

# *Śrī Vedānta-sūtra*

With the *Govinda-bhāṣya* Commentary of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa  
Translated by His Grace Kuṣakratha das Brahmācārī

## Adhyāyas 3 & 4

Expanded Commentary and Vedic Evidence

— by —

Śrī Gaurahari Dāsānudās Bābājī

— Published by —

Esoteric Teaching Seminars

ISBN 978-0-557-25697-6

<http://esotericteaching.org>

Licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 Unported License.  
You are free:

- **To Share** — to copy, distribute and transmit the work
- **To Remix** — to adapt the work

Under the following conditions:

- **Attribution:** You must attribute the work (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work) by providing a link to the above website.
- **Noncommercial:** You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- **Share Alike:** If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under the same or similar license to this one.

For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work. The best way to do this is with a link to <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Any of the above conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder. Nothing in this license impairs or restricts the author's moral rights.

## Table of Contents

Vedānta-sūtra.....	12
Adhyāya 3: Devotional Service.....	12
Pāda 1: Defects of Material Existence.....	12
Adhikaraṇa 1: The Soul’s Departure from Earth.....	12
Sūtra 3.1.1.....	14
Sūtra 3.1.2.....	15
Sūtra 3.1.3.....	16
Sūtra 3.1.4.....	16
Sūtra 3.1.5.....	17
Sūtra 3.1.6.....	18
Sūtra 3.1.7.....	18
Adhikaraṇa 2: The Soul’s Return to the Earth.....	19
Sūtra 3.1.8.....	19
Sūtra 3.1.9.....	20
Sūtra 3.1.10.....	20
Sūtra 3.1.11.....	21
Sūtra 3.1.12.....	21
Adhikaraṇa 3: Do the Impious Also Go to Candraloka?.....	22
Sūtra 3.1.13.....	22
Sūtra 3.1.14.....	23
Sūtra 3.1.15.....	23
Sūtra 3.1.16.....	24
Sūtra 3.1.17.....	24
Sūtra 3.1.18.....	24
Sūtra 3.1.19.....	25
Sūtra 3.1.20.....	26
Sūtra 3.1.21.....	26
Sūtra 3.1.22.....	26
Adhikaraṇa 4: The Soul Does not Become Ether.....	27
Sūtra 3.1.23.....	27
Adhikaraṇa 5: The Passage from Ether to Rain is Quick.....	27
Sūtra 3.1.24.....	28
Adhikaraṇa 6: The Descending Soul Does not Take Birth Among the Plants.....	28
Sūtra 3.1.25.....	28
Sūtra 3.1.26.....	29
Sūtra 3.1.27.....	29
Sūtra 3.1.28.....	30
Vedānta-sūtra.....	31
Adhyāya 3: Devotional Service.....	31
Pāda 2: Glories and Virtues of the Lord.....	31
Adhikaraṇa 1: The Supreme Personality of Godhead Creates Dreams .....	31
Sūtra 3.2.1.....	32
Sūtra 3.2.2.....	32
Sūtra 3.2.3.....	33
Adhikaraṇa 2: Not All Dreams Are Illusions.....	33
Sūtra 3.2.4.....	33

Sūtra 3.2.5.....	34
Adhikaraṇa 3: The Supreme Personality of Godhead Creates the Waking State.....	35
Sūtra 3.2.6.....	35
Adhikaraṇa 4: The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the Creator of Dreamless Sleep.....	36
Sūtra 3.2.7.....	36
Sūtra 3.2.8.....	37
Adhikaraṇa 5: The Same Person Returns to the Body.....	37
Sūtra 3.2.9.....	38
Adhikaraṇa 6: The State of Swoon.....	38
Sūtra 3.2.10.....	39
Adhikaraṇa 7: The Lord is One.....	39
Sūtra 3.2.11.....	40
Sūtra 3.2.12.....	40
Sūtra 3.2.13.....	41
Adhikaraṇa 8: the Form of Brahman.....	42
Sūtra 3.2.14.....	43
Sūtra 3.2.15.....	43
Sūtra 3.2.16.....	43
Sūtra 3.2.17.....	44
Adhikaraṇa 9: The Worshiped is Different from the Worshiper.....	45
Sūtra 3.2.18.....	46
Adhikaraṇa 10: The Jīva is not a Reflection of God.....	46
Sūtra 3.2.19.....	46
Sūtra 3.2.20.....	47
Sūtra 3.2.21.....	48
Adhikaraṇa 11: The “Neti-Neti” Text Explained.....	48
Sūtra 3.2.22.....	49
Adhikaraṇa 12: The Form of the Lord.....	50
Sūtra 3.2.23.....	50
Adhikaraṇa 13: The Supreme Personality of Godhead Can Be Seen.....	51
Sūtra 3.2.24.....	51
Sūtra 3.2.25.....	52
Sūtra 3.2.26.....	53
Sūtra 3.2.27.....	54
Adhikaraṇa 14: The Lord’s Qualities Are Not Different From His Self.....	55
Sūtra 3.2.28.....	55
Sūtra 3.2.29.....	55
Sūtra 3.2.30.....	56
Sūtra 3.2.31.....	56
Adhikaraṇa 15: The Supreme Personality of Godhead Experiences the Highest Bliss.....	57
Sūtra 3.2.32.....	58
Sūtra 3.2.33.....	59
Sūtra 3.2.34.....	59
Adhikaraṇa 16: The Supreme is Not Devoid of Variety.....	60
Sūtra 3.2.35.....	60
Sūtra 3.2.36.....	60
Adhikaraṇa 17: The Lord is the Highest.....	61

Sūtra 3.2.37.....	61
Adhikaraṇa 18: The Lord is All-pervading.....	62
Sūtra 3.2.38.....	62
Adhikaraṇa 19: The Supreme Lord Awards the Fruits of Action.....	63
Sūtra 3.2.39.....	64
Sūtra 3.2.40.....	64
Sūtra 3.2.41.....	64
Sūtra 3.2.42.....	65
Vedānta-sūtra.....	67
Adhyāya 3: Devotional Service.....	67
Pāda 3: Worshiping the Lord’s Attributes.....	67
Adhikaraṇa 1: The Lord Should Be Sought.....	69
Sūtra 3.3.1.....	69
Sūtra 3.3.2.....	70
Sūtra 3.3.3.....	70
Sūtra 3.3.4.....	71
Sūtra 3.3.5.....	71
Adhikaraṇa 2: The Lord’s Qualities are Described in Many Scriptures.....	72
Sūtra 3.3.6.....	73
Sūtra 3.3.7.....	74
Adhikaraṇa 3: The Ekāntī Devotees do not Meditate on all the Lord’s Qualities.....	74
Sūtra 3.3.8.....	74
Sūtra 3.3.9.....	75
Adhikaraṇa 4: The Lord’s Childhood and Youth.....	76
Sūtra 3.3.10.....	77
Adhikaraṇa 5: The Lord’s Activities are Eternal.....	77
Sūtra 3.3.11.....	78
Adhikaraṇa 6: Meditation on the Lord’s Qualities.....	79
Sūtra 3.3.12.....	79
Adhikaraṇa 7: The Supreme Lord Is Full of Bliss.....	80
Sūtra 3.3.13.....	80
Sūtra 3.3.14.....	80
Sūtra 3.3.15.....	81
Sūtra 3.3.16.....	82
Sūtra 3.3.17.....	82
Sūtra 3.3.18.....	83
Adhikaraṇa 8: The Supreme Personality of Godhead is the Father.....	84
Sūtra 3.3.19.....	85
Adhikaraṇa 9: One Should Meditate on the Transcendental Form of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.....	85
Sūtra 3.3.20.....	86
Sūtra 3.3.21.....	87
Sūtra 3.3.22.....	87
Sūtra 3.3.23.....	87
Sūtra 3.3.24.....	88
Sūtra 3.3.25.....	88
Adhikaraṇa 10: The Ferocity of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.....	89

Sūtra 3.3.26.....	89
Adhikaraṇa 11: Meditation on the Supreme Personality of Godhead.....	90
Sūtra 3.3.27.....	90
Sūtra 3.3.28.....	91
Adhikaraṇa 12: The Way to Attain Liberation.....	92
Sūtra 3.3.29.....	92
Sūtra 3.3.30.....	93
Adhikaraṇa 13: The Path of Spontaneous Love.....	93
Sūtra 3.3.31.....	94
Adhikaraṇa 14: The Methods of Devotional Service.....	94
Sūtra 3.3.32.....	95
Sūtra 3.3.33.....	96
Adhikaraṇa 15: Meditation on the Qualities of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.....	97
Sūtra 3.3.34.....	97
Sūtra 3.3.35.....	99
Adhikaraṇa 16: The Lord’s Transcendental Abode.....	99
Sūtra 3.3.36.....	100
Sūtra 3.3.37.....	100
Sūtra 3.3.38.....	101
Adhikaraṇa 17: The Qualities of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.....	101
Sūtra 3.3.39.....	102
Adhikaraṇa 18: The Goddess of Fortune.....	103
Sūtra 3.3.40.....	104
Sūtra 3.3.41.....	105
Sūtra 3.3.42.....	105
Adhikaraṇa 19: The Many Forms of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.....	106
Sūtra 3.3.43.....	107
Adhikaraṇa 20: The Spiritual Master.....	107
Sūtra 3.3.44.....	108
Adhikaraṇa 21: The Spiritual Master’s Mercy.....	108
Sūtra 3.3.45.....	108
Adhikaraṇa 22: The Supreme Personality of Godhead and the Individual Spirit Soul are not Identical.....	109
Sūtra 3.3.46.....	110
Sūtra 3.3.47.....	112
Adhikaraṇa 23: Spiritual Knowledge Brings Liberation.....	113
Sūtra 3.3.48.....	114
Sūtra 3.3.49.....	114
Sūtra 3.3.50.....	115
Adhikaraṇa 24: Worshiping the Saintly Devotees.....	116
Sūtra 3.3.51.....	116
Adhikaraṇa 25: The Liberated Souls Have Different Relationships with the Supreme Personality of Godhead.....	117
Sūtra 3.3.52.....	118
Sūtra 3.3.53.....	119
Adhikaraṇa 26: How to Attain Liberation.....	119
Sūtra 3.3.54.....	120

Adhikaraṇa 27: The Supreme Lord Resides in the Bodies of the Conditioned Souls.....	121
Sūtra 3.3.55.....	122
Adhikaraṇa 28: Different Mellows in the Spiritual World.....	122
Sūtra 3.3.56.....	123
Sūtra 3.3.57.....	123
Sūtra 3.3.58.....	124
Adhikaraṇa 29: The Different Features of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.....	124
Sūtra 3.3.59.....	125
Adhikaraṇa 30: Different Meditations on the Lord’s Different Forms.....	125
Sūtra 3.3.60.....	125
Adhikaraṇa 31: The Steadfast Worship of the Lord.....	126
Sūtra 3.3.61.....	126
Adhikaraṇa 32: Worshiping the Lord To Attain a Specific Benediction.....	127
Sūtra 3.3.62.....	127
Adhikaraṇa 33: Meditation on the Form of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.....	128
Sūtra 3.3.63.....	128
Sūtra 3.3.64.....	128
Sūtra 3.3.65.....	129
Sūtra 3.3.66.....	129
Sūtra 3.3.67.....	130
Sūtra 3.3.68.....	130
Śrī Vedānta-sūtra.....	131
Adhyāya 3: Devotional Service.....	131
Pāda 4: Transcendental Knowledge is Independent of Vedic Rituals.....	131
Adhikaraṇa 1: Transcendental Knowledge.....	131
Sūtra 3.4.1.....	132
Adhikaraṇa 2: Jaimini’s Opinion that Transcendental Knowledge is Subordinate .....	132
Sūtra 3.4.2.....	132
Sūtra 3.4.3.....	133
Sūtra 3.4.4.....	134
Sūtra 3.4.5.....	134
Sūtra 3.4.6.....	135
Sūtra 3.4.7.....	135
Adhikaraṇa 3: The Superiority of Transcendental Knowledge.....	136
Sūtra 3.4.8.....	136
Sūtra 3.4.9.....	136
Sūtra 3.4.10.....	137
Sūtra 3.4.11.....	137
Sūtra 3.4.12.....	138
Sūtra 3.4.13.....	139
Sūtra 3.4.14.....	140
Adhikaraṇa 4: The Glories of Transcendental Knowledge.....	140
Sūtra 3.4.15.....	140
Sūtra 3.4.16.....	141
Sūtra 3.4.17.....	142
Sūtra 3.4.18.....	142
Sūtra 3.4.19.....	143

Sūtra 3.4.20.....	144
Sūtra 3.4.21.....	144
Sūtra 3.4.22.....	144
Sūtra 3.4.23.....	145
Sūtra 3.4.24.....	146
Sūtra 3.4.25.....	147
Adhikaraṇa 5: The Person Qualified to Attain Transcendental Knowledge .....	147
Sūtra 3.4.26.....	147
Sūtra 3.4.27.....	148
Adhikaraṇa 6: A Person Situated in Transcendental Knowledge is not Free to Sin .....	148
Sūtra 3.4.28.....	149
Sūtra 3.4.29.....	149
Sūtra 3.4.30.....	150
Sūtra 3.4.31.....	150
Adhikaraṇa 7: The Svaṇiṣṭha Devotee and Varṇāśrama-dharma.....	151
Sūtra 3.4.32.....	151
Sūtra 3.4.33.....	151
Adhikaraṇa 8: The Pariniṣṭhita Devotee may Renounce Ordinary Duties .....	152
Sūtra 3.4.34.....	153
Sūtra 3.4.35.....	153
Adhikaraṇa 9: The Nirapekṣa Devotee.....	154
Sūtra 3.4.36.....	155
Sūtra 3.4.37.....	155
Sūtra 3.4.38.....	156
Adhikaraṇa 10: Renunciation.....	156
Sūtra 3.4.39.....	157
Sūtra 3.4.40.....	157
Sūtra 3.4.41.....	158
Sūtra 3.4.42.....	159
Sūtra 3.4.43.....	160
Adhikaraṇa 11: The Supreme Personality of Godhead Protects and Maintains the Nirapekṣa Devotee .....	161
Sūtra 3.4.44.....	161
Sūtra 3.4.45.....	162
Sūtra 3.4.46.....	162
Adhikaraṇa 12: Meditation on the Supreme Personality of Godhead.....	163
Sūtra 3.4.47.....	163
Adhikaraṇa 13: The Different Āśramas.....	164
Sūtra 3.4.48.....	164
Sūtra 3.4.49.....	165
Adhikaraṇa 14: The Secret of Transcendental Knowledge.....	166
Sūtra 3.4.50.....	166
Adhikaraṇa 15: Attaining Transcendental Knowledge in this Lifetime .....	167
Sūtra 3.4.51.....	167
Adhikaraṇa 16: Transcendental Knowledge and Liberation.....	168
Sūtra 3.4.52.....	169
Epilogue.....	170

Śrī Vedānta-sūtra.....	171
Adhyāya 4: The Results of Transcendental Knowledge.....	171
Pāda 1: The Glories of Transcendental Knowledge.....	171
Adhikaraṇa 1: One Should Always Engage in Devotional Service.....	171
Sūtra 4.1.1.....	171
Sūtra 4.1.2.....	172
Adhikaraṇa 2: Meditation on the Supersoul.....	172
Sūtra 4.1.3.....	173
Adhikaraṇa 3: The Supreme Lord is not the Mind.....	173
Sūtra 4.1.4.....	174
Adhikaraṇa 4: The Impersonal Brahman.....	174
Sūtra 4.1.5.....	174
Adhikaraṇa 5: The Creator of the Sun.....	175
Sūtra 4.1.6.....	175
Adhikaraṇa 6: Āsanas and Meditation.....	176
Sūtra 4.1.7.....	176
Sūtra 4.1.8.....	176
Sūtra 4.1.9.....	177
Sūtra 4.1.10.....	177
Adhikaraṇa 7: The True Nature of Meditation.....	178
Sūtra 4.1.11.....	178
Adhikaraṇa 8: Devotional Service Continues After Liberation.....	179
Sūtra 4.1.12.....	179
Adhikaraṇa 9: Transcendental Knowledge Destroys Past Sins.....	180
Sūtra 4.1.13.....	181
Adhikaraṇa 10: Transcendental Knowledge Destroys Past Pious Karmic Reactions.....	181
Sūtra 4.1.14.....	182
Adhikaraṇa 11: Arabdha-phala and Anarabdha-phala Karmic Reactions.....	182
Sūtra 4.1.15.....	183
Adhikaraṇa 12: Regular Duties and Karmic Reactions.....	184
Sūtra 4.1.16.....	184
Adhikaraṇa 13: Some Fine Points of Karmic Reactions.....	185
Sūtra 4.1.17.....	185
Sūtra 4.1.18.....	186
Sūtra 4.1.19.....	186
Śrī Vedānta-sūtra.....	188
Adhyāya 4: The Results of Transcendental Knowledge.....	188
Pāda 1: How a Person with Transcendental Knowledge Leaves his Material Body.....	188
Adhikaraṇa 1: The Time of Death.....	188
Adhikaraṇa 2: The Mind Enters the Breath.....	189
Adhikaraṇa 3: The Life-Breath Enters the Individual Soul.....	190
Adhikaraṇa 4: The Individual Spirit Soul Enters the Combined Elements.....	191
Adhikaraṇa 5: The Departure of the Enlightened Soul.....	192
Adhikaraṇa 6: The Senses Enter the Supreme.....	195
Adhikaraṇa 7: The Nature of the Senses' Entrance into the Supreme.....	196
Adhikaraṇa 8: The Hundred-and-first Nāḍī.....	197
Adhikaraṇa 9: The Path of the Sun's Rays.....	198



Adhikaraṇa 10: The Soul’s Departure During the Different Seasons.....	199
Śrī Vedānta-sūtra.....	202
Adhyāya 4: The Results of Transcendental Knowledge.....	202
Pāda 3: The Nature of the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the Path that leads to Him.....	202
Adhikaraṇa 1: Many Paths or One?.....	202
Sūtra 4.3.1.....	203
Adhikaraṇa 2: Vāyuloka.....	204
Sūtra 4.3.2.....	204
Adhikaraṇa 3: Varuṇaloka.....	204
Sūtra 4.3.3.....	205
Adhikaraṇa 4: The Ativāhika-devatā Demigods.....	205
Sūtra 4.3.4.....	205
Sūtra 4.3.5.....	206
Adhikaraṇa 5: The Divine Person.....	206
Sūtra 4.3.6.....	206
Adhikaraṇa 6: Bādari Muni’s Opinion.....	207
Sūtra 4.3.7.....	207
Sūtra 4.3.8.....	207
Sūtra 4.3.9.....	208
Sūtra 4.3.10.....	208
Sūtra 4.3.11.....	208
Adhikaraṇa 7: Jaimini Muni’s Opinion.....	209
Sūtra 4.3.12.....	209
Sūtra 4.3.13.....	209
Sūtra 4.3.14.....	210
Adhikaraṇa 8: Vyāsadeva’s Opinion.....	210
Sūtra 4.3.15.....	210
Adhikaraṇa 9: A Special Situation.....	211
Sūtra 4.3.16.....	211
Śrī Vedānta-sūtra.....	213
Adhyāya 4: The Results of Transcendental Knowledge.....	213
Pāda 4: The Glories of the Liberated Souls.....	213
Adhikaraṇa 1: The Original Forms of the Liberated Souls.....	213
Sūtra 4.4.1.....	213
Sūtra 4.4.2.....	214
Sūtra 4.4.3.....	215
Adhikaraṇa 2: The Individual Soul Meets the Supreme Personality of Godhead.....	215
Sūtra 4.4.4.....	215
Adhikaraṇa 3: The Qualities of the Liberated Soul.....	216
Sūtra 4.4.5.....	216
Sūtra 4.4.6.....	217
Sūtra 4.4.7.....	217
Adhikaraṇa 5: The Soul’s Desires Are Fulfilled.....	218
Sūtra 4.4.8.....	218
Adhikaraṇa 6: The Supreme Lord is the Master of the Liberated Souls.....	219
Sūtra 4.4.9.....	219
Adhikaraṇa 7: The Spiritual Body.....	219

Sūtra 4.4.10.....	220
Sūtra 4.4.11.....	220
Sūtra 4.4.12.....	221
Adhikaraṇa 8: The Bliss of the Liberated Souls.....	222
Sūtra 4.4.13.....	222
Sūtra 4.4.14.....	222
Adhikaraṇa 9: The Liberated Soul Is Full of Transcendental Knowledge.....	223
Sūtra 4.4.15.....	223
Sūtra 4.4.16.....	224
Adhikaraṇa 10: The Liberated Soul has not the Power to Create the World.....	224
Sūtra 4.4.17.....	225
Sūtra 4.4.18.....	226
Sūtra 4.4.19.....	226
Sūtra 4.4.20.....	227
Sūtra 4.4.21.....	228
Adhikaraṇa 11: The Liberated Soul Never Returns.....	228
Sūtra 4.4.22.....	228
Epilogue.....	230



# **Vedānta-sūtra**

## **Adhyāya 3: Devotional Service**

### **Pāda 1: Defects of Material Existence**

*na vinā sādhanair devo  
jñāna-vairāgya-bhaktibhiḥ  
dadāti sva-padam 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.”

The previous two Adhyāyas 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, meditated on by they who seek liberation. In those chapters all opposing views were refuted, and the real nature of the Supreme was described.

This third Adhyāya describes 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 *pādas*.

In the First Pāda, the various defects of material existence are explained to show that one should renounce the world. 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 Pāda, the Lord’s many glories and virtues will be described to show that one should love the Supreme Lord.

### **Adhikaraṇa 1: The Soul’s Departure from Earth**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: The *Pañcāgni-vidyā* portion of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [Adhyāya 5, *khaṇḍas* 3-10] describes the individual soul’s departure for another world and return to this world. The whole passage is given below for reference:

Śvetaketu Āruṇeya went to an assembly of the Pañcālas. Pravāhana Jaibali said to him: “Boy, has your father instructed you?” “Yes, Sir,” he replied.

“Do you know what place men go to when they leave this world?” “No, Sir,” he replied. “Do you know how they return again?” “No, Sir,” he replied. “Do you know where the path of the *devas* and the path of the forefathers diverge?” “No, Sir,” he replied.

“Do you know why the world never becomes full?” “No, Sir,” he replied. “Do you know why the fifth libation of water is called man?” “No, Sir,” he replied.

“Then why did you say you had been instructed? How could anybody who did not know these things say that he had been instructed?” Then the boy went sorrowfully back to the place of his father and said, “Though you had not instructed me, you said that you had instructed me.”

“That Rājanya asked me five questions, and I could not answer one of them.” The father said: “As you have told me these five questions of his, I do not know any one of them. If I knew them, how should I have not told you?”

Then Gautama went to the king’s place, and when he had come to him, the king offered him proper respect. In the morning the king went out on his way to the assembly. The king said to him, “Sir, Gautama, ask a boon of such things as men possess.” Gautama replied, “Such things as men possess may remain with you. Tell me the answers to the to the questions you addressed to the boy.”

The king was surprised and said to him, “Stay with me for some time. As to what you have asked me, Gautama, this knowledge did not go to any *brāhmaṇa* before you, therefore this knowledge belonged to the *kṣatriya* class alone.” Then he began:

“O Gautama, the altar on which the sacrifice is offered is the world of heaven; its fuel is the sun itself, the smoke his rays, the light the day, the coals the moon, the sparks the stars. On that altar the *devas* (or the *prāṇas* represented by Agni, etc.) offer the *śraddhā* libation consisting of water. From that oblation arises the sparkling *soma*.

“O Gautama, the altar is Parjanya (the *deva* of rain). Its fuel is the air itself, the smoke the clouds, the light the lightning, the coals the thunderbolt, the sparks the thunder. On that altar the *devas* offer the sparkling *soma*; from that oblation arises rain.

“O Gautama, the altar is the earth. Its fuel is the year, the smoke the sky, the light the night, the sparks the intermediate quarter. On that altar the *devas* (*prāṇas*) offer rain; from that oblation arises food, corn, grains, etc.

“O Gautama, the altar is man; its fuel is speech, the smoke the breath, the light the tongue, the coals the eye, the sparks the ear. On that altar the *prāṇas* offer food; from that oblation arises semen.

“O Gautama, that altar is woman; on that altar the *prāṇas* offer semen; from that oblation arises the embryo.

“For this reason the water of the fifth oblation is called man. This embryo, gestating in the womb for nine months, more or less, is born. When born, he lives whatever the length of his life may be. When he has departed, as appointed in the scriptures, his friends carry him to the funeral pyre, from whence he came, from whence he sprang.

“Those who know this, even though they may be *gṛhasthas* [householders], and those in the forest who follow faith and austerity, the *vānaprasthas* and the *parivrājakācāryas* who do not yet know the Supreme Personality of Godhead, go to light; from light to day, from day to the *śukla-pakṣa* [bright fortnight of the Moon], from the *śukla-pakṣa* to the *uttarāyana* [the six months when the Sun travels in the north], from the *uttarāyana* to the year, from the year to the Sun, from the Sun to the Moon, from the Moon to the lightning. There is a person there who is not human; he leads to the Brahman. This is the path of the *devas*.

“Those who, living in a village, practice a life of sacrifice, works of public utility and live by begging alms, go to the smoke, from the smoke to the night, from the night to the *kṛṣṇa-pakṣa* [dark fortnight of the Moon], from the *kṛṣṇa-pakṣa* to the *dakṣiṇayana* [the six months when the Sun travels in the south]; but they do not reach the year. From the months they go to the world of the forefathers, from the world of the forefathers to the ether, from the ether to the moon. That is the sparkling *soma*. Here they are eaten by the *devas*; yes, the *devas* eat them.

“Having dwelt there until their good *karma* is consumed, the return again the way they have come, to the ether, to the air. Then the sacrificer, having become air, becomes smoke; having become smoke, he becomes mist. Having become mist, he becomes a cloud; having become a cloud, he rains down. Then he is born as rice and corn, herbs and trees, sesame and beans. The escape from there is beset with great difficulties. For whichever persons eat that food and beget children, he takes birth among them and becomes like them.

“Those whose conduct in his previous lives has been good will quickly attain some good birth, like that of a *brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya* or *vaiśya*. But he whose conduct has been evil will quickly attain an evil birth: a keeper of a dog, keeper of a hog or even a *caṇḍāla* [dog-eater].

“There are many small creatures—flies, worms, etc.—which do not travel on either of these paths, but who constantly die and are reborn. Theirs is a third world. Therefore the world never becomes full. Thus let a man take care to live a pious and holy life, and thus the following *śloka* is said:

“A man who steals gold, who drinks alcohol, who dishonor’s his *guru*’s bed, who kills a *brāhmaṇa* or who associates with such people, falls down into the animal species; but he who knows the five sacrificial fires is not defiled by sin, even though he associates with sinners. He who knows is pure, clean, and attains the worlds of the blessed, yea, he attains the worlds of the blessed.”

*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 3.1.1

*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 body, the soul is embraced [by the subtle body]. This is so from the questions and answers [in the above-quoted passage of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*].**

Here *tad* means “the body.” That meaning is taken from the word *mūrti* in *Sūtra* 2.4.20. When the soul leaves one gross material body and enters another, he takes the subtle body with him. 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. semen. 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 he 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 the soul leaves one gross material body accompanied by the subtle material body, goes to the celestial world, falls from there, and again enters a woman's womb still accompanied by the same subtle material body.

Here someone may object: “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 3.1.2**

*try-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.**

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 3.1.3

*prāṇa-gateś ca*

*prāṇa* – of the *pranas*; *gateḥ* – of the departure; *ca* – and.

**Also because of the *prāṇas*’ departure.**

When the soul enters another material body the *prāṇas* also come. This is described in *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* [4.4.2]:

*tam utkrāmantaṁ prāṇo ‘nūtkrāmati prāṇam anūtkrāmantaṁ sarve prāṇā anūtkrāmanti.*

“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 3.1.4

*agny-ādi-gati-śruter iti cen na bhāktatvāt*

*agni* – fire; *ādi* – beginning; *gati* – going; *śruteḥ* - from the *Śruti-śāstra*; *iti* – thus; *cen* – 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.**

Here someone may object: “Is it not so that in the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* it is said:

*yasyāsya puruṣasya mṛtasyāgniṁ vāg apy eti vātaṁ prāṇaś cakṣur ādityaṁ manaś candraṁ diśaḥ śrotraṁ pṛthivīm śarīraṁ ākāśam ātmauśadhīr lomāni vanaspatīṅ keśā apsu lohitaṁ ca retaś 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 3.1.5

*prathame śravaṇād iti cen na tā eva hy upapatteḥ*

*prathame* – in the first; *śravaṇāt* – because of not being described in the *Śruti-śāstra*; *iti* – thus; *cen* – 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.**

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* [faith] 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 *sūtra* 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 3.1.6

*aśrutatvād iti cen na iṣṭādi-kāriṇām pratīteḥ*

*aśrutatvāt* – because of not being described in the *Śruti-śāstra*; *iti* – thus; *cen* – 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.**

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. . . ākāśāc 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]:

*devāḥ 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 a 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 tam 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 3.1.7

*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.**

The word *vā* [or] is used here to dispel doubt. The word *somarāja* here refers to the individual spirit soul. The description that he becomes 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-sāstra* shows that they who are ignorant of the Supersoul become servants of the *devas*. In *Bṛhad-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 rājñām paśavo 'nnaṁ viśām*

“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 *yajñas* would all be meaningless. If the *devas* ate whomever went to Candraloka, why would the souls be so eager to perform *yajñas* 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 evādhvānam punar nivartate.*

“After staying there for some time his *karma* is exhausted and he again returns.”

*Samśaya* [doubt]: When he leaves Svargaloka, does the soul bring his 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 *sampat* [to ascend], as in the words *sampatanty 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 3.1.8**

*kṛtātyaye 'nuśayavān dr̥ṣṭa-smṛtibhyām*

*kṛta* – of what is done; *atyaye* – at the end; *anuśaya* – *karma*; *vān* – possessing; *dr̥ṣṭa* – from the *Śruti-sāstra*; *smṛtibhyām* – from the *Smṛti-sāstra*.

**At the end there is still *karma*, because of the statements of *Śruti*- and *Smṛti*-śāstras.**

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: *dr̥ṣṭa-smṛtibhyām*: “By the statements of *Śruti*- and *Smṛti*-śāstras.” The *Śruti*-śāstra [*Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 5.10.7] explains:

*tad ayam 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 sūkara-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 *kvip*. 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 nivīṣanti.*

“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 3.1.9**

*yathetaṁ anevam ca*

*yathā* – as; *itam* – departed; *an* – not; *evam* – thus; *ca* – and.

**Also, not as he went.**

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 3.1.10**

*caraṇād iti cen na tad-upalakṣaṇārtheti kārṣṇājiniḥ*

*caranāt* – 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.**

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-carāṇa* [good conduct]. The word *carāṇa* 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 *carāṇa*, and as one performed *karma*, so one attains an appropriate birth.”

To this I reply: There is no fault here to interpret the word *carāṇa* as a synonym of *karma*. Kārṣṇājini Muni affirms that in this passage of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [5.10.7] the word *carāṇa* means *karma*. This is also true because the *Śruti-śāstras* affirm that *karma* is the origin of conduct. That is the meaning.

### **Sūtra 3.1.11**

*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.**

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 *carāṇa* in this passage means *karma*.

### **Sūtra 3.1.12**

*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.**

The word *tu* [but] is used here to begin a refutation of the previous argument. Bādari Muni thinks the word *carāṇa* here means ‘pious and impious deeds.’ An example of this is the sentence *punyaṁ 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 *carāṇa* here means *karma*, and any other interpretation of it is meaningless.

*Carāṇa* [good conduct] is merely a specific kind of *karma*. *Carāṇa* 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 *carāṇa* is a specific kind of *karma*, it is proved that the soul departing from Svargaloka is accompanied by the remainder of his *karma*.

### **Adhikaraṇa 3: Do the Impious Also Go to Candraloka?**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 *Īsopaniṣad* [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 3.1.13**

*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.**

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 *Kauśītaki 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 *Īsopaniṣad* are only an empty threat to frighten the sinners from acting badly. In truth the pious and the sinner both attain the same result.”

*Siddhānta* [conclusion]: To this I reply: No. It is not so. The sinner does not enjoy happiness. In the following words the author of the *sūtras* gives His conclusion.

### Sūtra 3.1.14

*samyamane tv anubhūyetaṛeṣām ārohāvarohau tad-gati-darśanāt*

*samyamane* – in Samyamani Puri; *tu* – but; *anubhūya* – experiencing; *itāreṣām* – 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.**

The word *tu* [but] is used here to begin the refutation of the *pūrvapakṣin*. The word *itāreṣām* [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 we 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  
āyam 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 3.1.15

*smaranti ca*

*smaranti* – the *Smṛti-śāstra*; *ca* – also.

**The *Smṛti-śāstras* also affirm it.**

*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 Yamarāja’s control.”

In this way the sages and *Smṛti-śāstras* affirm that the sinners come under Yamarāja’s control.

### Sūtra 3.1.16

*api sapta*

*api* – also; *sapta* – seven.

**There are seven and others also.**

In the *Mahābhārata* it is said:

*rauravo 'tha mahāms' caiva vahnir vaitaraṇī 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 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 3.1.17

*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.**

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 3.1.18

*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.**

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 3.1.19**

*na tṛtīye tathopalabdheḥ*

*na* – not; *tṛtīye* – in the third; *tathā* – so; *upalabdheḥ* – because of the perception.

**Not so in the third, for it is so perceived.**

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 and 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 Brahmaloaka and 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 3.1.20

*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.**

In this world also some pious persons, Droṇa and Dhr̥ṣṭadyumna 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 3.1.21

*darśanāc ca*

*darśanāt* – from seeing; *ca* – also.

**From seeing also.**

In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [6.3.1] it is said:

*Teṣām khalv eṣām bhūtānām trīny eva bījāni bhavanti. Aṇḍa-jam jīva-jam udbhij-jam.*

“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 3.1.22

*tr̥tīya-śabdāvarodhaḥ samśoka-jasya*

*tr̥tīya-śabda* – word; *avarodhaḥ* – description; *samśoka* – from grief; *jasya* – born.

**The grief-born is included in the third word.**

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 the perspiration-born creatures have the power to move about, and the plants do 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**

It has already been shown that the soul who performs pious deeds goes to Candraloka accompanied by his subtle material body, and after some time, again descends to the earth accompanied by the remnant of his *karma*. The way this happens is described in *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [5.10.5]:

*athaitam evādhvānam punar nivartante yathetam ākāśasm ākāśād vāyuh 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 3.1.23**

*tat-svābhāvvyāpattir upapatteḥ*

*tat* – of them; *svābhāvya* – similarity; *āpattiḥ* – attainment; *upapatteḥ* – because of being reasonable.

**It is similar to them, for that is reasonable.**

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**

*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 3.1.24**

*nāti-cireṇa viśeṣāt*

*na* – not; *ati* – very; *cireṇa* – for long; *viśeṣāt* - because of something specific.

**Not for very long, because of something specific.**

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***

*Viśaya* [statement]: The passage after entering rain is described in the following statement of *Śruti-śāstra*:

*ta iha vrīhi-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 3.1.25**

*anyādhiṣṭhite pūrvavad abhilāpāt*

*anya* – by an other; *adhiṣṭhite* – occupied; *pūrvā* – before; *vat* – like; *abhilāpāt* – because of the statement.

**In what is occupied by another because of a statement like the previous.**

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 inauspicious.” Therefore the description here that the descending souls take birth in this way is metaphorical. It is not literal.

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 him 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 hiṁsyāt 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.”

### Sūtra 3.1.26

*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*.**

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 *agnisomiya-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 *agnisomiya-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 3.1.27

*retah-sig-yogo ‘tha*

*retah* – semen; *sik* – sprinkling; *yogaḥ* – contact; *atha* – then.

### **Then there is contact with the male that sprinkles the semen.**

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 retah 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 3.1.28**

*yoneḥ śarīram*

*yoneḥ* – from the womb; *śarīram* – a body.

**The body comes from the womb.**

The word *yoneḥ* here is in the ablative case. The soul departs from his father's body and enters his mother's womb. In this way, so it may experience the fruits of his *karma*, the soul attains a new material body. In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [5.10.7] it is said:

*tad ya iha ramañīya-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.

# Vedānta-sūtra

## Adhyāya 3: Devotional Service

### Pāda 2: Glories and Virtues of the Lord

*vittir viraktiś ca kṛtāṅjaliḥ puro  
yasyāḥ parānanda-tanor vitiṣṅhate  
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 Pāda. 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.

The beginning of this Pāda describes 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 sṛjate. na tatrānandā mudaḥ pramudo bhavanty athānandān mudaḥ pramudaḥ sṛjate. na tatra veśantāḥ puṣkarīṇyaḥ sravantyaḥ sṛjate 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 creator of this dream world with chariots and other things the individual spirit soul or the Supersoul?

*Pūrvapakṣa* [the opponent speaks]: The individual spirit soul is the creator. In *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [8.7.1] Prajāpati declares that the individual soul has the power to create by willing.

*Siddhānta* [conclusion]: In the following words the author of the *sūtras* gives His conclusion.

### Sūtra 3.2.1

*sandhye sṛṣṇir āha hi*

*sandhye* – in the junction; *sṛṣṇir* – creation; *āha* – says; *hi* – indeed.

**Indeed, it says that in the junction there is creation.**

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 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 3.2.2

*nirmātāram caike putrādayaś ca*

*nirmātāram* – the creator; *ca* – and; *eke* – some; *putra* – sons; *ādayas* – beginning with; *ca* – also.

**Others [say] that He is the creator. Sons and others also.**

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 kāmam kāmam 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 vṛñiṣva*

“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 svapnenābhihanti.*

“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 3.2.3

*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.**

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 that 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

*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 3.2.4

*sūcakaś ca hi śruter ācakṣate ca tad-vidaḥ*

*sūcakas* – an indicator; *ca* – and; *hi* – indeed; *śruter* – of the *Śruti-śāstra*; *ācakṣate* – declare; *ca* – and; *tad* – that; *vidaḥ* – they who know.

**It gives omens. The *Śruti-śāstra* and the experts affirm it.**

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, *śruteḥ*: “The *Śruti-śāstra* affirms it.” The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [5.2.9] affirms:

*yadā karmasu kāmyeṣu  
striyaṁ svapne 'bhipāśyati  
samṛddhiṁ 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-vidah* 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:

*ādiṣṅāvān yathā svapne  
rāma-rakṣāṁ imāṁ haraḥ  
tathā likhitavān prātaḥ  
prabuddho buddha-kauśikaḥ*

“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 3.2.5

*parābhidhyānāt tu tirohitaṁ tato hy asya bandha-viparyayau*

*para* – of the Supreme Personality of Godhead; *abhidhyānāt* – by the will; *tu* – indeed; *tirohitaṁ* – 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.**

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, 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 dreams are real, because they are created by the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

### ***Adhikaraṇa 3: The Supreme Personality of Godhead Creates the Waking State***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Now will be explained that the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the creator of the waking state also. In the *Kaṭha 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.”**

*Samśaya* [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 3.2.6**

*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.**

As explained in *Kaṭha 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**

*Viṣaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 *nāḍīs*, 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 *nāḍīs*, the membrane surrounding the heart, and the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

*Samśaya* [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 3.2.7**

*tad-abhāvo nāḍīṣu tac chruter ātmani ca*

*tad* – of that; *abhāvo* – the absence; *nāḍīṣu* – in the *nadis*; *tac* – that; *chruter* – 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*.**

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 svapnaṁ na kañcana paśyaty athāsmiṁ prāṇa evaikadhā bhavati.*

“Then the soul enters the *nāḍīs*. When sleeping, the soul does not see any dream. Then the soul becomes 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 *nāḍīs*, 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 3.2.8**

*ataḥ prabodho ‘smāt*

*ataḥ* – therefore; *prabodho* – waking; *asmāt* – from Him.

**Therefore the waking state is from Him.**

Because the Supreme Personality of Godhead is the actual place where dreamless sleep occurs, and the *nāḍīs* 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 *nāḍīs*, 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* it is said:

*satas cāgatya na viduḥ sata āgacchamahe*

“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 3.2.9**

*sa eva tu karmānusmṛti-śabda-vidhibhyaḥ*

*sa* – he; *eva* – indeed; *tu* – but; *karma* – karma; *ānusmṛti* – memory; *śabda* – of the *Śruti-śāstra*; *vidhibhyaḥ* – from the instructions.

**It is he, because of the karma, the memory, the Śruti-śāstra and the teachings.**

The word *tu* [but] removes the doubt. The same person who had gone to sleep arises from it, and no one else. The reasons are four: First, he finishes the work that he had begun before going to sleep. The word *karma* in the text means ordinary worldly work. Second, he has memory in the form “I am the person who went to sleep and have now awakened.” Thirdly, the text of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [6.9.3] states:

“Whatever these creatures are, whether a tiger or lion, or a wolf or a boar, or a worm or an insect, or a gnat or a mosquito, that they become again and again.”

This means that on awakening, the creatures come back into the same body they had before then went to sleep. Fourthly, scriptural injunctions like *ātmanam eva lokam upāsita*: “One should worship with the aim of attaining the spiritual kingdom” [*Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 1.4.15] show that one should make efforts directed at attaining release. If everyone who went to sleep got liberation, then these injunctions about *mokṣa* would be redundant.

When it is said that a *jīva* enters into Brahman during sleep, what is meant is like a sealed jar of salt water being plunged into the Ganges. When he awakens, it is like the same jar taken out of the river with the same water in it. In the same way the *jīva*, covered by his desires, goes to sleep and for the time being puts aside all his sensory activities and goes to the resting place, namely the Supreme Brahman, and again comes out of it to get further experience. By this resting in Brahman he does not become similar to Brahman, as a person who has obtained *mokṣa*; therefore for these four reasons, the same person who had gone to sleep wakes up again into the same body.

### **Adhikaraṇa 6: The State of Swoon**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Now we shall consider the state of swoon, which is similar to the state of sleep.

*Samśaya* [arisa of doubt]: Does the *jīva* fully attain to Brahman in swoon, or only partially attain to Him?

*Pūrvapakṣa* [antithesis]: Swoon being a special kind of deep sleep, the soul attains to Brahman fully, as in deep sleep.

*Siddhānta* [Vedic conclusion]: The next *sūtra* sets aside this view.

## Sūtra 3.2.10

*mugdhe'rdhasampattiḥ pariśeṣāt*

*mugdhe* – in the swooning person or state; *arddha* – half; *sampattiḥ* – combination or attaining; *pariśeṣāt* – on account of the remaining.

**In the swooning condition, the *jīva* is in half combination with Brahman, because the rule of the remainder shows this.**

When a man is in a swooning or stunned condition, he is in half combination with Brahman, because of the rule of the remainder. In this condition the *jīva* soul does not reach Brahman fully as in deep sleep, because he is conscious of pain. Nor is there total lack of attaining Brahman, as in the waking state, because the soul is unconscious of external objects. Thus by the rule of the remainder, we conclude that there is half combination. We find this described in the *Varāha Purāṇa*:

“When the soul is at a distance from the Supreme Lord in the heart—that is, when he is in the eyes—then he is in waking consciousness. When he is nearer to the Lord—that is, in the throat—then he is in the dream consciousness. But when he has entered into the Lord, then he is in deep sleep. Therefore these are the three states; but swoon is an intermediate state, in which there is half combination with Brahman, because on recovery, there is memory of the consciousness of pain.”

An objector says, “These books describe only three states: waking, dreaming and deep sleep. Where do you get this fourth state called *mugdha* [swoon]? This is not a new state, but one of the above three.”

To this objection we reply that it is a separate state altogether. It is not the waking state, because external objects are not perceived through the senses. Nor is it the dreaming state, because the person is unconscious. Nor is it the deep sleep state, because the peaceful look of the face and stillness of the limbs are absent. Moreover it is a well-known state, recognized by physicians and the world. Therefore it is a different state and is to be inferred by the rule of the remainder.

Thus the purport of this Adhikaraṇa is that the Lord Hari alone must be worshiped and served with devotion, for His glory is such that He is the maker and controller of everything, even the conditions of consciousness such as waking, dreaming and the rest.

## **Adhikaraṇa 7: The Lord is One**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: The preceding passages have shown the glory of the Lord as the creator and controller of everything. Now His inconceivable nature, whereby He retains unity in Himself, although appearing manifold in many different places. Though in *Sūtra* 2.2.44 described that the powers of the Lord are mysterious, yet no reconciliation has been made in these *sūtras* of the paradoxical statement that the Lord, though one, appears simultaneously in many forms, which are apparently different from each other. That reconciliation will now be made through the doctrine of inconceivability.

The *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* [3.2] confirms this inconceivable potency of the Lord as follows:

*eko 'pi san bahudhā yo 'vabhāti*

Although the Lord is one, He is present in innumerable hearts as many.

Similarly, in the *smṛti-śāstra* it is said:

*eka eva paro viṣṇuḥ  
sarva-vyāpī na saṁśayaḥ  
aiśvaryaḍ rūpam ekam ca  
sūrya-vat bahudheyate*

“Viṣṇu is one, and yet He is certainly all-pervading. By His inconceivable potency, in spite of His one form, He is present everywhere, as the sun appears in many places at once.”

*Samśaya* [arisa of doubt]: Are the various forms of the Lord found in different places mutually different from each other or not?

*Pūrvapakṣa* [antithesis]: The difference of locality presupposes the difference in the objects occupying those localities; substances occupying different places cannot be identical, for the quality of being in different places separates them from one another. The above text is merely a general statement, and does not mean that One Lord exists in different places. Therefore, the fact is that there are many gods, occupying different places and having different jurisdictions. Thus the gods being many, there cannot exist that one-pointed devotion to one God, which you are trying to establish.

*Siddhānta* [Vedic conclusion]: God is one only, and not many, as will be shown by the next *sūtra*.

### **Sūtra 3.2.11**

*na sthānato'piparasyobhayaliṅgam sarvatra hi*

*na* – not; *sthānataḥ* – on account of location; *api* – even; *parasya* – of the Highest Lord; *ubhaya-liṅgam* – nondifferent on account of locality; *sarvatra* – everywhere; *hi* – because.

**[The essential nature] of the Supreme Lord, [though differentiated] by space, does not undergo any change of characteristics, because [He exists simultaneously] everywhere.**

There is no change of nature in the adorable Supreme Lord by the mere fact of His existing simultaneously in many places. Though there is a difference of locality, there is no difference in the substance occupying those locations, because His essential nature simultaneously manifests itself in every place by His inconceivable power. The word *sthānataḥ* [localities] signifies the centers where the Lord manifests His glory, where He displays His *līlā* [sportive pastimes]. These sacred places are also called the Samvyoma, or the highest abode of the Lord.

The devotees of the Lord are also of various kinds [*bhāvas*]. For example, some worship Him as servants to the perfect Master, others as His beloveds, and so on. In all these various locations and with all His devotees, the Lord, though manifesting different aspects, is essentially one and the same. He undergoes no change in His essential qualities because of location.

### **Sūtra 3.2.12**

*na bhedāditicenna pratyekamatadvacanāt*

*na* – not; *bhedāt* – on account of difference; *iti* – thus; *cet* – if; *na* – no; *pratyekam* – distinct; *atad* – the absence of that; *vacanāt* – on account of the statement.

**If it be said, “This is invalid because of the statement of difference,” we reply no, because [with reference] to every statement [declaring difference there is always] a counter-statement declaring nondifference.**



The objector says, “The statement made in the previous *sūtra* that the Lord remains one in all His manifestations is unreasonable. For in reality, these different manifestations are different entities, and cannot be called one. In fact, there is *bheda* or difference in the Lord.” This objection is raised in the first part of the *sūtra* and answered in the second part. With regard to every one of these manifestations, the texts take the precaution of saying that the Lord is one. Thus in *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* [2.5.19] we read the following:

Verily Dadhyañca [Dadhīci] proclaimed this nectar to the two Aśvins, and seeing this a Rṣi said, [*Rg Veda* 6.47.18]:

“An image of the Lord is in everyone of the forms in which the *jīva* is embodied, for every *jīva* has an image of the Lord in him. That image is for the sake of seeing and worshiping by that particular *jīva*. The Lord appears in multi-forms through His energies. Therefore it is right to say that these unlimited forms called Hari are all His. This Brahman is verily these Haris; this Brahman is the ten *avatāras* such as Matsya, etc.; this Brahman is the thousand *avatāras* of Viṣṇu such as Viśva, etc.; this Brahman is the Many, such as Parā, etc.; this Brahman is the Endless, such as Ajīta, etc. This is the Brahman, without cause and without effect, besides whom there is nothing and outside whom there is nothing. This Ātman is Brahman, omnipresent and omniscient. This is the teaching of the *Upaniṣads*.”

This text of the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* shows that every form of the Lord abiding in different individuals is the full and entire Supreme Brahman, and not a portion of Him, for an Infinity can have no parts.

### Sūtra 3.2.13

*api caivameke*

*api* - also; *ca* - and; *evam* - thus; *eke* – some.

**And also some teach thus: [that the Lord is one though multi-form].**

The words *api ca* [and also] mean “moreover.” Thus in the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* we read:

“He who knows the *omkāra* as partless and yet full of an infinity of parts, as the destroyer of all false knowledge and as blissful, he is verily a sage and no one else.”

These texts teach that the Lord is one partless whole, having an infinity of parts, each one of which is a whole infinity. The word ‘partless’ means devoid of differences in itself. ‘Infinity of parts’ means having innumerable parts, each of whom is a complete infinity [*svāmśa*]. It is thus written in the *Matsya Purāṇa*:

“The Supreme Viṣṇu is undoubtedly one only, though existing everywhere. He has one form, though through His glory, He appears as many, like the sun.”

The sense is this: as a prismatic crystal, though one only, appears to emit different colors to the eyes of the spectators when viewed from different angles, or as an actor on the stage appears playing different parts in different acts of the drama, while he remains one and the same, though expressing diverse emotions appropriate to the parts he is enacting for the time being; so the Lord Hari never abandons His essential unity of nature, though He appears as many, according to the different ideas or mental attitudes [*bhāva*] of His devotees meditating on Him, or according to the nature of His different pastimes or the works He is engaged in accomplishing. Thus in the *Viṣṇu Tantra*:

“As a prismatic crystal when looked at from different sides appears to possess blue, yellow, etc. colors, so the unchangeable Lord gets different forms in the eyes of His devotees, according to the different forms of meditation.”

And in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* [8.18.12]:

*yat tad vapur bhāti vibhūṣaṇāyudhair  
avyakta-cid-vyaktam adhārayad dhariḥ  
babhūva tenaiva sa vāmano vaṭuḥ  
sampaśyator divya-gatir yathā naṭaḥ*

“The Lord appeared in His original form, with ornaments and weapons in His hands. Although this ever-existing form is not visible in the material world, He nonetheless appeared in this form. Then, in the presence of His father and mother, He assumed the form of Vāmana, a *brāhmaṇa*-dwarf, a *brahmacārī*, just like a theatrical actor.”

Thus that one reality, the Supreme Brahman, having inconceivable powers, and being the substrate of all contradictory attributes, simultaneously becomes many in His manifestation. This gives rise to the notion of His possessing paradoxical qualities; and instead of detracting from His greatness, this strengthens the love of His devotees for Him, the Lord of inconceivable powers. Thus *bhakti* towards the Lord increases by such contemplation of His contradictory attributes.

## **Adhikaraṇa 8: the Form of Brahman**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Now the author establishes that the Lord’s body is pure spirit [*ātman*]. If the body of the Lord were separate from His Self [*ātman*], then *ātman* being a subordinate member, the devotion toward it would also be of a subordinate kind, and not a primary *bhakti*. But this is not the case; for devotion for the form of the Lord is felt, or rather experienced, as if it were drawn towards the primary object. The attraction the devotee feels for the beautiful form of the Lord is not secondary but primary. It therefore follows that the form of the Lord is the very Self of the Lord, the Lord Himself. The form of the Lord thus differs from other forms. Generally, the form embodies the soul, but the form of the Lord is the very Self or soul of the Lord; otherwise there would not be such an attraction for Him. *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* states:

“Obeisances to Kṛṣṇa, the destroyer of pain, whose transcendental form is being, knowledge and bliss.”

*īśvaraḥ paramaḥ kṛṣṇaḥ  
sac-cid-ānanda-vigrahaḥ  
anādir ādir govindaḥ  
sarva-kāraṇa-kāraṇam*

“Kṛṣṇa who is known as Govinda is the Supreme Godhead. He has an eternal blissful spiritual body. He is the origin of all. He has no other origin and He is the prime cause of all causes.”  
[*Śrī Brahma-saṁhitā* 5.1]

*Samśaya* [arisa of doubt]: Does Brahman have any form, or not?

*Pūrvapakṣa* [antithesis]: Brahman has a form, which consists of the very subtle matter of being, intelligence and bliss. The phrase *sac-cid-ānanda-vigrahaḥ* is a *bahuvrīhi* compound, meaning “He whose form is being, intelligence and bliss.” Therefore He has a form.

*Siddhānta* [Vedic conclusion]: The Lord has no form distinct from His Self, as is shown in the next *sūtra*.

### Sūtra 3.2.14

*arūpavadevahi tatpradhānatvāt*

*arūpavat* – without form; *eva* – indeed; *hi* – because; *tat* – of that; *pradhānatvāt* – because of being the Supreme Soul.

**Indeed, Brahman has no ordinary form, because as the Supreme Soul, His form is His Self.**

Brahman has no *rūpa* [form] or *vigraha* [shape]; hence He is called *arūpavat* [without form]. The word *eva* [indeed] is used to refute the argument of the *pūrvapakṣin*. Why do we say so? Because His form is His very Self. In ordinary cases, the form is always subordinate to the *ātman* or soul it embodies. But in the case of Brahman the Supreme Lord, the form is the *ātman*. Thus there is no difference between the form and self of Brahman—they are identical. The form of the Supreme Brahman possesses all the attributes of Brahman: all-pervading [*vibhu*], the knower [*jñātr̥tva*], the Supersoul [*paramātmā*], etc. His form is both the substance and the attribute of the Supreme.

An objector may say, “But it is a well-known fact that by meditating on Brahman, the Supreme Self and substance, knowledge and bliss, one loses consciousness of its opposite, namely *prakṛti*, which is inert and painful by nature. How is it then possible that the author of the *sūtras* would predicate a form with regard to such a Brahman, for all form is a limitation of life, and inconsistent with the true conception of Brahman as set forth above: that He is without form?” This objection is answered in the next *sūtra*.

### Sūtra 3.2.15

*prakāśavaccāvaiyarthiyāt*

*prakāśavat* – in the same way as the sun consists of light; *ca* – and; *avaiyarthiyāt* – on account of the lack of meaningfulness.

**And [the conception of form in relation to Brahman] is not meaningless, just as the idea of a form with regard to the sun, which is pure light.**

The word *ca* [and] in the *sūtra* is employed to remove the doubt expressed above. The suffix *-va* in *prakāśavat* has the force of *iva* [like] and it is added to the word *prakāśa* in the locative case. Thus as in the case of the sun, whose single form is pure light, a form is conceived for the purpose of meditation, and as such a conception is not without purpose, as it helps concentration of the mind; similarly in the case of Brahman, who is conceived to have an eternal transcendental form of knowledge and bliss, is conceived to have a form to facilitate meditation on Him, for meditation is impossible without concentrating on a form. The word *dhyāna* [meditation] is always used in conjunction with some form; as in the sentence, “The wife, separated from her husband, meditated on his form pictured in her mind.”

Nor must be thought that this mental picture of a form visualized for the sake of meditation is unreal, and actually Brahman has no form, because there is evidence of His having a form.

### Sūtra 3.2.16

*āha ca tanmātram*

*āha* - the *Śruti* declares; *ca* - and; *tanmātram* - consisting of the essence of His Self.

**The *Śruti* declares, however, that the form of the Supreme consists of the very essence of His Self.**

The force of the word *mātra* is to denote exclusiveness. Since the scriptures declare this transcendental form of the Lord to be the Supreme Self, this form is a real entity, and not simply the imagination of the devotee. In the *Atharva Veda*, the Lord is thus described [*Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad, Pūrva 12*]:

*sat-puṇḍarīka-nayanam*  
*meghābham vaidyutāmbaram*  
*dvi-bhujam mauna-mudrādhyam*  
*vana-mālinam īśvaram*

“The Supreme Lord, appearing in His two-armed form, had divine lotus eyes, a complexion the color of a cloud, and garments that resembled lightning. He wore a garland of forest flowers, and His beauty was enhanced by His pose of meditative silence.”

In this description, attributes like ‘lotus-eyed’ etc. are shown to be the essential qualities of the Lord. The Lord and His form are clearly identical, for this form is called the Lord in the above-quoted verse. So also in the *Padma Purāṇa* we read:

“There is no distinction between the Lord’s life and His form—the form is His life.”

In every other being, the form embodies the life, but in the case of the Lord, the form is the life, directly manifest. In other words, the body of the Lord is the Lord Himself.

### **Sūtra 3.2.17**

*darśayati cāthopi smaryate*

*darśayati* - the *Śruti* shows; *ca* - and; *atho* - fully; *api* - also; *smaryate* - the *Smṛti* declares.

**Moreover, the scripture also fully shows this, and the tradition also declares it.**

In answer to the question “How did Gopāla, the Supreme Self, who is above all *prakṛti*, descend on this earth and incarnate Himself in matter?” the *Śruti* describes the form of the Supreme Lord, and shows that His form is identical with His Self. The name Gopāla is primarily applied to the Lord’s most attractive form, with beautiful face, hands, feet and exquisite features of the entire body, which is the color of a blue raincloud. In the *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad, Pūrva 12*, the sages ask Lord Brahmā the following question: “What is the form of the Lord, what is His sacred formula of worship, and what is the method of His worship? Please tell this to us who are anxious to know.” Lord Brahmā replies:

“Kṛṣṇa is dressed as a cowherd boy, has the color of a cloud, is a youth, and stands under a desire-tree. There are the following verses on this subject:

“He who meditates in his heart on Kṛṣṇa as described below is freed from rebirth. The Supreme Lord, appearing in His two-armed form, has divine lotus eyes, a complexion the color of a cloud, and garments that resembled lightning. He wears a garland of forest flowers, and His beauty is enhanced by His pose of meditative silence. He is surrounded by cows, *gopas* and *gopīs*, underneath a desire-tree, adorned with divine ornaments, seated on a throne inlaid with jeweled lotuses, and fanned by the cool breezes resonant with the music of the waves of the River Kālindī.”

The *Smṛti* also declares that the form and Self of the Lord are identical:

*īśvaraḥ paramaḥ kṛṣṇaḥ  
sac-cid-ānanda-vigrahaḥ  
anādir ādir govindaḥ  
sarva-kāraṇa-kāraṇam*

“Kṛṣṇa who is known as Govinda is the Supreme Godhead. He has an eternal blissful spiritual body. He is the origin of all. He has no other origin and He is the prime cause of all causes.”  
[*Śrī Brahma-saṁhitā* 5.1]

Thus it is established that the form of the Lord is His Self. Though the usual concept of *ātman* as pure being logically excludes the idea of form, revelation is our sole guide in matters of transcendence; therefore we have to simply accept that Brahman’s form is identical with His Self. There is no room for argument with the inconceivable truths known only through Vedic revelation, so one must not doubt how the Lord’s form can be His very Self. It is one of the mysteries of Godhead, revealed by *Śruti* and confirmed by the experience of the self-realized souls. That transcendental form is perceived by the heart when it is purified by love, just as the form of music is perceived by the ear trained to perceive musical form. Therefore *bhakti* for the form of the Lord is not an inferior form of *bhakti*, for the form of the Lord is the Lord Himself.

If the Lord were formless, then the *Śruti* texts like *vijñāna-ghana* [form of intelligence] *ānanda-ghana* [form of bliss] would become meaningless, for they employ the word *ghana* [form]. Thus the form of the Lord is not only unlimited, being, knowledge and bliss, but also possesses all His transcendental qualities, such as being all-pervading and the Supersoul of all beings. To have any other conception of His form would be wrong and based upon error. As the Lord Himself says to Nārada in the *Mokṣa-dharma*:

“O Nārada, do not think that ‘I see this form because everything that has a form is visible.’ This form is not like other forms, because merely by willing, in a moment I can become invisible to you. For I am the Lord, and the teacher of the world by being the inner guide of all.”

### ***Adhikaraṇa 9: The Worshiped is Different from the Worshiper***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Now the author establishes the difference between the worshiper and the worshiped, between the *jīva* and Brahman. For if the worshiper were identical with the worshiped—the result of the *advaita* notion “I am That,” then *bhakti* would not arise, for no sane person entertains the notion that his own self is fit for his adoration, for *bhakti* is by nature offered to a being of superior nature to oneself. Though the author has repeatedly established the proposition that the *jīva* is different from the Lord, he again reverts to that topic, dealing with it from a different point of view, to enlighten those misguided souls who are deluded through false teachings into the idea that they themselves are the Supreme Brahman, and therefore prayers and *pūjā* are useless to them.

*Samśaya* [arisa of doubt]: The *Śruti* says,

“Just as many images of the sun are seen in various vessels of water, so in this world the various selves are to be considered reflections of the Supreme Self.”

Or as stated in the *Brahma-bindu Upaniṣad*:

“The Bhūta-ātman is indeed one, existing in every being. He appears as one or as many, like the reflection of the moon of water.”

Now arises the doubt. It has been demonstrated before that the Supreme Self is the very form of bliss and knowledge. Does that Supreme Self become the *jīva* under certain circumstances, or is He always separate from the *jīva*?

*Pūrvapakṣa* [antithesis]: The Supreme Self Himself becomes the *jīva*. For a *jīva* is nothing but the reflection of the Supreme in material energy or nescience. A reflection is identical with the original, for it exists as long as the original exists, and vanishes when the original ceases to exist. Therefore it has been said, “If a person looks at a mirror in front of him he sees his own face, but if he turns away, he sees nothing.” Therefore the Supreme Self, by its conjunction with nescience, has become the *jīva*.”

*Siddhānta* [Vedic conclusion]: The *jīva* is not a reflection of Brahman; this view is set aside by the next *sūtra*.

### **Sūtra 3.2.18**

*ataeva copamā sūryakādivat*

*ataḥ eva* – for this very reason; *ca* – and; *upamā* – absolute identity; *sūryakādivat* – just as between the sun and its images.

**Therefore the simile of the sun and its reflection applies to the *jīva* and the Supreme Self as showing difference.**

Here is the meaning of the *sūtra*: Because the *jīva* is separate from the Supreme Self, therefore he is spoken of figuratively like the reflection of the sun. For the relationship of the original and the reflected cannot exist for two substances that are identically one. For if the reflection were identically the same as its source, then the reflection of fire would burn things, and the reflection of a sword would cut. But there is no such identity, for the original and the reflection are different. The word *ca* [and] in the *sūtra* indicates that there are other sources of difference as well. Therefore, it follows that the *jīva* is different from the Supreme Self.

### **Adhikaraṇa 10: The Jīva is not a Reflection of God**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: The *jīva* is not a reflection of God.

*Samśaya* [arisa of doubt]: Admitted that, on account of the above simile, the *jīva* is different from the Supreme. But the very same simile, however, shows the *jīva* to be a reflection, at least, of the Lord’s consciousness.

*Pūrvapakṣa* [antithesis]: As the reflection of the sun in water is called *sūryaka*, so the reflection of the Supreme in *avidyā* [nescience] is called *jīva*. What is the harm of this understanding?

*Siddhānta* [Vedic conclusion]: This doubt is also set aside by the next *sūtra*.

### **Sūtra 3.2.19**

*ambuvadagrahaṇāttu na tathāttvam*

*ambuvat* – like the reflection of the sun on water; *agrahaṇāt* – in the absence of perception; *tu* – but; *na* – not; *tathāttvam* – that state.

**The *jīva* is not a reflection of the Supreme, like the sun reflected in water, because it is not so perceived.**

The similarity of the sun and water does not hold here. The sun is at a distance from the water, and so it is possible for its reflection to exist in the water; but the Supreme Self is all-pervading, so so no object can be at a distance from Him. Thus the term ‘reflection’ is meaningless when applied to the Supreme. So the similarity of the sun reflected in water does not apply to the Self and the *jīva*. Therefore the *jīva* cannot be a reflection of the Supreme Self.

The *Śruti* also says, “He is colorless, reflectionless.” [*Prasna Upaniṣad* 4.10] On the other hand, the *jīva* is an intelligent entity like the Supreme Self. The *Śruti* says, *nityo nityānām cetanaś cetanānām*: “He is the chief eternal among the eternal; the chief conscious entity among all conscious entities.” [*Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 2.2.13]

This refutes the illustration taken from the reflection of space found in some commentaries. Space has no reflection; the so-called reflection of space seen in water is actually a reflection caused by the rays of the sun in particular limited portions of the sky. The ‘reflection of space’ is a wrong notion of the ignorant, otherwise one would also see the reflections of the directions, such as north, east, etc. Nor are the sound and its echo a proper illustration, because an echo is simply the reflection of the original sound, and that the Lord and the *jīva* are different was already proved above.

### Sūtra 3.2.20

*vṛddhihrāsabhāktvamantarbhāvādubhayasāmañjasyādevam*

*vṛddhi* – increase; *hrāsa* – decrease; *bhāktvam* – being admitted of the difference; *antarbhāvāt* – because of being included in that; *ubhaya* – towards both; *sāmañjasyāt* – because of the appropriateness; *evam* – thus.

**[The comparison is not appropriate in its primary sense, but in its secondary sense] of participating in increase and decrease; because [the purport of the scripture] is fulfilled thereby, and thus both comparisons become appropriate.**

The comparison of the sun and its reflection does not hold in its primary sense, but it is a good illustration in its secondary sense of showing the increase of one—the greatness of the Supreme Lord—and the decrease of the other—the smallness of the *jīva*. The sun is great and powerful and so is the Supreme Lord, and the reflection is small and weak, and so is the *jīva*. Taking the illustration in this light, it holds good. Why do we say so? Because *antarbhāvāt*: the sense of the scriptures is fully satisfied by this mode of interpreting the simile. By explaining it thus, reconciliation between both the illustration and the object of illustration, and the standard of comparison and the subject of comparison, takes place.

The sense is this: In the preceding *sūtra*, the comparison of the sun and its reflection was set aside in its ordinary sense, but that same comparison was accepted in its secondary sense, namely, having regard to the attributes found in the sun and its reflection. Therefore it is to be understood in this way: the sun participates in increase; it is a large luminary, untouched by the limitations of the water in which it is reflected. It is independent and unvarying. Its reflections, the *sūryaka* [smaller suns] participate in decrease, for they are smaller than the original, and they vary in size according to the surface on which the reflection is made. They are also limited by the size and reflectivity, etc. of the reflecting surface, therefore they are not independent like the sun, but depend on the conditions of the reflecting surface.

Thus the Supreme Self is all-pervading, untouched by the attributes of *prakṛti* [matter], and independent. The *jīvas*, which are His *aṁsas* [parts], are not all-pervading but atomic, and because they

are affected by the material environment in which they exist, they are joined with the attributes of *prakṛti*, and are therefore not independent. Thus the comparison of the sun and its reflections to the Lord and the *jīvas* holds in that it illustrates the differences between the Lord and the *jīvas*, the subordination of the *jīvas* to the Lord, and also the similarity between them, inasmuch as both are conscious. However the simile fails if it is taken in the sense that the *jīvas* are identical with Brahman in the same way as the reflection is identical with the source. Therefore the *Pañgalopaniṣad* says that the *jīva* is a reflection, but without any *upādhi* [designation or medium]:

“The reflection is of two kinds: limited by *upādhi* and not so limited. The *jīva* is a reflection of the Lord, but not in any *upādhi*; just as the rainbow is a reflection of the sun, but not in any *upādhi* [like water, oil etc.]”

### Sūtra 3.2.21

*darśanācca*

*darśanāt* – because it is seen; *ca* – and.

**Moreover, it is thus seen [in the world that comparisons are taken in the secondary sense.]**

In similes like “Devadatta is a lion,” we find that the ordinary worldly usage is in favor of taking the comparison to apply only as far as it applies or is relevant. In other words, we accept the simile “Devadatta is a lion” only in terms of Devadatta’s courage; we do not accept it to indicate that he has claws, fur, etc. Therefore, the scriptural texts of comparison between the Lord and the *jīva* should be taken in the sense of a simile, only as far as they apply appropriately to the actual characteristics of both.

### **Adhikaraṇa 11: The “Neti-Neti” Text Explained**

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 *Brhad-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 vidyutaṁ sakṛd vidyutaiva ha vā asya śrīr bhavati ya evaṁ 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 satyaṁ teṣāṁ 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 3.2.22**

*prakṛtāyāvatvāṁ hi pratiśedhati tato bravīti ca bhūyaḥ*

*prakṛtā* – the topic under discussion; *etāvattvam* – 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.**

This passage of *Śruti-śāstra* 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, *na hy etasmāt*: “No person or thing is greater than Him.” 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 kṛṣṇāya*

“I offer my obeisances unto the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Kṛṣṇa, who is the eternal blissful form of knowledge” [*Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* 1.1]

*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 Him.”

*Siddhānta* [conclusion]: In the following words the author of the *sūtras* gives His conclusion.

### **Sūtra 3.2.23**

*tad avyaktam āha hi*

*tat* – that; *avyaktam* – unmanifest; *āha* – said; *hi* – indeed.

**Scripture says it is unmanifest.**

The Lord can be seen only by spiritual senses. This is described in *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* [6.9]:

*na sadṛśe 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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.

*Samśaya* [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 3.2.24**

*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*.**

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, *pratyakṣānumānābhyām*: “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  
kaścīd dhīraḥ pratyag ātmānam aikṣad  
āvṛta-cakṣur 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  
dṛṣṭavān 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.”

*bhaktiā tv ananyayā śakya  
ahaṁ 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 3.2.25

*prakāśādi-vac cāvaiśeṣyāt*

*prakāśa* – fire; *ādi* – beginning with; *vat* – like; *ca* – and; *na* – not; *vaiśeṣyāt* – with differences.

**He is [not] like fire or other things, for He has no such different features.**

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 anaṅv 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 paramēśvare  
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 3.2.26**

*prakāśaś ca karmany abhyāsāt*

*prakāśaḥ* – appearance; *ca* – and; *karmani* – in activity; *abhyāsāt* – by repetition.

**And when the activity is repeated, then He appears.**

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 nigūdhavat*

“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  
kaścīd 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 3.2.27

*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.**

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 His own form to them. He does this by His inconceivable mercy. That should be accepted. How is this known? The *sūtra* explains, *liṅgam*: “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:

*nityāvyakto 'pi bhagavān  
īkṣate nija-śaktiḥ  
tām rte paramātmānam  
kaḥ paśyetām itaṁ 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]:

*avyaktaṁ 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]:

*nāhaṁ 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.2.28**

*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.**

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, *ubhaya-vyapadeśāt*: “Because there is description of both.” The *Śruti-śāstra* describes both. That is the meaning. The word *tu* [indeed] here hints that the passages of the *Śruti-śāstra* 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 3.2.29**

*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.**

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 *tejah* is defined to mean either “the destroyer of ignorance” or “the destroyer of darkness.”

### Sūtra 3.2.30

*pūrvavad vā*

*pūrva* – past; *vat* – as; *vā* – or.

**Or, as the past.**

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 kālah  
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 3.2.31

*pratiśedhāc ca*

*pratiśedhāt* – because of denial; *ca* – also.

**Also because it is denied.**

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  
mṛtyoḥ sa mṛtyum 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 vṛṣṭam  
parvateṣu vidhāvati  
evām 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  
niścetanātmaka-śarīra-guṇaiś ca hīnaḥ  
ānanda-mātra-kara-pāda-mukhodarādīḥ  
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 tautological 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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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. 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 bliss 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 3.2.32**

*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.**

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, *setūnmāna-sambandha-bheda-vyapadeśebhyaḥ*: “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 jīvānām  
anyaj jñānam parasya ca  
nityānandāvyayam pūrṇam  
param jñānam vīdhiyate*

“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 3.2.33

*sāmānyāt tu*

*sāmānyāt* – because of resemblance; *tu* – but.

**But because of a common quality.**

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 bliss, which all have a single quality of ‘bliss-ness’ 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 pārthiva 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 3.2.34

*buddhy-arthah pāda-vat*

*buddhi* – of understanding; *arthah* – for the purpose; *pāda* – foot; *vat* – like.

**It is for understanding, like the word ‘foot.’**

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 *Rg 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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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.

### **Sūtra 3.2.35**

*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.**

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 3.2.36**

*upapateś ca*

*upapateḥ* – because of reasonableness; *ca* – also.

**Also because it is reasonable.**

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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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.

*Samśaya* [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 3.2.37**

*tathānya-pratiśedhāt*

*tathā* – so; *anya* – of another; *pratiśedhāt* – because of the denial.

**It is so, for another is denied.**

Nothing is greater than the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Why is that? The *sūtra* explains, *anya-pratiśedhāt*: “for another is denied.” In the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* [3.9] it is said:

*yasmāt param nāparam asti kiñcid*  
*yasmān nāṅīyo 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 tamasaḥ 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 param 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 īdyaḥ*

“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 3.2.38**

*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.**

Even though His form is of a moderate height, the Supreme Personality of Godhead is all-pervading. Why is that? The *sūtra* explains, *āyāma-śabdādibhyaḥ*: “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 īdyaḥ*

“Lord Kṛṣṇa, the supreme controller and the supreme object of worship, is present everywhere.”

In the *Taittirīya Araṇyaka* 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* [9.4-5], 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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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, it would be difficult to develop love for Him because of His miserliness. In the *Praśna Upaniṣad* [3.7] it is said:

*puṇyena puṇyaṁ lokaṁ 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 3.2.39

*phalam ata upapatteḥ*

*phalam* – fruit; *ataḥ* – from Him; *upapatteḥ* – because it is reasonable.

**The result is from Him, for that is reasonable.**

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, *upapatteḥ*: “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 3.2.40

*śrutatvāc ca*

*śrutatvāt* – because of being described in the *Śruti-sāstra*; *ca* – also.

**Also because it is affirmed by the *Śruti-sāstra*.**

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 3.2.41

*dharmam jaiminir ata eva*

*dharmam* – piety; *jaiminiḥ* – Jaimini; *ataḥ* – from Him; *eva* – indeed.

**Jaimini affirms that piety comes from Him.**

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 3.2.42

*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.**

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, *hetu-vyapadeśāt*: “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 yuktas  
tasyārāadhanam ihate  
labhate ca tataḥ kāmān  
mayaiva vihitān hi tām*

“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 first two Pādas of the second Adhyāya 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 Pādas.

# Vedānta-sūtra

## Adhyāya 3: Devotional Service

### Pāda 3: Worshiping the Lord's Attributes

*parayā nirasya māyām 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 Pāda 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 human-like 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 pāpam  
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 Pāda 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 the *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 it cannot be said that the qualities of the Lord are accepted only because of the material traditions of this world, because the revelation of scripture does not describe them as such. 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 etyopāsīta*

"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 qualitative 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 [*śākhā*] 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 3.3.1**

*sarva-vedānta-pratyayam codanādy-aviśeṣāt*

*sarva* – all; *veda* – *Vedas*; *anta* – end; *pratyayam* – 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*.**

The word *anta* [end] here means the conclusion. The word *anta* is also used in this way in *Bhagavad-gītā* [2.16]:

*ubhayor api dṛṣṭo '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, *codanādy-aviśeṣāt*: “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 3.3.2

*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.”**

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 jñanam 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 3.3.3

*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.**

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-mārgeṇa karma kurvīta nityaśaḥ*

*ānando hi phalaṁ yasmāc chākhā-bhedo hy aśakti-jāḥ*

*sarva-karma-kṛtau yasmād aśaktāḥ sarva-jantavaḥ*

*śākhā-bhedam karma-bhedam vyāsas tasmād acīkṣpad*

“Following the path of all the *Vedas*, one should regularly perform pious rituals. The result attained by this is bliss. 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 3.3.4

*sava-vac ca tan niyamaḥ*

*sava* – *yajñas*; *vat* – like; *ca* – and; *tat* – that; *niyamaḥ* – rule.

**That rule is like the *yajñas*.**

The *savas* 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 the Supreme Personality of Godhead, to the degree they have the power.” In the *Agni Purāṇa* it is said:

*yathā nadīnām salilam  
śaktyā sāgaratām vrajet  
evam sarvāṇi vākyāni  
pum-śaktyā brahma-vittaye*

“As the water of rivers, as far as it has the power, always enters the sea, so all words should be employed to understand the Supreme Lord, as far as their speaker has the power.”

### Sūtra 3.3.5

*darśayati ca*

*darśayati* – reveals; *ca* – also.

**It also reveals it.**

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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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. 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-bhujah 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 Sītā.”

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 dṛṣtvā sarve lokāḥ sarve devāḥ sarvāṇi  
bhūtāni bhītyā palāyante svayaṁ yataḥ kutaścīn na bibheti. bhīṣāsmād vātaḥ pavate bhīṣodeti  
sūryaḥ. bhīṣāsmād agniś cendraś ca mṛtyur dhāvati pañcamah.*

“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 *Rg-Veda* [1.154.1]:

*viṣṇor nu kaṁ vīryāṇi prāvocaṁ yaḥ pāṛthivāni vimame rajāmsiyo askambhayad uttaram  
sadhastham 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 3.3.6

*upasaṁhāro 'rthābhedād vidhi-śeṣa-vat samāne ca*

*upasaṁhārah* – 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.**

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, *arthābhedād*: “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 bhuvah svas tasmai namo namaḥ.*

“*bhūr bhuvah 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 3.3.7

*anyathātvam śabdād iti cen nāviśeṣāt*

*anyathātvam* – otherwise; *śabdāt* – because of the *Śruti-śāstra*; *iti* – thus; *cen* – 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.”**

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, *aviśeṣāt*: “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 cannot 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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. 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 3.3.8

*na vā prakaraṇa-bhedāt parovarīyastvādi-vat*

*na* – not; *vā* – or; *prakaraṇa* – of devotion; *bhedāt* – 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.**

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 *bhedāt* 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 *sva-niṣṭha* 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 Hiranya 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 Udgītha 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 3.3.9**

*saṁjñātaś cet tad uktam asti tu tad api*

*saṁjñātaḥ* – by the name; *cet* – if; *tad* – that; *uktam* – spoken; *asti* – is; *tu* – but; *tad* – that; *api* – also.

**If it is because of the name, then I reply, “But it was already said. That also.”**

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*: “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 *sva-niṣṭha* devotees who are in a general way devoted to all the forms of the Lord. Also, even the *sva-niṣṭha* devotees are not able to meditate on every single one of the Lord’s qualities. In the *Rg 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:

*nāntaṁ 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 Parovarīya 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 *svaniṣṭha* and *ekāntī* devotees also have different conceptions of the Lord, the *svaniṣṭha* 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 om tat sat. bhūr bhuvah svas tasmai vai namo namaḥ.*

“*om tat sat. bhūr bhuvah svaḥ.* 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:

*om cin-maye ‘smin mahā-viṣṇau  
jāte dāśarathe harau  
raghoḥ kule ‘khilam rāti  
rājate yo mahī-sthitaḥ*

“*om.* 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 3.3.10

*vyāpteś ca samañjasam*

*vyāpteḥ* - because of being all-pervading; *ca* – also; *samañjasam* – proper.

**It is proper because He is all-pervading and for other reasons also.**

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 *Rg Veda* [1.22.20]:

*tad viṣṇoḥ paramam 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**

*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 3.3.11**

*sarvābhedād anyatre*

*sarva* – all; *abhedāt* – because of non-difference; *anyatra* – in another place; *ime* – they.

**Because of complete non-difference they are in another place.**

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 bhūtam bhavac 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-līlānuraktaḥ*

“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  
tathāiva 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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.3.12**

*ānandādayaḥ pradhānasya*

*ānanda* – bliss; *ādayaḥ* – beginning with; *pradhānasya* – of the Supreme.

**Of the Supreme those qualities that begin with bliss.**

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**

*Viṣaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.3.13**

*priya-śirastvādy-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.**

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 3.3.14**

*itare tv artha-sāmānyāt*

*itare* – others; *tu* – but; *artha* – of result; *sāmānyāt* – because of equality.

**But others because of the sameness of the result.**

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 [*bhīṣāsmāt...* “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 3.3.15**

*ādhyānāya prayojanābhāvāt*

*ādhyānāya* – for meditation; *prayojana* – other purpose; *abhāvāt* – because of the absence.

**Because of the absence of another purpose, it is for meditation.**

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:

*ekam 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 saṅkarṣaṇaḥ prokta eka eva ca pañcadhā*

*aṅgāṅgitvena bhagavān krīḍate puruṣottamaḥ  
aiśvaryaṅ 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. Saṅkarṣaṇa 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 3.3.16

*ātma-śabdāc ca*

*ātma – ātmā; śabdāt – from the Śruti-śāstra; ca – also.*

**Also because the Śruti-śāstra employs the word ātmā.”**

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 3.3.17

*ātma-grhītir itara-vad uttarāt*

*ātma* – *ātma*; *grhītiḥ* – understanding; *itara* – others; *vat* – like; *uttarāt* – from the following.  
***Ātmā* here means “consciousness.” Because of the following it is like the others.**

Here someone may object: “In the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* [2.2.3] it is said:

*anyo 'ntara ātmā vā prāṇamayaḥ*

“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 ātmānandamayaḥ*

“The *ātmā* within is the *Ānandamaya*.”

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-sāstra* 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 3.3.18**

*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.”**

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, *avadhāranāt*: “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 *ānandamaya-puruṣa*. In this passage, passing over the *prāṇamaya-puruṣa* and the other *puruṣas*, one comes to rest at the description of the *ānandamaya-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 *ānandamaya-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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Here the author of the *sūtras* begins his description of other qualities of the Supreme Lord, such as the Lord’s being the father of all. In the *Śruti-śāstra* it is said:

*mātā pitā bhrātā nivāsaḥ śaraṇam suhṛd gatiḥ nārāyaṇaḥ*

“Lord Nārāyaṇa is our mother, father, brother, home, shelter, friend, and goal.”

In the *Jitānta-stotra*, Chapter One, it is said:

*pitā mātā suhṛd 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  
tvam ca svāmī gurur mātā  
pitā ca mama mādharma*

“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 3.3.19**

*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.**

Here the word *pūrvā* means “the previous qualities, such as being full of bliss.” The word *apūrvā* 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 worshipping 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 suhr̥do daivam iṣṭam*

“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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 abhrābhaṃ taruṇaṃ 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 3.3.20

*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.**

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], *cintayamś cetasā kṛṣṇam 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-kumāram naradas tam hovāca... tam mām bhagavān śokasya pāram 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 *śaktyāveśa-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 3.3.21

*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.**

All the qualities of the Lord are present in the four Kumāras and the other *śaktyāveśa-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 3.3.22

*na vāviśeṣāt*

*na* – not; *vā* – or; *aviśeṣāt* – because of non-difference.

**Or not, because of non-difference.**

One should not meditate on all the qualities of the Supreme Lord being present in the *śaktyāveśa-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 3.3.23

*darśayati ca*

*darśayati* – reveals; *ca* – and.

**It also reveals it.**

This truth is revealed in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [7.1.3], for Nārada Muni, who is here seeking the truth, is himself a *śaktyāveśa-avatāra*. In this way it is clear that all the qualities of the Lord are not present in the *śaktyāveśa-avatāras*.

### Sūtra 3.3.24

*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.**

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 *śaktyāveśa-avatāras*. The reason has been given in the previous *sūtra*. The reason is the *śaktyāveśa-avatāras* are individual spirit souls [*jīvas*]. In the Eṅāyanīya 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 3.3.25

*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.**

In the descriptions of the four Kumāras and other *śaktyāveśa-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 *śaktyāveśa-avatāras*.

The *śaktyāveśa-avatāras* may be compared to iron rods heated by a fire. As iron rods heated by a fire have two natures, so the *śaktyāveśa-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 *śaktyāveśa-avatāra*. They who meditate on these qualities in the *śaktyāveśa-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 *śaktyāveśa-avatāra*. They who meditate on his qualities may not ascribe to him all the qualities of the Supreme. However, they may meditate on the *śaktyāveśa-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 *śaktyāveśa-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 *śaktyāveśa-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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.3.26**

*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.**

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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: In the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* [1.11] it is said:

*jñātvā devaṁ sarva-pāsāpahāniḥ  
kṣīṇaḥ kleśair janma-mṛtyu-prahāniḥ  
tasyābhidhyānāt 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 Brahmaloaka, 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 3.3.27**

*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-sāstra*, and because of the means to the end it is like voluntary *kuśa* grass, prayers and hymns. This is said.**

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  
brāhmaṇiḥ śreyaśam pumsām  
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 3.3.28**

*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.**

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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 Sītā.”

In the *Brhad-āranyaka 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 3.3.29**

*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.**

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.

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-kṛpāpekṣā  
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 3.3.30**

*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.**

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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.3.31**

*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.**

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. 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]:

*nāyam 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 ‘mrto 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 3.3.32

*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*.**

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*: “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 kṛṣṇaṃ mukto bhavati saṃsṛteḥ*

“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-padaṃ pañcāṅgaṃ 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 paraṃ 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-śāstras* 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 3.3.33**

*yāvad-adhikāram avasthitir ādhikārikāṇām*

*yāvat* – as long as; *adhikāram* – the post; *avasthitih* – the situation; *ādhikārikāṇām* – of they who hold the posts.

**The office-holders stay for the duration of their terms in office.**

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 *Sūtra* 4.3.10.

As for the demigods opposing the Lord's desires, they do this only in conformance with His wish, 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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-āranyaka 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-śrotam*

“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 3.3.34**

*akṣara-dhiyām tv avarodhaḥ sāmānya-tad-bhāvābhyām aupasada-vat tad uktam*

*akṣara* – imperishable; *dhiyām* – in the idea; *tu* – but; *avarodhaḥ* – acceptance; *sāmānya* – equality; *tad* – of Him; *bhāvābhyām* – with the qualities; *aupasada* – the Aupasat *mantra*; *vat* – like; *tad* – 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.**

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, *sāmānya-tad-bhāvābhyām*: "Because He has the same qualities." The *Kaṭha 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-tīryaṅ  
na strī na ṣaṅḍo na pumān na jantuḥ  
nāyaṁ 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 non-manifestation. 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 *aupasada-vat* the *sūtra* gives an example to show that secondary features inevitably follow primary features. The word *upasad* here refers to a specific *mantra* in a specific Vedic ritual. When it is chanted in the Jamadagnya ceremony where *purodasa* cakes are offered with the *mantra agner vai hotram*, the *upasad mantra* is chanted in the *Sāma Veda* style. However, when it is chanted in a *Yajur Veda* ceremony, the *upasad 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-samyogaḥ*

“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.

### **Sūtra 3.3.35**

*iyad āmananāt*

*iyat* – this; *āmananāt* – by the description.

**It follows the description.**

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.” Meditating 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.3.36

*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.**

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 prasṛtam. 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 3.3.37

*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.**

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.

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 3.3.38**

*vyatihāro viśimṣanti hītara-vat*

*vyatihāro* – changeable; *viśimṣanti* – distinguish; *hi* – indeed; *itara* – others; *vat* – like.

**Like others, they say they are interchangeable.**

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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 [*viśaya*] 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 3.3.39**

*saiva hi satyādayaḥ*

*sā* – she; *eva* – indeed; *hi* – indeed; *satya* – truth; *ādayaḥ* – beginning with.

**Indeed, she is those that begin with truth.**

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 *pūrvapakṣin* 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’.

*aiśvaryaśya samagrasya  
vīryasya yaśasaḥ sriyaḥ  
jñāna-vairāgyayos cāpi  
ṣaṅṅām bhaga itīṅganaḥ*

“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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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-āranyaka 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, ultimately, the Supreme has no qualities and therefore it is not possible that 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 3.3.40

*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.**

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 anapāyinī  
yathā sarva-gato viṣṇus tathāiveyam 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 devī tvam vimukti-phala-dāyinī*

“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 3.3.41**

*ādarād alopah*

*ādarāt* – because of devotion; *alopah* – non-ending.

**Because of devotion it does not cease.**

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-rajāś cakame tulasyā labdhvāpi vakṣasi padaṁ 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 3.3.42**

*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.**

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-kāmēna* here means “with something that bears certain 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: In the *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* [1.54] it is said:

*tasmāt eva kṛṣṇaḥ paro devas taṁ dhyāyet taṁ raset taṁ bhajet taṁ yajet. iti. om tat sat.*

“Therefore, Lord Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Personality of Godhead. One should meditate on Him, glorify Him, serve Him, and worship Him. *om 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 3.3.43

*tan nirdharanānīyamas tad dr̥ṣṭaiḥ pṛthag hy apratibandhaḥ phalam*

*tat* – of that; *nirdharana* – of determination; *a* – not; *niyamaḥ* – rule; *tat* – that; *dr̥ṣṭaiḥ* – 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.**

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-dr̥ṣṭaiḥ*: “Because of what is seen.” In *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* [2.48] it is said:

*yatrāsau saṁsthitaḥ kṛṣṇas*  
*tribhiḥ śaktyā samāhitaḥ*  
*rāmāniruddha-pradyumnai*  
*rukmiṇyā sahito vibhuḥ*  
*catuḥ-śabdo bhaved eko*  
*hy oṁkāras hy aṁśakaiḥ 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 *om̐*.”

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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.3.44**

*pradāna-vad eva tad uktam*

*pradāna* – gift; *vat* – like; *eva* – indeed; *tad* – that; *uktam* – said.

**It is like a gift. That is said.**

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. But one will not be able to attain the Lord by merely hearing the scriptures and following the spiritual path. 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]:

*ācāryopasanaṁ 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***

*Samśaya* [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 3.3.45**

*liṅga-bhūyastvāt tad dhi balīyas tad api*

*liṅga* – of indications; *bhūyastvāt* – because of an abundance; *tad* – that; *hi* – indeed; *balīyaḥ* – more powerful; *tad* – that; *api* – also.

**Because of many symptoms it is more powerful. That also.**

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]:

*bhagavāms 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 śravaṇādiś 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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: In this way it is proved that by attaining the spiritual master’s mercy and by worshiping 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.

### **Sūtra 3.3.46**

*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.**

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 hairaṇyo 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 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]:

*omkāreṇāntaritam 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 ekam 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 words *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 ullasat*, Brahmā described the Lord’s spiritual abode named Mathurā, which is protected by the Lord’s *cakra* 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 but 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 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 3.3.47**

*atideśāc ca*

*atideśāt* – by comparison; *ca* – and.

**Also by comparison.**

In the *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* [2.63] Lord Nārāyaṇa tells Brahmā:

*yathā tvam saha putraiś ca*

*yathā rudro gānaiḥ saha*

*yathā śriyābhīyukto ‘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. The 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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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  
tathāiva 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 3.3.48**

*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.**

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 3.3.49**

*darśanāc ca*

*darśanāt* – by seeing; *ca* – also.

**Also by seeing.**

In the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* [2.2.8] it is said:

*bidyate hr̥daya-granthiś  
chidyante sarva-saṁśayāḥ  
kṣīyante cāśya 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 3.3.50**

*śruty-ādi-balīyastvāc ca na bādhaḥ*

*śruti* – the *Śruti-śāstras*; *ādi* – beginning with; *balīyastvāt* – 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.**

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-balīyastvāt*: “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 brahmānam īḍyaṁ 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 will be proved that spiritual knowledge is the true cause of liberation.

## **Adhikaraṇa 24: Worshiping the Saintly Devotees**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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.”

*Samśaya* [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 3.3.51**

*anubandhādibhyaḥ*

*anubandha* – repeated instructions; *ādibhyaḥ* – beginning with.

**Because of many instructions.**

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 dharma uddhava  
na svādhyāyas tapas tyāgo  
neṣṭa-pūrtam na dakṣiṇā  
vratāni yajñās chandāmsi  
tīrthāni niyamā yamaḥ  
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  
punya-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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [3.14.1] it is said:

*atha khalu kratumayaḥ puruṣo yathā kratur asmil loke puruṣo bhavati tathetaḥ pretya bhavati sa kratum 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-śāstra* 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 3.3.52**

*prajñāntara-prthaktva-vad dr̥ṣṭiś ca tad uktam*

*prajñā* – knowledge; *antara* – other; *prthaktva* – variety; *vat* – possessing; *dr̥ṣṭiḥ* – sight; *ca* – and; *tad* – that; *uktam* – said.

**As there are differences of knowledge, so also there are differences in sight. That is stated.**

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 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 in their *sādhana*, 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 3.3.53

*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.**

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 Nṛga, 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 *cakra* 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.3.54**

*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.**

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:

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

“As faithful wives control their saintly husband, so My devotees bring Me under their control.”  
[*Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* 9.4.66]

In the *Bhagavad-gītā* [8.22], it is said:

*puruṣaḥ sa paraḥ pārtha bhaktyā labhyas 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 *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* [1.2.24]:

*nāvirato duścaritāt  
nāsānto nāsamāhitaḥ  
nāsānta-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]:

*teṣāṃ 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 those 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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 [thesis or statement]:* 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 3.3.55**

*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.**

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 parvatam 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-dṛśaḥ  
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**

*Viṣaya [thesis or statement]:* 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 3.3.56

*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.**

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 3.3.57

*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*.**

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 *R̥g 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 3.3.58**

*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.**

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, *vāvirodhaḥ*: “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 he 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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.3.59**

*bhūmnaḥ kratu-vaj jāyastvaṁ tathā hi darśayati*

*bhūmnaḥ* – of the plurality; *kratu* – *yajña*; *vat* – like; *jāyastvam* – pre-eminence; *tathā* – si; *hi* – indeed; *darśayati* – shows.

**Like a *yajña*, plurality is most important. So, indeed, it reveals.**

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**

*Samśaya* [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 3.3.60**

*Nānā śabdādi-bhedāt*

*nānā* – variety; *śabda* – words; *ādi* – beginning; *bhedāt* – because of the difference.

## **They are different because of different words and other things.**

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 worshipping these forms are different, the forms themselves are different, and Their activities are also different.” In the *Smṛti-śāstra* it is said:

*kṛtam tretā dvāparam 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.3.61**

*vikalpo ‘viśiṣṭha-phalatvāt*

*vikalpaḥ* – option; *aviśiṣṭha* – not better; *phalatvāt* – because of the result.

**It is optional, for a better result is not obtained.**

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**

*Viṣaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.3.62**

*kāmyās tu yathā-kāmaṁ samuccīyeraṇ na vā pūrva-hetv-abhāvāt*

*kāmyāḥ* – for the objects of desire; *tu* – but; *yathā* – as; *kāmaṁ* – desire; *samuccīyeraṇ* – 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.**

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 benedictions, 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 puruṣaṁ 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, 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 ekam govindam sac-cid-ānanda-vigraham pañca-padam vṛndāvana-sura-bhūruha-talāsīnam satatam 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 verses 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 3.3.63**

*aṅgeṣu yathāśraya-bhāvaḥ*

*aṅgeṣu* – on the limbs; *yathā* – as; *āśraya* – shelter; *bhāvaḥ* – nature.

**Appropriate meditation on the limbs.**

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 3.3.64**

*śiṣṭaiś ca*

*śiṣṭaiḥ* – by the disciples; *ca* – and.

**Also by the disciples.**

In the *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* [1.51] it is said:

*atha haivam stutibhir ārādhayāmi tathā yūyam pañca-padam japantaḥ kṛṣṇam 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 kapyāsaṁ puṇḍarikam 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 3.3.65**

*samāhārāt*

*samāhārāt* – because of being collective.

**Because of being together.**

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 3.3.66**

*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.**

In *Bhagavad-gītā* [13.14] it is said:

*Sarvataḥ pāṇi-pādāṁ 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-vṛttimanti*

*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 3.3.67**

*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.**

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. So, 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 3.3.68**

*darśanāc ca*

*darśanāt* – from seeing; *ca* – also.

**By seeing also.**

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.

# Śrī Vedānta-sūtra

## Adhyāya 3: Devotional Service

### Pāda 4: Transcendental Knowledge is Independent of Vedic Rituals

*śraddhāveśa-manyāstrte sac-chamādyair  
vairāgyodvitti-simhāsanāḍhye  
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.”

The previous Pāda revealed the various aspects of transcendental knowledge, which were there called meditation, worship and other names. This Pāda will reveal 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 similar truths.

According to their different kinds of faith there are three kinds of seekers of transcendental knowledge, described as follows:

1. They who, desiring to see the wonders of the higher planets, faithfully perform the duties of *varṇāśrama-dharma*, are called *sa-niṣṭha*.
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.

#### **Adhikaraṇa 1: Transcendental Knowledge**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.4.1**

*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.**

All the goals of human life are attained by transcendental knowledge. That is the opinion of Lord Vyāsa. Why is that? The *sūtra* explains, *śabdāt*: “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 them, like of Kardama Muni and others, who have such desires.

In the next *sūtra* Jaimini Muni raises an objection.

### **Adhikaraṇa 2: Jaimini's Opinion that Transcendental Knowledge is Subordinate**

#### **Sūtra 3.4.2**

*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.**

Knowing the relationship between himself and the Supreme Personality of Godhead as a relationship between the worshiper and 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 parṇamayī juhur bhavati na sa pāpaṃ ślokaṃ śṛṇoti yadāṅkte cakṣur eva bhratr̥vyasya vṛṅkte*

“He whose sacrificial ladle is made of *parṇa* never hears sinful words. He whose eyes are anointed is protected from his enemies.

*yat-prayājānuyājā iḥyante 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-saṃskāra-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-vidhānaṃ guroḥ karmātiśeṣeṇābhisamāvṛtya kuṭumbe śucau deśe svādhyāyam adhiyāno dharmikān vidadhātmani sarvendriyāṇi sampratiṣṭhāpyāhimsān sarva-bhūtāny anyatra tīrthebhyaḥ sa khalv evaṃ vartayan yāvad āyusaṃ 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 3.4.3

*ācāra-darśanāt*

*ācāra* – of deeds; *darśanāt* – because of seeing.

**Because such deeds are seen.**

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 3.4.4**

*tac chruteḥ*

*tat* – that; *chruteḥ* – because of the *Śruti-śāstra*.

**It is so because of the *Śruti-śāstra*.**

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 3.4.5**

*samanvārambhaṇāt*

*samanvārambhaṇāt* – because of being together.

**Because of being together.**

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 3.4.6

*tadvato vidhānāt*

*tadvataḥ* – like that; *vidhānāt* – because of the rule.

**Because of a rule like that.**

In the *Taittirīya-saṁhitā* it is said:

*brahmiṣṭho brahmā darśa-paurṇamāsayos taṁ 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 3.4.7

*niyamāc ca*

*niyamāt* – because of a rule; *ca* – also.

**Also because of a rule.**

In the *Īsopaniṣad* [Mantra 2] it is said:

*kurvann eveha karmāṇi*

*jjīviṣec chataṁ 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.

This is the opinion of Jaimini and the *karma-mīmāṃsā* school. The author of the *sūtras* refutes this idea in the following words.

## **Adhikaraṇa 3: The Superiority of Transcendental Knowledge**

### **Sūtra 3.4.8**

*adhikopadeśāt tu bādarāyaṇasyaivam tad-darśanāt*

*adhika* – more; *upadeśāt* – because of the teaching; *tu* – but; *bādarāyaṇasya* – of Vyāsa; *evam* – thus; *tad* – 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.**

The word *tu* [but] is used here to begin the refutation of the *pūrvapakṣin*. 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 etam vedānuvacanena brāhmaṇā vividiśanti brahmacaryeṇa tapasā śraddhayā  
yajñenānāśakena caitam eva viditvā 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.

*śreyān dravya-mayād yajñāj  
jñāna-yajñaḥ parantapa  
sarvaṁ karmākhilam pārtha  
jñāne parisamāpyate*

“O chastiser of the enemy, the sacrifice of knowledge is greater than the sacrifice of material possessions. O son of Pṛthā, after all, the sacrifice of work culminates in transcendental knowledge.” [Bhagavad-gītā 4.33]

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.

### **Sūtra 3.4.9**

*tulyam tu darśanam*

*tulyam* – equal; *tu* – but; *darśanam* – scriptural;revelation.

**But the same thing is seen in the scriptures.**



The word *tu* [but] here is used to begin the refutation of the idea that transcendental knowledge is an inferior byproduct 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 vidvāṁsa āhur ṛṣayaḥ kārayeyāḥ kim arthā vayam adhyeṣyāmahe kim arthā vayam yakṣāmahe etad dha sma vai pūrve vidvāṁso 'gni-hotraṁ juhavāṁ cakrire etaṁ vai tam ātmānam viditvā brāhmaṇaḥ putra-pauṣyāś ca vitteṣaṇāyāś ca lokaiṣaṇāyāś ca vyutthāya bhikṣā-caryam 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* 3.4.4.

### **Sūtra 3.4.10**

*asārvatrikī*

*asārvatrikī* – not universal.

**It is not universal.**

The passage [*Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 1.1.8] referred to in *Sūtra* 3.4.4 does not have all transcendental knowledge as its scope. It specifically refers to the *udgītha-vidyā* [the Vedic hymns]. Therefore all transcendental knowledge is not a subordinate aspect of Vedic rituals.

In the next *sūtra* Vyāsa refutes the argument given in *Sūtra* 3.4.5.

### **Sūtra 3.4.11**

*vibhāgaḥ śata-vat*

*vibhāgaḥ* – division; *śata* – a hundred; *vat* – like.

**The distribution is like a hundred.**

The results of Vedic *yajñas* and transcendental knowledge, as described in *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4.4.2 [quoted in *Sūtra* 3.4.5], 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* 3.4.6.

### **Sūtra 3.4.12**

*adhyayana-mātra-vataḥ*

*adhyayana* – study; *mātra* – only; *vataḥ* – of one who possesses.

**Of one who has merely studied.**

The passage from the *Taittirīya-saṁhitā* quoted in *Sūtra* 3.4.6 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-sāstras* declare that a person fixed in transcendental knowledge of the Supreme renounces Vedic rituals.

Transcendental knowledge of the Supreme Personality of Godhead is not like ordinary religious or academic knowledge; it means direct consciousness of God. Therefore a person who properly studies the *Vedas*, does not misinterpret their 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*. But according to the author of the *sūtras*, this is not the case.

Here someone may object: “One who has simply studied is not qualified to perform Vedic *yajñas*. One must have wisdom 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 'haṁ mantra-vid evāsmi nātma-vit*

“I know many *mantras*, but I do not know the Supreme Personality of Godhead.”

Realization 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*

“The Supreme Personality of Godhead, being inconceivable to an ordinary man, can be understood only through the evidence of the Vedic injunctions.”

In this way it is shown that the Supreme is extraordinary, inconceivable, and beyond the limits imposed by the material world and mental processes. He cannot be understood by material logic, but only by His self-revelation to the self-realized soul.

### **Sūtra 3.4.13**

*nāviśeṣāt*

*na* – not; *aviśeṣāt* – because of being not specific.

**No. For it is not specific.**

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 Aranyaka* 10.5 it is said:

*na karmaṇā na prajāyā 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-sāstra* 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 3.4.14**

*stutaye 'numatir vā*

*stutaye* – for praise; *anumatih* – permission; *vā* – or.

**Or, the permission is for praise.**

The word *vā* [or] is used here for emphasis.

*Īsopaniṣad*'s 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. *Īsopaniṣad* [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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Now that the independence of transcendental knowledge has been explained, the great glory of transcendental knowledge will be described. In the *Vājasaneyī-śruti* [*Bṛhad-āranyaka 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 3.4.15**

*kāma-kāreṇa caike*

*kāma* – desire; *kāreṇa* – by doing; *ca* – and; *eke* – some.

**Also, some say he may act as he pleases.**

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 3.4.16**

*upamardam ca*

*upamardam* – destruction; *ca* – also.

**Destruction also.**

In the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* it is said:

*bhidyate hṛdaya-ganthiś  
chidyante sarva-saṁśayāḥ  
kṣīyante cāsya karmāṇi  
tasmin dṛṣṭe parāvare*

“The knot in the heart is pierced, and all misgivings are cut to pieces. When one sees the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the chain of fruitive actions is terminated.”

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 3.4.17**

*ūrdhva-retahsu ca śabde hi*

*ūrdhva* – up; *retahsu* – semen; *ca* – and; *śabde* – in the *Śruti-śāstra*; *hi* – indeed.

**In the *Śruti-śāstras* indeed among the celibates.**

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 pāṇḍityam nirvidya bālyena tiṣṭhāset. Bālyam ca pāṇḍityam ca nirvidyātha munir amaunaṁ ca maunaṁ ca nirvidyātha brāhmaṇaḥ kena syād yena syāt teneḍṣaḥ.*

“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 3.4.18**

*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.**

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.

*Īsopaniṣad Mantra 2* and the passage from *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* [quoted in the purport of *Sūtra 3.4.7*] 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-āranyaka 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 3.4.19**

*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.**

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-āranyaka Upaniṣad 3.5.1* quoted in the purport of *Sūtra 3.4.17* 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 3.4.7*] 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 3.4.13*.

### Sūtra 3.4.20

*vidhir vā dhāraṇa-vat*

*vidhiḥ* – rules; *vā* – or; *dhāraṇa* – studying; *vat* – like.

**Or, the rule may be like studying.**

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* 3.4.17] 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  
yathāham 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 3.4.21

*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.**

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, *apūrvatvāt*: “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 3.4.22

*bhāva-śabdāc ca*

*bhāva* – love; *śabdāt* – because of the *Śruti-śāstra*; *ca* – also.

**Also because the *Śruti-śāstra* describes love.**



In the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* [3.1.4] it is said:

*prāṇo hy eṣa sarva-bhūtair vibhāti  
vijānan vidvān bhavate nāti-vādī  
ātma-krīḍa ātma-ratiḥ kriyāvān  
eṣa brahma-vidāṁ 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* and *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 3.4.23

*pāriplavārthā iti cen na viśeṣitatvāt*

*pāriplava* – restlessness; *arthāḥ* – meanings; *iti* – thus; *cen* – 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.**

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:

*bhṛgu vai vāruṇir varuṇaṁ pītaram upasasāra adhīhi 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 priyaṁ 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.”

The *Śruti-sāstra* teaches the science of transcendental knowledge in these and other stories. 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 Yāma 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 that “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 3.4.24**

*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.**

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-āranyaka Upaniṣad* 4.4.22]:

*ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ śrotavyaḥ*

“One should hear of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. One should gaze upon Him.”

It 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 3.4.25**

*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.**

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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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*

“The *brāhmaṇas* strive to understand the Supreme Personality of Godhead by study of the *Vedas*, by *yajña*, by charity, by austerity and by fasting.”

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 3.4.26**

*sarvāpekṣā ca yajñādi-śrutir aśva-vat*

*sarva* – of all; *apekṣā* – need; *ca* – also; *yajña* – *yajnas*; *ādi* – beginning; *śrutiḥ* – the *Śruti-sāstra*; *aśva* – horse; *vat* – like.

**Also, all are needed. The Śruti-śāstra mentions yajñas and other things. They are like a horse.**

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 3.4.27**

*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.**

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 *yajñas*, 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.4.28**

*sarvānnānumatiś ca prāṇātyaye tad-darśanāt*

*sarva* – all; *anna* – food; *anumatih* – 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.**

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:

*maṭacī-hateṣu kuruṣvāṭikyā saha jāyayoṣastir ha cākrāyaṇa ibhya-grāme pradrāṇaka uvāsa. sa hebhyam kulmāśān khadantaṁ vibhikṣe taṁ hovāca. neto ‘nye vidyante yac ca ye ma imā upanihitā iti. eteṣāṁ me dehīti hovāca tān asmai pradadau hantānupānam ity ucchiṣṭaṁ vai me pītaṁ syād iti hovāca. na svidete ‘py ucchiṣṭa iti na va ajīviṣyāmīmān 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.

### **Sūtra 3.4.29**

*abādhāc ca*

*abādhāt* – because of being no impediment; *ca* – also.

**Also because there is no impediment.**

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 3.4.30**

*api smaryate*

*api* – also; *smaryate* – in the *Smṛti-śāstra*.

**Also in the *Smṛti-śāstra*.**

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 3.4.31**

*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.**

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-granthīnām  
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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: In the beginning of this Pāda three kinds of devotees were described, beginning with the *svaniṣṭha* devotee. 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 *svaniṣṭha* 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 *svaniṣṭha* 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 3.4.32**

*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.**

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 3.4.33**

*sahakāritvena ca*

*sahakāritvena* – as helpful; *ca* – also.

**Also, as helpful.**

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 *svaniṣṭha* 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-āranyaka Upaniṣad* [1.4.15] it is said:

*na hāsya karma kṣīyate*

“The pious deeds of a person situated in transcendental knowledge never perish.”

The *svaniṣṭha* 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, *sarvaṃ 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Now the situation of the *pariniṣṭhita* devotees will be examined. In the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* [3.1.4] it is said:

*ātma-krīḍa 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 3.4.34**

*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.**

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.”

*satataṁ 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 3.4.35**

*anabhibhavam ca darśayati*

*anabhibhavam* – not defeated; *ca* – and; *darśayati* – reveals.

**It reveals that he is not defeated.**

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 purport to *Sūtra* 3.4.2] 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 hr̥ṣīkeśety  
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 Hr̥ṣīkeśa!”

*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-kuśādānaṁ  
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.”

Thus has been shown 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.

## **Adhikaraṇa 9: The Nirapekṣa Devotee**

*Viṣaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.4.36**

*antarā cāpi tu tad dr̥ṣṭaiḥ*

*antarā* – outside; *ca* – and; *api* – indeed; *tu* – but; *tat* – that; *dr̥ṣṭaiḥ* – by what is seen.

**But certainly outside also, because of what is seen.**

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 dr̥ṣṭaiḥ*: “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 3.4.37**

*api smaryate*

*api* – also; *smaryate* – in the *Smṛti-śāstra*.

**Also in the *Smṛti-śāstra*.**

In this *sūtra* the word *api* [also] is used in the sense of joining things together.

In *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* [2.2.37] it is said:

*pibanti ye bhagavata ātmanaḥ satām  
kathāmṛtaṁ śravaṇa-puṭeṣu sambhṛtam  
punaṅti te viṣaya-vidūṣitāśayaṁ  
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:

*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 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.”

### **Sūtra 3.4.38**

*viśeṣānugrahaś ca*

*viśeṣa* – special; *anugrahaḥ* – mercy; *ca* – also.

**Special mercy also.**

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-yuktānām  
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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 *varṇa* 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 3.4.39

*atas tv itarat jyāyo liṅgāc ca*

*ataḥ* – from that; *tu* – indeed; *itarat* – the other; *jyāyaḥ* – better; *liṅgāt* – by the sign; *ca* – indeed.

**But indeed the others are better, for there is a sign.**

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-sāstra*’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 endless 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 *asramas* 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 3.4.40

*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.**

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, 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-sāstra* 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 *svaniṣṭha* devotee.

Here someone may object: “Is it not so that the scriptural text beginning with the words *sarvam 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 3.4.41**

*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.**

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 loka 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*. For example:

*nātyantikam vigaṇayanty api te prasādam  
kimv anyad arpita-bhayaṁ bhruva unnayais te  
ye 'ṅga tvad-aṅghri-śaraṇā bhavataḥ kathāyāḥ  
kīrtanya-tūrtha-yaśasaḥ kuśalā rasa-jñāḥ*

“Persons who are very expert and most intelligent in understanding things as they are engage in hearing narrations of the auspicious activities and pastimes of the Lord, which are worth chanting and worth hearing. Such persons do not care even for the highest material benediction, namely liberation, to say nothing of other less important benedictions like the material happiness of the heavenly kingdom.” [*Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* 3.15.48]

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 3.4.42

*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; *tad* – that; *uktam* – spoken.

**But some even that which begins with *upa*. The perfect stage of devotion is like food. This is said.**

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 gone, 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*. For example:

*samprasanne bhagavati  
puruṣaḥ prākṛtair guṇaiḥ  
vimukto jīva-nirmukto  
brahma nirvāṇam ṛcchati*

“One who actually satisfies the Supreme Personality of Godhead during one's lifetime becomes liberated from the gross and subtle material conditions. Thus being freed from all material modes of nature, he achieves unlimited spiritual bliss.” [*Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* 4.11.14]

In the next *sūtra* the author shows us another reason why the *nirapekṣa* devotees, even without endeavoring to attain them, easily attain *sālokya* [residing on the same planet with the Lord] and *sāmīpya* [staying near to the Lord] liberation.

### Sūtra 3.4.43

*bahis tūbhayathā smṛter ācārāc ca*

*bahiḥ* – outside; *tu* – indeed; *ubhayathā* – both ways; *smṛteḥ* – because of *Smṛti-sastra*; *ācārāt* – because of conduct; *ca* – also.

**Certainly outside in two ways because of *Smṛti-śāstra* and conduct.**

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* [11.2.55] it is said:

*visṛjati hṛdayaṁ na yasya sāksād  
dharir avasābhīhito 'py aghaughā-nāśaḥ  
praṇaya-rasanayā dhṛtāṅghri-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:

*nirapekṣaṁ munim śāntam  
nirvairam sama-darśanam  
anuvrajāmy aham nityam  
pūyeyety 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***

*Viṣaya* [thesis or statement]: In the previous passages the *nirapekṣa* devotees’ disinterest in the pleasures available in Brahmaloḥa 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]: The author of the *sūtras* gives His conclusion in the following words.

### **Sūtra 3.4.44**

*svāminah phala-śruter ity ātreyaḥ*

*svāminah* – 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.**

The bodily needs of the devotee are supplied by the Supreme Personality of Godhead [*svāminah*]. 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  
teṣāṃ nityābhīyuktānām  
yoga-kṣemam 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 puṣṅanti  
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 Aranyaka* [3.14.1].

In the next *sūtra* the author gives an example to show that the Lord is determined to maintain His devotees.

### **Sūtra 3.4.45**

*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.**

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  
vikrīṅṅite 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 3.4.46**

*śruteś ca*

*śruteḥ* – from the *Śruti-śāstra*; *ca* – also.

**From the *Śruti-śāstra* also.**

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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 be 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 3.4.47**

*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.**

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, *tṛtīyam 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” [*tṛtīyam*]. 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-upāsanā* 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 engaging in these other activities one also meditates on the Lord. 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: That transcendental knowledge is attained by three kinds of devotees, beginning with the *svaniṣṭha* 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 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.”

*Samśaya* [doubt]: Are they who are not in the *gṛhastha-āśrama* able to 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 3.4.48**

*kr̥tsna-bhāvāt tu gṛhiṇopasamhārah*

*kr̥tsna* – of all; *bhāvāt* – because of the existence; *tu* – but; *gṛhiṇā* – by the *gṛhastha*;  
*upasamhārah* – the goal.

**But because of all the goal is by a *gṛhastha*.**

The word *tu* [but] is used here to dispel doubt.

This passage from the scriptures declares that the goal is attained by a *grhastha* not because only they can attain liberation but because everything else [*kr̥tsna-bhāvāt*] is contained in *grhastha* life. This means that all the duties of all the *āśramas* are in some way included in the duties of *grhastha* life. Therefore the duties of other *āśramas*, such as nonviolence and sense control, are duties for the *grhasthas* also. In fact no duty in any other *āśrama* is incompatible with *grhastha* life. In the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* it is said:

*bhikṣā-bhujas̄ ca ye kecit  
pārivraḍ brahmacāriṇaḥ  
te 'py atraiva pratiṣṭhante  
gārhasṭhyaṁ tena vai param*

“*Sannyāsīs*, *brahmacārīs*, and all others who eat the food of begging depend on the *grhasthas*. Therefore the *grhastha-āśrama* is the best of *āśramas*.”

Because the *Śruti-sāstras* declare that the followers of the other *āśramas* may also attain liberation, if it is said that the followers of the *grhastha-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 3.4.49

*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.**

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 'dhyayanaṁ dānam iti prathamas tapa eva dvitīyo  
brahmacaryācārya-kula-vāsī trītyo '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-āranyaka Upaniṣad* [4.4.22] it is said:

*etam eva viditvā 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*:

*brahmacaryaṃ samāpya grhī bhavet. grhī bhūtvā vanī bhavet. vanī bhutvā pravrajat. yadi vetarathā brahmacaryād eva pravrajed grhād vā vanād vā. atha punar avratī vā vratī snātako vāsnatako votsannāgnir anagniko vā yad ahar eva virajyet tad ahar eva pravrajat.*

“When one completes his studies as a *brahmacārī*, a man should become a *grhastha*. After he has been a *grhastha* 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 *grhastha* 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 it.”

In the *Jābāla Upaniṣad* passage beginning with the words *Paramahamsānām*, the *nirapekṣa* devotees are specifically described. When the *grhasthas* are singled out it is because the duties of the other *āśramas* are all contained in the *grhastha-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 *grhastha-āśrama* is the only proper *āśrama* is refuted. Whether one should accept the *grhastha-āśrama* or the *sannyāsa-āśrama* is determined by whether one still has material desires or one has lost all taste for material things. Still, when a person has peacefulness, self-control, tolerance, and other virtues, whether he is within the *varṇāśrama-dharma*, or above *varṇāśrama-dharma*, he will certainly attain transcendental knowledge. This has been clearly explained.

## **Adhikaraṇa 14: The Secret of Transcendental Knowledge**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Now it will be said that transcendental knowledge is a great secret. In *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* [6.22] it is said:

*vedānte paramaṃ guhyaṃ  
purā-kalpe pracoditam  
nāpraśāntāya dātavyaṃ  
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.”

*Samśaya* [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 3.4.50**

*anāviṣkurvann anvayāt*

*anāviṣkurvan* – not manifesting; *anvayāt* – because of tradition.

**He does not reveal, because of the disciplic succession.**

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 those who are fit to receive it, transcendental knowledge bears fruit, but when it is given to persons 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 those who are able to understand it. It should not be taught to those who are not able. Those who are faithful and accept the scriptures are able to understand.

## ***Adhikaraṇa 15: Attaining Transcendental Knowledge in this Lifetime***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Now will be considered the time when transcendental knowledge is manifested. 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 3.4.51**

*aihikam aprastuta-pratibandhe tad darśanāt*

*aihikam* – in the present life; *aprastuta* – not manifested; *pratibandhe* – impediment; *tad* – that; *darśanāt* – from seeing.

**In the absence of obstacles it is in this life. That is so because of scriptural revelation.**

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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 3.4.52**

*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; *avadhr̥teḥ* – because of the determination.

**In the same way there is no specific rule about liberation, for it depends on the circumstances.**

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 ciraṁ 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.

# Śrī Vedānta-sūtra

## Adhyāya 4: The Results of Transcendental Knowledge

### Pāda 1: The Glories of Transcendental Knowledge

*dattvā vidyauśadham 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.”

This Adhyāya 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 Adhyāya bears the title “The Results of Transcendental Knowledge.”

### Adhikaraṇa 1: One Should Always Engage in Devotional Service

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: In the *Bṛhad-āranyaka 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 be performed 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 4.1.1

*āvṛttir asakṛd upadeśāt*

*āvṛtṭiḥ* – repetition; *asakṛt* – many times; *upadeśāt* – because of the teaching.

**It is repeated many times, for that is the teaching.**

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 idaṁ 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.

*śrī-bhagavān uvāca  
animitta-nimittena  
sva-dharmeṇāmalātmanā  
tīvrayā mayi bhaktyā ca  
śruta-sambhṛtayā ciram*

The Supreme Personality of Godhead said: “One can get liberation by seriously discharging devotional service unto Me and thereby hearing for a long time about Me or from Me. By thus executing one's prescribed duties, there will be no reaction, and one will be freed from the contamination of matter.” [*Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* 3.27.21]

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 4.1.2**

*liṅgāc ca*

*liṅgāt* – because of a sign; *ca* – also.

**Also because of a sign.**

In *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* [3.2] Bhṛgu Muni repeated a spiritual activity many times. By this sign [*liṅgāt*] 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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:

*juṣṭaṁ yadā paśyaty anyam īśam*

“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 4.1.3**

*ātmēti 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.**

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 ātmāyam lokāḥ*

“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.”

*tasmin nirmanuje 'raṇye  
pippalopastha āśritaḥ  
ātmanātmānam ātmasthaṁ  
yathā-śrutam acintayam*

“After that, under the shadow of a banyan tree in an uninhabited forest I began to meditate upon the Supersoul situated within, using my intelligence, as I had learned from liberated souls.”

[*Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* 1.6.15]

The word *ātmā* here should be understood to mean “the all-powerful Supreme Personality of Godhead, whose human-like 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 4.1.4

*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.**

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:

*kham vāyum agniṁ salilam mahīm ca  
jyotīṁṣi sattvāni diśo drumādīn  
sarit-samudrāmś ca hareḥ śarīram  
yat kiṁ ca bhūtam praṇamed ananyaḥ*

“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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: It has already been shown that one should think of the Supreme Personality of Godhead as the all-pervading Supersoul, because the descriptions of the impersonal Brahman are not like the descriptions of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

*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?

*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 4.1.5

*brahma-dṛṣṭir utkarṣāt*

*brahma* – of Brahman; *dṛṣṭiḥ* – sight; *utkarṣāt* – because of being exalted.

**He is seen as impersonal Brahman, for He is most exalted.**

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**

*Viṣaya* [thesis or statement]: In the *Puruṣa-sūkta* prayer [*Rg Veda* 10.90] it is said:

*candramā manaso jātaś  
cakṣuṣaḥ sūryo jāyata  
śrotrād vāyuś ca prāṇaś 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 4.1.6**

*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.**

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. It is stated in *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* [6.7-8]:

*apāṇi-pādo javano grahītā  
paśyaty acakṣuḥ sa śṛṇoty akarṇaḥ  
sa vetti vedyam na ca tasya vettā  
tam āhur agryam puruṣam purāṇam*

“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.”

## **Adhikaraṇa 6: Āsanas and Meditation**

*Viṣaya* [thesis or statement]: In the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* [2.8] it is said:

*trir-unnataṁ sthāpya samaṁ 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 4.1.7**

*āsīnaḥ sambhavāt*

*āsīnaḥ* – sitting; *sambhavāt* – because of possibility.

**Sitting, for then it is possible.**

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 4.1.8**

*dhyānāc ca*

*dhyānāt* – because of meditation; *ca* – also.



### **Also because of meditation.**

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 4.1.9**

*acalatvaṃ cāpekṣya*

*acalatvam* – stillness; *ca* – and; *apekṣya* – in relation to.

### **Also because it is related to stillness.**

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 4.1.10**

*smaranti ca*

*smaranti* – the *Smṛti-śāstra*; *ca* – also.

### **The *Smṛti-śāstra* also.**

In *Bhagavad-gītā* [6.11-14] Kṛṣṇa, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, states:

*śucau deśe pratiṣṭhāpya sthiram āsanam ātmanaḥ  
nāty-ucchritaṃ nāti-nīcam cailājina-kuśottaram*

*tatraikāgram manaḥ kṛtvā yata-cittendriya-kriyaḥ  
upaviśyāsane yuñjyād yogam ātma-viśuddhaye*

*samaṃ kāya-śiro-grīvaṃ dhārayann acalaṃ sthiraḥ  
samprekṣya nāsikāgram svaṃ diśaś cānavalokayan*

*praśāntātmā vigata-bhīr brahmacāri-vrate sthitaḥ  
manaḥ saṃyamyā mac-citto yukta āsīta mat-parah*

“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, neck and head erect in a straight line and stare

steadily at the tip of the nose. Thus, with an unagitated, subdued mind, devoid of fear, completely free from sex life, one should meditate upon Me within the heart and make Me the ultimate goal of life.”

In this way the *Smṛti-śāstra* explains that they who meditate should keep their bodies, senses, and minds still. Such stillness is not possible without adopting the *yoga-āsana*. Therefore a person engaged in meditation should adopt the *yoga-āsana*.

## **Adhikaraṇa 7: The True Nature of Meditation**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Now another point will be considered in relation to *Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* [4.5.6]:

*ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ*

“One should gaze on the Supreme Personality of Godhead.”

*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 4.1.11**

*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.**

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 samudrītaḥ  
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-nivātāśrayane 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 displeasing 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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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-vādiṇaś 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 padaṁ 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 4.1.12**

*āprāyaṇāt tatrāpi hi dṛṣṭam*

*ā* – until; *prāyaṇāt* – liberation; *tatra* – there; *api* – even; *hi* – indeed; *dr̥ṣtam* – seen.

**Until liberation. Even there it is seen.**

Devotional service should be performed both before and after liberation. Why is that? The *sūtra* explains, *hi dr̥ṣtam*: “Because it is seen in the *Śruti-śāstra*.” In the *Saupaṇḍya-śruti* it is said:

*sarvadainam 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. *Bhagavad-gītā* [9.2] states:

*rāja-vidyā rāja-guhyam  
pavitram idam uttamam  
pratyakṣāvagamaṁ dharmyam  
su-sukhaṁ kartum avyayam*

“This knowledge is the king of education, the most secret of all secrets. It is the purest knowledge, and because it gives direct perception of the self by realization, it is the perfection of religion. It is everlasting, and it is joyfully performed.”

## **Adhikaraṇa 9: Transcendental Knowledge Destroys Past Sins**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 pāpam 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 protam pradūyetaivam 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 nonexistent 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 bhoktavyaṁ  
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 4.1.13**

*tad-adhigama uttara-pūrvāghayor aśleṣa-vinsāśau tad- vyapadeśāt*

*tad-adhigame* – in the knowledge of Him; *uttara* – after; *pūrvā* – 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.**

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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: In *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* [4.4.22] it is said:

*ubhe u haivaiṣa ete taraty amṛtaḥ sādhy-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 4.1.14**

*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.**

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 affect the soul. 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” includes material pious deeds also. In *Bhagavad-gītā* [4.37] the Supreme Personality of Godhead affirms:

*yathaidhāmsi samiddho 'gnir*

*bhasma-sāt kurute 'rjuna*

*jñānāgniḥ sarva-karmāṇi*

*bhasma-sāt kurute tathā*

“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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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]. In the passage from *Bṛhad-aranyaka 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.

*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]: 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.

*Siddhānta* [conclusion]: In the following words the author of the *sūtras* gives His conclusion.

### **Sūtra 4.1.15**

*anārabdha-kārye eva tu pūrve tad avadheḥ*

*anārabdha* – not begun; *kārye* – effect; *eva* – indeed; *tu* – but; *pūrve* – previous; *tad* – that; *avadheḥ* – of the duration of time.

**But only *anārabdha-phala* karmic reactions, for that is the time limit.**

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-viguṇānvayāms tarhi deha-bhṛtām ca girāḥ*

“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 like that. Therefore what was said in the beginning about transcendental knowledge is right and true.

## **Adhikaraṇa 12: Regular Duties and Karmic Reactions**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Here someone may say: “It has been said that transcendental knowledge destroys all past pious karmic reactions. Therefore transcendental knowledge destroys all *kāmya-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 *kāmya-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 4.1.16**

*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.**

The word *tu* [but] is used here to dispel doubt.

The daily *agnihotra-yajña* and other *nitya-karmas* performed before transcendental knowledge is manifested have the manifestation of transcendental knowledge 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:

*karmanā 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 *ārabdha-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 suhrdaḥ 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 *ārabdha-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, *ārabdha-phala* karmic reactions are never destroyed.

*Siddhānta* [conclusion]: In the following words the author of the *sūtras* gives His conclusion.

### **Sūtra 4.1.17**

*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.**

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* 4.1.13 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 experienced 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 4.1.18**

*yad eva vidyayeti hi*

*yad eva vidyayā iti – Chāndogya Upaniṣad 1.1.10; hi – because.*

**Because of Chāndogya Upaniṣad 1.1.10.**

*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 4.1.19**

*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.**

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.”

# Śrī Vedānta-sūtra

## Adhyāya 4: The Results of Transcendental Knowledge

### Pāda 1: How a Person with Transcendental Knowledge Leaves his Material Body

*mantrād yasya parā bhūtāḥ  
parā bhūtādayo grahāḥ  
naśyanti sva-lasat-trṣṇaḥ  
sa kṛṣṇaḥ śaraṇam mama*

“May Lord Kṛṣṇa, who is radiant with the thirst to be reunited with His devotees, and whose *mantras* exorcise the ghosts and demons of repeated birth in the material world of five elements, be my shelter.”

In this Pāda will be described the way the soul travels to the world of the demigods, and the way a person enlightened with transcendental knowledge leaves his material body.

#### Adhikaraṇa 1: The Time of Death

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 4.2.1

*vān 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.**

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 4.2.2

*ata eva sarvāṅy anu*

*ataḥ eva* – therefore; *sarvāṅi* – all; *anu* – following.

**Therefore they all follow.**

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, *sarvāṅi*: “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 cittas 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

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Now the passage of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [6.8.6] quoted in the beginning of Adhikaraṇa 1 will again be considered.

*asya saumya-puruṣasya prayato vāñ-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 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 4.2.3**

*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.**

The words *tan manaḥ prāṇe* mean, “The mind enters the life-breath, accompanied by all the senses.” 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* 4.2.4.

### **Adhikaraṇa 3: The Life-Breath Enters the Individual Soul**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 4.2.4**

*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.**

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 rājānaṁ prayiyāsantam ugrāḥ pratya enasaḥ sūtā grāmaṇya upasamīyanty evaṁ haivam vidam sarve prāṇā upasamīyanti. yatraitad 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 4.2.5**

*bhūteṣu tac chruteḥ*

*bhūteṣu* – in all the elements; *tac* – that; *chruteḥ* – because of the *Śruti-śāstra*.

**In all the elements, because of the *Śruti-śāstra*.**

The individual spirit soul enters all the five elements. He does not enter the fire element only. Why is that? In *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* [4.4.5] it is said:

*jīvasyākāśamayo vāyumayas tejomaya āpomayaḥ pṛthivīmayaḥ*

“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 4.2.6

*naikasmin darśayato hi*

*na* – not; *ekasmin* – in one; *darśayataḥ* – they both reveal; *hi* – because.

**Because they both say it is not in one.**

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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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-āranyaka Upaniṣad* [4.4.7] it is said:

*yadā sarve pramucyante  
kāmā ye 'sya hṛdi 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 4.2.7

*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.**

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 enlightened soul passes through a different *nāḍī*. This is described in *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [8.6.6]:

*śataṁ caikā ca hṛdayasya nāḍyas tāsām mūrdhānam abhiniṣṛtaikā. tayordhvam āyann  
amṛtatvam eti viśvag anyā utkramaṇe bhavanti.*



“101 *nāḍīs* lead away from the heart. One passes through the head and leads to immortality. They 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 4.2.8

*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.**

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 direct 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 4.2.9

*sūkṣma-pramāṇataś 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.**

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 *Kauṣītaki 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 4.2.10

*nopamardenātaḥ*

*na* – not; *upamardena* – by destruction; *ataḥ* – therefore.

**Therefore it is not by destruction.**

*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 4.2.11

*tasyaiva copapatter ūṣmā*

*tasya* – of that; *eva* – indeed; *ca* – also; *upapatteḥ* – because of being possible; *ūṣmā* – heat.

**It has warmth, for that is reasonable.**

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 4.2.12

*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.**

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, *na*: “No.” 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 4.2.13

*spaṣṭo hy ekeṣām*

*spaṣṭaḥ* – clear; *hi* – because; *ekeṣām* – of some.

**Because it is clear in some.**

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 [*spāṣṭaḥ*] 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 samavalīyante 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 4.2.14**

*smaryate ca*

*smaryate* – in the *Smṛti-śāstras*; *ca* – also.

**In the *Smṛti-śāstras* also.**

In the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* [3.167] it is said:

*ūrdhvam ekaḥ sthitas teṣām  
yo bhittvā sūrya-maṇḍalam  
brahmalokam atikramya  
tena yāti parām 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 4.2.15**

*tāni pare tathā hy āha*

*tāni* – they; *pare* – in the Supreme; *tathā* – so; *hi* – because; *āha* – says.

**They [enter] into the Supreme, for thus it says.**

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 into the Supreme**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 4.2.16**

*avibhāgo vacanāt*

*avibhāgaḥ* – not divided; *vacanāt* – because of the statement.

**There is no division, for that is said.**

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 evāsyā paridraṣṭur imāḥ ṣoḍaśa-kalāḥ  
puruṣāyaṅāḥ 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 ‘mrto 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 4.2.17**

*tad-oko-’gra-jvalanam tat-prakāśita-dvāro vidyā-sāmarthyāt tac-cheṣa-gaty-anusmṛti-yogāc ca  
hārdānugṛhītaḥ śatādhikayā*

*tat* – of him; *okaḥ* – the home; *agra* – the point; *jvalanam* – illumination; *tat* – by Him; *prakāśita* – revealed; *dvārah* – 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; *anugrhitāḥ* – 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.**

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 illumined [*jvalanam*]. The door [*dvārah*] there is not illumined by the individual spirit soul. It is Lord Hari, who resides in the heart [*hārda*] who illumines 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [8.6.5] it is said:

*atha yatraitasmāt 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. śataṁ 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 4.2.18**

*raśmy-anusārī*

*raśmi* – rays; *anusārī* – following.

**He follows the rays.**

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 4.2.19**

*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.**

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, *na*: “No.” 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 nāḍīṣu srptā ābhyo nāḍībhyaḥ prayānte te amusminn āditye srptāḥ*

“The path of the sun’s rays begins at the sun and ends at the *nāḍīs*. It also begins at the *nāḍīs* and ends at the sun.”

In another place in the *Śruti-śāstra* it is also said:

*saṁsṛṣṭā vā ete raśmayaś ca nāḍyaś ca naiṣāṁ vibhāgo yāvad idam śarīram ataḥ etaiḥ paśyaty etair utkramate etaiḥ pravartate*

“The sun’s rays are connected to the *nāḍīs*, 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 4.2.20**

*ataś cāyane 'pi dakṣiṇe*

*ataḥ* – therefore; *ca* – also; *āyane* – in the passing; *api* – also; *dakṣiṇe* – in the south.

**Therefore it is also during the passing in the south.**

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 kālaṁ  
vakṣyāmi bharatarṣabha...*

*... 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 4.2.21

*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.**

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*  
*viparītam 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.

# Śrī Vedānta-sūtra

## Adhyāya 4: The Results of Transcendental Knowledge

### Pāda 3: The Nature of the Supreme Personality of Godhead and the Path that leads to Him

*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 those who have only the dim reflection of devotional service, the path that leads to Him.”

In this Pāda 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.

#### Adhikaraṇa 1: Many Paths or One?

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [4.15.5-6] it is said:

*atha yad u caivāsmiṇ śavyam kurvanti yadi ca nārīṣam evābhisambhavaty arcīṣo 'har aha  
āpūryamānam āpūryamāna- pakṣād yan sad-udaddeti māsān tān samebhyaḥ samvatsaram  
samvatsarād ādityam ādityāc candramasam candramaso vidyutam tat puruṣo 'mānavaḥ. sa  
etān brahma gamayaty eṣa deva-patho brahma-patha etena pratipadyamāna imam mānavam  
āvartam 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-yānam panthānam āpadyāgnilokam āgacchati sa vāyulokam sa varuṇalokam sa  
indralokam sa prajāpatilokam sa brahmalokam*

“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-āranyaka Upaniṣad* [5.10] it is said:

*yadā ha vai puruṣo 'smāt lokāt praiti sa vāyum āgacchati tasmāi sa tatra vijihīte yathā ratha-  
cakrasya kham 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 4.3.1**

*arcir-ādinā tat prathiteḥ*

*arciḥ* – light; *ādinā* – beginning with; *tat* – that; *prathiteḥ* – because of being well known.

**It begins with light, for that is well known.**

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 ‘ranye śraddhām tapa ity upāsate te arciṣam*

“This they know: Those 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 vipaścītām  
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

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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-yānaṁ 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 4.3.2

*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.**

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 ‘yam pavana eṣa eva devānām 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

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: In the *Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad* [1.3] it is said:

*sa varuṇalokam sa indralokam sa prajāpatilokam*

“He goes to Varuṇaloka. He goes to Indraloka. He goes to Prajāpatiloka.”

*Samśaya* [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 4.3.3**

*taḍito 'dhi varuṇaḥ sambandhāt*

*taḍitaḥ* – lightning; *adhi* – above; *varuṇaḥ* – Varuṇa; *sambandhāt* – because of the relationship.

**Varuṇaloka comes after lightning, for that is their relationship.**

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-śāstra* 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 4.3.4**

*ātivāhikās tal-liṅgāt*

*ātivāhikāḥ* – Ativahika demigods; *tat* – of that; *liṅgāt* – because of the symptoms.

**They are ātivāhika demigods, because of their characteristics.**

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 4.3.5**

*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.**

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, the things beginning with light 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**

*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 4.3.6**

*vaidyutenaiva tatas tac chruteḥ*

*vaidyutena* – by the person situated in light; *eva* – indeed; *tataḥ* – then; *tat* – that; *śruteḥ* – from the *Śruti-śāstra*.

**Then by the person in light. This is because of the *Śruti-śāstra*.**

When he comes to the plane of lightning, the enlightened soul is taken farther 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Having thus described the path by which the goal is reached, now the author describes the goal itself. 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 passages explains that the soul attains immortality.

*Siddhānta* [conclusion]: In the following words Bādari Muni gives his opinion.

#### **Sūtra 4.3.7**

*kāryam bādarir asya gaty-upapatteḥ*

*kāryam* – the created being; *bādarīḥ* – Bādari Muni; *asya* – of him; *gati* – attainment; *upapatteḥ* – because of being possible.

**Bādari Muni says it is the created one, for that is the only possible goal.**

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 4.3.8**

*viśeṣitatvāc ca*

*viśeṣitatvāt* – because of being specified; *ca* – also.

**Also because it is specifically stated.**

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 4.3.9

*sāmīpyāt tu tad vyapadeśaḥ*

*sāmīpyāt* – because of nearness; *tu* – but; *tat* – that; *vyapadeśaḥ* – designation.

**But that designation is because of nearness.**

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 4.3.10

*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.

**When the creation is annihilated [the soul goes] with its ruler to the Supreme, because of the explanation.**

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 4.3.11

*smṛteś ca*

*smṛteḥ* – from the *Smṛti-śāstra*; *ca* – also.

**From the *Smṛti-śāstra* also.**



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 4.3.12**

*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.**

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 4.3.13**

*darśanāc ca*

*darśanāt* – because of the sight; *ca* – also.

**Also because it is seen.**

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 *śatam 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 4.3.14

*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.**

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.

### **Adhikaraṇa 8: Vyāsadeva’s Opinion**

Now the author of the *sūtras* gives his opinion. He says:

### Sūtra 4.3.15

*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 Vyāsadeva’s opinion. Because both have faults and also because of the maxim beginning with the words *tat-kratuḥ*.**

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 Vyāsadeva. 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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.”

*omkāreṇāntaritaṁ 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 4.3.16**

*viśeṣaṁ ca darśayati*

*viśeṣaṁ* – special; *ca* – also; *darśayati* – shows.

**It reveals a special situation also.**

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  
  
teṣām ahaṁ samuddhartā  
mṛtyu-saṁsāra-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 paramaṁ 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.

# Śrī Vedānta-sūtra

## Adhyāya 4: The Results of Transcendental Knowledge

### Pāda 4: The Glories of the Liberated Souls

*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.”

In this Pāda will be described first the original forms of the liberated souls, and then their glory, opulence, bliss, and other features.

#### Adhikaraṇa 1: The Original Forms of the Liberated Souls

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 *abhiniṣpadyate* [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 4.4.1

*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.**

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 a goal of human endeavor, because it already exists. 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 4.4.2**

*muktaḥ pratijñānāt*

*muktaḥ* – liberated; *pratijñānāt* – because of the declaration.

**He is liberated because of the statement.**

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 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.

### **Sūtra 4.4.3**

*ātmā prakaraṇāt*

*ātmā* – the Supreme Personality of Godhead; *prakaraṇāt* – because of the context.

**It is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, because of the context.**

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 the Supreme Lord.

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 *param 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 *sālokya* liberation.

*Siddhānta* [conclusion]: In the following words the author of the *sūtras* gives His conclusion.

### **Sūtra 4.4.4**

*avibhāgena dr̥ṣṭatvāt*

*avibhāgena* – without separation; *dr̥ṣṭatvāt* – because of being seen.

**There is no separation, for that is seen.**

The liberated soul is not separated from the Lord. In this way the soul attains *sāyujya* liberation. Why is that? The *sūtra* explains, *dr̥ṣṭatvāt*: “For that is seen.” This means, “For this situation is seen in the *Śruti-sāstra*.” 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 pramīyate 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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 4.4.5**

*brāhmaṇa jaiminir upanyāsādibhyaḥ*



*brāhmeṇa* – 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.**

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 4.4.6**

*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.**

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 4.4.7**

*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.**

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 explained 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 krīḍan ramamāṇaḥ strībhir vā yānair vā jñātibhir vā*

“Laughing and enjoying pastimes, he is happy in the company of wives, relatives and chariots.”

*Samśaya* [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 4.4.8**

*saṅkalpād eva tac chruteḥ*

*saṅkalpāt* – by desire; *eva* – indeed; *tac* – that; *chruteḥ* – because of the *Śruti-śāstra*.

**Indeed it is by desire, because of the *Śruti-śāstra*.**

The liberated souls attain what they wish simply by willing. 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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 4.4.9**

*ata eva cānanyādhipatiḥ*

*ataḥ eva* – therefore; *ca* – also; *ananya* – without another; *adhipatiḥ* – master.

**Therefore there is no other master.**

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***

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 4.4.10

*abhāve bādarir āha hy evam*

*abhāve* – in non-existence; *bādariḥ* – Bādari Muni; *āha* – says; *hi* – because; *evam* – thus.

**Bādari Muni says there is none, for thus it is said.**

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.  
aśarīram 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* [7.1.35] it is said:

*dehendriyāsu-hīnānām vaikuṅṭha-pura-vāsinām*

“The bodies of the inhabitants of Vaikuṅṭha are completely spiritual, having nothing to do with the material body, senses or life air.”

### Sūtra 4.4.11

*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.**

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. śatam 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 4.4.12

*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.**

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. By the wish of the *yajamāna*, a twelve-day *yajña* becomes either a *śatra*, which has many *yajamānas*, or an *ahīna*, which has a single *yajamāna*. 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 paśyēt*

“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 sarvam 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 vaikuṅṭha-mūrtayah*

“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, “As a man wills in this life, so he attains in the next,” and also in the following words of the *Smṛti-śāstra*:

*gacchāmi viṣṇu-pādābhyām 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 4.4.13**

*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.**

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 4.4.14**

*bhāve jāgrad-vat*

*bhāve* – in existence; *jāgrad* – waking; *vat* – like.

**In the existence it is like being awake.**

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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: 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 mṛtyuṃ paśyati na rogaṃ nota-duḥkhitam sarvaṃ hi paśyaḥ paśyati sarvaṃ 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.

*Samśaya* [doubt]: Is this correct, or not?

*Pūrvapakṣa* [the opponent speaks]: In the *Bṛhad-āranyaka Upaniṣad* [4.3.21] it is said:

*prājñānātmanā . . .*

“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 4.4.15**

*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.**

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-āranyaka 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 4.4.16

*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.**

These words of *Bṛhad-āranyaka 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 svapītīty 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:

*vān 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 evaṁ sampraty ātmānam jānāty ayam aham asmīti no evemāni bhūtāni vināsam ivāpīto bhavati. nāham atra bhogyam 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: In *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* [8.1.6 and 8.2.1] it is said:

*atha ya iha ātmānam anuvidya vrajanty etāms ca satyān kāmāms teṣāṁ sarveṣu lokeṣu kāmācāro 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.”

*Samśaya* [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 4.4.17**

*jagad-vyāpāra-varjyaṁ prakaraṇād asannihitavāt*

*jagat* – of the material universe; *vyāpāra* – creation; *varjyam* – 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.**

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 4.4.18

*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.”**

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 4.4.19

*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.**

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 affect 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-cetasahaṇuṣṭhāya 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 ikṣā-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’.” [*Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* 2.5.13]

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 4.4.20**

*darśayataś caivam pratyakṣānumāne*

*darśayataḥ* – they show; *ca* – also; *evam* – thus; *pratyakṣa* – direct perception; *anumāne* – and logic.

**Direct perception and logic both reveal it.**

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  
amṛtasyāvyayasya 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 paramaṁ sāmyam upaiti*

“Freed from matter, the liberated soul becomes equal to the Supreme.”

The *Śruti-sāstra* thus explains that the liberated soul is equal to the Supreme. Then what is the use of even using the words ‘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 4.4.21**

*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.**

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* 4.4.18. In the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* [2.1.1] it is said:

*so ‘snute 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**

*Viśaya* [thesis or statement]: Now will be explained the truth that the liberated soul has the association of the Supreme Personality of Godhead eternally.

*Viśaya* [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 4.4.22**

*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.**

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 imam mānavam āvartam 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 āyusam brahmalokam abhisampadyate. na ca punar avartate.*

“Leaving this life, he enters the spiritual world. He never returns.”

In the *Bhagavad-gītā* [8.15-16] 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.”

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 *Śrīmad-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 imam 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-mūlam na muñcati  
mukta-sarva-parikleśaḥ  
panthāḥ sva-śaraṇam 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-paṅkāt sva-bhaktān  
nayaty acyutaś cit-sukhedhāmnī 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  
pāṭhyam śapatho ‘rpito ‘nyebhyaḥ*

“Let they 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.”

*Here ends Śrī Vedānta-sūtra; all glories to Śrīla Prabhupāda!*