lord's will a certain portion of past karmic reactions may remain. This will be explained later in this book. The last word of the sūtra is repeated to indicate the end of the chapter.

Epilogue

janayitvā vairāgyam
gunair nibadhnāti modayan bhaktān
yais tair baddho 'pi guṇair
anurajyati so 'stu me hariḥ preyān

May Lord Hari, who gives renunciation of the world to His devotees and delights by binding them with the ropes of His glorious qualities and who is Himself bound with the ropes of His devotees' glorious qualities, be the object of my love and devotion.

Chapter 4

Pada 1

Invocation

dattvā vidyausadham bhaktān
niravadyān karoti yaḥ
dṛk-patham bhajatu śrīmān
prītyātmā sa hariḥ svayam

May Lord Hari, who is glorious, handsome, blissful, and filled with love, and who cures His devotees by giving them the medicine of transcendental knowledge,

enter the pathway of my eyes.

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This chapter will consider the topic of the results obtained by one who has transcendental knowledge. Although some of the sūtras discuss the methods by which transcendental knowledge is obtained, because most discuss the results obtained by transcendental knowledge, this chapter bears the title, "The Results of Transcendental Knowledge".

Adhikaraṇa 1 One Should Always Engage in Devotional Service

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.5.6) it is said:

ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ

"One should gaze on the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

Samśaya (doubt): Must spiritual practices, such as hearing about the Lord's glories, be performed repeatedly, or is it acceptable they not be performed repeatedly (but only once)?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): As an agniṣṭoma-yajña and other yajñas need be performed only once in order to grant residence in Svargaloka, in the same way spiritual practices like hearing about the Lord's glories need be performed only once for the worshiper to directly see the Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 1

āvṛttir asakṛt upadeśāt

āvṛttiḥ—repetition; asakṛt—many times; upadeśāt—because of the teaching.

It is repeated many times, for that is the teaching.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The various activities of devotional service, which begin with hearing the glories of the Lord, should be repeated many times. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "asakṛt" (many times, for that is the teaching). In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.8.7) it is said:

sa ya eṣo 'ṇimā. etad ātmyam idam sarvam. tat satyam. sa ātmā. tat tvam asi.

"He is the resting place. Everything comes from Him. He is the supreme reality. He is the supreme person. You are like unto Him."

In these words Śvetaketu was instructed nine times. It is illogical to say that if the scripture mentions an activity once then there is no need to perform that activity many times. This may apply to an activity where the result is not directly seen, but for an activity that has the direct perception of the Supreme Personality of Godhead as its result, a result that is clearly seen, the activity must be repeated until the result is obtained. This is like threshing rice, where the activity must be continued until the husk is removed. Therefore the devotional activities that begin with hearing the Lord's glories should be performed again and again until the result is obtained.

Sūtra 2

liṅgāc ca

liṅgāt—because of a sign; ca—also.

Also because of a sign.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In Taittirīya Upaniṣad (3.2) Bhṛgu Muni repeated a spiritual activity many times. By this sign (līngāt) the importance of repetition is proved. It is understood that repetition is necessary for the conditioned souls, who have committed offenses.

Adhikaraṇa 2 Meditation on the Supersoul

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now another topic will be considered.

Samśaya (doubt): Should one meditate on the Lord as the supreme controller or as the all-pervading Supersoul?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): In the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (4.7) it is said:

juṣṭam yadā paśyaty anyam īsam

"He sees the Lord as the supreme controller."

Therefore one should meditate on the Lord as the supreme controller.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 3

ātmeti tūpagacchanti grāhayanti ca

ātmā—the Supersoul; iti—thus; tu—indeed; upagacchanti—know;

grāhayanti—teach; ca—also.

Indeed, they know and teach that He is the Supersoul.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (indeed) is used here for emphasis. The Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is both the supreme controller and the all-pervading Supersoul, should be worshiped. They who know the truth understand that the Supersoul is the first cause of all causes. In the Śruti-śāstra it is said:

yeṣāṁ no 'yam ātmāyaṁ lokaḥ

"He is the Supersoul, present in everyone's heart."

They also teach this truth to their disciples. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (1.4.7) it is said:

ātmety evopāsīta

"One should worship the Supersoul."

The word "ātmā" here should be understood to mean, "the all-powerful Supreme Personality of Godhead, whose humanlike form is full of knowledge and bliss". Some claim that the word "ātmā" means, "He who gives Himself to create the living beings and who therefore is the person from whom the living beings are manifested". The word "ātmā" however does not mean that when he is freed from illusion the individual spirit soul becomes the Supreme. That is a false idea, as we have already explained.

Adhikaraṇa 3

The Supreme Lord Is Not the Mind

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The worship of the Lord is described in the following words of Chāndogya Upaniṣad (3.18.1):

mano brahmety upāsīta

"One should worship the Supreme as the mind."

Samśaya (doubt): Should one meditate on the mind as being identical with the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the scriptures affirm that the mind and the Supreme Personality of Godhead are not different, therefore this kind of meditation should be done.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 4

na pratīke na hi saḥ

na—not; pratīke—in the part; na—not; hi—indeed; saḥ—He.

Not in the part. It is not He.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

One should not think that the mind or other things that are only parts are identical with the Supreme Lord Himself. This is because the Supreme Lord is not identical with His parts. Rather, the Supreme Lord is the support and the resting place of the mind. In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (11.2.41) it is said:

khaṁ vāyum agniṁ salilaṁ mahīṁ ca
jyotīṁṣi sattvāni diśo drumādīn
sarit-samudrāṁś ca hareḥ śarīraṁ
yat kiṁ ca bhūtaṁ praṇamed anyayaḥ

"A devotee should not see anything as being separate from the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Kṛṣṇa. Ether, fire, air, water, earth, the sun, and other luminaries, all living beings, the directions, trees and other plants, the rivers and oceans, and whatever a devotee experiences he should consider to be an expansion of Kṛṣṇa. Thus seeing everything that exists within creation as the body of the Supreme Lord, Hari, the devotee should offer his sincere respects to the entire expansion of the Lord's body."***

In this situation the nominative case should be understood to have the force of the locative. That is the conclusion here.

Adhikaraṇa 4 The Impersonal Brahman

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

It has already been shown that one should think of the Supreme Personality of Godhead as the all-pervading Supersoul.

Samśaya (doubt): Should one think of the Supreme Personality of Godhead as the impersonal Brahman, or should one not think of Him as the Brahman?

Viśaya (the subject to be discussed): The descriptions of the impersonal Brahman are not like the descriptions of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The Supreme Personality of Godhead should not be considered identical with the impersonal Brahman, for it has already been confirmed that He is identical with the all-pervading Supersoul.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 5

brahma-dṛṣṭir utkarṣāt

brahma—of Brahman; dṛṣṭiḥ—sight; utkarṣāt—because of being exalted.

He is seen as impersonal Brahman, for He is most exalted.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

As He is considered identical with the all-pervading Supersoul, so the Supreme Personality of Godhead should also be considered identical with the impersonal Brahman. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "utkarṣāt" (for He is most exalted). This means "for He is the abode of limitless transcendental qualities". In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (2.5.19) it is said:

ayam ātmā brahma sarvānubhūtiḥ

"He is the all-knowing Supersoul and He is also the impersonal Brahman."

This is also confirmed by the text that begins "atha kasmād ucyate brahma".

Adhikaraṇa 5 The Creator of the Sun

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Puruṣa-sūkta prayer (Rg Veda 10.90) it is said:

candramā manaso jātas
cakṣuṣaḥ sūryo 'jāyata
śrotrād vāyuś ca prāṇas ca
mukhād agnir ajāyata

"From His mind the moon was born. From His eye the sun was born. From His ear the wind and the life breath were born. From His mouth fire was born."

Here the Supreme Lord's eyes and the other parts of His body are described as the causes of the sun and other parts of the world.

Samśaya (doubt): Should they be thought of caused in this way or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The Lord's eyes and the other parts of His body are said to be soft and delicate like lotus flowers and other soft things. That is why they cannot be the cause of things that are harsh, rough, and very powerful (like the sun).

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 6

ādityādi-matayaś cāṅga upapatteḥ

āditya—the sun; ādi—beginning with; matayaḥ—conception; ca—and; aṅge—in the limb; upapatteḥ—because of being reasonable.

Also, the idea of the sun and other things is in the limb, for that is reasonable.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" (also) is used here to begin the refutation of the opponent's argument. This kind of meditation on Lord Viṣṇu's eyes and the other parts of His body should be performed. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "upapatteḥ" (for that is reasonable). This meditation is proper for it shows the Lord's greatness. It is by the Lord's greatness that His eyes are the creator of the sun and the other parts of His body are the creators of other great things. In this way it the scriptures prove that the parts of the Lord's body are transcendental. They are not like anything in the material world.

Adhikaraṇa 6 Asanas and Meditation

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (2.8) it is said:

trir-unnataṁ sthāpya samam śarīraṁ
hr̥dīndriyāṇi manasā sanniveśya
brahmoḍupena pratareta vidvān
srotāṁsi sarvāṇi bhayāvahāni

"With the neck, head, and back straight, and with all powers of concentration, one should meditate on the Supreme Personality of Godhead staying in the heart as the Supersoul. Traveling in the boat of the Supreme Lord's mercy, the learned devotee crosses the raging fearful waters of the cycle of repeated birth and death."

Samśaya (doubt): When meditating on the Lord is it compulsory that one adopt the āsana (yoga sitting-posture) described here, or is it not compulsory?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Meditation is performed in the mind. Therefore the adoption of a particular posture of the body is not compulsory.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 7

āsīnaḥ sambhavāt

āsīnaḥ—sitting; sambhavāt—because of possibility.

Sitting, for then it is possible.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

One should adopt an āsana (yoga sitting-posture), and then meditate on the Lord. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "sambhavāt" (for then it is possible). When one is reclining, standing up, or walking, the mind is liable to be distracted and then meditation is not possible. In Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (1.3) it is said:

te dhyāna-yogānugatā apaśyan

"Sitting in a yoga posture, and rapt in meditation, the sages gazed at the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

In this way they who desire to meditate on the Lord are described. Therefore one should adopt the āsana posture. Otherwise meditation is not possible.

Sūtra 8

dhyānāc ca

dhyānāt—because of meditation; ca—also.

Also because of meditation.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Meditation is defined as thinking of one thing only and not thinking of anything else. This kind of thinking is not possible when one is reclining or in any posture but the yoga āsana. Therefore one should sit in the yoga āsana.

Sūtra 9

acalatvaṁ cāpekṣya

acalatvaṁ—stillness; ca—and; apekṣya—in relation to.

Also because it is related to stillness.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" (also) is used here for emphasis. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad the word "dhyāna" (meditation) is used as a synonym of "stillness". There it is said (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 7.6.1):

dhyāyatīva pṛthivī

"The earth is still, as if it were rapt in meditation."

This also hints that meditation should be performed when one is sitting in a yoga āsana. Even in the mundane affairs of the world the word "dhyāna" is used in this way, as in the sentence, "dhyāyati kāntam proṣita-ramaṇī" (the girl is still, rapt in meditation on her absent beloved).

Sūtra 10

smaranti ca

smaranti—the Smṛti-śāstra; ca—also.

The Smṛti-śāstra also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In Bhagavad-gītā (7.11-13), the Supreme Personality of Godhead explains:

śucau deśe pratiṣṭhāpya
sthiram āsanam ātmanaḥ
nāty-ucchritam nāti-nīcam
cailājina-kuśottaram

tatraikāgram manah kṛtvā
yata-cittendriya-kriyaḥ
upaviśyāsane yuñjāt
yogam ātma-viśuddhaye

samaṁ kāya-śiro-grīvaṁ
dhārayann acalam sthiraḥ
sampsreṣya nāsikāgram svam
diśaś cānavalokayan

"To practice yoga, one should go to a secluded place and should lay kuśa grass on the ground and then cover it with a deerskin and a soft cloth. The seat should be neither too high nor too low and should be situated in a sacred place. The yogī should then sit on it very firmly and practice yoga to purify the heart by controlling his mind, senses, and activities and fixing the mind on one point. One should hold one's body, head, and neck erect in a straight line and stare steadily at

the tip of the nose."*

In this way the Smṛti-śāstra explains that they who meditate should keep their bodies, senses, and minds still. Without adopting the yoga āsana such stillness is not possible. Therefore a person engaged in meditation should adopt the yoga āsana.

Adhikaraṇa 7 **The True Nature of Meditation**

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now another point will be considered in relation to Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.5.6.

Samśaya (doubt): In worshiping the Lord are there restrictions of direction, place, and time to be observed, or are there no such restrictions?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): In Vedic rituals there are such restrictions. Because worship of the Lord is also described in the Vedas, these restrictions must also apply to worship of the Lord.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 11

yatraikāgratā tatrāviśeṣāt

yatra—where; ekāgratā—single-pointed concentration; tatra—there; aviśeṣāt—because of not being specific.

Where is single-pointed concentration, there because nothing is specific.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This sūtra means, "In whatever direction, place, or time (yatra) there is single-pointed concentration (ekāgratā) of the mind, in that (tatra) direction, place, or time one should worship Lord Hari". The meaning here is that in the worship of the Lord there is no restriction of direction, place, or time. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "aviśeṣāt" (because there is nothing specific). This means, "because the scriptures give no specific instruction in this matter". In the Varāha Purāṇa it is said:

tam eva deśam seveta
tam kalam tam avasthitim
tan eva bhogan seveta
mano yatra prasidati

na hi deśādibhiḥ kaścid
viśeṣaḥ samudīritaḥ
manaḥ-prasādanārtham hi
deśa-kālādi-cintanam

"One should seek a place, time, situation, and sensory environment where the mind becomes peaceful and cheerful. Other than that there is no specific instruction about place or environment. Place, time, situation, and sensory environment should be chosen to facilitate a peaceful and cheerful mind."

Here someone may object: Is it not so that there are actually rules regarding the place of worship? For example, in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (2.10) it is said:

same śucau śarkara-vahni-vāluka-
vivarjite śabda-jalāśrayādibhiḥ
mano-'nukūle na tu cakṣu-pīḍane
guhā-nivātāśrayaṇe niyojayet

"One should practice yoga in a solitary place with level ground free from pebbles and stones, free from winds, clean and pure, pleasing to the mind, not unpleasing to the eyes, secluded, and far from noisy bathing places."

Also, one should meditate in a holy place, for holy places bring liberation.

If this is said, then I reply: Yes. It is true. Still, there may be an unfortunate situation where one is not able to take shelter of a holy place, although of course, if there is no such misfortune, one should stay in a holy place and worship the Lord there. Still, the final conclusion is given here in the words "mano-'nukūle" (one should find a place that is pleasing to the mind).

Adhikaraṇa 8 Devotional Service Continues After Liberation

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Praśna Upaniṣad (5.1) it is said:

sa yo haitad bhagavan manuṣyeṣu prāyaṇāntam omkāram abhidhyāyīta

"O master, what world is attained by a person who up to the end of his life continues to meditate on Om?"

In the Nṛsimha-tāpanī Upaniṣad (2.4) it is said:

yaṁ sarve devā namanti mumukṣavo brahma-vādinaś ca

"All who are demigods, all who are philosophers, and all who yearn to attain liberation worship the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (3.10.5) it is said:

etat sama-gayann āste

"They sit down and chant the Sāma Veda to glorify Him."

In the Ṛg Veda (1.22.20) it is said:

tad viṣṇoḥ paramaṁ padam
sadā paśyanti sūrayaḥ

"The wise and learned devotees always see the supreme abode of Lord Viṣṇu."*

In these verses it is said that devotional service both leads to liberation and also continues after liberation.

Samśaya (doubt): Is devotional service performed only before liberation, or is it not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because liberation is the goal to be attained by performing devotional service, therefore devotional service is performed only as long as one is not liberated.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 12

āprāyaṇāt tatrāpi hi dṛṣṭam

ā—until; prāyaṇāt—liberation; tatra—there; api—even; hi—indeed; dṛṣṭam—seen.

Until liberation. Even there it is seen.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Devotional service should be performed both before and after liberation. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "hi dṛṣṭam". That means, "because it is seen in the Śruti-śāstra. In the Sauparṇa-śruti it is said:

sarvadaṇam upāsīta yāvad vimuktiḥ. muktā api hy enam upāsate

"Before attaining liberation the great souls always worship the Lord. After attaining liberation they continue to worship Him."

In this way it is said that the Lord is worshiped in both circumstances.

Here someone may object: The liberated souls do not worship the Lord. This is so because they have no goal to attain by such worship and because the scriptures do not order such worship.

To this I reply: That is true. Still, even though there is no scriptural order to compel them, the liberated souls nevertheless worship the Lord because they are attracted by His transcendental handsomeness. Also, a person who has jaundice eats sugar candy as medicine, but when he is cured he also continues to eat sugar.

In the same way the liberated souls continue to worship the Lord. In this way it is proved that the great souls worship the Lord both before and after they attain liberation.

Adhikaraṇa 9 Transcendental Knowledge Destroys Past Sins

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The way to attain transcendental knowledge having already been considered, now will be considered the results of that knowledge. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (4.14.3) it is said:

yathā puṣkara-palāśa āpo na śliṣyante evam eva vidi pāpaṁ karma na śliṣyate

"As water does not touch a lotus leaf, so sin does not touch a person situated in transcendental knowledge."

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (5.24.3) it is said:

tad yathaiṣīkā-tūlam agnau protaṁ pradūyetaivaṁ hāsya sarve pāpmānaḥ
pradūyante

"As a blade of iṣīkā grass is at once consumed by a fire, so are consumed the sins of a person situated in transcendental knowledge."

Samśaya (doubt): Must one experience the results of past and present sinful deeds to become free from the karmic results, or are such results destroyed and non-existent for a person situated in transcendental knowledge?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): One cannot become free from karmic reactions in any way other than experiencing their results. This is described in the following words of the Smṛti-śāstra:

nābhuktaṁ kṣīyate karma
kalpa-koṭi-śatair api

avaśyam eva bhoktavyam
kṛtaṁ karma śubhāśubham

"Even after millions of kalpas one does not cannot become free from karmic reactions in any way other than experiencing their results. Therefore one must experience the results of good and evil deeds."

This being so, all scriptural passages declaring otherwise should be understood to be merely empty flattery offered to they who are situated in transcendental knowledge.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 13

tad-adhigama uttara-pūrvāghayor aśleṣa-vinsāśau tad-vyapadeśāt

tad-adhigame—in the knowldege of Him; uttara—after; pūrva—and before; aghayoḥ—of sins; aśleṣa—not touching; vinsāśau—destruction; tat—of that; vyapadeśāt—because of the teaching.

When knowledge of Him is attained, then there is destruction and not touching of past and present sins, for that is the teaching.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tad-adhigamaḥ" here means, "knowledge of the Supreme Personality of Godhead". When such knowledge is present, then a person is no longer touched by sinful reactions to present deeds, and all accumulated past karma is destroyed. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "tad-vyapadeśāt" (for that is the teaching). This teaching has already been shown in the two passages of Chāndogya Upaniṣad quoted in the introduction to this adhikaraṇa. No one has the power to refute the clear meaning of these two passages of Śruti-śāstra. The passage declaring that one does not become free from karmic reactions in any way other than experiencing their results is meant to refer only to persons not situated in transcendental knowledge.

Adhikaraṇa 10

Transcendental Knowledge Destroys Past Pious Karmic Reactions

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.22) it is said:

ubhe u haivaiṣa ete taraty amṛtaḥ sādhv-asādhunī

"He crosses beyond all karmic reactions, both good and evil, and he becomes immortal."

In this way it is said that he crosses beyond the karmic reactions to both sins and pious deeds.

Samśaya (doubt): Do the reactions of past pious deeds meet the same fate as the reactions of past sins, that is, are the past pious deeds destroyed and the present pious deeds unable to touch the person performing them, or is this not so?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): This is not the fate of past and present pious deeds, for such deeds are not performed in disobedience to the teachings of the Vedas. Therefore one does not become free from karmic reactions to such deeds in any way other than by experiencing their results. Therefore it is not right to say that a person situated in transcendental knowledge can attain liberation as long as the obstacle of past good karma is still present.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 14

itarasyāpy evam aśleṣaḥ pāte tu

itarasya—of another; api—also; evam—thus; aśleṣaḥ—not touching; pāte—in destruction; tu—indeed.

Indeed, when it is destroyed the other ceases to touch.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This sūtra means that when transcendental knowledge is present, then the other (itarasya), which here means the past and present karmic reactions of pious deeds, is destroyed and ceases to touch. Thus happens in the same way it happens to past and present sinful reactions. It is not that because they are prescribed by the Vedas, material pious deeds do not obstruct transcendental knowledge. The result brought by material pious deeds is an obstacle impeding the result brought by transcendental knowledge. In truth, material pious deeds are not pure and spiritual. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.4.1) it is said:

sarve pāpmāno 'to nivartante

"All sins are then destroyed."

In this context the word "sins" is used to include material pious deeds also. In Bhagavad-gītā (4.37) the Supreme Personality of Godhead affirms:

yathaidhāmsi samiddho 'gniḥ. . .

"As a blazing fire turns firewood to ashes, O Arjuna, so does the fire of knowledge burn to ashes all reactions to material activities."*

In this verse the destruction of karmic reactions is described. In these general worlds all karmic reactions, past and present, sinful and pious, are included. The author of the sūtras describes this here in the words "pāte tu" (indeed, when it is destroyed). The word "tu" (indeed) is used for emphasis. In this way there is nothing wrong with the statement that liberation is attained when one's karmic reactions are destroyed.

Adhikaraṇa 11

Arabdha-phala and Anarabdha-phala Karmic Reactions

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: If transcendental knowledge causes the destruction of all past pious and sinful karmic reactions, then it would automatically bring with it (the liberation of the soul, and with that) the sudden death of the material body. This clearly does not happen, and therefore what has been said about transcendental knowledge cannot be true.

The author of the sūtras now begins this adhikaraṇa to refute this objection. Past pious and sinful karmic reactions are of two kinds: 1. anārabdha-phala (where the reactions have not yet begun to manifest), and 2. ārabdha-phala (where the reactions have begun to manifest).

Samśaya (doubt): Does transcendental knowledge destroy both kinds of past karmic reactions, or does it destroy only the anārabdha-phala karmic reactions?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): In the passage from Bṛhad-araṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.22) quoted in the beginning of adhikaraṇa 10, it is clearly said that both kinds of karmic reactions are destroyed. In this way it is clear that transcendental knowledge completely destroys both kinds of karmic reactions.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 15

anārabdha-kārye eva tu pūrve tad avadheḥ

anārabdha—not begun; kārye—effect; eva—indeed; tu—but; pūrve—previous; tat—that; avadheḥ—of the duration of time.

But only anārabdha-phala karmic reactions, for that is the time limit.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to dispel doubt. Only the anārabdha-phala past pious and sinful karmic reactions, reactions that have not yet begun to bear fruit, are destroyed by transcendental knowledge. The ārabdha-phala karmic reactions, which have already begun to bear fruit, are not destroyed in that way. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "tad-avadheḥ" (for that is the time limit). In Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.14.2) it is said:

tasya tāvad eva ciraṁ yāvan na vimokṣye

"One cannot attain liberation as long as his past karmic reactions persist."

In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (10.87.40) the personified Vedas pray to the Supreme Personality of Godhead:

tvad-avagamī na vetti bhavad-uttha-śubhāśubhayoḥ
guṇa-vigūṇānvayāms tarhi deha-bhṛtām ca giraḥ

"When a person realizes You, he no longer cares about His good and bad fortune arising from past pious and sinful acts, since it is You alone who control this good and bad fortune. Such a realized devotee also disregards what ordinary living beings say about him."***

In this way the scriptures explain that, by the Supreme Lord's will, the living entity remains in his material body until his ārabdha-phala karmic reactions are destroyed. Transcendental knowledge is very powerful. It can at once burn away all past karmic reactions, leaving behind no remainder. In this it is like a blazing fire that at once burns up any kind of fuel that may be supplied.

Although these statements of scripture should be accepted, still it is seen that many great sages, wise with transcendental knowledge, still remain living within material bodies. In that situation it should be accepted that, by the will of the Lord, these sages stay in this world, their ārabdha-phala karmic reactions not yet exhausted, for the purpose of teaching the truth of spiritual life to the others. As a jewel or other impediment may stop the burning of a fire, so transcendental knowledge's power to burn away all karmic reactions may be stopped in certain circumstances like this.

Here someone may object: Without taking shelter of a series of past karmic reactions, transcendental knowledge does not become manifested. Those karmic reactions may be compared to a potter's wheel. As, once begun to spin, the potter's wheel gradually stops of its own accord, so past karmic reactions gradually come to a stop.

To this objection I reply: No. It is not so. Transcendental knowledge is very powerful. It can at once uproot all karmic reactions. It is only the will of the Supreme Lord that stops transcendental knowledge. When a heavier stone is placed on a spinning potter's wheel, the wheel comes to an abrupt halt. (Transcendental knowledge stops all karmic reactions in a way like that.) Therefore what was said in the beginning about transcendental knowledge is right and true.

Adhikaraṇa 12 Regular Duties and Karmic Reactions

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may say: It has been said that transcendental knowledge destroys all past pious karmic reactions. Therefore transcendental knowledge destroys all kāmīya-karma (reactions to pious deeds performed to attain specific desires) as well as all nitya-karmas (karmic reactions to regular pious duties).

To refute this idea the present adhikaraṇa is begun.

Samśaya (doubt): Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.22) explains that transcendental knowledge destroys all past pious and sinful karmic reactions. Does this mean that, as kāmīya-karma reactions are destroyed by transcendental knowledge, the reactions to nitya-karma activities, such as the performances of agnihotra-yajñas, are also destroyed in the same way, or are they not also destroyed?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): It is the nature of transcendental knowledge to destroy all karmic reactions. Because it cannot abandon its own nature, transcendental knowledge must destroy the reactions of nitya-karmas also.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 16

agnihotrādi tu tat kāryāyaiva tad-darśanāt

agnihotra—agnihotra-yajñas; ādi—beginning with; tu—but; tat—that; kāryāya—for an effect; eva—indeed; tat—that; darśanāt—because of revelation.

But agnihotra-yajñas and other rituals have that as their effect, for that is the revelation.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "tu" (but) is used here to dispel doubt. Performed before transcendental knowledge is manifested, the daily agnihotra-yajña and other nitya-karmas have the manifestation of transcendental as their karmic reaction. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "tad-darśanāt" (for that is the revelation). In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.22) it is said:

tam etaṁ vedānuvacanena

"By studying the Vedas they come to understand the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

This means that transcendental knowledge (is the karmic result of nitya-karmas, such as study of the Vedas). Transcendental knowledge, then, destroys all past pious karmic reactions except for those of nitya-karma duties, such as the performance of daily agnihotra-yajñas. That is the meaning of the sūtra.

Transcendental knowledge does not destroy the karmic reactions of nitya-karma duties for the attainment of transcendental knowledge is itself the karmic reaction these duties produce. When a house is set afire some seeds within it may become heated but not destroyed. Such grains can never be sown, for they will never sprout into plants. In the same way the reactions to nitya-karma activities are not destroyed (although they will not sprout into future material bondage). In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad it is said:

karmaṇā piṭṛlokaḥ

"By performing nitya-karma duties one goes to Piṭṛloka."

This shows that sometimes nitya-karma duties bring the attainment of Svargaloka as their karmic reaction. These reactions all become destroyed.

Adhikaraṇa 13 Some Fine Points of Karmic Reactions

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

It has been shown that by the Lord's will the ārabdha-phala pious and sinful karmic reactions of they who are enlightened with transcendental knowledge remain and are not destroyed. The Lord does this so the enlightened souls may

stay in the material world for some time and teach the spiritual truth to the people in general. Now it will be shown that for some nirapekṣa devotees the Lord at once destroys their ārabdhā-phala karmic reactions. Thus these devotees do not have experience these karmic reactions. In the Kaṣītakī Upaniṣad (1.4) it is said:

tat-sukṛta-duṣkṛte vidhunute tasya priyā jñātayaḥ sukṛtam upayānty apriyā
duṣkṛtam

"His pious and sinful karmic reactions are removed. His pious reactions are given to his friends and kinsmen. His sinful reactions are given to his enemies."

In the Śātyāyani-śāstra it is said:

tasya putrā dāyam upayānti suhṛdaḥ sādhu-kṛtyām dviṣantaḥ pāpa-kṛtyām.

"His children claim their inheritance, and his friends claim the reactions of his pious deeds. His enemies must take the reactions of his sins."

Samśaya (doubt): Are the ārabdhā-phala karmic reactions sometimes destroyed without the person having to experience their results, or is this never so?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Without experiencing them, ārabdhā-phala karmic reactions are never destroyed.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 17

ato 'nyāpi hy ekeṣām ubhayoḥ

ataḥ—then; anyā—another; api—also; hi—indeed; ekeṣām—of some; ubhayoḥ—of both.

Therefore there is another also. Of some there is both.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

For some nirapekṣa devotees who are very ardently devoted to the Lord, their

pious and sinful ārabdha-phala karmic reactions are removed without their having to experience the results. The reason for this is given in the word "anyā" (there is another also). This means, "there is another scriptural quote, a quote revealing that by the Supreme Lord's will ārabdha-phala karmic reactions are sometimes also destroyed". The other scriptural quote is the passage from Kauṣītikī Upaniṣad previously quoted, and the passage from the Śātyāyana-śāstra also.

This is the meaning: In one place the scriptures say that ārabdha-phala karmic reactions are destroyed only when the person experiences them, and in another place the scriptures say that transcendental knowledge can destroy ārabdha-phala karmic reactions. If these two statements are not to be thought of as contradicting each other, they must be considered to apply to different circumstances. These scriptural statements do not apply to kāmya-karma activities, for sūtras 13 and 14 stated that all pious and sinful karmic reactions are destroyed, and because sins are by definition not kāmya-karma activities.

Therefore, for some very dear devotees, who ardently yearn to see the Lord and who are no longer able to bear separation from Him, the Supreme Lord takes away their ārabdha-phala karmic reactions, and distributes them to those persons who are close to those devotees. This will be further described in another adhikaraṇa. Thus the devotee's ārabdha-phala karmic reactions are experience by these people. In this way the rule the Lord has decreed for ārabdha-phala karmic reactions is maintained.

Here someone may object: Karmic reactions are formless, and therefore it is not logical to say that they can be given to others as if they were tangible objects.

If this is said, then I reply: That is not true. Because He is all-powerful, the Supreme Lord can do anything He wishes, even if what He does is different from what you think is logical. Therefore the Supreme Personality of Godhead can remove the ārabdha-phala karmic reactions of some great devotees who ardently yearn to see Him.

In the next sūtra the author refutes the claim that the karmic reactions of one person cannot be given to another.

Sūtra 18

yad eva vidyayeti hi

yad eva vidyayā iti—Chāndogya Upaniṣad 1.1.10; hi—because.

Because of Chāndogya Upaniṣad 1.1.10.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Chāndogya Upaniṣad 1.1.10 shows the power of transcendental knowledge, even when it is only knowledge of the individual spirit soul. The word "hi" in this sūtra means "because". This means that because transcendental knowledge cannot be stopped by any obstacle, and because the Supreme Personality of Godhead in these circumstances gives His own mercy, sometimes the living entity does not have to experience his ārabdha-phala karmic reactions. No one should be surprised at this.

What happens then? The author of the sūtras gives the following explanation.

Sūtra 19

bhogena tv itare kṣapayitvātha sampadyate

bhogena—by enjoyment; tu—indeed; itare—the other; kṣapayitvā—leaving; atha—then; sampadyate—obtains.

Renouncing the two others, he enjoys.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This sūtra means, "leaving behind the gross and subtle material bodies (the two others), and attaining the body of a personal associate of the Lord, the liberated devotee enjoys transcendental bliss". This is described in the following words of Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.1.1):

so 'śnute sarvān kāmān

"Then he enjoys the fulfillment of all his desires."

That is the meaning of the sūtra's word "sampadyate" (he enjoys transcendental bliss).

Invocation

mantrād yasya parā bhūtāḥ
parā bhūtādayo grahāḥ
naśyanti sva-lasat-tṛṣṇaḥ
sa kṛṣṇaḥ śaraṇam mama

May Lord Kṛṣṇa, who is radiant with the thirst to be re-united with His devotees, and whose mantras exorcise the ghosts and demons of repeated birth in the material world of five elements, be my shelter.

Adhikaraṇa 1 The Time of Death

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the next pada will be described the way the soul travels to the world of the demigods. In this pada will be described the way a person enlightened with transcendental knowledge leaves his material body. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.8.6) it is said:

asya saumya-puruṣasya prayato vān-manasi sampadyate manaḥ prāṇe prāṇas tejasi
tejaḥ parasyām devatāyām

"When a good person leaves his material body, the voice enters the mind, the mind enters the life-air, the life-air enters the element fire, and the element fire enters the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

Samśaya (doubt): Does the voice itself enter, or do only the activities of the voice enter?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the nature of the mind is not like the nature of the voice, and because the voice and other parts of the body are subordinate to the mind, therefore it is only the activities of the voice that enter.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 1

vāñ manasi darśanāc chabdāc ca

vāk—voice; manasi—in the mind; darśanāt—because of sight; śabdāt—because of sound; ca—also.

Because of what is seen and heard, voice enters mind.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Voice itself enters the mind. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "darśanāt" (because of what is seen). This means that even when the external voice is silent, it is seen that the voice is still active in the mind. The sūtra also explains, "śabdāt" (because of what is heard). In the scriptures (Chāndogya Upaniṣad) it is heard:

vāñ manasi sampadyate

"The voice enters the mind."

Any other interpretation would do violence to the clear meaning of this quote. No evidence actually supports the idea that only the activity of the voice enters the mind.

Here someone may object: Because mind does not possess the nature of the voice, voice itself cannot have entered the mind. It is only the activities of one thing that can enter another thing dissimilar in nature. An example of this is the activities of fire, which can thus enter water. This is so, for it is clearly seen.

If this is said, then I reply: Voice and mind meet. They do not join together and become one. The meaning is that even though their natures are different, the two of them actually do meet.

Sūtra 2

ata eva sarvāṇy anu

ataḥ eva—therefore; sarvāṇi—all; anu—following.

Therefore they all follow.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: The voice may enter the mind, but the mind does not enter the element fire.

If this objection is raised, the sūtra gives the following reply, "sarvāṇi" (all). This means, "the sense of hearing and all the other senses also enter". The word "anu" here means, "they all enter, following behind the voice". In the Praśna Upaniṣad (3.9) it is said:

tasmād upaśānta-tejāḥ punar-bhavam indriyair manasi sampadyamānair yac cittaś tenaiṣa prāṇa āyāti

"When the fire of life is extinguished, the senses enter the mind, and the soul again takes birth. Accompanied by that mind, the soul is born again."

In the Praśna Upaniṣad (4.2) it is said:

yathā gārgya marīcayo 'staṁ gacchato 'rkasya sarva etasmimś tejo-maṇḍale ekī-bhavati tāḥ punar udayataḥ pracaranty evaṁ ha vai tat sarvaṁ pare deve manasy ekī-bhavati

"O Gārgya, as the rays of sunlight enter the setting sun only again to emerge from the rising sun, in the same way the senses enter their deity, the mind."

Adhikaraṇa 2

The Mind Enters the Breath

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the passage of Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.8.6) quoted in the beginning of

adhikaraṇa 1 will be again considered.

Samśaya (doubt): Does this passage mean to say that the mind enters the life-breath, or that it enters the realm of the moon?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (3.2.13) declares:

manaś candram

"The mind enters the moon."

Therefore the mind enters the moon.

Siddhānta (conclusion): in the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 3

tan manaḥ prāṇa uttarāt

tat—that; manaḥ—mind; prāṇe—in the life-breath; uttarāt—then.

Then the mind enters the life-breath, because of what follows.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The words "tan manaḥ prāṇe" mean, "accompanied by all the senses, the mind enters the life-breath". Why is that? Because of the statement that follows (uttarāt).

Here someone may object: This cannot be, for Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3.2.13 affirms that the mind enters the moon.

The author of the sūtras replies to this objection in sūtra 3.1.4.

Adhikaraṇa 3

The Life-Breath Enters the Individual Soul

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be considered the following words of Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.6.1):

prāṇas tejasi

"The life-breath enters fire."

Samśaya (doubt): Does the life-breath, which is by then accompanied by the mind and the senses, enter the element fire, or does it enter the individual spirit soul (jīva)?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.6.1) says that the life breath enters the element fire, therefore the life-breath enters the element fire.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 4

so 'dhyakṣe tad-upagamādibhyaḥ

saḥ—it; adhyakṣe—to the master; tat—that; upagama—approaching; ādibhyaḥ—beginning with.

That in the master because of the scriptural statements that begin with the descriptions of approaching it.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "saḥ" (that) here means "the life-breath", and the word adhyakṣe" (in the master) here means, "in the individual spirit soul, who is the master of the body and senses". Thus the life breath enters the individual spirit soul. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "tad-upagamādibhyaḥ" (because of the scriptural statements that begin with the descriptions of approaching it). In the Bṛhad-

āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.3.38) it is said:

tad yathā rājānam prayiyāsantam ugrāḥ praty enasaḥ sūtā grāmaṇya upasamīyanti
evam haivaṁ vidadṁ sarve prāṇā upasamīyanti. yatra itad ūrdhvocchvāsī bhavati.

"As bodyguards, warriors, charioteers, and generals gather around a king who is about to depart on a great march, so do all the senses and life-breaths gather around the soul who is about to leave its material body."

In this way the Śruti-śāstra explains that the life-breath and the senses enter the individual spirit soul. This statement does not contradict the other statement of the Śruti-śāstra that the life-breath enters the element fire, for it may be said that after the life-breath enters the soul the two of them proceed to enter the element fire. This is like saying that the Yamunā, joining with the Ganges, proceeds to enter the ocean.

Adhikaraṇa 4

The Individual Spirit Soul Enters the Combined Elements

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be considered the statement that the individual spirit soul enters the element fire.

Samśaya (doubt): Do the individual spirit soul and the life-breath enter the element fire, or do they enter all the elements combined?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The Śruti-śāstra says that the life-breath enters the element fire, therefore the life-breath enters the element fire.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 5

bhūteṣu tac chruteḥ

bhūteṣu—in all the elements; tat—that; śruteḥ—because of the Śruti-śāstra.

In all the elements, because of the Śruti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The individual spirit soul enters all the five elements. It does not enter the fire element only. Why is that? In Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.5) it is said:

jīvasyākāśamayo vāyumayas tejomaya āpomayaḥ pṛthivīmayāḥ

"The individual spirit soul enters the elements ether, air, fire, water, and earth."

In this way the Śruti-śāstra affirms that the individual spirit soul enters all the material elements. A further explanation is given in the next sūtra.

Sūtra 6

naikasmin darśayato hi

na—not; ekasmin—in one; darśayataḥ—they both reveal; hi—because.

Because they both say it is not in one.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

It should not be considered that the individual spirit soul enters into one element, into fire. The word "hi" here means "because". This means, "because this was described in the questions and answers in Chāndogya Upaniṣad Chapter 5, Parts 3-10.

Adhikaraṇa 5

The Departure of the Enlightened Soul

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be considered a doubt that may arise concerning Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.8.6.

Samśaya (doubt): Does this passage describe the departure from the material body of the soul enlightened with transcendental knowledge, or the soul that is not enlightened?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): In Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.7) it is said:

yadā sarve pramucyante
kāmā ye 'sya hr̥di sthitāḥ
atha martyo 'mṛto bhavaty
atra brahma samaśnute

"When his heart is free of all material desires, the mortal becomes immortal. Then he enjoys spiritual life, even in this world."

There word "atra" (here in this world) means that the enlightened soul need not leave the material world. Even in this world he enjoys the bliss of spiritual life.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 7

samānā cāsṛty-upakramād amṛtatvaṁ cānuṣya

samānā—equal; ca—also; āsṛti-upakramāt—at the beginning; amṛtatvam—immortality; ca—and; anuṣya—not burning.

Indeed, in the beginning they are the same. Also, immortality is without burning.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The first "ca" means "indeed". In the beginning, the enlightened soul and the unenlightened soul depart from the material body in the same way. However, when they reach the nāḍīs (subtle pathways emanating from the heart), their paths diverge. The enlightened soul passes through one of the hundred nāḍīs, but the unenlightened soul passes through a different nāḍī. This is described in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.6.6):

śataṁ caikā ca hṛdayasya nāḍyas tāsāṁ mūrdhānam abhiniḥṣṭaikā. tayordhvaṁ āyann amṛtatvam eti viśvag anyā utkramaṇe bhavanti.

"101 nāḍīs lead away from the heart. One passes through the head and leads to immortality. The others lead to a variety of destinations."

This is also described in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.2). The soul endowed with transcendental knowledge departs from the material body through the passage passing through the top of the head. The unenlightened souls depart through the other passages. The scriptural statement (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.7) explaining that the enlightened soul enjoys spiritual life even in this world means that such a soul no longer produces any karmic reactions even though his connection with the material body is not yet burned away.

Sūtra 8

tad āpīteḥ saṁsāra-vyapadeśāt

tat—that; āpīteḥ—until; saṁsāra—of the world of birth and death; vyapadeśāt—because of the teaching.

That is so, for it is taught that until then there is the world of birth and death.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

This describes the immortality of an enlightened soul who is free from sin even though his connection to a material body is not yet burned away. How is that? The sūtra explains, "āpīteḥ" (until then). Until he attains the direct association of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the individual spirit soul still has a relationship with a material body, and thus he remains in the world of repeated birth and

death. The direction association of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is attained when the soul travels to the world of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. That is the conclusion of the Vedas.

Sūtra 9

sūkṣma-pramāṇataḥ ca tathopalabdheḥ

sūkṣma—subtle; pramāṇataḥ—from the source of knowledge; ca—also; tathā—so; upalabdheḥ—because of being seen.

The subtle, because of authority and direct perception.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this contact the relationship of the enlightened soul with the material body is not yet burned away. This is because the subtle (sūkṣma) material body still persists. How is that known? The sūtra explains, "pramāṇataḥ" (because of authority). Even when he travels to the worlds of the demigods, the enlightened soul retains relationship with a subtle material body, as is seen in the words of the moon-god in Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad (1.3). Therefore in the previous passage of Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.7) the "immortality" described is one where the relationship between the soul and the material body is not yet burned away.

Sūtra 10

nopamardenātaḥ

na—not; upamardena—by destruction; ataḥ—therefore.

Therefore it is not by destruction.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.7 does not describe the kind of immortality where the relationship of the individual spirit soul and the material body is

destroyed.

Sūtra 11

tasyaiva copapatter ūṣmā

tasya—of that; eva—indeed; ca—also; upapatteḥ—because of being possible; ūṣmā—heat.

It has warmth, for that is reasonable.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The warmth that touches the gross material body while it is alive is manifested from the subtle material body, not the gross body. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "upapatteḥ" (for that is reasonable). When it is alive the gross body is warm, and when it is dead, the gross body is not warm. From this it can be seen that the warmth in the gross body comes from the subtle body.

The word "ca" (also) here shows another reason also. When he leaves the gross body, the enlightened soul also takes the heat-producing subtle body with him.

Next, fearing that another doubt will be raised, the author of the sūtras speaks the following words:

Sūtra 12

pratiṣedhād iti cen na śārīrāt

pratiṣedhāt—because of denial; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; śārīrāt—from the resident of the body.

If someone says that it is denied, then I reply: No. It is not so. Because of the resident of the body.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: The enlightened soul does not leave the gross

material body. This is corroborated by the following words of Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.6):

athākāmayamāno yo 'kāmo niṣkāma āpta-kāmo na tasya prāṇā utkramanti
brahmaiva san brahmātyeti

"One who does not desire, who has no material desires, and whose desires are all fulfilled, his life-breaths do not leave. He is spirit. He goes to the spirit."

In this way the scriptures deny (pratiṣedhāt) that the enlightened soul leaves his material body.

If (cet) this objection is raised, then the author of the sūtras replies, "No" (na). This means that the text of the Upaniṣad does not specifically say that the life-breath leaves the body. The meaning of this text is that the life-breath does not leave the individual spirit soul. After all, it is clearly seen that even enlightened souls leave their material bodies.

Sūtra 13

spaṣṭo hy ekeṣām

spaṣṭaḥ—clear; hi—because; ekeṣām—of some.

Because it is clear in some.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this passage of Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.4.6) there is no room for controversy. This is so because (hi) in some (ekeṣām) recensions of the Vedas, namely the Madhyandina recension, is seen a clear (spaṣṭaḥ) denial of the idea that the life-breath does not leave the material body. This same passage in the Madhyandina recension reads:

na tasmāt prāṇā utkramanti. atravaiva samavaliyante brahmaiva san brahmātyeti.

"The life-breaths do not leave him (the soul). They enter there. He is spirit. He goes to the spirit."

The word "atra" (there) clearly shows that the life-breaths enter the spirit soul.

To this the objector may reply: In the Kāṇva recension, in Yājñavalkya's answer to Artabhāga's question, it is clearly seen that the life-breaths of the soul enlightened with transcendental knowledge do not leave the material body.

To this objection I reply: This passage describes a special case, where the enlightened soul is very distressed in separation from the Supreme Lord.

The impersonalists claim that this passage describes a person who thinks he is one with the impersonal Brahman. They say that for him the life-breaths do not leave the material body.

To this I reply: This is fool's idea. No words in the text support this interpretation. At any rate, the impersonalist idea has already been clearly refuted.

Sūtra 14

smaryate ca

smaryate—in the Smṛti-śāstras; ca—also.

In the Smṛti-śāstras also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Yājñavalkya-smṛti (3.167) it is said:

ūrdhvam ekaḥ sthitas teṣāṁ
yo bhittvā sūrya-maṇḍalam
brahmalokam atikramya
tena yāti parāṁ gatim

"Among all of them, one great soul travels upward. He breaks through the circle of the sun. He passes beyond the planet of Brahmā. He enters the supreme destination."

In the Śruti-śāstra also it is said that the enlightened soul passes through the nāḍī at the top of the head and thus leaves the material body. In this way it is

proved that the enlightened soul certainly does leave his material body.

Adhikaraṇa 6 **The Senses Enter the Supreme**

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

That the individual spirit soul, accompanied by the life-breath and the senses, enters the element fire and the other subtle elements at the time of death has already been proved, and the fallacious idea that the soul enlightened with transcendental knowledge does not also depart from his body in this same way has been dispelled. Now the following will be considered.

Samśaya (doubt): Do the enlightened soul's voice and other working senses, life-breath, and elements of the gross and subtle material bodies enter into the material features that are their direct causes, or do they enter into the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): They enter into their direct causes. This is described in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3.2.13.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 15

tāni pare tathā hy āha

tāni—they; pare—in the Supreme; tathā—so; hi—because; āha—says.

They in the Supreme, for thus it says.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.8.6) it is said:

tejaḥ parasyām

"Fire enters the Supreme."

In this way it is established that the "tejaḥ", which here includes the voice and other senses, the life-breath, and the bodily elements, enters the Supreme Personality of Godhead. This is so because the Supreme is the cause and the resting-place of all. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "tathā hy āha", which means "because the Śruti-śāstra affirms that it is so". This is confirmed in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.8.6):

tejaḥ parasyām devatāyām

"Fire enters the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3.2.3 should be interpreted metaphorically. This has already been explained (in sūtra 3.1.4).

Adhikaraṇa 7

The Nature of the Senses' Entrance in the Supreme

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now another consideration will be examined.

Samśaya (doubt): When the enlightened soul's life-breath, voice, mind, and other senses enter the Supreme Personality of Godhead do they merely enter or do they become one with Supreme Personality of Godhead, as is explained in Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 3.2.8)?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because of the previous statements and because there is no specific statement otherwise, it should be held that they merely enter.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 16

avibhāgo vacanāt

avibhāgaḥ—not divided; vacanāt—because of the statement.

There is no division, for that is said.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The life-breath and other features of the material body merge into and become one with the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the master of inconceivable potencies. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "vacanāt" (for that is said). In the Praśna Upaniṣad (6.5) it is said:

evam evāśya paridraṣṭur imāḥ ṣoḍaśa-kalāḥ puruṣāyaṇāḥ puruṣam prāpyās tam gacchanti

"As rivers merge into the ocean, so do the sixteen elements of the material body merge into the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

After thus explaining that the life-breath and the other elements of the material body merge into the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the Upaniṣad continues:

bhidyete cāsām nāma-rūpe puruṣa ity evam procyate sa eṣo 'mṛto bhavati

"The elements of the body then lose their names and forms. They are said to become one with the Supreme. When this happens to the elements of his material body, the individual spirit soul becomes immortal."

Thus the elements of the material body lose their names and forms. This is the meaning: When he leaves the gross material body, the soul enlightened with transcendental knowledge is followed by the now greatly weakened subtle material body. When the soul finally leaves the egg of the material universe behind, the subtle body merges into the eighth covering of the universal shell. Now completely pure and free from any touch of matter, the soul attains a spiritual body and then gains the association of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Adhikaraṇa 8 The Hundred-and-first Nāḍī

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will begin a discussion to show one specific aspect of the enlightened soul's departure from the material body. In Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.6.6) as well as in Kaṭha Upaniṣad (7.6) it is said that the unenlightened souls depart from the material body by the path of the hundred nāḍīs and the enlightened soul departs by another nāḍī.

Samśaya (doubt): Is this description correct or is it not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the nāḍīs are both very numerous and very fine it is not possible for the spirit soul to distinguish them one from another. Therefore this description is not correct. The scriptures explain:

tayordhvam āyann amṛtatvam eti

"Going upwards, he attains immortality."

Therefore (going upwards is the important factor) and it is not important which nāḍī the soul enters at the moment of leaving the material body.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 17

tad-oko-'gra-jvalanam tat-prakāśita-dvāro vidyā-sāmarthyāt tac-cheṣa-gaty-anusmṛti-yogāc ca hārdānuḡhītaḥ śatādhikayā

tat—of him; okaḥ—the home; agra—the point; jvalanam—illumination; tat—by Him; prakāśita—revealed; dvāraḥ—the door; vidyā—of transcendental knowledge; sāmarthyāt—by the power; tat—that; śeṣa—remainder; gati—path; anusmṛti—memory; yogāt—by the touch; ca—and; hārda—He who resides in the

heart; anugr̥hītaḥ—being the object of mercy; śatādhikayā—by the hundred-and-first.

Then the top of his home is illumined and the door is revealed by Him. By the power of transcendental knowledge, by the memory of the path it brings, he attains the mercy of He who resides in the heart. By the hundred-and-first.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The enlightened soul departs by the path of the hundred-and-first nāḍī, which is called Suṣumnā. It is not that the enlightened soul cannot discern where is this nāḍī. Because of the two causes that begin with the power of transcendental knowledge, the soul attains the mercy of He who resides in the heart. This is possible by the power of transcendental knowledge. The effect of transcendental knowledge is that it enables the soul to remember the correct path to take in departing from the body. This soul also obtains the mercy of Lord Hari, who resides in a palace in the heart (hārda). That is the meaning here.

When, accompanied by the voice and the other senses and elements of the material body, the enlightened soul is about to depart, the top portion (agra) of the heart, which is his home (okaḥ), becomes illuminated (jvalanam). The door (dvāraḥ) there is not illuminated by the individual spirit soul. It is Lord Hari, who resides in the heart (hārda) who illuminates and reveals (prakāśita) that door. In this way the soul becomes aware of the entrance to the hundred-and-first nāḍī. In this way the enlightened soul departs.

Adhikaraṇa 9

The Path of the Sun's Rays

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.6.5) it is said:

atha yatraismāt śarīrād utkramaty etair eva raśmibhir ūrdhvam ākramate. sa om iti vā hodvā mīyate sa yāvat kṣipyen manas tāvad ādityam gacchaty etad vai khalu loka-dvāram viduṣām prapadanam nirodho 'viduṣām tad eṣa ślokaḥ. śatam caika ca. . .

"After he departs from the body, the soul travels on the sun's rays. Casting off the material mind, and meditating on the sacred syllable Om, the soul travels to the sun, which is the doorway to the worlds. They who are enlightened with transcendental knowledge may enter that doorway, but they who are not enlightened are stopped from entering. The following verse describes this: There are a hundred and one nāḍīs. . . ."

This means that after he passes through the nāḍī on the top of the head, the enlightened soul travels on the path of the sun's rays.

Samśaya (doubt): Must the soul depart from the body during the daytime, or may he also depart during the night (and still attain liberation)?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because during the night the rays of the sun do not shine, the enlightened soul must depart from the material body only during the daytime.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 18

raśmy-anusārī

raśmi—rays; anusārī—following.

He follows the rays.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Whenever he dies, the enlightened soul is able to follow the rays of the sun. This is so because the Śruti-śāstra gives no specific instruction in this regard.

Sūtra 19

niśi neti cen na sambandhasya yāvad deha-bhāvitvād darśayati ca

niśi—during the night; na—not; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; sambandhasya—of the relationship; yāvat—as long as; deha-bhāvitvāt—because of the existence of the body; darśayati—reveals; ca—also.

If someone says that it is not during the night, then I reply: No. Because the relationship exists as long as the body is present. It also reveals it.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may object: is it not so that because at night the rays of the sun are not present, the soul departing from his body cannot follow them at that time?

If (cet) this is said, then the sūtra replies, "No" (na). Why is that? The sūtra explains, "sambandhasya" (because of the relationship). This means that as long as the material body is present there is a relationship with the sun's rays. Therefore the soul may depart at any time of the day or night and still travel by the path of the sun's rays.

It is clearly seen that the body remains warm in both the hottest of days and the coldest of nights. If the body had not relationship with the sun this would not be possible.

The scriptures also give further proof of the body's unchanging relationship with the sun. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.6.2) it is said:

amuṣmād ādityāt prayānte tathāsu nāḍiṣu sṛptā ābhyo nāḍibhyaḥ prayānte te
amusminn āditye sṛptāḥ

"The path of the sun's rays begins at the sun and ends at the nāḍiṣ. It also begins at the nāḍiṣ and ends at the sun."

In another place in the Śruti-śāstra it is also said:

samsṛṣṭā vā ete raśmayaś ca nāḍyaś ca naisām vibhāgo yāvad idam śarīram ataḥ
etaiḥ paśyaty etair utkramate etaiḥ pravartate

"The sun's rays are connected to the nāḍiṣ, and that connection is never broken as long as the material body is alive. By the sun's rays the soul sees. By them he departs. By them he performs actions."

In this way it is proved that the soul enlightened with transcendental knowledge is always able to travel by the path of the sun's rays.

Adhikaraṇa 10 The Soul's Departure During the Different Seasons

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the following will be considered.

Samśaya (doubt): If he dies during the six months when the sun travels in the south, does the enlightened soul still attain the benefit of his knowledge, or does he not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Both Śruti-śāstra and Smṛti-sāstra affirm that in order to attain the spiritual world one must die during the six months when the sun travels in the north. Also, it is seen that Bhīṣmadeva and other great souls refused to die until that auspicious time had arrived.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 20

ataś cāyane 'pi dakṣiṇe

ataḥ—therefore; ca—also; āyane—in ther passing; api—also; dakṣiṇe—in the south.

Therefore it is also during the passing in the south.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because transcendental knowledge does not bring only a partial result, and also because it removes all obstacles in its path, the enlightened soul attains the fruit of his knowledge even if he dies during the six months when the sun passes in the south. The argument of our opponent is very foolish and slow-witted. As will be explained in the future, the word “uttarāyaṇa” here does not mean “the six months when the sun passes in the south”, but rather it means “the ātivāhika-devatās, or the demigods that carry the soul to the higher worlds”.

Blessed by his father, Bhīṣmadeva had the power to choose the time of his

death. It is either to demonstrate that power, or to show the example of a saintly person that he acted in that way. Therefore there is no disadvantage in dying during the six months when the sun passes in the south.

Here someone may object: The Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself affirms in Bhagavad-gītā (8.23-26):

yatra kāle tv anāvṛttim
āvṛttim caiva yoginaḥ
prayātā yānti taṁ kālam
vakṣyāmi bhāratarṣabha. . .

. . . śukla-kṛṣṇe gatī hy ete
jagataḥ śāśvate mate
ekayā yāty anāvṛttim
anyayāvartate punaḥ

"O best of the Bhāratas, I shall now explain to you the different times at which, passing away from this world, the yogī does or does not come back.*

"Those who know the Supreme Brahman attain the Supreme by passing away from the world during the influence of the fiery god, in the light, at an auspicious moment of the day, during the fortnight of the waxing moon, or during the six months when the sun travels in the north.*

"The mystic who passes away from this world during the smoke, the night, the fortnight of the waning moon, or the six months when the sun passes to the south reaches the moon planet but again comes back.*

"According to Vedic opinion, there are two ways of passing from this world, one in light and one in darkness. When one passes in light, he does not come back. But when one passes in darkness, he returns."*

In this passage word "day" and other words denoting time are prominent, and therefore it is clearly shown that time is an important factor for the attainment of liberation. It is also shown that one who dies during the night or during the six months when the sun passes in the south does not attain liberation.

The author of the sūtras speaks the following words to refute this objection.

Sūtra 21

yoginaḥ prati smaryate smārte caite

yoginaḥ—the yogīs; prati—to; smaryate—is remembered; smārte—the two that are remembered; ca—and; ete—they.

It is remembered of the yogīs. Also, two are remembered.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The yogīs, that is they who are devoted to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, do not take these descriptions of the passing of the moon, the light, and other points in time very seriously. They merely make a mental note of them (smaryate). The sūtra explains, "ete smārte" (they are remembered). The Supreme Lord explains in Bhagavad-gītā (8.27):

naite sṛtī pārtha jānan
yogī muhyate kaścana

"Although the devotees know these two paths, O Arjuna, they are never bewildered."*

The conclusion is that a person situated in transcendental knowledge need not be concerned about the specific time of his death. The mention of specific times is not prominent in this passage from Bhagavad-gītā (8.23-26). The passage begins with the mention of fire, which has nothing to do with time. In fact, the different factors mentioned in this passage are all ātivāhika-devatās (demigods that carry the soul from the body). The author of the sūtras will explain this in sūtra 4.3.2. It is also said:

divā ca śukla-pakṣaś ca
uttarāyaṇam eva ca
mumūrṣatām prasastāni
viparītaṁ tu garhitam

"The best times for they who are about to die are the daytime, the bright fortnight, and the six months when the sun travels in the north. The other times are not good."

This verse describes the condition of the souls not enlightened with transcendental knowledge. They who are enlightened with transcendental knowledge always attain Lord Hari. The time when they leave their material bodies is not relevant.

Pada 3

Invocation

yaḥ sva-prāpti-patham devaḥ
sevanābhāsato 'diśat
prāpyam ca sva-padam preyān
mamāsau śyāmasundaraḥ

I love handsome and dark Lord Kṛṣṇa, who shows, even to they who have only the dim reflection of devotional service, the path that leads to Him.

Adhikaraṇa 1
Many Paths or One?

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this pada will be described the nature of the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the path that leads to the realm of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (4.15.5-6) it is said:

atha yad u caivāsmiṇ śavyam kurvanti yadi ca nārçiṣam evābhisambhavaty arciṣo
'har aha āpūryamānam āpūryamāna-pakṣād yan sad-udaḍḍeti māsān tān
samebhyaḥ samvatsaram samvatsarād ādtityam ādityāc candramasaṁ candramaso
vidyutaṁ tat puruṣo 'mānavaḥ. sa etān brahma gamayaty eṣa deva-patho brahma-
patha etena pratipadyamāna imam mānavam āvartaṁ nāvartante.

"Whether his final rites are performed or not, the yogī goes to the light. From the light he goes to the day. From the day he goes to bright fortnight. From the bright fortnight he goes to the six months when the sun travels in the north. From the six months when the sun travels in the north he goes to year. From the year he goes to the sun. From the sun he goes to the moon. From the moon he goes to lightning. From there a divine person leads him to Brahman. This is the path to the Lord, the path to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. They who travel this path do not return to the world of human beings."

In this passage light is the first stage on this path. However, in the Kauṣītakī

Upaniṣad (1.3) it is said:

sa etaṁ deva-yānaṁ panthānam āpadyāgnilokam āgacchati sa vāyulokaṁ sa varuṇalokaṁ sa indralokaṁ sa prajāpatilokaṁ sa brahmalokaṁ

"He travels on the path of the heavenly planets. He goes to Agniloka. He goes to Vāyuloka. He goes to Varuṇaloka. He goes to Indraloka. He goes to Prajāpatiloka. He goes to Brahmaloaka."

Here Agniloka is the first stage. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (5.10) it is said:

yadā ha vai puruṣo 'smāt lokāt praiti sa vāyum āgacchati tasmai sa tatra vijihīte yathā ratha-cakrasya khaṁ tena ūrdhva ākramate sa ādityam āgacchati

"Leaving this world, the soul goes to Vāyuloka. There he passes through the opening of a chariot-wheel. Then the soul ascends to the sun."

Here Vāyuloka is the first stage on the path. In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (2.11) it is said:

sūrya-dvāreṇa virajāḥ prayānti

"Passing through the doorway of the sun, the soul is cleansed of all impurities."

Here the sun is the first stage on the path. In other scriptures other accounts are also seen.

Samśaya (doubt): Is only one path to the world of the Supreme described here, or are many different paths, beginning with the path that begins with light, described here in these passages of the Upaniṣads?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because these paths are all different there must be many different paths.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 1

arcir-ādinā tat prathiteḥ

arcīḥ—light; ādinā—beginning with; tat—that; prathiteḥ—because of being well known.

It begins with light, for that is well known.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The enlightened souls travels to the world of the Supreme Personality of Godhead on a path that begins with light. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "tat prathiteḥ" (for that is well known). In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (5.10.1) it is said:

tad ya ittham vidur ye ceme 'raṇye śraddhām tapa ity upāsate te arcīṣam

"This they know: They who perform austerities and worship the Lord with faith travel on the path that begins with light."

This passage is taken from the chapter describing the knowledge of the five fires (pañcāgni-vidyā). Therefore the path that begins with light is traveled even by they who study the fire and other vidyās. In the Brahma-tarka it is said:

dvāv eva mārgau prathitāv
arcir-ādir vipāścītām
dhūmādiḥ karminām caiva
sarva-veda-vinirṇayāt

"Two paths are famous. The path beginning with light is traveled by they who are enlightened with transcendental knowledge, and the path beginning with smoke is traveled by they who perform Vedic rituals. That is the conclusion of all the Vedas."

This being so, it is understood that the scriptures describe a single path for the enlightened souls, and therefore the differences in the descriptions should be reconciled in the same way they were in the case of the attributes of the Lord. This is so because the knowledge to be described here is one, even though the scriptural texts seem to give different explanations. The conclusion, then, is that the path begins with light. Any other interpretation breaks the real meaning of the Vedic texts.

Adhikaraṇa 2 Vāyuloka

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now is begun a new discussion to show that Vāyuloka and other places should be added to the sequence that begins with light. In the previously quoted passage from Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad (1.3) it was said:

sa etaṁ deva-yānam panthānam āpadyāgnilokam āgacchati sa vāyulokam

"He travels on the path of the heavenly planets. First he goes to Agniloka and then to Vāyuloka."

Samśaya (doubt): Should Vāyuloka be added to the path that begins with light, or should it not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): It should not, for the Śruti-sāstra describes these stages in a specific sequence, and because that sequence cannot be changed by someone's whim.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 2

vāyum abdād aviśeṣa-viśeṣābhyām

vāyum—Vāyu; abdāt—from the year; aviśeṣa—because of not being specific; viśeṣābhyām—and because of being specific.

Vāyu comes after the year, for it both specific and not specific.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the path beginning with light, the stage of Vāyuloka should be placed after the year and before the sun. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "aviśeṣāt" (for it is not specific). This means that in the passage from Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad (1.3) it was not specifically stated where Vāyuloka comes in the sequence. However, in the passage from Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (5.10) there is a specific statement that Vāyuloka comes before the sun in this sequence. Also, in Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (6.2.15) it is said that after the months, and after Devaloka, the soul comes to the sun. The Devaloka here should be understood to be Vāyuloka. In the scriptures it is said:

yo 'yaṁ pavana eṣa eva devānāṁ gṛhaḥ

"Vāyuloka is the home of the devas."

Therefore, because it is the home of the devas, Vāyuloka is also called Devaloka. Some say that there is a specific planet, Devaloka, which is part of this sequence. (If this interpretation is accepted, then Devaloka) should be placed after the year and before Vāyuloka. It should not be placed between the months and the year, for that stage in the sequence is well known. Therefore Devaloka and Vāyuloka should both be placed between the year and the sun.

Adhikaraṇa 3 Varuṇaloka

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad (1.3) it is said:

sa varuṇalokaṁ sa indralokaṁ sa prajāpatilokaṁ

"He goes to Varuṇaloka. He goes to Indraloka. He goes to Prajāpatiloka."

Saṁśaya (doubt): Is Varuṇaloka one of the stages in the path beginning with light?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because there is no place for it in this path, as there was a place for Vāyuloka, Varuṇaloka is not a stage in this path.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 3

taḍīto 'dhi varuṇaḥ sambandhāt

taḍītaḥ—lightning; adhi—above; varuṇaḥ—Varuṇa; sambandhāt—because of the relationship.

Varuṇaloka comes after lightning, for that is their relationship.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (4.15.5) it is said:

candramaso vidyutam

"He leaves the moon and goes to lightning."

It is seen that the soul travels from lightning to Varuṇaloka. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "sambandhāt", which means "for that is the relationship between lightning and Varuṇaloka". First lightning is manifested, and then comes rain. In the Śruti-sāstra it is said:

yathā hi viśālā vidyutas tīvra-stanita-nirghoṣā jīmūtodare nṛtyanty athāpaḥ
prapatanti vidyotate stanayati varṣayati vai

"When brilliant lightning and heavy thunder play among the clouds, water will fall. Lightning, thunder, and rain follow in that sequence."

Because the rain has a close connection with Varuṇa, there is also a close relation between Varuṇaloka and the realm of lightning. After Varuṇaloka come Indraloka and Prajāpatiloka. Varuṇaloka should be placed there because there is not other place for it and because it is reasonable to place it there. In this way the path to the spiritual world, a path that begins with the realm of light and proceeds to Prajāpatiloka, has either twelve or thirteen stages.

Adhikaraṇa 4 The Ativāhika-devatā Demigods

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now a certain aspect of the path that begins with light will be considered.

Samśaya (doubt): Are the light and other things landmarks on the path, or are they persons carrying the enlightened soul?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): They are landmarks, for the text describes them in that way. They are like landmarks people may indicate, just as one may say, "Go to the river. Then there will be a hill, and after that will be a village." Or they may be persons, for the words could be interpreted in that way.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 4

ātivāhikās tal-liṅgāt

ātivāhikāḥ—Ativahika demigods; tat—of that; liṅgāt—because of the symptoms.

They are ātivāhika demigods, because of their characteristics.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The things beginning with light are demigods appointed by the Supreme Personality of Godhead to carry the soul. They are neither landmarks nor ordinary persons. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "tal-liṅgāt" (because of their characteristics). This means that they have the characteristics of they who carry others. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad it is said:

tat-puruṣo 'mānavaḥ sa etān brahma gamayati

"He is a divine person. He brings them to the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

The divine person described here brings the soul to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The light and other things are his assistants. That is the meaning.

That they are neither landmarks nor ordinary persons is corroborated in the following sūtra.

Sūtra 5

ubhaya-vyāmohāt tat siddheḥ

ubhaya—both; vyāmohāt—because of bewilderment; tat—that; siddheḥ—because of proof.

It is proved because the other two are untenable.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because they who die during the night do not have contact with the daytime and thus cannot have contact with the light and other things on the path, these things cannot be landmarks. Because ordinary persons are not very powerful and therefore cannot carry the soul in this way, they cannot be ordinary persons either. In this way the Śruti-śāstra shows that they can be neither landmarks nor ordinary persons. Therefore they must be ātivāhika demigods. That is the meaning.

Adhikaraṇa 5
The Divine Person

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Samśaya (doubt): Does the divine person sent by the Supreme Personality of Godhead descend to the plane of light, or does he descend only to the plane of lightning?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because the Supreme Personality of Godhead sends His messengers even to the earth to carry back Ajāmila and others, therefore this divine person must descend to the plane of light.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 6

vaidyutenaiva tatas tac chruteḥ

vaidyutena—by the person situated in light; eva—indeed; tataḥ—then; tat—that; śruteḥ—from the sruti-sastra.

Then by the person in light. This is because of the Śruti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

When he comes to the plane of lightning, the enlightened soul by a messenger sent by the Lord Himself. How is that known? the sūtra explains, "tac chruteḥ" (because of the Śruti-śāstra). In Chāndogya Upaniṣad (4.15.5) it is said:

candramaso vidyutaṁ tat-puruṣo 'mānavaḥ sa etān brahma gamayati

"From the moon he goes to the lightning. There a divine person takes him to the Supreme."

In this way it is shown the Varuṇaloka and the others are the assistants of that divine person. The case of Ajāmila is extraordinary. It is not typical.

Adhikaraṇa 6

Bādari Muni's Opinion

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Having thus described the path by which the goal is reached, now the author describes the goal itself.

Viṣaya (the topic to be discussed): The topic here is Chāndogya Upaniṣad 4.15.5), which says:

sa etān gamayati

"There a divine person takes him to the Brahman."

In the following section the opinion of Bādari Muni is given first.

Samśaya (doubt): here it is said that a divine person brings the soul to "brahma". Is this "brahma" the Supreme Personality of Godhead, or is it the demigod Brahmā, who has four faces?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The word "brahma" here must refer to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, for in this passage explains that the soul attains immortality.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words Bādari Muni gives his opinion.

Sūtra 7

kāryam bādarir asya gaty-upapatteḥ

kāryam—the created being; bādariḥ—Bādari Muni; asya—of of him; gati—attainment; upapatteḥ—because of being possible.

Bādari Muni says it is the created one, for that is the only possible goal.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Bādari Muni thinks that the divine person takes the soul to the demigod Brahmā. Why is that? The sūtra explains, “asya gaty-upapatteḥ” (for that is the only possible goal). The demigod Brahmā is situated in a single place, and therefore the soul can go from one place to another in order to meet Him. The Supreme Personality of Godhead, however, is all-pervading, always present everywhere. Therefore it is not possible for the soul to go from one place to another in order to meet Him. That is the meaning.

Sūtra 8

viśeṣitatvāc ca

viśeṣitatvāt—because of being specified; ca—also.

Also because it is specifically stated.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.14.1) it is said:

prajāpateḥ sabhām veśma prapadye

"He attains the home of Prajāpati."

In this way it is specifically stated that he attains the demigod Brahmā.

Sūtra 9

sāmīpyāt tu tad vyapadeśaḥ

sāmīpyāt—because of nearness; tu—but; tat—that; vyapadeśaḥ—designation.

But that designation is because of nearness.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.2.15) it is said:

sa etya brahmalokān gamayati tu teṣu brahmalokeṣu parāḥ parāvanto vasanti.
teṣām iha na punar āvṛttir asti.

"Then he takes them to Brahmaloaka. In Brahmaloaka they stay for many ages. They do not return."

Here the explanation (vyapadeśaḥ) is that they do not return. This means that because they are near (sāmīpyāt) to liberation, they will be liberated in the future. This means that the enlightened souls attain the world of the demigod Brahmā. They thus attain liberation along with the demigod Brahmā. In this way they do not return.

When does this occur? The next sūtra explains.

Sūtra 10

kāryātyaye tad-adhyakṣeṇa sahātaḥ param abhidhānāt

kārya—of the creation; atyaye—at the end; tat—of that; adhyakṣeṇa—the ruler; saha—with; ataḥ—then; param—the Supreme; abhidhānāt—because of the explanation.

With its ruler to the Supreme when the creation is annihilated because of the explanation.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

When the material creation up to the world of four-faced Brahmā is destroyed, they go with the ruler of the material world, the four-faced Brahmā, from that created world to the Supreme Brahman, who is different from the four-faced Brahmā. The reason for this is given by the sūtra, "abhidhānāt" (because of the explanation). In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (3.1.1) it is said:

brahma-vid āpnoti param

"He who knows Brahman attains the Supreme."

It is also said there:

so 'śnute sarvān kāmān saha brahmaṇā

"There, in the company of Brahman, he enjoys the fulfillment of all his desires."

The phrase "with Brahman" here means, "with the demigod Brahmā, who has four faces." That is the meaning.

Sūtra 11

smṛteṣ ca

smṛteḥ—from the Smṛti-śāstra; ca—also.

From the Smṛti-śāstra also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

brahmaṇā saha te sarve
samprāpte pratisañcare
parasyānte kṛtātmānaḥ
praviśanti param padam

"When the material universe is destroyed, they whose hearts are devoted to the Supreme Lord, enter the supreme abode along with the demigod Brahmā."

In this way the saniṣṭha devotees travel on the path beginning with light, a path that brings them to the demigod Brahmā. That is the opinion of Bādari Muni.

In the next sūtra Jaimini Muni gives his opinion.

Adhikaraṇa 7 Jaimini Muni's Opinion

Sūtra 12

param jaiminir mukhyatvāt

param—the Supreme; jaiminiḥ—Jaimini; mukhyatvāt—because of being primary.

Jaimini thinks it is the Supreme, for that is the primary meaning.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Jaimini Muni thinks the soul is taken to the Supreme. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "mukhyatvāt", which means "for that is the primary meaning of the word Brahman". Also, it is not correct to say that it is not possible to attain the Supreme (for He is all-pervading). When the devotees become free from all material designations then they can attain the Supreme Lord, which means then they can perceive His presence.

Sūtra 13

darśanāc ca

darśanāt—because of the sight; ca—also.

Also because it is seen.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In the Dahara-vidyā chapter of Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.12.3) the goal is clearly described as the Supreme Brahman. This is so because the attributes of immortality are ascribed to this Brahman and also because the soul who travels to this Brahman

manifests his own original spiritual form. All these explanations would not be appropriate if the Brahman here were the demigod Brahmā. Indeed, this chapter of the Upaniṣad is not about the demigod Brahmā. It is clearly about the Supreme Brahman, the Supreme Lord.

In the Kaṭha Upaniṣad, in the passage beginning "śataṁ ca", the Supreme Brahman is clearly described as the goal of this path. In another place in the Śruti-śāstra, in the passage beginning with the word "dharmāt", the goal also must be the Supreme Brahman, for he is described there as immortal. It is also said:

Sūtra 14

na ca kārye pratipatty-abhisandhiḥ

na—not; ca—and; kārye—in the created; pratipatti—knowledge;
abhisandhiḥ—desire.

The desire is not to know the created.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here the word "pratipatti" means "knowledge", and the word "abhisandhi" means "desire". The soul enlightened with transcendental knowledge does not desire to learn the truth about the demigod Brahmā, for the attainment of that knowledge is not the highest goal of life. However, he does desire to attain knowledge of the Supreme Brahman, for that is the highest goal of life. One attains the goal he strives for. This is explained in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (3.14). Therefore the conclusion is that the divine person leads the devotees to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. That is the opinion of Jaimini Muni.

Now the author of the sūtras gives his opinion. He says:

Sūtra 15

apratīkālambanān nayatīti bādarāyaṇa ubhayathā ca doṣāt tat-kratuś ca

a—not; pratīka—form; ālambanān—resting; nayati-leads; iti—thus;
bādarāyaṇaḥ—Vyāsadeva; ubhayathā—both; ca—and; doṣāt—because of fault; tat-kratuḥ—by the maxim beginning with the words "tat-kratuḥ"; ca—also.

He leads they who take shelter of the Lord as He who has no material form. That is Vyādeva's opinion. Because both have faults and also because of the maxim beginning with the words "tat-kratuḥ".

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The divine person leads to the Supreme the *saniṣṭhas* and all other devotees who do not think that the Supreme is material. These devotees are different from they who worship the Lord as the names and forms of this world. That is the opinion of Vyādeva. He does not accept the view that the divine person leads the worshipers of the demigod *Brahmā*, nor does he accept the view that the divine person leads all the worshipers of the Supreme. Why not? The *sūtra* explains, "ubhayathā ca doṣāt", which means "because both views contradict the statements of scripture".

The first view contradicts the following words of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (8.12.3):

param jyotir upapadya

"He meets the effulgent Supreme Person."

The second view contradicts the description in *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (5.10) of the goal attained by they who have knowledge of *pañcāgni-vidyā* and who travel on the path beginning with light. Another reason is given in the maxim of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (3.14.1) that declares a person attains a destination appropriate to the nature of his faith. They who identify the Supreme with the words and other things in the material world cannot travel by the path beginning with light, for this would contradict the maxim of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*. However, in the scriptures it is affirmed that they who worship the Lord in the words of the Vedic mantras attain their desires independently. In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (7.1.5) it is said:

sa yo nāma brahmety upāste yāvan nāmno gataṁ tatrāsya kama-cāraḥ

"He who worships the Lord as the sounds of the Vedic mantras attains the goal of the mantras. He attains his desire."

However, they who are followers of *pañcāgni-vidyā* travel by the path of light until they reach *Satyaloka*. They do this because they worship the Supersoul. When they attain perfect knowledge of the Supreme, they are able to rise above the realm of *Satyaloka*. This is so, for the *Śruti-śāstra* declares that they who travel on that path never return to the material world.

Adhikaraṇa 9 A Special Situation

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be explained the truth that the Lord Himself takes certain exalted nirapekṣa devotees back to His own abode. In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.22 and 24) it is said:

etad viṣṇoḥ paramaṁ padaṁ ye
nityodyuktāḥ samyajante na kāmān
teṣāṁ asau gopa-rūpaḥ prayatnāt
prakāśayed ātma-padaṁ tadaiva

"To they who always diligently worship Lord Viṣṇu's transcendental form, the Lord, in His original form as a cowherd boy, shows His lotus feet.

omkāreṇāntaritam ye japanti
govindasya pañca-padaṁ manuṁ tam
teṣāṁ asau darśayed ātma-rūpaṁ
tasmān mumukṣur abhyasen nityaṁ śantyai

"To they who chant the five-word mantra with Om and Govinda, the Lord reveals His own form. Therefore, to attain transcendental peace, they who desire liberation should regularly chant this mantra."

Samśaya (doubt): Are the nirapekṣa devotees carried to the spiritual world by the ātivāhika demigods, or by the Supreme Lord Himself?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The scriptures affirm:

dvāv eva mārgau

"There are two paths."

The conclusion is that they who are enlightened with transcendental

knowledge travel by the path beginning with light. In that way they enter the spiritual world. That is affirmed by the Śruti-śāstra. That is how the Supreme Lord becomes the cause of their liberation.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 16

viśeṣam ca darśayati

viśeṣam—special; ca—also; darśayati—shows.

It reveals a special situation also.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The general situation is that the souls enlightened with transcendental knowledge are carried to the spiritual world by the ātivāhika demigods. However, those nirapekṣa devotees who are especially distressed in separation from the Lord are carried there by the Supreme Lord Himself, for the Lord becomes impatient and cannot tolerate any delay in bringing them back to Him. This is a special situation. The Śruti-śāstra reveals the truth of this situation in Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad (1.22 and 24). The Supreme Lord Himself also explains (Bhagavad-gītā 7.6 and 7):

ye tu sarvāṇi karmāṇi
mayi sannyasya mat-parāḥ
ananyenaiva yogena
mām dhyāyanta upāsate

teṣāṃ ahaṃ samuddhartā
mṛtyu-saṃsāra-sāgarāt
bhavāmi na cirāt pārtha
mayy āveśita-cetasām

"But those who worship Me, giving up all their activities unto Me and being devoted to Me without deviation, engaged in devotional service and always meditating upon Me, having fixed their minds upon Me, O son of Pṛthā, for them I am the swift deliverer from the ocean of birth and death."*

The word "ca" (also) in this sūtra means that for the liberated souls there are two paths, one where the material body is cast off, and the other where contact with the material body is maintained. It is not possible to say that the nirapekṣa devotees follow the path that begins in light. Also, in the Varāha Purāṇa the Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself says:

nayāmi paramam sthānam
arcir-ādi-gatiṁ vinā
garuḍa-skandham āropya
yatheccham anivāritaḥ

"My devotees need not follow the path beginning in light. Riding on Garuḍa's shoulders, I personally take them to My supreme abode."

In this way the truth has been explained.

Pada 4

Invocation

akaitave bhakti-save 'nurajyan
svam eva yaḥ sevakasāt karoti
tato 'ti-modam muditaḥ sa devaḥ
sadā cid-ānanda-tanur dhinotu

May the Supreme Personality of Godhead, whose form is eternal and full of knowledge and bliss, and who, pleased with His devotees sincere devotion, gives Himself to them, fill us with transcendental happiness.

Adhikaraṇa 1

The Original Forms of the Liberated Souls

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In this pada will be described first the original forms of the liberated souls, and then their glory, opulence, bliss, and other features. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.12.3) the demigod Brahmā explains:

evam evaiṣa samprasādo 'smāt śarīrāt samutthāya param jyotir upasampadya svena rūpeṇābhiniṣpadyate sa uttamaḥ puruṣaḥ

"By the Supreme Lord's mercy, the enlightened soul leaves his material body and enters the effulgent spiritual world. There he attains his own spiritual body. He becomes the most exalted of persons."

Samśaya (doubt): Does the liberated soul attain a body, like the bodies of the demigods, that is different from himself, or does he manifest his original identity, which is not different from himself?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): he attains a body different from himself. This must be so because the word "ābhiniṣpadyate" (is attained) is employed here. Any other interpretation would make this word meaningless and would also make meaningless the scriptures' statement that liberation is a benefit attained by the soul. If this form is only the original nature of the soul and it had existed all along, then attaining it would not be a benefit granted to the soul. Therefore this form is newly attained by the soul and is different from the soul's original nature.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 1

sampadyāvīrbhāvaḥ svena-śabdāt

sampadya—of he who has attained; āvīrbhāvaḥ—manifestation; svena—svena; śabdāt—by the word.

Because of the word "svena" it is the manifestation of he who has gone.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The individual spirit soul who, by means of devotional service accompanied with knowledge and renunciation, attains the effulgent Supreme, becomes free from the bondage of karma and attains a body endowed with eight virtues. This body is said to be the soul's original form. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "svena-

śabdāt" (because of the word "svena"). The word "svena" here means, "in his own original form". For this reason it cannot be said that this passage means, "the soul arrives there and then accepts that form, which is an external imposition". In that way it is proved that the form here is the original form of the soul. This is not contradicted by the use of the word "niṣpadyate", for that word is also used to mean, "is manifested". An example of that usage is seen in the following words of the Śruti-śāstra:

idam ekaṁ su-niṣpannam

"He is manifested."

Also, it is not that the manifestation of the soul's original form cannot be, because it already exists, a goal of human endeavor. This is so because even though the soul's original form exists, it is not openly manifested. Therefore it is not useless to say that the soul may endeavor to openly manifest the original form of the soul. Therefore the manifestation of that form can be an object of human endeavor.

Here someone may say: When the spirit soul is manifested in its original form and it attains the effulgent Supreme, as described in the words "param jyotir upasampadya", the the liberated state thus attained is characterized mainly by the cessation of all material sufferings.

If this is said, then I reply: No. It is not so. The Śruti-śāstra explains that in the liberated state the soul is filled with intense spiritual bliss. This is described in Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.7):

rasaṁ hy evāyaṁ labdhvānandī-bhavati

"When one understands the Personality of Godhead, the reservoir of pleasure, Kṛṣṇa, he actually becomes transcendently blissful."*

Here someone may object: How do you know that approaching the effulgent Supreme Lord is true liberation?

If this is said, the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 2

muktaḥ pratijñānāt

muktaḥ—liberated; pratijñānāt—because of the declaration.

He is liberated because of the statement.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The liberated soul manifests his original form. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "pratijñānāt" (because of the statement). The original condition of the soul is described in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.7.1). After that description, the following promise is given (8.9.3):

etaṁ tv eva te bhūyo 'nuvyākhyāsyāmi

"Again I will explain it to you."

The demigod Brahmā proceeded to explain that the liberated soul is free from wakefulness, dreaming, and dreamless sleep, the three conditions of material consciousness and also free from the material body, which is created by the karmic reactions of pleasant and unpleasant deeds. The demigod Brahmā described this in order to fulfill the promise he made in 8.9.3). Because this passage explains that the soul becomes liberated when he is free from the external material body created by karmic reactions, it should be understood that in the liberated state the soul is manifested in its original form.

In this way it is proved that Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.12.3) explains that in the liberated state the soul manifests its original form. Now another point will be considered.

Samśaya (doubt): Does the word "jyotiḥ" in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.12.3) refer to the sun-globe or to the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): It refers to the sun-globe. This must be so for the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad declares that after passing through the realm of the sun one attains liberation. The sun-globe is also described in that way in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad's description of the path beginning with light.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

ātmā prakaraṇāt

ātmā—the Supreme Personality of Godhead; prakaraṇāt—because of the context.

It is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, because of the context.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "jyotiḥ" here refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. It does not refer to the sun-globe. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "prakaraṇāt" (because of the context). Although the word "jyotiḥ" can refer to either, because of the context it refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. It is like the word "devaḥ", which in the sentence "devo jānāti me manaḥ" (your lordship knows my heart) means "your lordship".

The word ātmā" in this sūtra means "the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who is all-powerful and full of knowledge and bliss". The word "ātmā" is derived from the verbal root "at". In this way "ātmā" means, "He who is splendidly manifest", "He who is attained by the liberated souls", and "He who is all-pervading". It also means "Upaniṣad", and it has many other meanings also. Further, the word "ātmā" also shows that the Supreme is a person. This is also seen by the use of the phrase "uttamaḥ puruṣaḥ" in the Upaniṣads and Bhagavad-gītā. In this way it is seen that the "paraṁ jyotiḥ" in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.12.3) refers to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Lord Hari.

Adhikaraṇa 2

The Individual Soul Meets the Supreme Personality of Godhead

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now another topic will be considered.

Samśaya (doubt): When the liberated soul attains the effulgent Supreme in the spiritual world, is the liberation sālokya (residing on the same planet) or sāyujya (meeting with the Lord)?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): As a person entering a king's capitol resides in the same city as the king but does not attain a private audience with the king, so the liberated soul resides on the same planet with the Lord. Therefore the soul attains sālohya liberation

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 4

avibhāgena dṛṣṭatvāt

avibhāgena—without separation; dṛṣṭatvāt—because of being seen.

There is no separation, for that is seen.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The liberated soul is not separated from the Lord. In this way the soul attains sāyujya liberation. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "dṛṣṭatvāt" (for that is seen). This means, "for this situation is seen in the Śruti-śāstra". For example, in Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (3.2.8) it is said:

yathā nadyah syandamānāḥ samudre
astam gacchanti nāma-rūpe vihāya
yathā vidvān nāma-rūpād vimuktaḥ
parāt param puruṣam upaiti divyam

"As flowing rivers abandon their names and forms and meet with the sea, so the enlightened soul, free of what had been his name and form, meets with the effulgent Supreme Person."

That the word "sāyujya" means "meeting" is seen in the following passage of the Mahā-Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad (25.1):

ya evaṁ vidvān udag-ayane pramiyate devānām eva mahimānam gatvādityasya
sāyujyam gacchati

"The soul that dies during the six months when the sun travels in the north

attains the glory of the gods. He approaches the sun and attains sāyujya with it."

Sālokya and the other kinds of liberation are different varieties of sāyujya. It is not that when they feel the sentiment of separation from the Lord the liberated devotees are not also, at that same moment, meeting with the Lord. This is so because the Lord is always manifested in their thoughts and continues to touch them with His glories.

The example (of the rivers entering the ocean) given above should not be taken to mean that the liberated souls become identical with the Lord. When water from one place enters water of another place, the two waters do not actually merge and become identical. They remain separate. This is seen in the fact the the volume of water in the ocean increases as the rivers flow into it.

Adhikaraṇa 3 The Qualities of the Liberated Soul

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the author will describe the pleasures experienced by the liberated soul. In order to describe these pleasures the author will describe the liberated soul's spiritual form and its host of advantages, which begin with the blessing at all its desires are at once fulfilled. First the liberated soul's advantages and virtues will be described.

Samśaya (doubt): When he meets the effulgent Supreme Lord, does the individual spirit soul manifest a form glorious with many virtues and advantages, or does the soul manifest a form of spiritual consciousness, or does the soul manifest a form with both virtues and consciousness, for these two can certainly exist together in a single form?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Here Jaimini Muni gives his opinion.

Sūtra 5

brāhmaṇa jaiminir upanyāsādibhyaḥ

brāhmaṇa—given by the Supreme Personality of Godhead; jaiminiḥ—jaimini; upanyāsa—references; ādibhyaḥ—beginning with.

Jaimini Muni thinks it is with what is given by the Supreme Personality of Godhead, for there are references and other proofs.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The liberated soul is glorious with a host of virtues and advantages, beginning with sinlessness and the attainment of every desire, which are all gifts from the Supreme Personality of Godhead. How is this known? The sūtra explains, "upanyāsādibhyaḥ" (for there are references and other proofs). The reference here is to the demigod Brahmā's description (in Chāndogya Upaniṣad 8.7.1) of the individual spirit soul's virtues. The word "ādi" (beginning with) refers to the Chāndogya Upaniṣad's description of the liberated soul's activities, such as his eating and enjoying pastimes. In this way the liberated soul is by nature filled with glories and virtues. That is the opinion of Jaimini Muni. In the Smṛti-śāstra this is also described in the passage beginning with the words, "yathā na hrīyate jyotsnā".

Sūtra 6

citi tan-mātreṇa tad-ātmakatvād ity auḍulomiḥ

citi—in consciousness; tan-mātreṇa—of that only; tad-ātmakatvāt—because of the nature; iti—thus; auḍulomiḥ—Auḍulomi.

It is consciousness alone, for that is its nature. That is the opinion of Auḍulomi Muni.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

When its material ignorance is burned away by transcendental knowledge and it attains its spiritual form and meets the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the individual spirit soul is manifested as pure consciousness alone. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "tad-ātmakatvād" (for that is its nature). In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.5.13), in the second story of Maitreyī, it is said:

sa yathā saindhava-ghano 'nantaro 'bāhyaḥ kṛtsno rasa-ghana evaṁ vā are ayam
ātmānantaro 'bāhyaḥ kṛtsnaḥ prajñāna-ghana eva

"as salt has neither inside nor outside, but is a mass of taste and nothing else, so the soul also has neither inside nor outside, but is a mass of knowledge and nothing else."

In this way it is concluded that the soul is consciousness alone and nothing else. The scriptural statements affirming that the soul is sinless and has other virtues are merely meant to teach that the soul has not material qualities, such as material happiness, qualities that are all temporary and subject to change. That is the opinion of Auḍulomi Muni.

Now the author of the sūtras gives His opinion.

Sūtra 7

evam apy upanyāsāt pūrva-bhāvād avirodham bādarāyaṇaḥ

evam—thus; api—even; upanyāsāt—from the reference; pūrva—of the previous; bhāvāt—from the nature; avirodham—not contradicting; bādarāyaṇaḥ—Vyāsa.

Even though there are these references, it does not contradict what was before. That is the opinion of Vyāsadeva.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Even though it is true that the soul consists of pure consciousness, that truth does not contradict the soul's possession of the eight virtues. That is the opinion of Vyāsadeva. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "upanyāsāt pūrva-bhāvād avirodham" (even though there are these references, it does not contradict what was before).

This means that Auḍulomi's quote from scripture does not contradict Jaimini's previous quotation of the words of the demigod Brahmā. The conclusion is that both scriptural statements are clear and without reservations, and therefore both are equally compelling evidence, and therefore both are equally true statements about the liberated soul.

Vyāsadeva certainly accepts the statement of Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.5.13) that the soul is consciousness alone, consciousness untouched by material qualities. Indeed, this view does not at all contradict Jaimini's opinion.

The statement that the soul is pure consciousness is meant to show that it has not the slightest trace of matter in its nature. That statement is not at all opposed to the statement that the soul has eight transcendental virtues, just as the statement that a block of salt is taste only does not at all contradict the statement that the block of salt has hardness, a certain shape, and other qualities visible to

the eyes and the other senses. In this way it is shown that the soul, which consists of transcendental knowledge certainly possesses the eight virtues, which begin with sinlessness.

Adhikaraṇa 5 The Soul's Desires Are Fulfilled

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the author of the sūtras will describe the truth that all the desires of the liberated soul are at once fulfilled. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.12.3) it is said:

sa tatra paryeti jakṣan kṛīḍan ramamāṇaḥ strībhir vā yānair vā jñātibhir vā

"Laughing and enjoying pastimes, he is happy in the company of wives, relatives, and chariots."

Saiṁśaya (doubt): Does the liberated soul's meeting with his relatives and the others happen because of an endeavor of his part or does it happen spontaneously simply by his desire?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): In the material world even kings and other powerful people, of whom it is said that their every desire is fulfilled, must still exert some effort to attain that fulfillment. In the same way the liberated souls attain their desires by willing accompanied with action.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 8

saṅkalpād eva tac chruteḥ

saṅkalpāt—by desire; eva—indeed; tat—that; chruteḥ—because of the Śruti-śāstra.

Indeed it is by desire, because of the Śruti-śāstra.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Simply by willing the liberated souls attain what they wish. How is that known? The sūtra explains, "tac chruteḥ" (because of the Śruti-śāstra). In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.2.1) it is said:

sa yadi pitṛloka-kāmo bhavati saṅkalpād evāsya pitarāḥ samuttiṣṭhanti. tena pitṛlokena sampanno mahīyate.

"If desires to go to Pitṛloka, simply by his will he finds the pitās standing before him. In this way he finds himself glorified by the residents of Pitṛloka."

In this way the Śruti-śāstra affirms that he attains his wishes by merely willing that they be fulfilled. Any other view cannot be accepted here. In the previously quoted passage of Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.5.13), the statement was qualified by other evidence from the scriptures. In this passage, however, we see not other statements of scripture that might qualify or change the clear statement of these words. However, this kind of liberation, where the soul's own happiness and glory and power are prominent, is not liked by they who are eager to taste the nectar of service to the Supreme Lord. They reject it and they speak many words criticizing it.

Adhikaraṇa 6

The Supreme Lord is the Master of the Liberated Souls

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the author the sūtras will show that the liberated soul, whose every desire is fulfilled, takes shelter of the Supreme Personality of Godhead alone.

Samśaya (doubt): Is the liberated soul subject to the orders of anyone other than the Supreme Personality of Godhead, or is the soul not subject to the orders of anyone other than the Supreme Personality of Godhead?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): As a person who enters a king's palace must obey the orders of many people there, so the liberated soul who has entered the palace of the Supreme Personality of Godhead must also obey the orders of many others.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 9

ata eva cānanyādhipatiḥ

ataḥ eva—therefore; ca—also; ananya—without another; adhipatiḥ—master.

Therefore there is no other master.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Because (ataḥ), by the grace of the Supreme Personality of Godhead all the liberated soul's desires are at once fulfilled, the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the liberated soul's only master (ananyādhipatiḥ). There is no other master for him. Taking shelter of the Supreme Lord, the liberated soul shines with great splendor. If this were not so then there would be no difference between the liberated soul and the soul trapped in the world of repeated birth and death.

By worshiping the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the liberated soul attains the condition where his every desire is at once fulfilled. Feeling merciful to him, the Supreme Lord gives limitless transcendental bliss to the soul who thus takes shelter of Him. In this way the Lord becomes very pleased. That the Lord thus fills the liberated soul with bliss will be explained in sūtra 4.4.20. It has already been demonstrated that the individual spirit soul is part and parcel of the Supreme Lord, and the Supreme Lord is the supreme controller and enjoyer.

Because the liberated soul is in a position where his every desire is at once fulfilled, his only master is the Supreme Lord. He has no other master. For this reason ordinary prescribed duties and prohibitions no longer apply to him. If they did apply to him he would no longer be in a position where his every desire is at once fulfilled. This view is held by some philosophers.

Adhikaraṇa 7

The Spiritual Body

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now the author of the sūtras will show that the liberated soul has a spiritual body.

Samśaya (doubt): Does the liberated soul who has attained the association of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, as described in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.12.3), have a spiritual body or does he not? Can he have any body he wishes, or can he not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Here Bādari Muni gives his opinion.

Sūtra 10

abhāve bādarir āha hy evam

abhāve—in non-existence; bādarih—Bādari Muni; āha—says; hi—because; evam—thus.

Bādari Muni says there is none, for thus it is said.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Bādari Muni thinks that the liberated soul has no body. The body and its paraphernalia are all created by past karma. Because he is free from all past karma, the liberated soul does not have a body. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "āha hy evam" (thus it is said). The word "hi" here means "because". In Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.12.1) it is said:

na ha vai sa-śarīrasya sataḥ priyāpriyayor apahatir asti. aśarīraṁ vāva santam priyāpriye na sprśataḥ

"He who has a body cannot become free of pleasure and pain. Only one who has no body is untouched by pleasure and pain."

This means that as long as the body is present it is not possible to be free of sufferings. That is why the Upaniṣad explains:

asmāt śarīrāt samutthāya

"The soul then leaves the body."

Also, in Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam it is said:

dehendriyāsu-hīnānām
vaikuṅṭha-pura-vāsinām

"They who live in the spiritual world have neither bodies nor senses."

Sūtra 11

āha hy evam jaiminir vikalpāmananāt

āha—says; hi—because; evam—thus; jaiminiḥ—Jaimini Muni; vikalpa—opinion; āmananāt—by thought.

Jaimini Muni has that opinion, because it is said thus and because that view is accepted.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Jaimini Muni thinks the liberated soul has a body. Why is that? The sūtra explains, "vikalpāmananāt" (because that view is accepted). In the Bhūma-vidyā passage of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.26.2) it is said that the liberated soul can manifest many different bodies simultaneously:

sa ekadhā bhavati dvidhā tridhā bhavati pañcadhā saptadhā navadhā caiva punaś caikādaśa smṛtaḥ. śataṁ ca daśa caikaś ca sahasrāṇi ca vimśatiḥ.

"He becomes one. Then he becomes two. Then three. Then five. Then seven. Then nine. Then eleven. He becomes one hundred and ten. He becomes one thousand and twenty."

Because the individual spirit soul is atomic in nature, it cannot expand itself to become many different bodies, so these bodies must be possessions of the atomic soul. Nor can it be said that this statement of the Upaniṣad is not true, for this is in a passage describing the process of liberation. The body described here must actually exist, and also it must not have been created by past karmic reactions. This will be explained later with a quote from the Smṛti-śāstra.

In the next sūtra Vyāsadeva gives His opinion.

Sūtra 12

dvādaśāha-vad ubhaya-vidham bādarāyaṇo 'taḥ

dvādaśa—twelve; āha—days; vat—like; ubhaya—both; vidham—kinds; bādarāyaṇaḥ—Vyāsadeva; ataḥ—therefore.

Vyāsadeva says it is of both kinds, like the twelve days.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Lord Vyāsadeva thinks that because the liberated soul's every desire is at once fulfilled both conditions must be true. This is so because statements describing both conditions are found in the scriptures. Therefore it should be accepted that the liberated soul may have a body, and again he may not have a body. This is like the twelve days. A twelve-day yajña becomes, by the wish of the yajamāna, either a satra, which has many yajamānas, or an ahīna, which has many yajamānas. There is no contradiction in this. In the same way the liberated soul may, by his own wish, either have a body or not have a body. That is the meaning. The truth is that they who by the power of transcendental knowledge have broken the bonds of material existence are in a situation where all their desires are at once fulfilled. Those amongst them who desire to have a body can at once have any body they wish. This is described in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.26.2). They who do have no desire to have a body do not have a body. This is described in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.12.1). They who desire always to employ a spiritual body in the service of the Supreme Lord eternally manifest such a body by their spiritual powers. That is how it should be understood. In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (2.4.14) it is said:

yatra tv asya sarvam ātmaivābhūt tat kena kaṁ paśyet

"Everything there is spiritual. What is the nature of the seer? What is the nature of the seen?"

In the Mādhyandina-śruti it is said:

sa vā eṣa brahma-niṣṭha idaṁ śarīraṁ martyam atisṛjya brahmābhisampadya
brahmaṇā paśyati brahmaṇā śṛṇoti brahmaṇaivedaṁ sarvaṁ anubhavati

"Devoted to the Supreme Lord, the individual soul leaves his mortal body and meets the Lord. By the Lord's grace he sees. By the Lord's grace he hears. By the Lord's grace he perceives everything."

In the Smṛti-śāstra it is said:

vasanti yatra puruṣāḥ
sarve vaikunṭha-mūrtayaḥ

"Everyone there has a spiritual form like that of the Supreme Personality of Godhead."

The spiritual desire of the soul is cultivated from the very beginning of his devotional activities. This is described in the "yathā kratuḥ" maxim and also in the following words of the Smṛti-śāstra:

gacchāmi viṣṇu-pādābhyāṁ
viṣṇu-dṛṣṭyānudarśanam

"I walk with Lord Viṣṇu's feet. I see with Lord Viṣṇu's eyes."
In the Smṛti-śāstra it is again said:

muktasyaitad bhaviṣyati

"This is the nature of the liberated soul."

Adhikaraṇa 8

The Bliss of the Liberated Souls

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be shown the truth that through his spiritual body the liberated soul enjoys spiritual pleasures. That he enjoys spiritual pleasures is affirmed by the following words of Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.1.1):

so 'śnute sarvān kāmān

"He enjoys all pleasures."

Now the author of the sūtras begins His explanation that this is so in both situations (possessing or not possessing a body).

Samśaya (doubt): Is it possible for the liberated soul to enjoy pleasures, or is it not possible?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because he has neither body nor senses, the liberated soul cannot enjoy any pleasures. If a yogī somehow has the power to enjoy pleasures, still he will not do so because, being filled with spiritual bliss, he has no thirst for them.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 13

tanv-abhāve sandhya-vad upapatteḥ

tanu—of a body; abhāve—in the absence; sandhya—a dream; vat—like; upapatteḥ—because of reasonableness.

In the absence of a body it is like a dream, for that is reasonable.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Even in the absence of a body pleasure is still possible. The sūtra explains, "It is like a dream, for that is reasonable." The word "sandhya" here means "dream". As in a dream one can enjoy pleasures without a body, so the liberated soul can also enjoy pleasures without a body. Thus it is said.

Of course, when a body is present the pleasure is much greater. The author of the sūtras explains this in the following words.

Sūtra 14

bhāve jāgrad-vat

bhāve—in existence; jāgrat—waking; vat—like.

In the existence it is like being awake.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "bhāve" here means, "when there is a body". When there is a body the pleasure is like that in the waking state. Our opponent claims that the liberated soul does not desire to enjoy the delicious tastes and other pleasures mercifully offered to him by the Supreme Lord. However, the truth is that the liberated soul, desiring to render devotional service, certainly does desire to enjoy the pleasures that the Lord in His kindness offers. He does this out of love for the Lord. In this way it should be understood.

Adhikaraṇa 9

The Liberated Soul Is Full of Transcendental Knowledge

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be shown the truth that the liberated soul has all transcendental knowledge. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.26.2) it is said:

na paśyo mṛtyuṁ paśyati na rogaṁ nota-duḥkhitam sarvaṁ hi paśyaḥ paśyati

sarvam āpnoti sarvaśaḥ

"The liberated soul does not see death. He does not see disease. He does not see suffering. Still, he sees everything. He attains everything everywhere."

In this way it is said that the liberated soul has knowledge of everything.

Saiṁśaya (doubt): Is this correct, or not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): In the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.3.21) it is said:

prājñenātmanā. . .

"Embraced by the all-knowing Supreme Personality of Godhead, the individual soul is oblivious to all that is within and all that is without."

Therefore it is certainly not correct (to say that the individual spirit soul is all-knowing).

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 15

pradīpa-vad āveśas tathā hi darśayati

pradīpa—a lamp; vat—like; āveśaḥ—entrance; tathā—so; hi—because; darśayati—reveals.

Its entrance is like a lamp, furthermore it reveals.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

As with its rays of light a lamp enters many places, so the with his expansion of knowledge the liberated soul enters many things to be known. Furthermore (tathā hi), the words of Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (4.18) give the following revelation (darśayati):

prajñā ca tasmāt prasṛtā purāṇī

"By the Supreme Lord's mercy the soul's ancient knowledge is revived."

This verse should be interpreted, "By the Supreme Lord's mercy the soul's ancient knowledge is revived."

Here someone may object: It is not correct to say that the liberated soul is all-knowing. Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.3.21) explains that the liberated soul is oblivious to everything and thus does not know anything at all.

If this is said, the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 16

svāpyaya-sampattyor anyatarāpekṣyām āviṣkṛtam hi

svāpyaya—deep sleep; sampattyoh—of the moment of death; anyatara—either; apekṣyām—in relation to; āviṣkṛtam—manifested; hi—because.

It refers either to dreamless sleep or to the death-swoon, for thus is it revealed.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

These words of Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad (4.3.21) do not show that the liberated soul is oblivious and has no knowledge at all. Rather, these words refer either to dreamless sleep or to the death-swoon, (svāpyaya-sampattyor anyatarāpekṣyām). The word "svāpyaya" here means, "dreamless sleep", and the word "sampatti" here means, "the moment of leaving the body". In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.8.1) sleep is defined in these words:

svam apīto bhavati tasmād enam svapīṭity ācakṣate

"When one indeed (api) enters (ita) himself (sva), then it is said that he sleeps (svapiti)."

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (6.8.6) the time of death is described in these words:

vāñ manasi sampadyate

"At the time of death the voice enters the mind."

In this way the Śruti-śāstra describes the state of consciousness during dreamless sleep and the moment of death. However, the Śruti-śāstra also explains that in the liberated state the soul is all-knowing.

The condition of dreamless sleep is described in these words of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.11.1):

nāham khalv ayam evaṃ sampraty ātmānam jānāty ayam aham asmīti no evemāni bhūtāni vināśam ivāpīto bhavati. nāham atra bhogyaṃ paśyāmi.

"Sound asleep, he does not even know who he is. He cannot say: I am he. His knowledge of everything perishes. I do not see this as a good or pleasant state of being."

On the other hand, the liberated soul is described in these words of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.12.5):

sa vā eṣa etena divyena cakṣuṣā manasy etān kāmān paśyan ramate ya ete brahmaloke

"Seeing with divine eyes the pleasures in the spiritual world, he rejoices in his heart."

The death-swoon, however, is described in these words:

etebhyo bhūtebhyaḥ samutthāya tāny evānuvinaśyati

"Rising, at the moment of death, from the elements of the material body, the soul suddenly loses all consciousness."

Here the word "vinaśyati" means, "he cannot see anything". In this way it is proved that the liberated soul is all-knowing.

Adhikaraṇa 10

The Liberated Soul Has Not the Power to Create the World

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

In Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.1.6 and 8.2.1) it is said:

atha ya iha ātmānam anuvidya vrajanty etāṁś ca satyān kāmāṁś teṣāṁ sarveṣu
lokeṣu kāma-cāro bhavati. sa yadi pitṛloka-kāmo bhavati.

"He who knows the truth of the Supreme Personality of Godhead and places his desires in eternal spiritual happinesses may go, when he leaves this body, to any world he wishes. If he desires to create a Pitṛloka planet, then that planet is at once created."

Saṁśaya (doubt): Does the liberated soul have the power to create a material universe, or does he not?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): Because he is equal to the Supreme Lord, and also because all his desires are at once fulfilled, the liberated soul must also have this power.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 17

jagad-vyāpāra-varjyaṁ prakaraṇād asannihitavāt

jagat—of the material universe; vyāpāra—creation; varjyaṁ—except for; prakaraṇāt—because of the context; asannihitavāt—because of the absence of nearness.

Except for creating the universe, because of the context and because he is not near to it.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The creative power of the liberated soul is described in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (8.2.1). However, the liberated soul has not the power to create a material universe. Only the Supreme Personality of Godhead has the power to create, maintain, and destroy the material universes. This is described in Taittirīya Upaniṣad (3.1.1). How is this known? The sūtra explains, “prakaraṇād asannihitavāt” (because of the context and because he is not near to it). From the context it is seen that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the topic discussed in this passage of Taittirīya Upaniṣad (3.1.1). Neither by a great struggle nor by chanting mantras can the individual spirit soul obtain this kind of power. This is corroborated by the explanation given in Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.6.1). Also, the liberated soul is not the subject of discussion in any passage near to (asannihitavāt) these words of Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.6.1). If it were otherwise (and the liberated souls had the power to create the material universe), then the author of the sūtras would not have defined the the Supreme Personality of Godhead in these words (Vedānta-sūtra 1.1.2):

janmādy asya yataḥ

"That Brahman (the Supreme Spirit) is He from whom the creation, sustenance, and destruction of the manifested universe arises."*

Also, if the liberated souls had the power to create universes, there would be many creators and from that there would arise a great chaos and calamity. Therefore the liberated souls have not the power to create material universes.

Here someone may object: In Taittirīya Upaniṣad 1.5.3) it is said:

sarve 'smai devā balim āvahanti

"All the demigods bring offerings to him."

Also, in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (7.25.2) it is said:

sa svarāḍ bhavati tasya sarveṣu lokeṣu kāma-cāro bhavati

"He is independent. He can go to any world."

In this way it is seen that because he is worshiped by all the demigods, and because he has all extraordinary powers, the liberated soul can certainly create material universes.

If this is said, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 18

pratyakṣopadeśān neti cen nādhikārika-maṇḍalasyokteḥ

pratyakṣa—direct; upadeśāt—because of the teaching; na—not; iti—thus; cet—if; na—not; adhikārika—of great leaders; maṇḍalasya—of the circle; ukteḥ—from the statement.

Someone may say: "No. It is not so. Because there is a direct teaching," If this is said, I reply: "No. What you say is not true. Because those texts describe great leaders."

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Here someone may say, "It is not correct to say that the liberated souls have no power to create material universes, for many passages of the Śruti-śāstra directly describe that power." If this is said, then the author of the sūtra replies, "No. It is not so." Why not? The sūtra explains, "adhikārika-maṇḍalasyokteḥ" (Because those texts describe great leaders). These texts explain how, by the mercy of the Supreme Lord, the liberated soul can travel to the planets of the great demigods, such as that of the four-faced Brahmā, and enjoy many pleasures there. In this way it is said that the great liberated souls, such as Nārada Muni and the four Kumāras can travel to the planets of the demigods, and when they do the demigods there honor them with great respect.

These passages of the Upaniṣad mean in truth that by the Supreme Lord's mercy the liberated souls can travel to many different worlds and feel pleasure by seeing the Lord's glories and opulences there. These passages should not be wrongly interpreted to mean that the individual spirit soul has the power to create material universes.

Here someone may object: If the liberated soul is thus an enjoyer of various material pleasures, then he is not different from a conditioned soul, for all material pleasures must come to an end.

If this is said, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 19

vikārāvartī ca tathā hi sthitim āha

vikāra—the changes of material existence; a—not; vartī—existing; ca—and; tathā—so; hi—because; sthitim—situation; āha—says.

Furthermore it is changeless, for it describes that condition.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "vikāra" here refers to the six kinds of transformation, beginning with birth, that are present in the material world. These transformations do not effect the liberated soul. Neither do these transformations affect the supremely pure Personality of Godhead, his transcendental abode, or anything else that has transcendental qualities like those of the Supreme Lord. Aware of what is the truth about all these worlds, the liberated soul may observe them but he does not really reside in them. The word "hi" in this sūtra means, "because". The true nature of the liberated soul is described (sthitim āha) in the following words of Kaṭha Upaniṣad (2.2.1):

puram ekādaśa-dvāram
ajasyāvakra-cetasah
anuṣṭhāya na śocati
vimuktaś ca vimucyate

"Although he resides in the city of eleven gates, the city of the unborn and pure-hearted Supreme, he does not lament. He is free. He is liberated."

Although his spiritual form seems to be covered, the soul enlightened with transcendental knowledge is liberated in truth. Although he seems to reside in the world of the three modes, he is liberated. That is the meaning of this verse. In these two ways he is liberated. He has directly attained the goal of life. The covering of material life is like a garland of clouds. It covers the eyes of the conditioned souls, but it does not cover the Supreme Personality of Godhead. In Śruti-śāstra it is said:

vilajjamānayā yasya
sthātum īkṣā-pathe 'muyā
vimohita vikantthante
mamāham iti durdhiyaḥ

"The illusory energy of the Lord cannot take precedence, being ashamed of her position. But those who are bewildered by her always talk nonsense, being absorbed in thoughts of 'It is I' and 'It is mine'."*

Therefore the clouds (of material illusion) can never really cover the sun (of the Supreme Personality of Godhead).

Here someone may object: The goal of life is to make manifest the true nature of the individual spirit soul, who is blissful, whose desires are all at once fulfilled, and who has a host of transcendental virtues. That is enough. Why should one labor to understand the Supreme Lord also?

If this is said, the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 20

darśayataś caivam pratyakṣānumāne

darśayataḥ—they show; ca—also; evam—thus; pratyakṣa—direct perception; anumāne—and logic.

Direct perception and logic both reveal it.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Although he has the transcendental qualities already described, because he is atomic in size the liberated soul does not, by himself, have bliss that is limitless. It is when he associates with the Supreme Personality of Godhead that the liberated soul attains limitless bliss. This is described in Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.7):

rasam hy evāyam labdhvānandī-bhavati

"When one understands the Personality of Godhead, the reservoir of pleasure, Kṛṣṇa, he actually becomes transcendently blissful."*

Also, in the Bhagavad-gītā (14.27), Lord Kṛṣṇa explains:

brahmaṇo hi pratiṣṭhāham
amṛtasyāvyaśasya ca

śāśvatasya ca dharmasya
sukhasyasikāntikasya ca

"And I am the basis of the impersonal Brahman, which is immortal, imperishable, and eternal, and is the constitutional position of ultimate happiness."*

This is like a poor man who takes shelter of a rich man and becomes wealthy.

Here someone may object: in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (3.1.3) it is said:

nirañjanaḥ paramam sāmyam upaiti

"Freed from matter, the liberated soul becomes equal to the Supreme."

The Śruti-śāstra thus explains that the liberated soul is equal to the Supreme. What is the use, then, of even using the word, "the Supreme Lord"? The so-called atomic nature of the individual soul is only a figure of speech. The truth is that the individual soul is all-pervading.

If this is said, then the author of the sūtras gives the following reply.

Sūtra 21

bhoga-mātra-sāmya-liṅgāc ca

bhoga—enjoyment; mātra—only; sāmya—equality; liṅgāt—by the sign; ca—also.

Also because of the indication that the equality is only in enjoyment.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

The word "ca" (also) is used here for emphasis. As a frog jumps, so the word "na" (not) should jump into this sūtra from sūtra 18. In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad (2.1.1) it is said:

so 'śnute sarvān kāmān saha brahmaṇā vipaścitā

"The liberated soul enjoys all transcendental pleasures in the company of the all-knowing Supreme Personality of Godhead."

The meaning here is that the Upaniṣad's statement that the liberated soul is equal to the Lord applies only to the soul's enjoyment of transcendental happiness. The liberated soul is not equal in nature to the Supreme Lord. That is the meaning. This objection was previously refuted in sūtra 2.3.19. In this way it is proved that the equality of the Supreme and the individual spirit soul is in the matter of enjoyment only, that their natures are different, and that difference is real.

Adhikaraṇa 11

The Liberated Soul Never Returns

Introduction by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Now will be explained the truth that the liberated soul has the association of the Supreme Personality of Godhead eternally

Viṣaya (the subject to be discussed): All scriptural statements describing the soul's entrance into the spiritual realm of the Supreme Lord are here the subject of discussion.

Samśaya (doubt): Does the liberated soul stay in the spiritual world eternally, or does he not stay there eternally?

Pūrvapakṣa (the opponent speaks): The spiritual world is a place like Svargaloka or any other place. As one may fall down from Svargaloka, so one may also fall down from the spiritual world. Therefore the liberated soul does not necessarily stay in the spiritual world eternally.

Siddhānta (conclusion): In the following words the author of the sūtras gives His conclusion.

Sūtra 22

anāvṛttiḥ śabdād anāvṛttiḥ śabdāt

an—without; āvṛttiḥ—return; śabdāt—because of the scriptures.

No return, because of the scriptures. No return, because of the scriptures.

Purport by Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

A devotee who faithfully worships and serves the Supreme Lord and then goes to the Lord's spiritual world, never returns. How is that known? The sūtra explains, "śabdāt" (because of the scriptures). In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (4.15.6) it is said:

etena pratipadyamānā imāṁ mānavam āvartaṁ nāvartante

"They who enter the spiritual world never return to the world of men."

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (4.15.1) it is said:

sa khalv eva vartayan yāvad āyusaṁ brahmalokam abhisampadyate. na ca punar avartate.

"Leaving this life, he enters the spiritual world. He never returns."
In the Bhagavad-gītā (8.15 and 16) Lord Kṛṣṇa declares:

mām upetya punar janma
duḥkhālayam aśāsvatam
nāpnuvanti mahātmānaḥ
samsiddhiṁ paramām gatāḥ

"After attaining Me, the great souls, who are yogīs in devotion, never return to this temporary world, which is full of miseries, because they have attained the highest perfection.*

ā-brahma-bhuvanāl lokāḥ
punar āvartino 'rjuna
mām upetya tu kaunteya
punar janma na vidyate

"From the highest planet in the material world down to the lowest, all are

places of misery wherein repeated birth and death take place. But one who attains My abode, O son of Kuntī, never takes birth again."*

In the Bhagavad-gītā (8.15 and 16) Lord Kṛṣṇa also declares:

Here someone may express the following fear: Lord Hari is all-powerful, the master of all, perhaps at some point in time He may throw the liberated soul out of the spiritual world. Or perhaps the liberated soul may at some time voluntarily leave the spiritual world.

There is no need to fear in this way, for Lord Kṛṣṇa has explained in Bhagavad-gītā (7.17):

priyo hi jñānino tv artham
aham sa ca mama priyaḥ

"of these, the wise one who is in full knowledge in union with Me through devotional service is the best. For I am very dear to him, and he is very dear to Me."*

Lord Kṛṣṇa also declares in Śrīma-Bhāgavatam (9.4.68):

sādhavo hṛdayam mahyam
sādhūnām hṛdayam tv aham

"The pure devotee is always in the core of My heart, and I am always in the heart of the pure devotee. My devotees do not know anything else but Me, and I do not know anyone else but them."*

In these words the mutual love of the Lord and His devotee is described.

In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (9.4.65) Lord Kṛṣṇa declares:

ye dārāgara-putrāptān
prāṇān vittam imān param
hitvā mām śaraṇam yātāḥ
katham tāms tyaktum utsahe

"Since pure devotees give up their homes, wives, children, relatives, riches, and even their lives simply to serve Me, without any material improvement in this life or in the next, how can I give up such devotees at any time?"*

In Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam (2.8.6) it is also said:

dhautātmā puruṣaḥ kṛṣṇa-
pāda-mūlaṁ na muñcati
mukta-sarva-parikleśaḥ
panthāḥ sva-śaraṇaṁ yathā

"A pure devotee of the Lord whose heart has once been cleansed by the process of devotional service never relinquishes the lotus feet of Lord Kṛṣṇa, for they fully satisfy him, as a traveler is satisfied at home after a troubled journey."*

In this way the scriptures explain that the Supreme Personality of Godhead will never abandon His devotee and the devotee will always ardently love the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The Supreme Personality of Godhead is always truthful and His desires are always at once fulfilled. He is an ocean of love for they who take shelter of Him. He washes away the ignorance that made His devotees turn from Him. Once He brings back to Himself His dear devotees, who are His parts and parcels, the Supreme Personality of Godhead will not again let them go.

In the same way the individual soul, who had been searching for happiness and who finally has turned from the pathetic, wretched, pale reflection of happiness he had for many births sought in the material world in many ways, and who now, by the mercy of the bona-fide spiritual master has understood the truth of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, of whom he is a part and parcel, who now has no desire apart from the Supreme Lord, who is now purely engaged in devotional service to the Supreme Lord, and who has now attained the Supreme Lord, whose spiritual form is filled with limitless bliss, and who is the merciful friend and master, will never desire to leave such a Lord. In this way the truth is understood from the scriptures. This truth is understood only by taking shelter of the scriptures. The words of the sūtra are repeated to indicate the conclusion of the book.

Epilogue

samuddhṛtya yo duḥkha-pankāt sva-bhaktān
nayatya acyutaś cit-sukhe dhāmi nitye
priyān gāḍha-rāgāt tilārdham vimoktum
na svecchaty asāv eva su-jñair niṣevyaḥ

Let the wise worship and serve Lord Govinda, the infallible Supreme Personality of Godhead, who lifts his devotees from the mud of material sufferings, takes them to His eternal and blissful spiritual abode, and out of deep love for them will not leave them for even half a moment.

śrīmad-govinda-pādā-
ravinda-makaranda-lubdha-cetobhiḥ
govinda-bhāṣyam etat
pāthyam śapatho 'rpito 'nyebhyaḥ

Let them whose hearts are greedy to taste the honey of the lotus flower that is glorious Lord Govinda's feet study this Govinda-bhāṣya. Let a curse fall on the non-devotees who try to study it.

vidyā-rūpaṁ bhūṣaṇaṁ me pradāya
khyātiṁ ninye tena yo mām udāraḥ
śrī-govindaḥ svapna-nirdiṣṭa-bhāṣyo
rādhā-bandhur bandhurāṅgaṁ sa jīyāt

All glories to graceful and handsome Lord Govinda, who is the dear friend of Śrī Rādhā, who kindly gave me the name Vidyābhūṣaṇa, and who spoke this commentary to me in a dream.