

Śrī Śrī Caitanya Śikṣāmṛta & Daśamūla Tattva #3

Lecture given in Bhaktivedānta Academy, Śrī Māyāpura, as part of Śrī Śrī Caitanya Śikṣāmṛta and Daśa Mūla Tattva Course, a Precursor course to the study of Śāstra Cakṣus of Bhaktivedānta Theological Seminary

LECTURE AUDIO:

https://bhaktividyapurnaswami.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/03_Ch2-3_p.9-13.mp3

TRANSCRIPTION

TRANSCRIPTION

His Holiness Bhaktividyā Pūrṇa Svāmī Mahārāja: On page 8... So, we were discussing about on the Vedas, that you are not making an interpretation, you are using more direct meaning, and that will always be in line with *paramparā*. If you leave *paramparā* and start to interpret your own meanings, then you end up with something that is not exactly our line. So,

Reading from Śrī Śrī Caitanya Śikṣāmṛta & Daśa Mūla Tattva Study Guide: *There are many varieties of interpretations. Jagadīśa mentions in Śabda Śakti Prakāśa that there are countless types of interpretation, such as jahatsvārtha, ajahatsvārtha, nirūḍha and adhunikā. However, none of these interpretive means can be used to define the nature of something spiritual. Rather, in doing so, they give rise to misinterpretation.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: So, in other words, there is these means of interpretation. But they are not meant for something spiritual, they are meant for something mundane. So if you apply it on the spiritual, then you are going to get problems. Just automatically.

Reading from Study Guide: *Śaṅkarācārya argues that direct meaning of words cannot be used in relation to indescribable phenomena; therefore, the indirect interpretation must be used for find the meaning of Vedic statements.*

Prabhu (1): Activity.

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Right? So now, he is saying that direct meaning of words cannot be used. So then, if we are applying that, then he is saying, 'Okay, the Veda says Kṛṣṇa is God,' so then he will say, 'Well, we can't take the direct meaning because this is something spiritual, so words don't actually carry it. So then we will say that it means the unborn within Kṛṣṇa is supreme.' But now, if we take his philosophy fully, that words can't be taken directly, then that means his words also cannot be taken directly. So then we have to say, 'He says the unborn in Kṛṣṇa is the supreme, so we have to take the indirect meaning of that, which would be Kṛṣṇa Himself is the Supreme Personality of Godhead.' You know what I am saying? So here it is, is he is talking to, he is bewildering the intelligent class of man, and common people, that is another thing. But intelligence is saying, 'The Vedas, the words of the Vedas, because they are material, can't be describing something spiritual. So we will give an interpretation.' But somehow or another people forget that their interpretation is also just as

mundane in their, means, according to their perspective as the Veda would be. The Veda is going to be mundane, their interpretations are going to be mundane. So the words of the Veda that they are saying you can't use directly, you have to use indirectly, then that means their words also would be the same, they wouldn't have direct meaning either. Does that make sense? But people won't catch that, why won't they catch that? What is the inherent fault of the living entity, why this would be attractive?

Prabhu (1): *To cheat and get cheated?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Cheat and get cheated, yeah, but what would be the basis of why you would want to cheat and get cheated?

Prabhu (2): *Misgivings?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Misgivings. And what is in this case of the, when we are dealing within impersonalism, what is the misgiving? What is the platform? What is the term, what do we use... Means if we are using, we are dealing in two, we are dealing with the jñāna and the karma, what are other terms that we use to describe these two? You know, things that go in two? Sambandha, abhidheya and prayojana, those are three. What do we use at two? We are dealing with sambandha and prayojana, right? Abhidheya follows. There is a whole group of these two that create a material thing, right? No? I and mine, envy and attachment. So the impersonalist, his thing is 'I.' So what is that 'I'? What is the next few words after 'I' for the impersonalist?

Prabhus: *I and mine? God?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: No, I and mine, but in, just in 'I', taking the 'I' part?

Prabhus: *'I am God.'*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: 'I am God,' right? And then mine is...? 'The material energy is for my enjoyment because I am God.' So, 'Because I am God, therefore my interpretation is valid, is spiritual, but the Veda, which is authority, which coming from God, I am opposed to that, actually.' So even though they claim to be following the Vedic authority, they are pious in that way, but their mentality is not pious, it is cheating. Because they are not accepting actually the authority of the Vedas by saying that you can't use the direct meaning. Does this make sense? So that is the whole point, is that we have to be very, very careful about all this so-called interpretation. Okay, so now...

Reading from Study Guide: *Madhvācārya has objected to this as follows:*

In examining the power of words, it is seen that where direct meaning is not accepted, interpretation also has no place. Where there exists no village, how can one argue about its extent or size? Where there is no father, can one speak of his son?

HH BVPS Mahārāja: So, if you are saying is that the direct meaning is not accepted, so it says that there is a village, so the direct method is not right, so there is no village. So how do you describe there is no village? You don't accept that there is a father, so therefore there is son, so if there is no father how is there a son? But they quite happily go on discussing the nature of the village in their own words, when they have already rejected the idea that the village exists. Do you understand? But because of their pride they don't understand this. So

that's the whole thing. Because they want to be God, therefore they can't understand this. That's why they are *bhrama*. So this is *vaikuṅṭha-bhrama*, everything is eternal. So they are in illusion. So that is from Tattvamuktāvalī 22.

Reading from Study Guide: *If the direct meaning is rejected in relation to spiritual matters, then what use is interpretation of the same words, which must depend ultimately upon the direct meaning?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Means you are saying we can't take the direct meaning, so we are going to have to interpret it by indirectly, but it is expected that the students are going to take the meaning of your indirect statement directly. Right? Does that make sense? Otherwise then, where is the relationship with the teacher? Does that make sense? So this is a problem. They don't see it, but it exists.

Reading from Study Guide: *Therefore the intelligent man will reject interpretation and accept the direct connotative power of the words of the scriptures in trying to understand the Absolute Truth.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Because the point is is, God who is Absolute, He created language, He expanded the śāstra. That means that even though it is impossible for words to describe the transcendental supreme Absolute Truth, because He is God, He has done it. Does that make sense? Means, He is the Supreme Person, so therefore He can do anything, and He has. Language can express feeling and meaning, it can express the transcendence, it can express something beyond our experience because it has come from God. But not because of the grammar or other, the semantics of it, the vocabulary and all this. Because of its nature, its ability to carry the cit-potency. You know what I am saying? Right? Because what is important about the cit-potency?

Prabhu (1): *It is knowledge.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: It is knowledge, but also...? Where does fall in sambandha, abhidheya and prayojana?

Prabhu (1): *Abhidheya.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Abhidheya. So that means there is knowledge and...?

Prabhu (1): *Activity.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Activity. So if we have knowledge and activity, then you get realization, which will be...?

Prabhu (1): *Prayojana.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Prayojana, because then that alters your lifestyle, that alters how you perceive things, that alters your experience, right? So then having altered that experience, then that becomes the platform by which now you perceive things. So from that perception then your activities again will be improved. So then that improved activity will get even a better result. Does that make sense? So in this way it dynamically moves forward. So, therefore, what is important in this now, in performing the activities of *cit*, then what is the important element within that?

Prabhu (3): *Perform with knowledge?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Perform with knowledge, and then... But what is the purpose of that knowledge, what are you trying to gain?

Prabhu (1): *Knowledge about the Supreme.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Knowledge about the Supreme, but why do you want knowledge about the Supreme? Is knowledge about the Supreme enough?

Prabhu (4): *Relationship.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Relationship. And then what will that relationship be based on?

Prabhu (4): *Sambandha.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Sambandha, that is relationship, but I am saying, now you have a relationship with somebody, why do you have that? Why do you want to have a relationship with another person?

Prabhu (1): *It is nature?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: It is nature, yes, that is natural, but what is it that you are seeking? It is natural to do what you are seeking. Just like it is natural for a kid to eat, but why do they eat? Is a kid eating because it is good for their health and they will grow nicely, and they will have strong teeth and good organs, and then when they get bigger, then they will be able...? Is that why they eat?

Prabhu (2): *There is a need.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: There is a need, okay, but there is also something else that goes along with this need.

Prabhu (5): *Fulfilment, satisfaction.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Fulfilment, satisfaction, what are they fulfilling?

Prabhu (1): *Desire.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Desire, okay, desire, these needs. And so, what about taste? Kids, do they eat things that they don't like the taste of? Not really. So that means, it is rasa is what is important. Does that make sense? So one always has to be able to bring something back to that. The tattva is to define the form of rasa. Rasa is defined by tattva. You know what I am saying? But there is the experience. In other words, you can define the form of it, then there is the experience of it right?. So then in that way then what is important about activity? What does it do? You don't catch? Okay. What is the importance of a copper wire?

Prabhu (1): *It carries electricity.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: It carries electricity. So is the copper wire actually the main focus? No, it is the electricity, but in performing the activity of electrical work, what is all the

activity about? The wire, connecting the wire, making all the different adjustments in the wire, everything is about the wire. Okay?

[To the side] Can you just ask the gentleman back there if he needs something?

Okay? Does that make sense? So the copper wire carries it, therefore the activities carry the *cit*-potency, the internal potency. Right? So that means, what is not as important are the words, but what the words carry. Because they carry the transcendental.

[To the side] What happens? Say it again?

Prabhu (1): *He came to sell patati.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: I see, okay. So

Prabhus: *[Indistinct] I will ask... [Indistinct] will take care...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Okay, okay. So that means then the words can carry that, means, they can be an instrument for it, they themselves may not be spiritual, but they are designed by God that they can carry spiritual. Does that make sense? Copper wire is not electricity, but it has the capacity to carry it. Does that make sense? So, therefore the concept of language itself in the material world is not specifically spiritual, but it has the ability to carry or, how you say? Describe spiritual. Does that make sense? Yes?

Prabhu (2): *Mahārāja, originally the language is designed by God so that He can be glorified?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: So that...?

Prabhu (2): *So that Kṛṣṇa can be glorified by this language.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Yes, Kṛṣṇa can be glorified, means, the relationship between Kṛṣṇa and the devotees can be expressed. Because the words are one thing, but what they express - that is what is special. You know, like Kṛṣṇa will sit there and play with words with the devotees. So it is not so much the grammatical usage that makes, it is just that interaction where He is playing with them by goofing on the words, the experience gained from that - that is what is important because that is your prayojana. Does that make sense? Because prayojana is an experience, it is not a situation, it is not an activity. Does that make sense? Yes?

Prabhu (6): *So the language actually also can carry the mood? Or...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Yeah, can carry the mood, because of the verb. Because the mood, the verb... The language can carry the mood, it can carry accomplishment, time; it can carry the nature of the subject, and the nature of the object, it can carry all these different things. So it can express all that, but the purpose you are expressing that is for rasa. That is the whole idea. So, everything is like that, for expressing rasa. Yes?

Prabhu (1): *And also, on last Prabhupāda's Appearance Day...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Last Prabhupāda's Appearance Day?

Prabhu (1): *Jananivāsa Prabhu was mentioning that, he was saying Śrīla Prabhupāda's stories, and one of the, he was saying that Śrīla Prabhupāda was complaining to Brahmānanda Prabhu about doors slamming.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Doors slamming, yes.

Prabhu (1): *So he was saying that sometimes he was thinking over a word for three days to get the exact, exact mood across of what the ācāryas are presenting. So, that's why he was saying that the slamming of the doors were a problem for him because he was contemplating on the word.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: The word, okay. And so, how would that be applied here?

Prabhu (1): *Just that Mahāśaya was saying that word carries the mood...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Word carries the mood? And so, a slamming door gets in the way of understanding that mood?

Prabhu (1): *Śrīla Prabhupāda was saying that, you know, it is disturbing him...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: It is disturbing him, but why would it disturb him?

Prabhu (1): *He is contemplating.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: No, he is contemplating, but now the door is slammed, so therefore we are talking about the moods are being conveyed. So why would he be disturbed by that slamming door?

Prabhu (4): *He was disturbed...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: But he was disturbed, that we know.

Prabhu (7): *Because of noise?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Because of noise.

Prabhu (3): *It disturbs the life-airs.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: It disturbs the life airs. But you are dealing all with the physical. Why did the door slam?

Prabhu (3): *Because somebody was in rajo-guna, he was in a hurry...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: If someone is in a hurry, someone is in ignorance, he is unconscious, and so therefore it carries the mood. So the mood was passion or ignorance, and so therefore when the door slams, it will carry that mood. So, therefore it is an annoyance. Okay?

So the whole point is is, whatever we deal with they are mediums for carrying or expressing rasa. Does that make sense? So, this is the difficulty then, is that they are trying to... [to the side] [indistinct]

Prabhu (1): *[indistinct]*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: You were expecting them, or...? Okay.

[to the side] [indistinct] Hare Kṛṣṇa! Like that, but quickly because we are running a class.

So, the whole idea is that even though seemingly it seems logical that the material words can't carry a spiritual meaning, but the point is is, by God's arrangement if they are in connection with the spiritual authority, they can. Because when the wire, it has the potential to carry electricity, but when does it actually carry the electricity?

Prabhu (7): *If there is electricity.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: If there is electricity, but, yes, I have a copper wire here, and I have some electricity over there.

Prabhu: *When it is connected.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Yeah, so they are connected, so in other words, if your words are connected to the Veda and your understanding is direct that you are connecting it to God, then it carries transcendence. But the reason is, their words can't carry it, just as they are saying that the Veda can't carry it, is because it is not connected to the Supreme Lord. So, therefore, through this Māyāvādī understanding you can never get to the transcendental platform because if the point of connection is not transcendental, how will then something removed from that, your own interpretation of it, carry it? You know what I am saying? Does that make sense? So that's the whole... Okay?

Prabhu (6): *And if the words cannot carry then how would they express it anyway?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Yeah. But their idea is, you have to take the indirect meaning. But then you take the indirect meaning of what they said, they expect you to take the direct meaning. Because they are guru, you follow the authority. But they are not following the Vedic authority, so where does their authority to be an authority come from? That is the whole point. So Śāṅkarācārya came to bewilder the Buddhists, so he is actually talking of voidism, do you understand? Because it says, it is covered Buddhism. But they will say, 'No, he presents the Vedic culture, all the Vedas, everything like that.' But according to this statement, does he actually accept the authority of the Veda? No. In one sense, culturally, yes. But in philosophy, no. Culturally everything that Śāṅkarācārya and any of his followers do is based on the Veda. So what he has done is basically re-introduced Vedic culture into Buddhism. The Buddhists, they rejected the... Why did Buddha reject the Vedas?

Prabhu (1): *They were being misused.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: They were being misused, misinterpreted. So he rejects them. So here they are coming along and misinterpreting the Veda. So the point is is, they are not actually taking the Veda for what it is. Right? They are taking the external form of it, so, therefore, then it makes it very easy. Now the Vedic culture is there, the acceptance of scriptures is there, everything is there. But then the ācāryas, Rāmānuja, Madhva can come and establish therefore Vaiṣṇavism. It is harder to do that with Buddhists because there is no Veda, there is no culture and there is no God. So here at least then you are dealing with, you have the culture, you have the Vedas, you don't have God. So it is very subtle that... So it is covered Buddhism, in that it is actually atheistic, it doesn't accept the authority of the Veda on one level. It is covered Buddhism. Buddhism is obviously that because they reject everything, the

whole Veda. But here it is, they accept the Vedas, but they don't accept that they can deliver spiritual. So at least all the material is in place. But the concept that there is spiritual is there and all these, so there is a differentiation between material and spiritual, so it is not just all void. Yes?

Prabhu (5): *What about quoting? Sometimes the quote is taken from a particular context that Prabhupāda quote is like, you could say because it is Prabhupāda's quote it is perfect, but then it is put in another context...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: And so then what?

Prabhu (5): *Then...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: What are you getting at?

Prabhu (5): *That the words and realization, both is important, right, in what you present...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: It is important, the point is is, the words have to be in such a way that they carry the potency. So if it is not used in the proper way, how will they carry it? A wire carries the electricity as long as it is connected, if it is not connected it won't carry electricity. So Prabhupāda puts it in one context, therefore it is connected, you take it out of that context, then it is not connected any more. Does that make sense? Yeah. That is why it is important to understand the context in which the thing is given. Is that okay?

Reading from Study Guide: *The following kārīkā summarizes the point:*

"Lord Caitanya, who bestowed the Vedic knowledge unto the heart of Brahmā, has appeared in Kali Yuga in Navadvīpa. He has revealed the pure essence of the Vedas, freeing the pure Vedic philosophy from the contamination of Kali Yuga. The human being in concluding anything must certainly indulge in the four faults of error, omission, limitation and cheating. In relation to spiritual matters, even the greatest learned men cannot avoid these four defects. Therefore, in spiritual matters, the only authority is the word of Veda, which has no human author. All other proofs, such as sense perception, inference, simile and tradition, when they are in agreement with the Vedic word, can be useful and relevant.

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Right? Does that make sense?

Prabhu (6): *Mahārāja... from previous point...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Previous point?

Prabhu (6): *About the indirect meaning. Actually, from the direct meaning, if we say that the indirect meaning should be taken, but there can be unlimited indirect meanings?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: That is there, but then they will always take the indirect meaning of their authority. Just like in the modern academics, they will say, 'Well, this is just faith, or it is interpolation,' because it doesn't fit into their concept, because they are taking themselves as authority.

Prabhu (6): *But isn't it that everybody is God?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: That is the whole point, Māyāvādīs think they are God.

Prabhu (6): *So then everybody is the authority?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Yeah. So that's why it is that it only works up to a point, it sounds very good, but then after that they make themselves the authority.

Prabhu (6): *And then Śaṅkarācārya as the authority then sings bhaja govindam bhaja govindam...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Like that. They are bewildered because they can't figure out what he is talking about. That is slightly bewildering to them. What is really bewildering to them, he has written a book on Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. They acknowledge that he has written a book and they can't understand why. He has written it, showing how Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Personality of Godhead and everything. But it is like, it is one of those things that is there, but they don't talk about it. You know, like you have in a family, you know, one of your uncles is in prison or something, or crazy, or something really embarrassing, they just... If you ask them, they will say it exists. They have no idea why he has written it. But it is there. It is really a nice book. He just establishes.... glorifies Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, everything like that. They can't figure it out. Okay. So, therefore, sense perception, inference, simile, tradition is all useful if it is in agreement with the Vedic word. Right? That's your way, your point. If it is not in agreement, it doesn't have any purpose, doesn't have any meaning. Does that make sense?

So then, Lord Caitanya, who bestowed the Vedic knowledge unto the heart of Brahmā, has appeared in Kali Yuga and in that He has revealed the pure essence of the Vedas, freeing it from the influence of Kali Yuga. He has come to give the essence because people don't have the time to go into so much detailed study. They can only get to the essence. Does that make sense? So then, the human being, he will have these four defects, so therefore anything he deals with will have defects. But the śāstra is not written by any human. Let alone only by a realized soul, it is not by a human – by God. Then of that, then you have great personalities that are basing everything on the Veda. Okay? So this is... Okay. We have this little dip at the bottom of the page, and it doesn't seem to go anywhere. See, there is some variety of footnote from somewhere. Oh, yeah, there are footnotes before, we seem to be missing the footnotes.

Prabhu (6): *Yeah, I will check it out.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Remember, there were all those little numbers before? So, okay. And this is... Now it says Chapter 3. When did we do Chapter 2?

Prabhu (4): *We are doing Chapter 2.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: We are doing Chapter 2? Chapter 1... Okay, āmnāya is the... Chapter 1 is establishes Lord Caitanya's, the principles, then āmnāya is the first chapter. So now we have dealt with āmnāya, okay? Now Chapter 2 'Kṛṣṇa is the Absolute Truth,' that is the next one? Now *pramāṇa* is done, now we are working on *prameya*. So the first prameya then is 'Kṛṣṇa is the Absolute Truth.' So He is the Supreme. Okay?

Reading from Study Guide:

CHAPTER THREE

Kṛṣṇa is the Absolute Truth

In the Caitanya Caritāmṛta, there is the following authoritative statement (āmnāya vākya) concerning Kṛṣṇa:

"The Vedas sometimes speak directly of Kṛṣṇa, using the primary import of words, and sometimes speak indirectly of Kṛṣṇa, using the secondary import of words. Sometimes they speak of Kṛṣṇa with affirmative, logical statements and sometimes by negative or contrary expression." (CC Madhya 10.146)

"The Personality of Godhead Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the original primeval Lord, the source of all other expansions. All the revealed scriptures accept Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the Supreme Lord." (CC Ādi [2.]106)

"Lord Kṛṣṇa Himself is the one undivided Absolute Truth, the ultimate reality. He manifests Himself in three features-as Brahman, Paramātmā and Bhagavān. (CC Ādi 2.65)

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Yeah, this other one doesn't say what chapter it is, okay. Then,

Reading from Study Guide: *"The Personality of Godhead is He who is described as the Absolute Whole in the Vedas, Bhāgavatam, Upaniṣads and other transcendental literatures. No one is equal to Him. Through their service, devotees see that Personality of Godhead, just as the denizens of heaven see the personality of the sun. Those who walk the paths of knowledge and yoga worship only Him, for it is Him they perceive as the impersonal Brahman and localized Paramātmā." (CC Ādi 2.24-26)*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Okay, so it means, the devotees because of their service, by their service they qualify themselves, they see the Personality of Godhead, Bhagavān. Just as the denizens of heaven by their previous pious activities qualify themselves to see the sun-god. We only see the sun, but because of their piety they see the sun-god. Does that make sense? Okay, so, in other words, those who are following the path of, here, karma and yoga, or in this way karma and jñāna, then they are only worshipping Kṛṣṇa, but they are perceiving the Brahman aspect and the Paramātmā. So all they are seeing is Kṛṣṇa. So even in there, we see that there is some benefit, they are moving forward. Right? That is why Bhaktivinoda Thākura is saying that there is nothing that is not useful. But the difficulty is just their perception is not enough to see the total, the full picture. Does that make sense?

Like let's say, you have a person, they are into welfare work, social work, helping others, that is nice. But the point is is, if you really want to help them then give them God consciousness. So they have that sentiment to give their time and energy to help other people, benefit other people, that is very good. But the point is is, why do something so temporary, do something... For the same effort you could do something eternal. Does that make sense? So, so these impersonalists and the yogīs, then they are perceiving the impersonal Brahman and the localized Paramātmā, those are aspects of Kṛṣṇa, but they don't understand they are aspects of Kṛṣṇa. They think that is the Absolute Truth in whole, so then they miss the point. So that is the difficulty. Seeing that Brahman is part of Kṛṣṇa and Paramātmā is expansion of Kṛṣṇa, localized form, then that is not a problem. That's not a problem because you see it in connection with Kṛṣṇa. The problem is is, seeing Paramātmā and Brahman not in connection with Kṛṣṇa. Does that make sense? That is how the devotees can discuss Brahman and the position of Brahman realization, because they see it as one of the aspects of Kṛṣṇa, not the

ultimate but as a way of connecting oneself. You want to connect yourself to Kṛṣṇa, so I connect my activity to Kṛṣṇa, but that is the body and the senses, right? Does that make sense? So you can also connect your understanding how Kṛṣṇa is in every atom, between every atom and how everything is His energy. Do you understand? It is not that I can connect the body, and then I can connect Bhagavān, so I have body - Bhagavān. You can also use these in-between stages. So, in other words, what anybody is trying to perceive in their life is Kṛṣṇa. There is not something else, there isn't anything else. Just that they are not able to see Kṛṣṇa in it. Does this make sense? Yeah? Okay. That's CC Ādi 2.24-26.

Reading from Study Guide: *The Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad says:*

*"Bhagavān is worshipable by all. He is the basis of all entities who take birth."
Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 5.4*

In the Bhāgavatam, bhagavān is identified as Kṛṣṇa:

"All the above mentioned incarnations are either plenary portions or portions of the plenary portions of the Lord, but Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the original Personality of Godhead." (Ś.B. 1.3.28)

In the Bhagavat-gītā, Kṛṣṇa says:

"O conqueror of wealth, there is no Truth superior to Me." (BG 7.7)

And also,

"By all the Vedas am I to be known." (BG 15.15)

In the Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad it is said (in verse 21, Pūrva Tāpanī):

"Therefore Kṛṣṇa is the supreme Lord. One should meditate on Him, chant His name, worship Him and make offerings to Him. All pervading and controlling all, he is to be worshipped. Although he is one, he appears in many forms such as Kurma, Matsya, Vāsudeva and Saṅkarṣaṇa. Those wise persons who worship this form situated on his pīṭha attain eternal happiness. Others, worshipping Brahman or Paramātmā, cannot attain happiness."

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Because what we discussed before, the Brahman perception and the Bhagavān perception, I mean, the Paramātmā perception are concepts of this world. They are transcendental concepts, but they are only practiced by those within the material sphere. In the spiritual world they don't think about Brahman or Paramātmā because Kṛṣṇa is in front of them. Why would they have to think about Paramātmā? Right? Does that make sense? We think about Brahman because we are trying to separate our consciousness from material to spiritual, therefore we make a differentiation. But if everything is spiritual there is no need to differentiate. Does that make sense? Yeah. So, therefore, these two cannot give you the ultimate happiness. They cannot give you the ultimate platform. Does that make sense? They are used as tools, just like karma is not going to give you anything, or jñāna is not going to give you. So they are used as tools in devotional service because everything is connected to Kṛṣṇa, therefore it is used. But it is used according to the authority of the Vedas.

Reading from Study Guide: *There is a kārīkā in this regard:*

"Kṛṣṇa is the only Lord. Paramātmā is his part and Brahman is his light. Nārāyaṇa in Vaikuṅṭha is a lordly manifestation of Kṛṣṇa. There is no doubt about this, since the Vedas and other scriptures clearly show this."

Taittirīya Upaniṣad says:

"Brahman is eternal, conscious, and infinite. He is situated in the heart as Paramātmā and in Vaikuṅṭha as Nārāyaṇa. Whoever knows this vipaścīt Brahman attains auspicious qualities similar to the Lord's. (Taittirīya Upaniṣad. 2.1)

HH BVPS Mahārāja: You are only doing... You are on the first chapter, right? You are in Śikṣāvallī [the first part of Taittirīya Upaniṣad]? Yeah, okay. So when you get to Ānandavallī [the second part of Taittirīya Upaniṣad] then you will learn this verse. Yeah, I just don't remember the svaras.

Reading from Study Guide: *Here, the expression vipaścīt Brahman means Kṛṣṇa. Śrīmad Bhāgavatam also uses the word "Brahman" to indicate Kṛṣṇa, as in the following words:*

gūḍham paraṁ brahma manuṣya liṅgam yaṁ mitram paramānandaṁ pūrṇam brahma sanātanam

Viṣṇu Purāṇa also uses the word Brahman to mean Kṛṣṇa:

yatrāvātīrṇaṁ kṛṣṇākhyam paraṁ brahma narākṛtim

Where the supreme Brahman called Kṛṣṇa appeared in human-like form Gītā says, brahmaṇo hi pratiṣṭhāham, I am the basis of Brahman. [00:40:32]

By these authoritative statements and many thousands more, paraṁ brahma or vipaścīta Brahman is equated with Kṛṣṇa. The meaning of vipaścīt is "wise" (indicating Brahman with quality). It ranks important among the sixty-four qualities of Kṛṣṇa.

The qualities of Kṛṣṇa are as follows:

- 1. soft-limbed*
- 2. endowed with all auspicious bodily characteristics*
- 3. beautiful*
- 4. very effulgent*
- 5. strong*
- 6. in the prime of youth*
- 7. able to speak all sorts of languages*
- 8. truthful*

9. *speaks in a pleasing manner*
10. *eloquent*
11. *learned*
12. *intelligent*
13. *genius*
14. *clever in rasa*
15. *cunning*
16. *skillful*
17. *grateful*
18. *determined in vows*
19. *acts according to time, place and person*
20. *sees through the eyes of scripture*
21. *clean*
22. *sense controlled*
23. *steady*
24. *mild*
25. *forgiving*
26. *grave*
27. *patient*
28. *equal to all*
29. *generous*
30. *righteous*
31. *brave*
32. *merciful*
33. *respectful*
34. *straightforward*
35. *courteous*

36. *bashful*
37. *protector of those surrendered to Him*
38. *happy*
39. *friend of His devotee*
40. *controlled by prema*
41. *makes everyone happy*
42. *dignified*
43. *famous*
44. *attractive to all*
45. *refuge of the devotee*
46. *attractive to women*
47. *worshipable by all*
48. *prosperous*
49. *the best*
50. *endowed with opulences*
51. *always situated in His own form*
52. *omniscient*
53. *ever youthful*
54. *form of concentrated eternity, knowledge and bliss*
55. *endowed with all mystic powers*
56. *endowed with inconceivable energies*
57. *shelter of unlimited universes*
58. *the origin of all avatāras*
59. *giver of liberation to even His enemies*
60. *attractive to those enjoying the self*
61. *ocean of pastimes amazing to all*
62. *surrounded by gopīs resplendent with unequalled love in śṛṅgāra rasa*

63. *plays the flute which attracts the whole universe*

64. *unequaled beauty which astounds all creatures*

Among the sixty-four qualities, the first fifty are present in the jīvas to a small degree.

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Notice the word 'small.' Jīva is very small, so there is only so much of these qualities you can stuff into 1/10,000th of the tip of the hair. So, therefore one should never be too proud. Right? [Laughter] No?

Reading from Study Guide: *All of them are present in Kṛṣṇa to the fullest extent. The first fifty qualities and the next five qualities are partially present in Lord Śiva and others.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Means like Brahmā or like that, depending upon their position.

Reading from Study Guide: *The next five qualities, along with the previous fifty-five qualities are present in Nārāyaṇa, Lord of Vaikuṅṭha. Nārāyaṇa has these sixty qualities in full. However, these sixty qualities appear in Kṛṣṇa in a more wonderful manner. In addition, Kṛṣṇa possesses four exceptional qualities: the sweetness of his pastimes, the sweetness of his love, the sweetness of his form and the sweetness of his flute. No one except Kṛṣṇa has these four qualities. Therefore the Parabrahman or vipaścit Brahman, the highest manifestation of truth, should be understood to be Śrī Kṛṣṇa.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Right? So you have these 50 qualities that the jīva has in partialness, Kṛṣṇa has in full. The next, those 50 plus the next 5, then Śiva and other have them in some quantity, like that, but not in full. Right? Nārāyaṇa has them in full. But then we see, Kṛṣṇa has them, those in full, plus He has 4 more that Nārāyaṇa doesn't have. So that means, He is even attractive to Nārāyaṇa. Kṛṣṇa is in... Okay?

Reading from Study Guide: *When Kṛṣṇa's innumerable qualities are diffused like light rays, that is termed Brahman.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: So, in other words, the qualities themselves, is just from that, they are just so wonderful, that diffuses from there, this, the qualities, so then they are taken as Brahman. Because everything is connected. But it is just all you are appreciating is the diffusion of the qualities. Does that make sense?

Reading from Study Guide: *Therefore the Vedas, in describing the supreme as satyam jñānam anantam are indicating the effulgent Brahman.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: In other words, the diffusion of His qualities.

Reading from Study Guide: *The form of the Absolute Truth in the heart or in the universe is Paramātmā. The Lord creates all the universes and then enters them by His expansions. The form of the Lord who enters the universes and the hearts of the jīvas is an expansion of Kṛṣṇa, called Paramātmā. This form is also known by many other names, such as lord, controller, creator, lord of the universe, maintainer, and protector.*

He also protects the souls in the material world by taking the avatāra forms such as Rāma and Kṛṣṇa. In the spiritual sky, paravyoma, one of Kṛṣṇa's expansions known as Nārāyaṇa is present eternally.

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Okay? Does that make some sense? Yes?

Prabhu (6): *Of those qualities, one of them, the 20th, that He sees through the eyes of scripture, it's...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Yes. Because otherwise He has created... In other words, how do you guarantee that your pastimes are always going to be the same, the same standard? Because it is always related to the scripture. So the scripture is how Kṛṣṇa likes things. So then, even when He is having His pastimes, it is still according to the scriptures, though He has written them.

Prabhu (6): *So Kṛṣṇa follows, He establishes, He [indistinct]...*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: It is basically what Kṛṣṇa likes to do is what is described in the Veda.

Prabhu (6): *So how can somebody argue that we don't follow?*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: That makes it very hard on their part to...

Prabhu (6): *... establish.*

HH BVPS Mahārāja: Yeah. Because the point is, you are chanting the holy name, Kṛṣṇa is there now, He is following the Vedas. We are saying the Vedas don't apply now, then that means the holy name doesn't apply now. Because Kṛṣṇa in the form of His holy name, coming because of your chanting or appearing because of your chanting there is going to be following the Veda. You know what I am saying? So if you don't accept the Veda, then how are you going to accept the Lord?

It is all being done for... In other words what we were discussing before, the impersonalists do it because they think I am God, like that. And so then we can't get distracted by that, that I am God, or I am the enjoyer, you know. So because of that then people separate themselves from authority. And once you disconnect yourself from authority, therefore all these other... From *pramāṇa*, then all the *prameyas* won't be actually right, correct, they will be wrong. Because if they are not based on the Veda there will be something wrong about that. Because if it is our own interpretation, it is going to have one of the four defects or all four of them.

Today is Thursday, right? We will continue tomorrow.

*Oṃ Hare Kṛṣṇa Hare Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa Hare Hare Hare Rāma Hare Rāma Rāma Rāma
Hare Hare*

Śrīla Prabhupāda kī jaya!

[end of lecture]

[end]