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Overview

The Sārārtha-varṣini is an orthodox Gauḍīya vaishnava commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā. This research project aimed to use the text of the Sārārtha-varṣini as the starting point for an investigation into the Gauḍīya sect around the time of its composition. The project began by establishing a scholarly edition of the text with the aid of extant manuscripts and available printed editions. A critical edition and translation of the first three chapters are presented in the appendix.

As the project progressed, interesting archival material surfaced, and the relationship of the sect with the state of Amber/Jaipur became the focus. The role of Gauḍīya religious dignitaries in religious debate in Jaipur was investigated, and the issue of sectarian affiliation emerged as an issue for which the text of the Sārārtha-varṣini was particularly illuminating.

Joseph O’Connell and Klaus Klostermaier had done fine academic research on works by the same author and had even touched on this work. Nevertheless, a large amount of groundwork remained to be done to ascertain basic issues such as names, dates, claims of authorship, and other biographical details. Sections One and Two of this dissertation review previous scholarship and tradition on these issues and provide new insights from textual analysis and archival investigation.

With regard to the politico-religious milieu in Rajasthan, V.S. Bhatnagar, Monika Horstman and Irfan Habib had already performed significant archival research and published extremely useful findings. My study was therefore greatly assisted in this area, and this dissertation was able to build on the very solid foundation established by these fine scholars. This study contains reference to many archival documents already published by them, and it introduces a good deal of previously unpublished archival records. Of particular interest are the new records regarding the influence of Viśvanātha Cakravarti, Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhāṭṭācārya, and Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāna. Section Three combines old and new material to create for the first time a “historical” snapshot of these Gauḍīya dignitaries and the politico-religious issues of their times.

The analysis of the sectarian influences on the text of the Sārārtha-varṣini (Section 4) brings together the historical issues of the era and the edited text. This section provides clear empirical analysis on the sectarian affiliation of the sect in matters of doctrine. The textual evidence clearly indicates that the Gauḍīya-Mādhva affiliation was merely an “official” stance. Evidence from the text points to a much stronger doctrinal allegiance to Śrīdhara Swami and the Bhāgavata-purāṇa. The
Bhagavad-gītā commentary has provided an invaluable common platform from which to compare the Gaurīya sect with other established sects and important commentators.
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**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Bhāgavata-purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Bengali Era (Bāṅgā Saṁvat, Bāṅgā-ābda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrU</td>
<td>Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOL</td>
<td>India Office Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAOS</td>
<td>The Journal of the American Oriental Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRAS</td>
<td>The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>Jaipur State Archives, Bikaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KaU</td>
<td>Kaṭha Upaniṣad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KD</td>
<td>Kapaddvāra Collection (Kapāra-dvārā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ms(s)</td>
<td>manuscript(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MuU</td>
<td>Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>New Catalogus Catalogorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLI</td>
<td>National Library of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Nusukha Puṇya (Jaipur State Archives Bound Volumes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Narottama-viḷāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Paṇini (Āṣṭādhyāyī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKS</td>
<td>Suker Kshetra Shodh Sansthan, Kasganj (Collection of Dr N.C. Bansal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>the Śāka era (Śāka saṁvat, Śākābda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRI</td>
<td>The Vrindavan Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
<td>the Vikrama era (Vikrama saṁvat)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Indic Language Transliteration Conventions

For all Indic language words in this dissertation, I follow the I.P.A. transliteration conventions for Sanskrit. Anyone familiar with Sanskrit will recognise easily all the diacritics used. Bengali and Hindi present one minor problem: the retroflex flaps. These have been transliterated (following Barz and Yadav 1992) with ṛ and ṛh (e.g. Gauṛiya). This is the same symbol as for the retroflex vowel (as in kṛṣṇa), but there can be no confusion since the two never occur in the same environment: the flap ṛ only occurs after a vowel, whereas the vowel ṛ never occurs after another vowel.

Acceptable English words like “Swami” (also “Goswami”) or “Hindi” are written as if they were English words, that is to say without transliteration and in their simplest form (i.e. Swami not svāmin).

I have not used diacritics where an Indic word has a commonly accepted English rendering (e.g. “Jaipur” or “Jai Singh”). Diacritics have equally not been used where modern Indian authors or institutions present themselves in publications with an Anglicised rendition of an Indic name (e.g. “Ghosh”, “Chakrabarti” or “Man Singh II Museum”). For bibliographical references, all titles, authors, and institutions have been transcribed exactly how they are on the title page of published works.

Other proper names are given with transliteration but without italics (e.g., Gaṃeṣṭa). Compounded Indic proper names received only initial capitalisation (Bhagavad-gītā and not Bhagavad-Gītā).

Diacritics have not been used when a word has become “anglicised by marriage”, i.e., when it has accepted English derivational suffixes (e.g., “Vaishnavism” as opposed to “vaishṇava”). When a word accepts English derivational suffixes, then it is treated as a “naturalised” English word.

Sanskrit nouns appear in the basic form in which they would appear in a

1 The retroflex flaps are an unfamiliar sound for English speakers. They are made by flapping the tip of the tongue along the roof of the mouth down across the gums behind the front teeth. It is generally heard as a “funny kind of d.” Therefore in some transliteration systems the flaps are transliterated by the symbol “ḍ” (eg. Gauḍiya). However in that case there is no way of differentiating them from ordinary retroflex stops. Other systems use a different diacritic (e.g., “ṛ”) but my font did not allow that luxury, and in any case it is not necessary.
Sanskrit compound. That is to say, they have no case ending ("Skanda-purāṇa" and not "Skanda-purāṇam") and they exhibit their simplest stem form ("sannyāsī" and not "sannyāsin").

As this dissertation involves Sanskrit, Braj Bhasha, Rajasthani, Bengali, and Persian material, there was the potential for multiple transliterations of the same word, e.g., vaiśnava, vaisnav, baisnab, boišnob, baisno, and so on. I have tried as much as possible to transliterate in a regular way, generally using the standard Classical Sanskrit forms. In my own writing I have therefore included the final “a” in words like “Govinda-deva”. In the transliteration of a quoted vernacular passage, I have exercised my discretion to use an appropriate standard for that particular dialect or language, taking into account prosodic considerations.

I have taken the liberty of sporadically using the ordinary honorifics and suffixes like “Śri” or “Bhaṭṭācārya”. This is basically to give the text a little variety, especially with frequently mentioned persons such as “Caitanya” or “Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya”. The honorifics serve to convey the honour given to them by their followers and they help to avoid monotony. Thus throughout the text “Caitanya”, “Śri Caitanya”, and “Caitanyadeva” all refer to the same person. Similarly the section on Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya contains references to “Kṛṣṇadeva”, “Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma”, and “Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya” in order to break the monotony.

The names of modern Indian authors have been transliterated as they appear on the cover of their books (e.g. Prasad). If the books are in Hindi or Bengali, I have rendered the names with diacritics (e.g. Hari-dāsa Dāsa).

---

2 Some well-known place names (like “Braj”) have escaped the final “a” treatment.
A Note on the Historical Sources and Methodology.

The first part of this dissertation contains some historical information as a background to the text, which is edited and translated as the second half of this dissertation.

Archival records for this project are relatively rich, thanks to the involvement in the affairs of Braj by the rulers of Amber/ Jaipur in the 17th and 18th centuries. The correspondence between the maharajas and the temple priests constitutes the bulk of the archival documents available for the period. Some of these have been retained in the Jaipur State Archives (Bikaner), and others have been retained in the various temples of Braj and Jaipur. The documents are written in Persian, Sanskrit, Rajasthani and Braj-bhāṣā, and some are bilingual.

The records held in the Jaipur State Archives (JSA) are immense and only a fraction of them deal with the religious history which is the focus of this dissertation. Thus far only limited use has been made of these documents by scholars of religious history. The majority of documents from the Jaipur State Archives used in this dissertation are previously unpublished.

The documents of the Jaipur State Archives Collection are arranged by type of document, and the following categories have been used in this study:

- **Kharitā** are “official letters” written between the chief priests of the temples and the ruler. Those kept in the Archives are the letters

---

3 The political history of the period has been ably chronicled by V.S. Bhatnagar (1974) making extensive use of the vast archival materials.

4 Bhatnagar’s chapter on “Cultural Institutions” is really only an appendix to the very fine political history. M. Horstmann makes good use of the Jaipur State Archives in her later works (1994, 1999, and forthcoming). A.K. Roy (1975, 1986) makes some use of the Jaipur State Archives collection, but not always accurately (see section 2.4 below).

5 Dr. Prof. Monika Horstmann is working on a related field, and has conducted similar archival research.

6 A much more detailed description of these document types is furnished by Bhatnagar (1972: 347-355) and Horstmann (1999: 41-61).
received by the maharaja. Mostly these are standard letters of
to visit the temple and giving him a gift of blessed food or
clothing (prasād). Some, however, contain interesting requests.
Unfortunately they are rarely dated. The Kharitā are written on fine
coloured paper with distinctive decorative motifs and watermarks.

- Parvānā are “royal orders”. They are authoritative documents
informing the court officials of the decision of the maharaja in regard
to matters such as the offering of land in jagir and dedicating villages
to a deity. They document the government processes. These note-pad
size papers are stored in bundles according to date.
- Sanad is a “voucher” or a “statement of accounts”. These cover the
fiscal orders relating to land grants. Almost like a receipt, the sanad
are quite often issued to the recipient of the grant.
- Dastur Kaumwar are records of gifts given as part of Jaipur court
protocol. These documents are stored according to caste (kaum).
These record official visits of religious dignitaries to the court. The
bundles of notepad size pieces of paper have been transcribed and
indexed in bound volumes. They contain occasional cross-references
to the Siah Hazur.
- Siah Hazur are records of the daily activities of the maharaja.
- Nusukhā Puṇya are accounts of the charity given by the maharaja.
They give more detail about the offering of villages in jagir to those
with whom the maharaja was pleased, such as court officials, temple
priests, deities, and warriors. This extensive collection is transcribed
and bound (but not indexed) and is divided into two sections: one
arranged according to village and district, the other according to caste
of the recipient.

Another collection of immense importance is the Kapaddvara Collection kept
in the maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum in the Jaipur City Palace. This is a
smaller collection of documents similar to those in the Jaipur State Archives
Collection, but which were kept in the personal wardrobe (kapara-dvārā) of the
maharaja. Being the private collection of the maharaja they were not taken to
Bikaner with the other documents in the State Archives. These contain many of the
statements of opinion which Maharaja Sawai Jai Singh II solicited from pandits from
as far away as Navadvīpa in Bengal. Unfortunately, for bureaucratic reasons, the
collection was not open for inspection during this project, but G.N. Bahura and
C. Singh (1988) have provided a short synopsis in English of all the documents, and
the work of Horstmann provides some transcripts.

The letters written from the Jaipur State to the chief priests (mahant or adhikārī) have mostly been preserved in the collections of the various temples themselves. The Vṛndāvana Research Institute (Vṛndāvana U.P.) has microfilmed a good quantity of documents from the temples of Govindadeva, Rādhā-Dāmodara and Madan-mohana, all in Vṛndāvana.

A small but significant collection of Persian, Braj, and Rajasthani documents pertaining to the official dealings of certain Gauḍīya vaishnavas has been published by Irfan Habib (1996). This is a synopsis of documents from various sources arranged by the name of the person involved.

Monika Horstmann (1996 & 1999) has also published some very significant documents concerned with the custodianship of the Govindadeva temple. Both this and the collection of Habib are documents collated by the deceased Tarapada Mukherji.

The only problem with the above documents is that they only record the “official” dealings, such as the exchange of land, money and gifts, or with squabbles which had to be resolved by the state authorities. Some of the more reclusive members of the sect are not mentioned at all in these documents.

More specific personal information about our author is found in sections of two traditional works composed by members of the Gauḍīya sect. The older of the two is Narahari Cakravarti’s Narottama-vilāsa, which appears to have been written some time between 1700 and 1750. The second work is Gopāl Kavi’s Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvālī, which was written in 1843. Both works are verse hagiographies, the former written in Bengali and the latter in Braj-bhāṣā. Both provide interesting information of a personal and devotional nature.

The only problem with these two works is that they are not “history”; they do not provide accurate chronological or factual detail for the purposes of modern academic scholarship. The authors are operating in a different paradigm, in which such concerns are not prominent. What is essential for these writers is to impress

---

The author, Narahari Cakravarti, says that his father had become Viśvanātha’s disciple in Sādābād. This would mean his father was initiated sometime before 1679. As Viśvanātha probably lived for another fifty years after that, and as Narahari’s account mentions the passing away of Viśvanātha, it was probably written shortly after his demise. The dates mentioned here are discussed in detail below.

A copy of an autograph manuscript dated 1900VS was kindly provided by N.C. Bansal.
upon their readers the spirit of bhakti of their respective biographical subjects. Even authorities within the Gauḍīya movement have pointed out that the main worth of these particular books is devotional and not strictly historical.9

It is difficult to generalise, and each book must be taken case by case. In the Narottama-vilāsa we find a collection of traditional anecdotes about the life of Viśvanātha Cakravarti. Thus, it is a mixture of very interesting “oral history” and pious tradition.10

The issue is further complicated with the description of miraculous events such as the appearance of lights at the birth of Viśvanātha Cakravarti or his ability to write in the rain without getting wet.11 It would be inappropriate to refer to these incidents as “history”, as they rely on a belief in supernatural powers which is not within the domain of academic research. Yet in the same paragraph there is reference to Viśvanātha’s birth and childhood in the village of Deva-grāma in the MurshīdBād district of Bengal, which is a widely accepted “fact”.12

Thus, although some aspects of the Narottama-vilāsa are obviously not appropriate for historical purposes, one would nevertheless not like to “throw the baby out with the bath water”. Many of the details furnished in the Narottama-vilāsa are valuable insights into the life of Viśvanātha Cakravarti and a historian is perhaps best advised to be like the legendary haṁsa bird, which drinks only the milk from the mixture of water and milk.

Therefore, for the purposes of “historical enquiry”, one is obliged to make a selective use of traditional sources. Leaving aside miraculous incidents as non-verifiable, and making allowances for the non-historical nature of the works, the traditional accounts can be safely accepted as “based on historical events”, particularly with regard to plausible descriptions of non-controversial happenings.

9 Rosen (1991) p.8-11. Rupert Snell (1994 2) remarks that historical research is referential, whereas traditional Indian hagiography is reverential. He quotes Mahipati as saying that what these biographers “sought by writing about the lives of the saints was their company, sat-saṅga.”


11 Narottama-vilāsa Chapter 13.

The account of the *Narottama-vilāsa* is most valuable when the details of the story conform with documentary and manuscript evidence. The balancing act is where to draw the line.

Rupert Snell has remarked a recent re-evaluation within academic circles of traditional sources:

More recent research on this literature, however, sees it as addressing and revealing facets of belief and attitude which, though at some remove from historical actuality, lie at the very heart of the traditions they represent.\(^{13}\)

This “anthropological” approach accepts traditional accounts for what they tell us about the belief system of the people concerned. This approach, however, does not resolve the question at hand but rather crosses the river at a point further down stream\(^{14}\), for the question still remains: what do these traditional sources tell us about the events of the times?

The narrations of the *Narottama-vilāsa* tell us what was current within the tradition about Viśvanātha Cakravarti in the period just after his passing away. They tell us of the existence of a traditional version of the events, and their historical strength lies in their relative proximity to the period. Their historical weakness is their fusion with articles of faith and metaphysics.

Traditional sources have been used in this dissertation to corroborate assumptions which have been formed using the limited “historical” evidence of the archival and manuscript material. Thus traditional sources have been used to fill out the narrative framework established by stronger historical evidence. As in any history, the reader is asked to make allowances for the varying quality of the various sources. B.B. Majumdar reminds us of the hermeneutical fragility of any attempt at writing “history”:

Narahari Chakravarti was a diligent historian, a fine biographer, an expert in prosody, an expert geographer of the areas surrounding Mathura and Nabadwip.... His account...might not be absolutely free from historical errors. But the same sort of doubt may be raised


against all historians from Herodotus to Tarachand.\textsuperscript{15}

Although Majumdar is perhaps a little generous in his evaluation of Narahari Cakravarti as a historian, the point is valid. Even archival documents used in this research may not be "true" in some absolute sense. There is no guarantee that the authors of these government documents were in full knowledge of all the facts of the events and disputes they arbitrated on. They recorded what they were told and what they felt to be the facts of the case, but whether that always corresponded to the events is not guaranteed. And more often than not, they recorded only part or one side of a story.

All sources, whether traditional or "official", whether oral or written, necessarily only record a version of a story. A history such as this attempts to bring together all these versions of the story and let them all contribute each in their own way to represent the events of the period. \textit{Caveat lector} - let the discerning reader form an impression of the period taking into account the varying values of the sources involved.

This dissertation by necessity adopts the hermeneutic mode of the discipline of history which, in the words of Schleger, is based on the elementary creed that one must find out "whether or not something actually happened, whether it happened in the way it is told or in some other way."\textsuperscript{16} These often unexpressed ideological foundations are theoretical aims which are of course impossible in practice and even if partially possible are not the end of all enquiry. Of equal importance, especially in a historical investigation which includes religious tradition, is to know what different people said happened, what different people believed happened, and the possible reasons for this.

In this regard, the method adopted in this research resembles the method of New Cultural History.\textsuperscript{17} The approach of this dissertation is in some ways similar to the approach of Natalie Zemon Davis in her classic, \textit{The Return of Martin Guerre}, where she uses diverse evidence to shed light on the famous story of Martin Guerre. Here I have used archival evidence not only from the life the author and his disciples but also from the politico-religious debates of the period to provide a framework from which to analyse the text of the \textit{Sārārtha-varṣini}. The approach adopted here could be viewed as part of a larger trend to blur the boundaries between History, Cultural Studies, Anthropology, and Religious Studies.

\textsuperscript{15} B.B Majumdar 1965 p.81.

\textsuperscript{16} August Schlegel quoted by Harvey (1966: 4) and Neusner (1974: 39).

\textsuperscript{17} See for example, \textit{The New Cultural History}, edited by Lynn Hunt (1989).
All history is an act of interpretation, and even though this project claims to be “an archival investigation” without any particular theoretical stance, it must nevertheless take account, in the interpretive task, of the stance of the interpreter. It is not quite so easy to assume the “perfect impartiality” of a theoretically disinterested observer when the very enterprise of “history” is an ideology in itself. This is particularly the case when one uses the tools of historical enquiry on cultures and periods where those values were perhaps not shared. It is all too easy to integrate these cultures on our own terms and absorb them along western academic lines.

Another theoretical and methodological issue faced in this study is the tension between archival records and religious tradition. Being at the interface of politics and religion, this study proposes to bring together disparate sources such as archival documents and “pious legends”, which are normally treated as incompatible. It is true that they are born of conflicting epistemology, but they co-existed in the society of the time, so there should be a place for both of them in a history of the period. Both archival sources and “pious legend” have their limitations in what they can tell us. This dissertation proposes an integrated approach viewing them as complementary sources, rather than contradictory. Our method entails using both sources in a way that takes into account their respective shortcomings. Where there are discrepancies, rather than proclaiming tradition right or wrong, our approach will be to look for insight into the mechanisms behind the development of traditions.

Nevertheless, the primary focus of this project is on the archival material and on establishing as far as possible the series of events connected with the rise of religious patronage in the period. To this framework the traditional sectarian sources can be added to enrich the history with details, traditions, beliefs, and the world-view of the practitioners.
Section 1: The Text

1.1 Authorship

The *Sārārtha-varṣini* tīkā is universally attributed to Viṣvanātha Cakravarti. The extant printed editions of the work all attribute it to Viṣvanātha Cakravarti. Secondary literature also attributes the work to Viṣvanātha Cakravarti. In this respect the traditional attribution is widely accepted.

Within the commentary itself there is no indication of the author’s identity, so the association of Viṣvanātha Cakravarti with the *Sārārtha-varṣini* tīkā is largely based on the tradition handed down within the sect.

The earliest reference in traditional literature to the *Sārārtha-varṣini* tīkā is found in the *Narottama-vilāsa* of Narahari Cakravarti. This work must have been written shortly after the time of Viṣvanātha Cakravarti, as the author describes himself as the son of one of Viṣvanātha Cakravarti’s disciples, Jagannātha Vipra.

At one point in the work, Narahari Cakravarti lists the major literary works of his father’s guru and says: “His *Bhagavad-gītā* commentary has no other match.”

Although this passage of the *Narottama-vilāsa* does not mention the name of Viṣvanātha’s *Bhagavad-gītā* commentary, it does show us that Viṣvanātha was already widely associated with a commentary on the *Bhagavad-gītā* at the time of Narahari Cakravarti. When contemporary followers of the sect write biographical essays on Viṣvanātha Cakravarti, they usually follow directly or indirectly the

---

1 The printed editions used in the textual editing in this dissertation are listed in the bibliography. For a discussion of these and a list of other printed editions refer to section 2.7.


3 There is some contention about the authorship of some of Viṣvanātha Cakravarti’s works, e.g., the *Camatkara-candrika*, which some contend is by Kavi-karnapurā (q.v. De 1961 p.603fn.).

4 NV ch. 13: “kaila bhāgavater tippanī mahāśaya, śrī gītāra tippanī nāhika yāra para.”
descriptions given in the *Narottama-vilāsa*.

To find a stronger historical basis for the association of *Sārūrtha-varṣinī tīkā* with Viśvanātha Cakravarti we must look toward the manuscript evidence.

The principal manuscript with which I worked was a manuscript which I located in the City Palace Museum in Jaipur ("Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum"). The manuscript is dated 1766 VS (approx 1709AD). As will be shown in the course of this study, that date is well before the death of Viśvanātha Cakravarti. The scribe’s colophon of that manuscript reads: “Thus ends this commentary upon the *Bhagavad-gītā* composed by that great gentleman and very venerable teacher, Viśvanātha Cakravarti.”

This represents very strong contemporary evidence that the *Sārūrtha-varṣinī tīkā* was written by Viśvanātha Cakravarti. At the very least we can assert that this commentary, the *Sārūrtha-varṣinī tīkā*, was associated with Viśvanātha Cakravarti even during his own lifetime. The manuscript in question is very reliable, being from the personal collection of Maharaja Jai Singh II (the founder of Jaipur).

At least this evidence rules out the possibility that the *Sārūrtha-varṣinī* was written by some later and lesser known author and passed off as the work of the illustrious Viśvanātha Cakravarti in order to gain credibility for the work. It is highly unlikely that someone could do so during the lifetime of Viśvanātha Cakravarti.

1.2 Title

The text which is the focus of this study is a commentary (or a “tīkā”) on the *Bhagavad-gītā*. Its title is “*Sārūrtha-varṣinī*” (That which Showers Down the Essential Meanings).

Some scholars have suggested that this work also goes under the name of “*Sārūrtha-darsinī*” (That which Reveals the Essential Meanings). For example, in Winand Callewaert’s very comprehensive listing of Sanskrit commentaries on the Gītā, we find the following entry: “Cakravartti, Viśvanātha, (end 17th cent.), *BG-“

---

5 E.g., Kapoor 1984 p.459 onwards.

6 Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum MS#5610 folio118. Details on this ms are given in the appendix.

7 refer to Table one in section 2.1

8 इन महामहोपायत्रमहाद्विविधनायमहाश्वेतायत्रा निरीक्षिता श्रीभगवतीनाटीकाम् समाप्तः
As another example, Joseph O’Connell, in his ground-breaking thesis on Gauḍīya Vaishnavism, refers to Viśvanātha’s Bhagavad-gītā commentary as the Sārārtha-darśinī. O’Connell acknowledges that there is a diversity of opinion saying,

Viśvanātha’s commentary (ṭīkā) on the Gītā is variously called Sārārtha-darśinī by Haridāsa Dāsa (GVS 2;116) and Sārārtha-varṣiṇī by Adharacandra Cakravarti.....I shall follow Haridāsa in calling it Sārārtha-darśinī.\(^9\)

In a subsequent article, O’Connell revises his position and refers to the work as “Sārārtha-varṣiṇī” and adds parenthetically that it “is also mentioned as Sārārtha-darśinī”.\(^11\) This second view is presumably O’Connell’s preferred position, with which I completely agree.

With the benefit of the further research, however, I think we can now be much clearer on this topic: Viśvanātha’s commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā is called “Sārārtha-varṣiṇī” and definitely not Sārārtha-darśinī. Any references to it as Sārārtha-darśinī are simply errors.

The textual evidence is very clear here. At the end of every chapter of this commentary we find a summary verse: “Thus ends this chapter of the Sārārtha-varṣiṇī, which is to bring joy to the hearts of devotees....”\(^12\)

Moreover, at the end of the last chapter the author writes in very clear prose, “Thus ends this commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā called “Sārārtha-varṣiṇī”\(^13\). This is followed by another verse referring to “Sārārtha-varṣiṇī”.

In this way there are twenty explicit references to the title in the text of the commentary. This is confirmed in all manuscripts consulted as well as in the available printed versions. So there can be no doubt as to the title of the book.

The confusion with the name Sārārtha-darśinī is not just a matter of an alternative name or an alternative reading. It is actually a mix-up with another commentary written by Viśvanātha Cakravarti. Sārārtha-darśinī is the name of his

---

\(^9\) Callewaert 1983 p.100.


\(^11\) O’Connell 1976 p.35.

\(^12\) “iti sārārtha-varṣīnyāṁ harṣīnyāṁ bhakta-cetasāṁ....”

\(^13\) “iti śrī-bhagavad-gītā-ṭīkā sārārtha-varṣiṇī samāpti-bhūtā...”
commentary on the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*. Viśvanātha has deliberately mirrored the titles of the two works, and perhaps this is the source of the confusion.

Viśvanātha has also ended each chapter of his *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* commentary with the very same verse: “Thus ends this chapter of the *Sārārtha-darśini* commentary which is to bring joy to the hearts of devotees...”  

The only difference is the use of the words “*darśini*” and “*varṣini*” in the respective commentaries. Manuscripts evidence from the Bhāgavata commentary also confirms this.

Thus, although some confusion is understandable, it is very clear that the title of Viśvanātha Cakravarti’s *Bhagavad-gītā* commentary is “*Sārārtha-varṣini*” and definitely not *Sārārtha-darśini*. Nor should *Sārārtha-darśini* be given as an alternative name for his Gītā commentary. “*Sārārtha-varṣini*” is the name of Viśvanātha’s *ṭīkā* on the Bhāgavad-gītā, and “*Sārārtha-darśini*” is the name of his *ṭīkā* on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa.

Dr V.K. Caturvedi’s version of the title, “Bhakta-harṣini”, is simply a mistake, most likely caused by confusion arising from the concluding verse of each chapter which also includes the words “*harṣinyāṁ bhakta-cetasāṁ*”.

Dr B.P. Singh’s “*Sārārtha-vārdhini*” is likewise to be rejected.

### 1.3 Date of Composition

As discussed above, there is no author’s colophon at the end of the *Sārārtha-varṣini* *ṭīkā* as is sometimes found at the end of such works, indicating the author as well as the date, place, and circumstances of composition of the work. In the absence of definitive proof, we can only hypothesise as to when the *Sārārtha-varṣini*...
The only scholar who has attempted to conjecture a date is J. T. O’Connell, who mentions in passing that it was composed “toward the end of the seventeenth century.”\footnote{J. T. O’Connell 1976 p.43; Callewaert (1983 p. 100). One would assume that Callewaert is following O’Connell.} I accept that view as generally accurate. Yet for the purposes of the present study, which is wholly devoted to this text, I think it also appropriate for me to go into more detail. It will not be the last time in this dissertation that I will build on the excellent foundations laid by Professor O’Connell.

Notwithstanding the paucity of evidence on the matter, I would propose that the *Sārārtha-varṣini* was written at sometime in the period of five years between 1704 and 1709.\footnote{1761-1766VS.} It is doubtful whether we will ever know in exactly what year the work was written, but I am confident that we can narrow it down to this period of five years.

### 1.3.1 The upper limit of composition.

Definitely the *Sārārtha-varṣini* was written before 1709. This we can say unequivocally because the JMS manuscript was transcribed in 1709.\footnote{The dates of manuscripts are cryptically written, and this one is dated: “vairi-śatru-sapta-prthvi” “enemy-foe-seven-earth”. Read from right to left, this gives 1766 VS, where “earth” stands for one and “enemy” and “foe” stand for six. On the cover of that manuscript, someone has written 1733 VS, but I think the more likely interpretation of “vaiρi” or “śatru” is six and not three. Besides, the manuscript is from the personal collection of the Maharajas of Amber and Jaipur, and such a work is far more likely to have been commissioned by Sawai Jai Singh II in 1709AD than by Raja Ram Singh in 1676AD.} Perhaps we could say that the original must have been completed by 1708 to allow time for copies to be made and taken to Amber (Jaipur) and then for this copy to be completed for the maharaja by 1709.

Thus the upper limit is fairly straightforward - it must have been completed before 1709, because the oldest extant manuscript was transcribed in 1709. The lower limit is less simple and consequently more speculative.

### 1.3.2 The lower limit of composition

I have proposed 1704 as the earliest date of composition because 1704 marks
the date of completion of Viśvanātha’s commentary on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa. I am proposing that Viśvanātha Cakravarti composed the commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā after having completed his commentary on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa.

Put simply, the Bhāgavata-purāṇa is a far more important text for the Gauḍīya-vaiṣṇavas, and thus it would seem that Viśvanātha Cakravarti would have commented on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa before commenting on the Bhagavad-gītā.

Whilst explaining why none of the great Gauḍīya literati before Viśvanātha Cakravarti had ever commented on the Bhagavad-gītā, O’Connell says,

...the difficulty with the Gītā is that it does not give sufficiently unambiguous precedence to bhakti over karma and jñāna. The Gītā says nothing of the Vṛndāvana līlā, the delicacy of which is a distinguishing aspect of Gauḍīya vaiṣṇava meditation.

One does not have to rely on inference or deduction to establish that the Bhāgavata-purāṇa takes precedence over the Bhagavad-gītā within the Gauḍīya sect. Jīva Goswami kindly provides us with a formal statement of its epistemology in his Tattva-sandarbha.

In a nutshell, Jīva argues that knowledge gained by traditional methods such as direct perception or inference is inherently faulty and inappropriate for enquiries into transcendent and inconceivable matters. Thus he concludes that only knowledge obtained through revealed scripture (śabda) is valid because of its non-human origin. The archetypal scriptures are the four Vedas, but Jīva says that the Itihāsa and Purāṇas are equally divine in origin and more appropriate than the Vedas, since the meaning of the Vedas cannot really be fully ascertained without them.

And of all the Itihāsa and Purāṇas, Jīva identifies the Bhāgavata-purāṇa as the highest because it is satīva in nature, is divinely composed, is the essence of all Vedas, Itihāsa, and Purāṇas, is based on the Brahma-sūtra and is widely available in its complete form. He sums up by calling the Bhāgavata-purāṇa the “Monarch of all means of acquiring valid knowledge”.

Jīva remarks that Vyāsa was not satisfied after composing all the Purāṇas and

---

24 The author’s colophon is dated at 1626 SS.
26 ibid, p. 196.
27 “sarva-pramāṇāṇāṁ cakravartibhūtam...” Tattva-sandarbha 18.
Itihāsa, and Brahma-sūtras. Therefore he composed the Bhāgavata-purāṇa. This is a reference to a story from the Bhāgavata-purāṇa where Vyāsa’s guru, Nārada, says that Vyāsa’s inner dissatisfaction is a result of his not having directly glorified the activities of Kṛṣṇa in previous works such as the Mahābhārata.\(^{28}\)

For the purposes of the present study it is sufficient to note that according to the internal logic of the members of the Gauḍīya sect, the Bhāgavata-purāṇa is epistemologically far superior to all other scriptures including the Mahābhārata, in which we find the Bhagavad-gītā. This is not a tacit convention, but an explicit axiom of the sect.

This is why I contend that Viśvanātha Cakravarti would have commented on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa before commenting on the Bhagavad-gītā.

None of Viśvanātha Cakravarti’s predecessors in the sect had composed any commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā, and Rūpa and Sanātana are very sparing in their quotations from the Gītā.\(^{29}\)

It is not that the Bhagavad-gītā was unpopular or unauthoritative with the founding fathers of the Gauḍīya sect. Jīva and Kṛṣṇa Dāsa quote quite extensively from it. This is probably due to their subject matter. The works of Rūpa and Sanātana, as a general rule, centre upon the sweet feelings of devotion to Kṛṣṇa felt by the inhabitants of Braja. Obviously one finds little mention of that in the Gītā. Jīva’s Sandarbhas and Kṛṣṇa Dāsa’s Caitanya-caritāmṛta are more didactic and doctrinal in nature, and thence the simple authoritative verses of the Gītā appear quite often in their works. Even so, quotations from the Bhāgavata-purāṇa are far more frequent than those from the Bhagavad-gītā.\(^{30}\)

Thus it most likely that Viśvanātha Cakravarti composed the Sārārtha-varṣīṇī commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā after having completed his commentary on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa. There is of course the possibility that the two texts were composed simultaneously.

As mentioned above, there are certain common characteristics between the Sārārtha-varṣīṇī and the Sārārtha-darśīnī.\(^{31}\) Both are commentaries on standard texts. The names of the two texts are mirrored. At the end of each chapter of both works there appears a verse which is identical in both works except for the words

---

\(^{28}\) BP. 1.5.1-10.

\(^{29}\) De 1961 p. 220, 253; O’Connell 1970 p.195. O’Connell contends that there were probably one or two obscure commentaries written by lesser known Gauḍīya writers, which have subsequently become unavailable.

\(^{30}\) Tables in De 1961 p. 451 and O’Connell 1970 Appendix III.

\(^{31}\) Section 1.2
“varṣini” and “darśini” in the respective texts. This could all be interpreted as an indication of twin works closely related in form and possibly in time. The Bhāgavata-purāṇa commentary was completed in 1704. I would suggest that the Bhagavad-gītā commentary was composed at the same time or shortly afterwards.

The conclusion of available evidence on the date of composition of the Sārārtha-varṣini is that it was written sometime in the first decade of the eighteenth century, and most likely between 1704 and 1709.

---

32 “iti sārārtha-varṣinyām harṣinyām bhakta-cetasām....” and “iti sārārtha-darśinyām harṣinyām bhakta-cetasām....”
Section 2: The Author

2.1 Dated Works

In trying to ascertain a time-period for the life of Viśvanātha Cakravarti, the best place to start is with a list of his dated works and related documents:

Table 2: Dated Works and Documents Related to Viśvanātha Cakravarti.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td><em>Surata-kathāmṛta</em></td>
<td>according to Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda (1951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td><em>Kṛṣṇa-bhāvanāmṛta</em></td>
<td>MS# 1938 Vrindavan Research Institute¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td><em>Prema-sampūṭa</em></td>
<td>MS# 2671 VRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td><em>Ānanda-candrikā</em></td>
<td>MS# 6237, 4158 VRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td><em>Sārārtha-darśinī</em></td>
<td>MS# 10899 VRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td><em>Sārārtha-varṣinī</em></td>
<td>MS# 5910 Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>signed document</td>
<td>VRI microfilm T1: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>document</td>
<td>Document deposited with Dr. N. C. Bansal, Suker Kshetra Shodh Sanstan, Kasganj. Also Wright Collection #17 (mentioned by Habib1996 p.135)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table is a list of available dated works and documents. To the best

---

¹ The date 1685 (1607 SS) given by Sarasvati (1922: 24) and S.K. De (1962: 398) is perhaps a confusion of 1601 and 1607 (১৬০১ and ১৬০৭ in Bengali script).
of my knowledge, there are no autograph manuscripts available. All the references above are to copies of manuscripts where the date of composition of the original is mentioned in the colophon. I have personally sighted all these dates except for the Surata-kathāmṛta, which I could not locate. The date of 1678\(^2\) is given by Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda\(^3\) and has been accepted by A.K. Majumdar and Klostermaier.\(^4\) In any case, the \textit{Krṣṇa-bhāvanāmṛta} is clearly dated just one year later, so it is not a controversial or exceptional date.

On the other hand V. K. Caturvedi does have a very controversial date to add to the above list.\(^5\) He proposes that the Gaurāṅga-līlā was written in 1669, which is ten years earlier than any of Viśvanātha’s other dated works. Obviously this would be relevant in calculating the date of birth of Viśvanātha Cakravarti. Yet I feel there are grounds for doubting the validity of this date. Firstly, Caturvedi gives no source or quote to back up this assertion. I checked several manuscript and printed editions of the “Gaurāṅga-līlā”, and none have any indication of date of composition.\(^6\)

That is not a reason in itself to doubt the date, for Dr Caturvedi may well have other evidence to which we do not have access. However, just a few pages further on, Caturvedi gives a different date for the composition of that same book: SS1601 (1704AD), some thirty five years later.\(^7\) This creates enough doubt to warrant disregarding both dates, until such time as either can be properly substantiated.

Dr Caturvedi also gives 1705 as the date of composition of Kṣaṇadā-gīta-cintāmanī, which is less controversial. Nonetheless, I have chosen to ignore that date, because again Caturvedi gives no reference for his statement, and again I have not been able to find any corroboration for it in primary or secondary sources.\(^8\)

\(^{10}\) SS 1600
\(^{11}\) Vidyāvinoda 1951 p.
\(^{12}\) Klostermaier 1974 p.98 fn
\(^{13}\) Caturvedi
\(^{16}\) Of the numerous manuscripts of the Kṣaṇadā-gīta-cintāmanī held in the VRI none has any indication of date of composition. I have a feeling that Caturvedi’s date (1705) is simply based on the assumption that Viśvanātha died shortly after his last dated work, \textit{Sārārtha-darśini} (1704),
The item dated 1712 in the table above is a previously unpublished archival document. It is a sammati-patra (a formal statement of opinion) bearing the signature of some fifty seven vaisñavas including Viśvanātha Cakravarti.9

The item from the following year (1713) is perhaps linked with the previous one, as both involve the mahant (head priest) of the Govindadeva temple, Jagannath Goswami, as well as a group of other Gaurīya vaisñavas. Taken together these two documents are significant, as they are the latest dated evidence of Viśvanātha Cakravarti. They show that Viśvanātha was active at least ten years after his last dated literary work.

There is another document from the Rajasthan State Archives which could possibly push the date back a few years later. The letter is from the mahant of the Gokulānanda temple and is addressed to Jai Singh II (ruled 1699-1743). The mahant asks the maharaja to do something urgently about the brigands on the roads around Braj.10 Although there is no year on the letter, there is a month, fortnight, weekday and tīthi. Within the reign of Jai Singh II that particular configuration can only fall in 1700, 1710, 1716, 1737, or 1741.11

The contents of the letter seem to describe perfectly the period in 1716 when Churaman Jat (Jāt) had been charged with the security of the roads in the area and was exploiting the opportunity by extorting taxes from travellers and harassing local land owners.12 The letter complains of those very activities: “The vaisyas are committing many great atrocities, disturbing the people, beating cows, Brahmans and women and blocking the roads”.

---

8 (...continued)
and that the Kṣaṇadā-गīta-cintāmani, being incomplete, was written in the last year or so before his death. However, documentary evidence uncovered in this study shows that Viśvanātha was alive and active ten years later.

9 see 2.4 for discussion of its contents.

10 Rajasthan State Archives Kharitā 4/1 #252.

11 My thanks to Dr. Chris Eade of the ANU for these calculations.

12 Entwistle 1987 p. 188.

13 Of course, the Jāts are not strictly speaking vaisyas; they are more like an ethnic group including groups of warriors, landowners, agriculturalists, and peasants. They are in the middle ground between kṣatriyas and vaisyas, but are not accepted by either group (R.P. Singh 1988 p.6). The (continued...)
In fact, in September of 1716 Jai Singh was given charge of the campaign to subdue Churaman, and Jai Singh laid siege to his fortified town of Thun in Braj. More importantly, it was during that very campaign that Jai Singh visited Viśvanātha’s temple in Rādhā-kuṇḍa and dedicated the revenue from a whole village as a regular stipend for the running of the temple. This letter was written on the 13th day of the dark fortnight of Kārtika, which would be just a fourteen days before Jai Singh’s visit on the full-moon day. Indeed it was perhaps this letter that prompted the maharaja to leave his military exploits for a few days to visit Rādhā-kuṇḍa on the occasion of the auspicious full moon.

Viśvanātha’s connection with the deity of Gokulānanda is well-documented, and the majority opinion of scholars would certainly have Viśvanātha alive in 1716. Therefore I am satisfied that this letter written by the mahant of the Gokulānanda temple was written by Viśvanātha Cakravarti in 1716. However, since that assertion relies on a certain amount of inference, I have not included it in the above table of dated works and documents of Viśvanātha Cakravarti.

---

13 (...continued)

word used in this document is vanik-putra. In Braj-bhāṣā the word “vanik” generally refers to a vaiśya (Śāhityik Braj-bhāṣā Koś Vol III p.224), so vanik-putra means “sons of vaiśyas” or “vaiśyas by birth alone”. With the antagonism between the Jāts and the Rajputs it would have certainly been diplomatic of the author of the letter to refer to the Jāts as vaiśyas, even though the emperor had recently given Churaman the title of “Rao” (Bhatnagar 1974 p. 122).


15 More details in section 2.4 below.

16 “kārtik bādi vāsara budhāḥ tīthau 13 sthāna parvata pālapā”. The Kachavāhā documents use a purṇīmānta system (Horstmann 1999: 69). Whether or not the letter from the Gokulānanda-jī temple uses the same system is not clear.

17 See sections 2.2 and 2.4 respectively.
2.2 Date of Birth and Death

The date of birth of Viśvanātha Cakravarti is not known. This, however, has not stopped scholars in the field from making certain inferences. The most popular way of calculating has been to look at the dated works and documents (discussed in the previous section) and subtract twenty or so years from the earliest dated work to arrive at a date of birth.

The shortcoming of this method is that one will never know at what age he wrote that first dated work. Moreover, only a fraction of his works are dated, and one has no idea how many works he wrote before the first dated work.\(^\text{18}\)

The same procedure generally applies for fixing the time of his death: add a few years onto the date of his last dated work. The same shortcoming obtains: one will never know exactly how many years before his death he wrote that last dated work nor how many other undated works were written after the last dated work.

There is no available evidence which would allow one to pinpoint an exact date of birth or death for Viśvanātha Cakravarti. Given this, it is perhaps unrealistic to try to situate his life within dates of birth and death. However, date of birth and death are the conventional historical methods of locating a person in history. Pressure to conform to this convention seems to be the main motivation for scholars to nominate a date of birth for Viśvanātha Cakravarti.\(^\text{19}\)

But in the case of Viśvanātha Cakravarti the only thing one can say with any assurance is that he was active from at least 1679 until 1713 or beyond. This much one can definitely say based on the evidence compiled in the table of dated works and documents above.

Notwithstanding the paucity of dated documentation, one can approximately establish the period of the life of Viśvanātha Cakravarti, and with the help of other evidence one can say a few sensible things about his date of birth and death.

2.2.1 Date of Birth

Extrapolating from the evidence one can propose a likely date of birth. The table below shows the various dates which have been proposed for the birth of Viśvanātha Cakravarti:

---

\(^\text{18}\) Section 2.7 lists some thirty six works attributed to Viśvanātha Cakravarti, and only a handful of them are dated (section 2.1).

\(^\text{19}\) And yet, even today many people in the sub-continent do not know their date of birth. It is quite possible that Viśvanātha Cakravarti himself did not know his own date of birth.
Table 3: Proposed Dates for the Birth of Viśvanātha Cakravarti.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>“Vṛndāvana Kathā”</td>
<td>reported by G.P. Sharma and Mital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.K. Darśanācārya</td>
<td>1987 p. 16 (alternate date: 1654).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>P. D. Mital</td>
<td>1965 p. 65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.W. Entwistle quoting De (not found in De20)</td>
<td>1987 p.192.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Haridāsa Dāsa</td>
<td>1957 p.1370.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Bābā</td>
<td>intro. to the Grantha-ratna-paṅcakam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haridāsa Śāstri</td>
<td>intro. to the Sāṅkalpa-kalpa-druma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O.B.L. Kapoor</td>
<td>1984 p. 459 (following Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Bābā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(“probably around”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td>Haridāsa Das (“matāntara”)</td>
<td>as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Gaurīya vaisnava jana-śruti”</td>
<td>reported by G. P. Sharma 1991.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

20 Entwistle gives no reference from De, and I could find no such reference in the works of De at my disposal. De simply says that Viśvanātha Cakravarti lived “at the end of the 17th and beginning of the 18th century” (1960 p.254). In another place De mentions that Viśvanātha died “about 1754” (1961 p. 170 fn.).
The above table represents the range of scholarly opinion regarding the date of birth of Viśvanātha Cakravarti. From this table one thing is very clear: there is no definitive evidence as to exactly when he was born, therefore scholars have made general inferences, or followed in the footsteps of previous scholars. The range of proposed dates is about forty years with the earliest date being 1628 and the latest being 1667.

As discussed in section 2.1 above, Viśvanātha Cakravarti’s earliest reliably dated works are the Surata-kathāmṛta (1678) and the Kṛṣṇa-bhāvanāmṛta (1679). It is from these dates that one must work back to find a likely date of birth. From the above table I would immediately reject the two latest dates (1667 and 1664), since they would have Viśvanātha Cakravarti writing these two works at the age of eleven or fourteen, which would seem unreasonably young for someone to write the extensive 1,326 ślokas of the Kṛṣṇa-bhāvanāmṛta in mahākāvya style. Of course, such a feat is not impossible, but on the balance of probabilities it is highly unlikely.

The hagiographies of the Gaurīya sect contain no claims that he began writing elevated poetry at such an early age. The main source of biographical detail is the thirteenth chapter of the Narottama-vilāsa. There we find descriptions of Viśvanātha passing a seemingly normal childhood in the village of Deva-grāma, getting married, and furthering his studies in the town of Saidābad under Kṛṣṇa-carana Cakravarti and Rādhā-ramaṇa Cakravarti. According to tradition Viśvanātha Cakravarti opened a grammar school and taught students in Saidābad.²¹

Thus not even the hagiographies of the sect give any indication of Viśvanātha starting his devotional literary career at such an early age. To the contrary, in the Narottama-vilāsa he is portrayed as a grammar teacher, and his devotional literary achievements are not mentioned until he renounces his family life and goes to settle in Braj:

He (then) settled near Rādhā-kuṇḍa and composed many books which spread throughout the world.²²

---


²² NB ch. 13: “karilen bās rādhā-kuṇḍ samīpe te, racilen bahu granth byapil jagate”.

A similar description is found in the VDA (Gokulānanda-caritra section, chapter 32):

(continued...)
This would indicate that Viśvanātha was much older than eleven when he began to compose his devotional literary works in Braj. In any case, one would imagine that had Viśvanātha Cakravarti started writing mahā-kāvyya at the age of eleven, the sect’s biographers would not have passed over this fact.

Moreover, the manuscript evidence supports the proposition that Viśvanātha did the bulk of his writing in Braj. All the dated manuscripts of Viśvanātha Cakravarti also mention either Rādhā-kūṭa or Vṛndāvana as place of composition.²³

There is one work of Viśvanātha Cakravarti which was not written in Braj. The colophon of his commentary on the Alāṅkāra-kaustubha has no date, but it does contain the following reference to the place of composition:

This commentary called “Subodhinī” was written by Viśvanātha Śarmā Cakravarti, the resident of Saidābād.²⁴

It would thus appear that this work on poetics and rhetoric was written in Saidābād. In this way the manuscript evidence clearly indicates that the bulk of his devotional work was written in Braj, with at least one work on poetics having been written in Saidābād. Thus the manuscript evidence lends support to the Narottama-vilāsā’s description of Viśvanātha living in Saidābād as a Brahmin teacher and subsequently settling in Braj as a renunciant.

Since the colophons of even his earliest dated works mention that they were composed in Braj, it follows that the Subodhinī tīkā was written even before the earliest dated works, since it was written in Saidābād.

This has important implications for any attempt to calculate Viśvanātha Cakravarti’s date of birth. It was mentioned above that the date of birth of Viśvanātha Cakravarti could only be approximated by counting backwards from his

²² (...continued)

lai gokulānande kau kinau rādhā-kūṭa nivāsā, 
tini tah śrīmat bhāgavat hi pai tīkā kari prakāsā. 
tahā rahi kē puni viśvanāth ne granth anek banā'e, 
śrī gokulānande ka u puni tah āchi bhānti laḍā'e

“He took (the deity called) Gokulānda and settled in Rādhā-kūṭa, and there he wrote his commentary upon the Śrīmat Bhāgavata. Whilst living there he wrote a good many books and lovingly worshipped Śrī Gokulānanda.”

²³ Refer to Table 4 in section 2.3.

²⁴ saiyadābāda-vāsī-śrī-viśvanāthākhya-śarmanā cakravarṭīti nāmneyam kṛtā tīkā su-bodhini
SECTION 2.2.1 - Date of Birth

earliest dated works. But taking into account traditional and manuscript evidence we must also allow time for Viśvanātha to be educated, married, and become a teacher of sufficient qualification and renown to write at least one substantial book, the Subodhini तिका on the Alankāra-kaustubha. We must also allow him to stay sufficiently long in Saidābād to become identified as a "resident of Saidābād", since all traditional sources describe him as being born and raised in Deva-grāma and moving to Saidābād as a young man.25

I would suggest that Viśvanātha would have to be at the very least thirty years old at the time of his first devotional literary works, which were composed in Braj and dated 1678 and 1679. That would put his date of birth no later than 1648. Perhaps it would be wiser in the circumstances to say that Viśvanātha Cakravarti was born at sometime in the first half of the seventeenth century.

The date of birth of ca.1660 proposed by Klostermaier and O'Connell26 would have Viśvanātha already in Braj writing mahā-kāvyya at the age of eighteen, which in light of the traditional and textual evidence is not likely. Slightly better is the age of twenty-four, which would be the case were we to accept a date of birth of 1654 as proposed by Haridāsa Dāsa, Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Bābā, Haridāsa Śāstrī, Kapoor, and Haberman.

As stated above, I would feel more comfortable giving him at least thirty years to live in Saidābād, write at least one book, then renounce his family life, settle in Braj and compose several large works.27 We must also keep in mind that over thirty works are ascribed to Viśvanātha Cakravarti and only a handful have dates, so it is most likely that some of the undated works were composed even before the first dated work in 1678.

So I would re-iterate that one should leave at least thirty years before 1678


26 Table 2 above.

27 There seems to be a tradition that Viśvanātha wrote at least another three books whilst in Saidābād: the Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu-bindu, Ujjvalanīlā-māṇi-kirana, and Bhāgavatāmṛta-kāṇa. This tradition is referred to by Haridāsa Dāsa (1957: 133), D.S. Dāsa (1992: 102), Darśanācārya (1987: 20), and Kapoor (1984: 459). Were this tradition to be based on some truth, it would underline the necessity to leave ample time for Viśvanātha to establish himself as an author in Saidābād. However, A.K. Majumdar (personal correspondence quoted by Klostermaier [1974: 98]) considers that the Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu-bindu was written in 1704 in Vṛndāvana.
if one desires to postulate a date of birth for Viśvanātha Cakravarti.

Thus the proposed dates (from Table 2 above) which fall in the first half of the seventeenth century are all acceptable, and there has as yet been no evidence adduced to definitively confirm or deny any of them. One might wonder whether the earliest proposed date in Table 2 (1628) is perhaps "too early". The latest documented record we have of Viśvanātha Cakravarti is 1713.28 Were he to have been born in 1628, he would have been eighty-five years old in 1716 and seventy-six in 1704, when he composed his commentary on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa. Although these are quite advanced ages, they are not unprecedented, and 1628 can not be disregarded simply on these grounds.

There is a traditional story which, if true, would push Viśvanātha's date of birth even earlier. The thirteenth chapter of the Narottama-vilāsa recounts a brief visit to Braj by Viśvanātha as a very young man, and on that visit he is said to have met with Mukunda Dāsa "a few days" after the death of Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Kaviṛāja. Kṛṣṇa Dāsa was born in about 1527 and passed away not too long after completing the Caitanya-caritāmṛta in 1616.29 Were Viśvanātha to have met Mukunda Dāsa "a few days" later, that would push Viśvanātha's date of birth well back before 1616.

This is significantly earlier than most scholars have previously been willing to postulate. Such a hypothesis, however, relies upon taking the description of the Narottama-vilāsa as a precise "historical" account, whereas it is actually a collection of non-historical oral traditions put to writing.

We have documents which mention Viśvanātha being alive in 1713, almost a hundred years later. This would significantly reduce the probability of a date of birth in the early 1600s, despite ages of over a hundred having often been associated with Viśvanātha.30

2.2.2 Date of Death

The date of death of Viśvanātha is to be approached in much the same way as his date of birth. Referring back to the documented dates of Table One in section 2.1 above, one can postulate that Viśvanātha Cakravarti died some time after the 1713. If one accepts my analysis of the document in Rajasthan State Archives (Kharitā 4/1 #252), that date could be pushed back to 1716 (see section 2.1 above).

Below is the range of dates that have been proposed by various scholars for

---

28 See Table 1 above (section 2.1).

29 According to De (1961: 56) and B. Majumdar (1939: 305).

the date of death of Viśvanātha Cakravarti:

**Table 4 : proposed dates for the death of Viśvanātha Cakravarti.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Date</th>
<th>PropONENT</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>B.P. Singh (&quot;possibly&quot;)</td>
<td>1988 p. 719.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soon after 1704</td>
<td>S. Sen</td>
<td>1935 p. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>B.S. Sarasvatī</td>
<td>1922 p.24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>&quot;Vṛndāvana Kathā&quot;</td>
<td>reported in Mital 1965 p. 65fn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>A.W. Entwistle</td>
<td>1987 p.192 (quoting De, but see below?)³¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Saidābād Memorial Engraving</td>
<td>reproduced in D.S. Dāsa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>Klostermaier (&quot;circa&quot;)</td>
<td>1974 p. 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>N. C. Bansal</td>
<td>1980 p. 303.³²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>G. P. Sharma</td>
<td>1991 II p.23 (following Bansal).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the range of scholarly opinion as to the date of death

---

³¹ Again Entwistle's quote from De is mysterious (see footnote to Table 2). Entwistle says that De gives 1724 as Viśvanātha's date of death as opposed to Mital who gives 1754. However De (1961: 170 fn) clearly says that Viśvanātha died in "about 1754".

³² The date "1881" on p.301 is a misprint.
of Viśvanātha Cakravarti. Again there is a lack of definitive evidence, and scholars have inferred dates in a range of fifty years between 1704 and 1754.

The first few dates can now be rejected out of hand, since we have documentary evidence of Viśvanātha Cakravarti being alive in 1713 and perhaps in 1716. Thus from the table above the proposed date of 1704 (B.P. Singh) as well as the proposed date of 1708 (B.S. Sarasvatī, B.K Darśanācārya and “Vṛndāvana Kathā”) are both to be rejected as impossible.

For the same reasons, J.T. O’Connell’s suggestion (“first or second decade of the eighteenth century”) is also unacceptable, because Viśvanātha Cakravarti was clearly still alive in the first decade of the eighteenth century.

This leaves only three proposed dates on Table Three: 1724 (Entwistle), 1730 (Saidābād Memorial), and 1754 (De, Mital, Klostermaier, Bansal, Haberman, and Sharma). It is not possible to confirm or deny these dates.

I find the date of 1754 questionable for reasons to do with documentary evidence related to two of Viśvanātha Cakravarti’s disciples: Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya and Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāṇa. The Jaipur archival evidence relating to these two is extensive enough to be dealt with in a separate section. For the purpose of the present section I would like to draw attention only to those documents which would help us to establish the death of Viśvanātha Cakravarti.

Both Baladeva and Kṛṣṇadeva are traditionally considered to be students of Viśvanātha Cakravarti. Baladeva explicitly refers to himself as a student (śiṣya) of Viśvanātha Cakravarti in the puspikā of his commentary on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa:

Thus ends the first chapter of this Vaiśṇavānandana commentary composed by the student of Viśvanātha Cakravarti, Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāṇa. A document from the VRI microfilm collection portrays Kṛṣṇadeva as one of the

---

33 See section 2.1 above.

34 Section 3.1.2 and 3.1.3.


36 Vaiśṇavānandana 1:1 (puspikā): “iti viśvanātha-cakravarti-śiṣya-baladeva-vidyābhūṣaṇa-racitāyāṁ vaiśṇavānandinyāṁ tīkāyāṁ prathamo ‘dhyāyāḥ’.”
students of Viśvanātha Cakravarti living in the Gokulānanda-kuñja. 37

After an active public life, Kṛṣṇadeva died between 1745 and 1749. By 1745 it was reported that Kṛṣṇadeva had relinquished his post in Jaipur, and in 1749 his grand son lodged an application with the Maharaja of Jaipur to take over his deceased grandfather’s office as priest of the Vinodī-lāl temple. 38 Thus Kṛṣṇadeva had passed away before 1749. 39

Therefore, on the balance of probability one would say that Viśvanātha Cakravarti would normally have passed away before his student Kṛṣṇadeva. Of course, if a student dies young, it is always possible that the teacher would survive the student, but in this case we at least know that Kṛṣṇadeva did not die a young man, since he had a mature grandson.

Moreover, there are records of him as mahant of the Rādhā Vinodī-lāl temple for over thirty years. 40 We have no information about the date of death of Viśvanātha, so it would be prudent to assume that he passed away before his disciple Kṛṣṇadeva, who passed away around 1745. Thus I would question the proposition that Viśvanātha Cakravarti passed away in 1754, since it would see him passing away almost ten years after his student, Kṛṣṇadeva, who himself seems to have lived a fairly long life.

Archival evidence concerning Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa also casts doubt on the proposed date of 1754. In 1742 the mahant of the Govindadeva temple in Jaipur wrote to Sawai Jai Singh, assuring him that he and the others would appoint new mahants in consultation with Vidyābhūṣaṇa. At that time Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa was in charge of the service of Govindadeva in Vṛndāvana, and it would appear from this letter that he was considered the ultimate authority within the Gauriṣya sect in Braj at that time. 41 This would suggest that his teacher, Viśvanātha Cakravarti,

---

37 VRI microfilm T1: document 25.
39 More detail on these events is found in section 3.1.2.
40 Jaipur State Archives: Nusūkhā Puṇya Vol 19 p. 247; VRI microfilm T1: document 25. For a more detailed treatment see section 3.1.2.
41 Document #1531 Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum ( Kapadwara Collection). One of the great tragedies of this research was the impossibility of accessing the Kapadwara documents for reasons which appear only bureaucratic. G.N. Bahura has given a synopsis of the main documents in his Catalogue (1988). This particular document (#1531) by great fortune is described in greater detail by M. Horstmann (1996: 186), (continued...)
had already passed away by 1742.

In conclusion, one can say that Viśvanātha Cakravarti was definitely still alive in 1713, and had most probably already passed away in 1742. Thus I would accept as plausible only two dates from Table 3 above: 1724 (Entwistle) and 1730 (Saidābād Memorial). As Entwistle’s date seems perhaps to be the result of a certain serendipity, I would probably only commend the Saidābād Memorial. It is interesting to note that the Saidābād Memorial also had a plausible date of birth. There is perhaps a case for looking into that memorial tablet more closely.

41 (...continued)
whose synopsis I quote here.

42 See the footnote to Table 3 above.

43 See the conclusion of the previous section.

44 In the course of this research I was not able to go to Saidābād, but perhaps further investigation as to the source of the dates on the plaque will reap interesting results. It was only erected in 1936. The Memorial is referred to by Darśanācārya (1976: 225), G.P. Sharma (1991: 13) and D.S. Dāsa (1992: 106). According to Dās’s translation, the memorial marks the house where Viśvanātha resided in Saidābād.
2.3 Places of Residence

From traditional sources we hear unanimously that Viśvanātha Cakravarti was born in Deva-grāma in the Nadia district of West Bengal. According to the Narottama-vilāsa, Viśvanātha received his education there and subsequently settled in Sāidābād as a student of Kṛṣṇa-carāṇa Cakravarti and Rādhā-ramaṇa Cakravarti.

As discussed above, the colophon of Viśvanātha’s commentary on the Alankāra-kaustubha indicates that this work on poetics was written by Viśvanātha in Sāidābād as a Brahmin teacher.

This commentary called “Subodhini” was written by Viśvanātha Śarmā Cakravarti, the resident of Sāidābād.

Two words are significant in this statement. The first is the Brahmin appellation “Śarmā” which we do not find used in Viśvanātha’s later life in Braj. This is consistent with the idea that at this stage of his life he was earning a living as a Brahmin and that later in Braj he lived as a renunciant and thus no longer used the caste appellation.

The other word of interest is “Sāidābād-vāsi”, identifying Viśvanātha as a “resident of Sāidābād”, which would indicate that he remained in Sāidābād for a considerable length of time.

In the Narottama-vilāsa we hear that Viśvanātha briefly visited Vṛndāvana during this period of residence in Sāidābād. The author of Narottama-vilāsa says that his father became a student of Viśvanātha upon the latter’s return to Sāidābād from Vṛndāvana. It appears that Viśvanātha remained in Sāidābād teaching such students, and continuing his own study under Rādhā-ramaṇa Cakravarti. That book describes Viśvanātha renouncing his young wife and eventually leaving Sāidābād.

The remainder of Viśvanātha’s life seems to have been spent in the Braj area.

---

46 Section 2.2.1 above.
47 saiyadābād-vāsī-śrī-śīvaṇāthākhyā-śarmaṇā cakravartītī nāmneyam kṛtā tīkā su-bodhīnī
48 A.K. Majumdar doubts whether Viśvanātha Cakravarti ever got married (personal correspondence reported by Klostermaier [1974: 97]).
as a renunciant. The traditional biographies depict him residing at Rādhā-kunḍa in the house previously owned by Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Kavirāja. The manuscript evidence seems to match the traditional accounts:

---

49 NB ch. 13: “karilen bās rādhā-kūṇḍ samīpe te, racilen bahu granth byapil jagate”.

Also VDA (Gokulānanda-caritra section, chapter 32):

_lai gokulānande kau kīnau rādhā-kūṇḍa nivāsā,
tini tah śrīmat bhāgavat hi pai tīkā kari prakāsā.
tahā rahi kē puni viśvanāth ne granth anek banā'e,
srī gokulānande ka u puni tah āchī bhāntī laḍā'e_

“He took (the deity called) Gokulānda and settled in Rādhā-kunḍa, and there he wrote his commentary upon the Śrīmat Bhāgavata. Whilst living there he wrote a good many books and lovingly worshipped Śrī Gokulānanda.”

50 S.K. Sen 1935 p. 239. Kṛṣṇa dāsa’s house in Rādhā-kunḍa is mentioned in the documents presented by Habib (1996: 144). From Kṛṣṇa Dāsa it passed to Hari Dāsa, the _adhikārī_ of Govindadeva temple. Perhaps after Govindadeva moved on from Rādhā-kunḍa to Kāmā on the way to Jaipur (ca. 1671), the house was vacated and passed on to Viśvanātha Cakravartī.
### Table 5: Dated Works and Documents Indicating Place of Residence of Viśvanātha Cakravarti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year AD</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Place of Composition</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>undated</td>
<td>Alankāra-kaustubha</td>
<td>Saidābād</td>
<td>composed by “Saidābād-vāsi”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇa-bhāvanāṁrta</td>
<td>Rādhā-kuṇḍa</td>
<td>“sarasyos tate gandharva-giridharinoh”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Prema-sampuṭa</td>
<td>Rādhā-kuṇḍa</td>
<td>“Rādhā-girindra-saras-tate”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Ānanda-candrikāṭīkā</td>
<td>Vṛndāvana</td>
<td>“Vṛndāvane”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>Sārārtha-darśinīṭīkā</td>
<td>Rādhā-kuṇḍa</td>
<td>“Rādhā-kṛṣṇa-saras-tate”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>signed document</td>
<td>Rādhā-kuṇḍa</td>
<td>“Gokulānanda-jī kuṇḍa” (rādhā-kuṇḍa-vāśī).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>document</td>
<td>Rādhā-kuṇḍa</td>
<td>in connection with admittance to “Rādhā-kuṇḍa”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undated</td>
<td>Saṅkalpa-kalpadruma</td>
<td>Vṛndāvana</td>
<td>“Yoga-pīṭha.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table displays the available documents and literary works which indicate Viśvanātha Cakravarti’s place of residence or place of composition of a literary work. Indeed five documents link him with Rādhā-kuṇḍa (or Rādhā-kṛṣṇa-kuṇḍa). This is a sacred pond in the village of Ariṭh (now simply known as “Rādhā-kuṇḍa”) which was excavated and paved by Raghunātha Dāsa Goswami. Rūpa Goswami described it as the most sacred place in the universe, and many of the Gauḍīya greats lived there. It would appear from the above table that Viśvanātha spent most of his time there.

---

51 References for all these documents and manuscripts are given in Table One in Section 2.1 above.


53 Upādesāṁṛta verse 11.
The document of 1712 mentions Viśvanātha Cakravarti at the head of a list of devotees living in the “Śrī Gokulānanda-ji kuṇḍa”. A “kuṇḍa” is an informal group of huts etc., set amongst trees and gardens centred presumably in this case upon the worship of “Śrī Gokulānanda-ji”, the deity worshipped by Viśvanātha Cakravarti.54

In 1716 Sawai Jai Singh dedicated the whole village of Dholān to the service of this “Thākura Śrī Gokulānanda-ji”.55 The documents confirm that the deity was “residing in Rādhā-kunḍa in the district of Kāmā”. Thus it would seem that Viśvanātha Cakravarti passed the last years of his life in Rādhā-kunḍa with state support for himself and his deity. Tradition has it that he died in Rādhā-kunḍa on Māgh Śukla Pañcamī.56

But life was not always comfortable for Viśvanātha in Rādhā-kunḍa. It seems that a few years earlier in 1713 a dispute had broken out, and a large group of Gaurīya devotees, including Viśvanātha, were excluded from living in Rādhā-kunḍa by the then mahant of the Govinda-deva temple, Jagannātha Goswami.57

The grounds of the dispute are uncertain, but it seems that earlier Rūpa Kavirāja had stolen a sacred book and some other goods and fled. In 1711 his disciples tried unsuccessfully on his behalf to have him re-admitted to Rādhā-kunḍa.58 In 1713 Rūpa Kavirāja was re-admitted with a large group of prominent devotees including Viśvanātha, Manohar Ray-ji (poet, guru of Priya Dāsa), Mohan Dāsa Swami (a leader of the Gaurīya society), and Kṛṣṇa Priya Thākurāṇī. It is not clear how all these eminent Gaurīya devotees became embroiled in the dispute. The matter was settled quickly by the jamāndārs and mukaddam (landholders and head men of the village).59

It is clear that Viśvanātha’s principal place of residence was Rādhā-kunḍa. And yet, although the majority of Viśvanātha’s dated literary works attest to this, at

54 See section 2.4 below for details.
55 Kartik sudi 15 VS 1773 {Friday 30th October, 1716 AD}. The parvāna was not finalised until Phalgul Sudi 4 VS 1774 {Sunday 6th March, 1718 AD} (Jaipur State Archives NP vol. 17 p. 205).
56 Haridāsa Dāsa 1957 p.1370; Mital 1961 p. 66; Kapoor 19
least two of his books were written in Vrindavana: the Ananda-candrika and the Sankalpa-kalpa-druma. Thus it would seem that he spent some time in Vrindavana as well.

Passages from the Sankalpa-kalpa-druma shed more light on this. In verses 99 and 100, which are addressed to Govardhana Hill and Radhā-kunda, Viśvanātha refers to himself as residing there and intending to die there. The next verse is addressed to the Yoga-pīṭha, the site of the big Govindadeva temple in Vrindavana, which is known in Gaurīya literature as an intimate meeting place of Radhā and Krṣṇa:

O Yoga-pīṭha! Divine desire tree of Vrindavana! Since you have yourself forced me to reside here in you, therefore you should swiftly fulfill all my desires as I live here on top of you.60

Viśvanātha’s disciple, Krṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhāṭṭācārya, has written a commentary on this book and about this verse he writes:

A disciple of Viśvanātha who lived in Mathurā had a dream in which Mahāprabhu came to him as a sannyāsī and ordered him to buy a kuṇja on the Yoga-pīṭha spot and give it to Viśvanātha Cakravarti. This the disciple did and forced Viśvanātha to accept it. Therefore in this verse the word “forced” has been used.61

It seems therefore that Viśvanātha also had a residence in Vrindavana on the Yoga-pīṭha spot near the Govindadeva temple.62 Senior residents of Vrindavana can still remember a spot near the Govindadeva temple in Pathara-pura where the samādhi memorial of Viśvanātha used to be.63

---

60 Sankalpa-kalpa-druma v. 101.
61 ibid tīkā.
62 Mītal (1968: 339) says that Viśvanātha lived in Vrindavana but in his old age moved to Radhā-kunda. The places of composition of his dated works (shown in Table 4 above) do not to confirm this.
63 G. Ghosh, the librarian of the VRI, recounts that in his childhood the samādhi memorial of Viśvanātha Cakravarti was in this spot in Pathara-pura and that the memorial was moved to its present site between the Yamunā and the Radhā-ramaṇa temple when the old land was sold.

(continued...)
Later on, by around 1820, the temple of Gokulananda-jī had been moved from Rādhā-kunda to this spot in Vrindāvana, and documents of that time still refer to the land as “cakarvarat kā dharā”, or “Cakravarti’s land”.  

It would not be surprising if Viśvanātha Cakravarti, like many of the other renunciants of Braj, wandered around the region and spent periods of time in various spots of the pilgrimage circuit of Braj. Indeed the Narottama-vilasa portrays Viśvanātha as living in a cave on the sacred hill of Govardhana whilst composing some of his commentaries.  

There is no indication that Viśvanātha ever left Braj after having settled there. The Gauḍīya devotees place great importance on living in Braj. Rūpa Goswami identified it as one of the vital aspects of Gauḍīya devotional practice. Viśvanātha, himself, when commenting upon Rūpa’s statement, confirms that living in Braj is the best option for a devotee. If that is not possible then he recommends “living there in one’s mind”.  

In fact, one traditional account portrays Viśvanātha as having taken a vow to never leave Braj:  

The officer took the mount and came to Rādhā-kunda. He said, “Sawai Jai Singh has summoned you to Jaipur.” Viśvanātha Cakravarti would not go and said, “I am a renunciant, under no circumstances would I ever leave Braj.”

---

63 (...continued)  
Haridāsa Dāsa (1957: 1370) and Kṛṣṇadāsa Bābā (1954: 6) both corroborate this story saying that Viśvanātha’s samādhi memorial used to be in Pathara-purā.

64 Jaipur State Archives NP “Thākuradvārā” p. 201.

65 svapna-chale kṛṣṇa-caitanyera ājñā haila, govardhane kandarāte vasi ṭīkā kaila

66 Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu 1.2.40.


68 VDA Chapter 32 (Gokulananda-jī-carittra): “lai asavāri ka u pradhān tab rādhā kuṇḍ hi ā’e, kahi savā’i jai singh hi nē jaipur tum bulvā’e. viśvanāth cakravartī ne kari calan ki nahī, ham virakt bād hi ke kāraṇ tajī hai braj ko nahī”.  

---
The incident referred to here is the subject of considerable diversity of opinion, and its historicity will be dealt with later. For the purposes of the present discussion on the place of residence of Viśvanātha Cakravarti, this particular quote simply shows the existence of a tradition that Viśvanātha never left Braj.
2.4 Temple

Viśvanātha Cakravarti is generally associated with the deity of Gokulānanda-ji. Most of the great Gaurīya literati of Braj established the worship of a particular arca-vigraha (icon statue) of Kṛṣṇa. Generally the worship of that deity was continued by their disciples, and in many cases large temples were eventually erected to house the deity. For example, Rūpa Goswami started the worship of Govindadeva, and that worship was continued by his followers, who erected a massive temple for the deity.

The documentary evidence clearly links Viśvanātha with the deity of Gokulānanda-ji. The Vṛndāvana Research Institute holds a microfilm of a 1712 sammati-patra (letter of approval) signed by a large number of residents of Vṛndāvana and Rādhā-kuṇḍa.69 The signatures are grouped together under headings such as “Gopīnāth-jīr kuṇja” and “Śrī Madan-gopāl-jīr kuṇja”. This demonstrates how some Gaurīya renunciants in Braj lived together in groups under a senior mahant, and each group had its own deity which served to identify them as a group.

The word “kuṇja” refers particularly to a park-like garden, with informal pergolas and unattached one storey huts here and there. In this context “kuṇja” refers to the gardens and simple residences surrounding a particular temple.70 The temples themselves varied from simple huts to massive structures like Govindadeva’s temple in Vṛndāvana.

In the 1712 document under the heading of “Gokulānanda-jīr kuṇja”, there are six signatures, and the first is “Viśvanātha”. Among the others is the name of “Kṛṣṇadeva Bhaṭṭācarya”, the disciple of Viśvanātha who soon afterwards went on to hold an influential position in the court of Maharaja Sawai Jai Singh II.71 This is clear evidence of Viśvanātha’s connection with the temple of Gokulānanda-ji in Rādhā-kuṇḍa.

Just a few years later in 1716, Sawai Jai Singh visited Rādhā-kuṇḍa. He had come to the area on an Imperial campaign against the Jāts, whose headquarters were in the fortified towns of Thun and Deeg on the eastern side of the Braj region.72 Before commencing the siege proper, Jai Singh took time off to visit Rādhā-kuṇḍa. Ātmarāma, Jai Singh’s contemporary biographer, records that the maharaja bathed

69 Vṛndāvana Research Institute, microfilm T1: 25.
71 Horstmann 1996 p. 193 note 29. See section 3.1.2 below for more detail.
72 Bhatnagar 1974 p.124-5 with all documentary references.
in the sacred waters of Rādhā-kūṇḍa on the full-moon day of the auspicious month of Karttika.\footnote{Savā’i Jai Singh Carita: verse. 528 (ed. by G.N. Bahurū 1979): “kātif pūnya u bhūp tab vha ta i rādha-kūṇḍa, nha’i bahuri ayo tahā bic mādi arirād” As indicated above in section 2.1, it is quite possibly a letter from the Gokulānanda-jī temple a fortnight earlier that prompted Jai Singh to visit Rādhā-kūṇḍa in the middle of the preparations for the siege.}

Archival evidence indicates that on that same day the maharaja made a solemn vow to offer the income of a whole village to the service of Śrī Gokulānanda-jī in Rādhā-kūṇḍa.\footnote{“Mīto kātif sudi 15 sāvat 1773 na i sākalap kriyo” [Friday 30th October 1716] (Rajasthan State Archives NP vol. 17 p.205). The ritual offering of something valuable to a deity is called sankalpa. As this sankalpa took place at Rādhā-kūṇḍa, one would assume that it consisted of a ritual bathing followed by taking some sacred water and sesame seeds in the palm of his hand and the recitation of mantras under the direction of a priest. More detail about sankalpa is furnished in Section 3.1.2.} Thus it would appear that the maharaja visited Viśvanātha’s temple in Rādhā-kūṇḍa. And Jai Singh must have been impressed by his experience, for he set up a permanent state income for the temple. In any case it would indicate that the institution was significant enough to warrant state subvention.

The grant is described in the official documents as a “puṇya-bhēṭ” or a charitable gift to the deity. Horstmann describes a bhēṭ in this way:

\begin{quote}
Bhēṭ is basically a “complimentary gift made to a superior, here more specifically a religious donation. It could consist of money or other objects, such as real estate property. A bhēṭ was not issued on application on the part of the grantee. Bhēṭs were made for usufruction or consumption of the object granted. Bhēṭ was not allowed to be sold.\footnote{Horstmann 1999 p. 37.}
\end{quote}

In this case the entire taxation revenue from the village of Dholān (1,000 r/. per year) was gifted to the deity, or to the mahant of the temple as a representative of the deity. The money would be used for the stipends of the priests and expenses connected with the daily food and ornament offerings to the deity.

Thus it would seem that towards the end of his lifetime, Viśvanātha
Cakravarti’s situation was quite comfortable. He was surrounded by disciples and received from the Jaipur state a healthy stipend and running expenses for his temple. One thousand rupees per year would have been a very considerable amount of money in 1716.\textsuperscript{76}

All the documentary correspondence concerning this grant confirms that the original temple of Gokulānanda-ji was in Rādhā-kuṇḍa. Scholars like Entwistle and Mital who claim that the temple was always in Vṛndāvana did not perhaps enjoy access to this earlier documentation.\textsuperscript{77}

Viśvanātha must have passed away some time after this; there are no more documented references to him. The worship of Gokulānanda-ji, however, was continued (presumably by Viśvanātha’s disciples), and the patronage of the temple by the Jaipur state was renewed each time a new Mahārājā ascended the throne. Thus we see the sponsorship extended by Īśvarī Singh in 1745 and by Madho Singh in 1751.\textsuperscript{78} In 1754 the Mahārājā wrote a letter to support the Thākura-ji’s priests in a dispute with a certain Rām-jīvan.\textsuperscript{79}

Sometime before 1820 the temple was transferred from Rādhā-kuṇḍa to Vṛndāvana.\textsuperscript{80} The associated documents speak of the new temple being in

\textsuperscript{76} As mentioned below, Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya purchased a small residence in Kāmā in the same year for 150 rupees.

\textsuperscript{77} Mital 1962 p.65; Entwistle 1987 p.192. See below for a clarification of this issue.

\textsuperscript{78} Jaipur State Archives, NP Vol 17 p.205. Parvāna of Mādho Singh dated “Magasar budi 12 VS 1808” {15\textsuperscript{th} November 1751 AD}.

\textsuperscript{79} Jaipur State Archives NP Vol 17 p.206. Cīṭhī dated “Kārtik sudī 6 VS 1811” {22\textsuperscript{nd} November 1754 AD}.

\textsuperscript{80} Jaipur State Archives NP Thākura-dvārā Vol. 46 p. 200-201. I cannot agree with A.K. Roy’s reading of this document (1985: 70). He reads into it that “Mā-ji Bārā Bhaṭṭhyāṇi-ji brought Gokulānanda-deva to Vṛndāvana from Rādhā-kuṇḍa and had a temple built for the deity in the place where Lokanath Goswami’s deity, Rādhā-Vinoda, was.” This is a complete misinterpretation of the document which simply says that in 1820 Gokulānanda-ji was already residing in Vṛndāvana and that in that year an agreement was reached between Mā-ji Bārā Bhaṭṭhyāṇi-ji and the adhikār of the temple, Nima-caraṇa, by which she could take 3,100 gaj from Cakravartī’s land to build a kuṇḍa mahāl, and, in return for giving up all claim on the land, the temple would be paid 1 rupee 1 anna daily (442 (continued...)}
Vṛndāvana on “Cakarabarti’s land”, adjacent to markets, shops and the “kuñj-mahal” of Mā-ji Baṛā Bhāṭhyānī-ji. This would indicate that Gokulānda-ji was transferred to Viśvanātha Cakravarti’s kuñja in Pathara-purā near the Govinda-ji temple in Vṛndāvana.81

Gopāl Kavi Ray in his Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvalī (written 184382) refers to the temple of Thākura Rādhā-Gokulānanda-ji in Vṛndāvana. He describes the temple of Gokulānanda-ji as also housing a pratibhū deity of Rādhikā Vinodī-lāl known as “Vijai Rādhikā Vinodī-lāl”, the original having been taken to Jaipur.83 Gopāl Kavi remarks that the temple and samādhi memorial were both at the same spot (i.e. Patharā-purā), and he says they were both built by “Jai Singh”.84

Recently the samādhi memorial of Viśvanātha has been moved from Pathar Purā to its present site near the samādhi memorial of Lokanāth between the Rādhā-ramanā Temple and the Jamunā river.85 The deities of Rādhā-Gokulānanda-ji and Vijai Vinodī-lāl-ji are also installed there.

Traditional accounts such as the Narottama-vilāsa and the Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvalī have copious references to the deity of Gokulānanda-ji in relationship with Viśvanātha Cakravarti. Both works have a similar colourful story depicting how Viśvanātha first obtained that deity:

There was a supremely peaceful brahmacārī who came to circumambulate the holy pilgrimage centre of Mathura. He always

80 (...continued)
rupees 2 anna yearly) for the deity’s food offerings.

81 See section 2.3 above.

82 An autograph ms dated VS 1900 was kindly photocopied for me by Dr N.C. Bansal. His publication of this work is forthcoming.

83 Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvalī (Ch. 32, end of Sarvabhumī Paṅḍita Caritra). A.K. Roy (1985: 71) notes that in the Rādhā Vinoda temple in Jaipur there is also a Gokulānanda-ji, and that in the Gokulānanda temple in Vṛndāvana there is also Rādhā-Vinoda. It seems likely the Vṛndāvana temple holds the original Gokulānanda-ji and a pratibhū Rādhā Vinoda, whereas the Jaipur temple holds the original Rādhā Vinoda and a pratibhū Gokulānanda-ji.

84 Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvalī (Ch. 32, v. 69 {end of Sarvabhūmi Carita}).

85 See also section 2.3 above.
took pleasure from his service to a deity called Śrī Gokulānanda. How can one describe his activities? One day Śrī Gokulānanda appeared to the brahmacārī in a dream and spoke to him with a gentle smile: “In Vṛndāvana there is one Viśvanātha Cakravarti; you should offer Me to him.” At daybreak, the brahmacārī went and offered Śrī Gokulānanda to Viśvanātha with great bliss. Viśvanātha said, “Look, you are the proper servant of this deity; I can’t understand why you are offering Him to me.” The brahmacārī replied, “I was instructed to do so by the deity”. “Well, He will only suffer from this. I’m telling you, you do the service to Śrī Gokulānanda.” Upon hearing this, the brahmacārī returned to where he was staying. Again Śrī Gokulānanda appeared to him in a dream and instructed him once more, “Take me again to Viśvanātha at daybreak. In the meantime I will instruct him to accept Me.” At daybreak, according to the instruction of the Lord, again the brahmacārī set off for Viśvanātha’s place in great joy. At that same time, blissful Śrī Gokulānanda appeared to Viśvanātha in a dream, and addressed him with sweet words, “O Viśvanātha, don’t worry your mind over this. Just offer Me whatever you receive as a mendicant. If you serve Me in this way, I will be supremely satisfied with your service. Saying this, He bestowed great mercy upon Viśvanātha, whose sleep broke at that very instant. I cannot describe Viśvanātha’s excited and agitated state. Just then the pilgrim brahmacārī arrived. In great happiness he offered Śrī Gokulānanda to Viśvanātha, who became fully absorbed in the happiness of service to the deity.86

---

86 NV Chapter 13:

parama suṣānta eka brahmacārī, mathurā ā’īlā tīrtha pradaksīṇa kari
śrī gokulanandera sevāya sadā rata, tāhre yaiche kriyā tā kahibe kebā kata
eka dina svapna-chale śrigokulananda, brahmacarī prati kahe häsi manda manda
vṛndāvane viśvanātha cakravarti yathā, tāhre samarpaha more haiyā yāha tathā
rajanī prabhāte brahmacārī mahānande, viśvanātha samarpaye śrī gokulanānde
viśvanātha kahe laha servā adhikārī, more samarpahaa kena bujhite nā pārī
brahmacārī kahe more ha’īlā ādesa, viśvanātha kahe ethā pā’ībena kleśa
āpāni karaha servā āmāra kathāya, śuni brahmacārī gela āpana vāsāya
punāḥ śrī gokulanānda ha’iyā sadaya, brahmacārī prati punāḥ svapne nideśaya
punāḥ prāte laiyā more yābe tāhre sthāne laiben teṅho āmi kahibo tānhāne
brahmacārī prātahkāle prabhura ājñāye, viśvanātha pāše cale ullāsa hiyāya

(continued...)
The Narottama-vilāsa also mentions that Viśvanātha worshipped a famous Govardhana-śilā which had been given to Raghunāth Dāsa Goswami by the founder of the sect, Caitanya-deva. This sacred stone from the Govardhan Hill had been given by Raghunāth to Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, who gave it to Mukunda Dāsa, who gave it to Kṛṣṇa Priyā Ṭhākurāṇi, who in turn gave it to Viśvanāth. Narahari reports that in his time, this śilā was also worshipped in the temple alongside Gokulānanda-ji. This is still the case today in the current Gokulānanda-ji temple in Vṛndāvana.

We noted above that there was certain confusion on the part of scholars like Mital and Entwistle about the location of the temple of Gokulānanda-ji. As the work of both these scholars is generally very reliable, it is important to clarify the matter. Entwistle says that “Gokulananda was worshipped along with Rahdavinod in Vrindaban”. This is obviously a confusion with the current state of affairs, in which both deities are worshipped in the same temple in Vṛndāvana. At the time of Viśvanātha Cakravarti, however, there was certainly no connection between the two.

A reference from the Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvalī tells us that Rādhā-vinoda

86 (...continued)
ethā śrī gokulananda ānanda āvēse, svapne viśvanātha prati kahe mrdū-bhāse uhe viśvanātha tumī nā bhārīha mane, āpāna bhaksāṇa dravya ānibo āpāne yaiche taiche yadi mora sevā kara tumī, tāhāte’i parama ānanda pābo āmī brahmaçārī adya more laiẏā āsibe, tumī sevā kāile tenhe mahānanda pābe eta kahi ati anugrahe kaila kole, śrī viśvanātha nirdāhanga hena kāle ha’ilo byākula yaiche kahite nā pāri, hena kāle a’īlā tairthika brahmaçārī śrī gokulānande ati sukhe samarpila, viśvanātha aiche sevā sukhe magna haila

Also VDA Chapter 32 (Gokulānanda-ji-caritra):

\[
\text{ik paṇḍit ke sevya gokulānand-ju ṭhākur so’i,}
\text{tīn paṇḍit sa u kahi svapn ma i ati prasann hai jo’ī...}
\]

87 Kṛṣṇa-priyā is mentioned in the documents collated by Habib (1996: 146). As the widow of Braja-kumara, she seems to have been embroiled in disputes concerning his estate, particularly the gardens and buildings around the samādhi tombs of Rūpa and Jīva Goswami.

88 NV Chapter 13:

\[
\text{hena kuṇḍa-vāsī ṭhakurāṇi viśvanāthe, madhye madhye śilā sevā karāna sakṣate}
\text{govardhana śilā sōbhā kahan nā haya, adyāpi gokulānanda pāše vilāsaya.}
\]
was located in Karauli before coming to Jaipur/Amber. Presumably the deity was taken from Braj to Karauli in around 1670 as part of the general exodus of deities from Braj which followed the razing of the fabulous temple of Kesavadeva in Mathura by the troops of Aurangazeb. Certainly Radha-vinoda-ji had come to Jaipur by 1714, for by then we find documentation of the deity’s state patronage in Jaipur.

Thus, for most of the active career of Visvanatha Cakravarti, the deity of Radha-vinoda was not even in Braj. On the other hand, all the documentary evidence indicates that Visvanatha worshipped Rādhā-gokulananda in Rādha-kunḍa, and it was not until well after his death that the deity was moved to Pathara-pura in Vṛndāvana (around 1820). In 1843 Gopal Kavi reports that the deity of Gokulānanda-ji was in Vṛndāvana accompanied by a pratibhū image of Rādhā-vinoda.

On a related matter, Entwistle also states that Rādhā-gokulananda had been brought to Rādha-kunḍa by Kṛṣṇadeva Sarvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya. Again this seems to be a confusion of two histories. There are no archival documents pertaining to the origin of the deity, but, as noted above, traditional sources agree that the deity of Gokulānanda-ji was given to Visvanatha by an anonymous brahma-cāri. The Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvalī account, to which Entwistle refers as the source of his information, also includes this story as well as a story about Kṛṣṇadeva Sarvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya coming to Rādha-kunḍa, and it seems that Entwistle has confused the two.

Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvalī, Chapter 32 (Sarvabhūmi-carita). The full passage is quoted in section 3.2 below.

Entwistle 1987 p. 180-187

Refer to section 3.1.2 below for documentary references.

Entwistle 1987 p. 192.

2.5 Name

The name of the author of the Sarartha-varṣiṇī is Viśvanātha Cakravartī. This has been established in Section 1.1 above.

Earlier in his youth Viśvanātha also used the title Śarmā, a general caste name of Brahmans. In his later life this name Śarmā is not found. Often we find the title "Mahopādhyāya", which literally means "a great teacher" and which is a term of respect for a very learned person. This title is found in the scribal colophons, including the oldest available manuscript dated 1709, which is well within the lifetime of Viśvanātha. It would seem that this title of "Mahopādhyāya" was the title conventionally used with Viśvanātha after he settled in Braj and gradually became famous as an author and a teacher.

Manuscript colophons also use the title "Ṭhākura" (or Ṭhakkura) in connection with Viśvanātha Cakravartī. This is a title meaning "venerable", very often used with the names of the various deities, but also used with devotees as a term of respect.

Although the caste title "Śarmā" is not found in Viśvanātha’s later years, his family name “Cakravartī” is certainly widely used. He signs simply as “Viśvanāthasya” in the Sanskrit document of 1712, but all other contemporary

94 The colophon of Subodhinī tīkā reads:

satyādābād-vāst-śrī-viśvanāthākhyā-śarmā cakravartītī nāmneyaṁ kṛtā tīkā su-bodhini

95 Ms# 5910 Maharaja of Jaipur Museum. Also in the colophon of the Śrī-bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu-bindu.

96 Colophons of Saṅkalpa-kalpa-druma and Śrī-gaurāṅga-līlāmṛta.

97 Haridāsa Dāsa 1957 p. 294.

98 Haridāsa Dāsa (1957: 1370) mentions his father as “Rām Nārāyaṇ Cakravartī”. Thus Cakravartī is his family name. I am more inclined to accept this than A.K. Majumdar’s suggestion (in Klostermaier [1974: 97]) that Viśvanātha received the name “Cakravartī” from his connection with his initiating guru Rādhā-ramaṇa Cakravartī. It is far more likely for the caste name “Cakravartī” to pass through birth lines than through initiation lines.

99 Vṛndāvana Research Institute microfilm T1: 25.
documents refer to him as “Viśvanātha Cakravarti”. Baladeva Vidyābhūṣanā also refers to him as “Viśvanātha Cakravarti”.

“Cakravarti” is a Bengali Brahmin caste name, and it is somewhat surprising that Viśvanātha would have retained it after retiring to Braj as a renunciant.

It would be simplistic to say that the followers of Caitanya completely rejected all caste divisions. They certainly played down caste divisions and rejected caste identity as temporary, mundane, and irrelevant for devotional purposes. Nevertheless they were not interested in a caste revolution and were happy enough to function within the society of the time and let that society continue to provide the material necessities of life.

In any case, the society of devotees in Braj continued to use a Brahmin caste name to identify Viśvanātha Cakravarti. The most common Bengali vaisnava appellation is “Dāsa”, meaning “servant” or “slave” (e.g., Kṛṣṇa Dāsa, Narottama Dāsa). Other great renunciants in the line have been called “Goswami” (e.g., Rūpa Goswami, Jīva Goswami) or “Ācārya” (e.g., Advaita Ācārya, Śrīnivāsa Ācārya), but rarely are caste appellations used to identify renunciants within the sect. There is a feeling that the renunciant is no longer identified in terms of caste or family but rather as a servant of Kṛṣṇa.

I would suggest that Viśvanātha must have already had some fame before becoming fully devoted to the life of Gaurīya Vaishnavism and certainly before settling in Braj as a renunciant. As discussed in section 2.2.1 above, it would seem
that Viśvanātha spent some time in Saidābād as a Brahmin teacher, and I would suggest that he built up a name for himself as “Viśvanātha Cakravarti” and that he arrived in Braj with that name well-established.104

Another name by which Viśvanātha Cakravarti was known is “Hari-vallabha” or simply “Vallabha”. This is a pen name under which Viśvanātha is supposed to have compiled one of the earliest anthologies of vernacular vaiṣṇava poetry, called Kṣaṇadā-gītā-cintāmaṇi. This is a compendium of three hundred and nine poems by about forty-five different poets.105 The fifty three poems with the bhanitā “Hari-vallabha” or “Vallabha” are universally attributed to Viśvanātha Cakravarti.106

The tradition which links Viśvanātha Cakravarti with this “Hari-vallabha” is a very old one. The Narottama-vilāsa, which was written shortly after Viśvanātha Cakravarti, says explicitly:107

Śrī Viśvanātha’s (other) name is “Hari-Vallabha”. This is clear from the way he signs his songs, which all learned men acknowledge.

Some have suggested that this was a confidential initiate name.108 Haridāsa Dāsa says that he took the name Hari-vallabha after accepting veṣa, or the clothes and lifestyle of a renunciant. Yet Haridāsa Dāsa concedes perhaps that Viśvanātha

---

104 Similarly, two of the celebrated “Six Goswamis of Vṛndāvana” retained the South Indian Brahmin name “Bhaṭṭa”: Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gowsami and Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa Goswami.


107 Narottama-vilāsa Ch. 13:
śrī viśvanāthera nāma śrī hari-vallabha
gūtera ābhoge vyakta kahe vijña saba.

The author, Narahari Cakravarti, says that his father had become Viśvanātha’s disciple in Saidābād. This would mean sometime well before 1679. As Viśvanātha probably lived for another fifty years after that, Narahari’s account was probably written shortly after Viśvanātha had passed away.

never officially took veśa.\textsuperscript{109}

Others contend that “Hari-vallabha was the devotional and mystic name of Viśvanātha’s guru and Viśvanātha adopted it as his own pen name in deference to him.”\textsuperscript{110} A.K Majumdar (in Klostermaier 1974: 97) even suggests that Hari-vallabha was Viśvanātha’s original name and that he accepted the name Viśvanātha Cakravarti “as a sign of respect for his spiritual predecessor”, Gaṅgā-Nārāyaṇa Cakravarti. As mentioned above, this is a doubtful origin of the name Cakravarti. In any case, Gaṅgā-nārāyaṇa Cakravarti was the parama-parama-guru of Viśvanātha and not his direct guru as suggested by Majumdar (in Klostermaier).

There is no reason to reject the very old version of the Narottama-vilāsa that “Hari-vallabha” was the name used by Viśvanātha to write vernacular poetry. There is no evidence at all of the name “Hari-vallabha” being used other than for this purpose. None of the contemporary records or other scribal colophons refer to anyone by that name. On the other hand, there are numerous references to “Viśvanātha Cakravarti”. Thus, if “Hari-vallabha” were an initiation name, it was definitely not widely used at all. It appears likely that it was simply a pen name.

Contemporaries certainly referred to him by the name “Viśvanātha Cakravarti” or permutations of that name. Hita Rasika Dasa of the Rādhā-vallabha sampradāya was a fellow resident of Braj in Viśvanātha Cakravarti’s time. Writing in around 1694, Hita Rasika Dāsa pays tribute to him simply as “Cakravarti”.\textsuperscript{111}

In 1709 the scribe of the Sārārtha-varśini ms referred to him as “Viśvanātha Cakravarti”.\textsuperscript{112} We noted above that he signed as “Viśvanātha” on the document of 1712.\textsuperscript{113} The document of 1713 refers to him as “Viśvanātha Cakravarti”.\textsuperscript{114} His students and followers refer to him as “Viśvanātha Cakravarti”, or “Cakravarti”, or simply just “Viśvanātha”. We noted that Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa referred to himself as “viśvanātha-cakravarti-śiṣya”. Kṛṣṇadāsa offers homage to

\textsuperscript{109} Haridāsa Dāsa 1957 p. 1370

\textsuperscript{110} S. Sen 1935 p. 258.

\textsuperscript{111} Rasika-siddhānta-cintāmaṇi v. 117: “khyāta cakravarti ke hai `śādhu suśila anupa...” (quoted by Bansal [1980: 409]).

\textsuperscript{112} MS# 5910, Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum.

\textsuperscript{113} VRI microfilm T1: 25.

\textsuperscript{114} Document deposited with Dr. N. C. Bansal, Sudder Kshetra Shodh Sansthan, Kasganj. Also Wright Collection #17 (mentioned by Habib1996 p.135).
his guru as both “Cakravarti” and “Viśvanātha Cakravarti”\textsuperscript{115} The verses of Śrī Govardhana Bhaṭṭa praise him simply as “Viśvanātha”\textsuperscript{116} Later writers such as Narahari Cakravarti and Gopāla Kavi use all these appellations.

All these references indicate that “Viśvanātha Cakravarti” was indeed the primary epithet of the author of the \textit{Śārārtha-varṣiṇī}.

Moreover, they indicate that Viśvanātha Cakravarti’s name was held in high regard. In this connection, the most weighty of the above references to Viśvanātha Cakravarti is that of Hita Rasika Dāsa, the poet from the Rādhā-vallabha \textit{sampradāya}:

Cakravarti is famous as a unique and good-natured \textit{sādhu}. He constantly contemplates in his mind the devotional practice of Śrī Rūpa.....\textsuperscript{117}

Even though sectarian boundaries were less pronounced at that time than today,\textsuperscript{118} still it is significant that Viśvanātha Cakravarti should attract eulogies from members of other sects within his own lifetime.

The praise heaped on Viśvanātha Cakravarti by the scribe of the Jaipur court also indicates that his name and fame were established well within his own lifetime. The 1709 copy of the \textit{Śārārtha-varṣiṇī} from the Jaipur Pothī-khānā describes Viśvanātha as a gentleman and a great scholar (“mahāśaya-mahāmahopādhāya”).

Shortly afterwards, in 1718, Sawai Jai Singh personally commissioned his favourite scribe to copy Viśvanātha Cakravarti’s \textit{mahā-kāvyā}, the \textit{Kṛṣṇabhāvanāmṛta}\textsuperscript{119} Many of the works of Viśvanātha Cakravarti are held in the maharaja’s library in Jaipur and were no doubt commissioned during this period.

\textsuperscript{115} \textit{...cakravarti mukhe vaktā śrī kṛṣṇa caitanya, śrīla viśvanātha-cakravarti guru tāhāra caraṇa dhīyaṇe saṣṭa amṛta-vrṣṭi tāra bhāṣā dīna kṛṣṇa dāsa bhaṅe} (quoted by Haridāsa Dāsa[1957: 1188])

\textsuperscript{116} “\textit{granthālīm racayantam ujjvala-rasam śrī-viśvanātham bhaje}” (quoted by D.S. Dāsa [1993: 130]).

\textsuperscript{117} Rasika-siddhānta-cintāmaṇi v. 117: “\textit{khyāta cakravartī ke hai’ sādhu suṣīla anupa...}” (quoted by Bansal [1980: 409]).

\textsuperscript{118} Entwistle 1987 p. 136 ff.

\textsuperscript{119} \textit{“śrī-śrī-śrī-śrī-mahārājādhirāja-jayasinghadevajitakṣaṇī-anuḥ kṣemat idam tulā-rāmeṇa”} : Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum ms #287 (catalogue entry reads simply “by a disciple of Caitanya”).
They include the Bhagavatāmṛta-kaṇikā\textsuperscript{120}, the Ujjvala-nīla-maṇi-kīraṇa-leśa\textsuperscript{121}, the Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu-bindu\textsuperscript{122}, the Mādhurya-kādambini\textsuperscript{123}, and commentaries to the Bhagavad-gītā and Bhāgavata-purāṇa.\textsuperscript{124}

Thus during his own lifetime, Viśvanātha Cakravarti’s name and fame extended outside the sect and even all the way to the court of Jaipur/Amber. Within his own sect he came to be considered as an incarnation of Rūpa Goswami.\textsuperscript{125}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{120} Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum mss # 2602, 2715 (anonymous in the catalogue).
\item \textsuperscript{121} Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum mss # 534, 2716 (anonymous in the catalogue).
\item \textsuperscript{122} Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum mss#2594-6, 2598, 2717.
\item \textsuperscript{123} Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum mss # 2672, 2687, 5780 ( simply “gaurīya” in the catalogue).
\item \textsuperscript{124} Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum mss 5910 and 2914 respectively.
\item \textsuperscript{125} References provided by D.S. Dāsa 1993 p. 129-132.
\end{itemize}
2.6 Sect and Lineage

Viśvanātha Cakravarti belonged to the Gauṛiya vaishnava sect. One of the hallmarks of the sect is its veneration of Śrī Caitanya, and we find ample examples of this at the beginning of the literary works of Viśvanātha Cakravarti. For example, in the maṅgalācaraṇa of the text studied in this project we find explicit homage to “Śrī-kṛṣṇa-caitanya”:

May the golden-beamed moon of Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Caitanya rise in my mind. That Caitanya-moon makes the lotus-like devotees bloom with joy; the Caitanya-moon eradicates the darkness of this world by its own splendour, by his own holy name. May that Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Caitanya increase my attachment for himself.\(^{126}\)

Similar homages to Caitanya are to be found at the beginning of the following of Viśvanātha’s major works: Mādhurya-kādamboṭi, Kṛṣṇa-bhāvanāmrtā, Camatākāra-candrikā, Sārārtha-darśini tīkā, Sukha-vartanī tīkā, Prema-bhakti-candrikā tīkā, and the Subodhinī tīkā.

Viśvanātha also said to have composed some works in direct praise of Śrī Caitanya, such as the Gaurāṅga-līlāmṛta (sometimes known as the Gaurāṅga-smaraṇa-maṅgala-stotram), as well as a commentary on Kṛṣṇa Dāsa’s classic biography of Caitanya, the Caitanya-caritāmṛta.

These are all very clear indications of Viśvanātha’s allegiance to the Gauṛiya sect.

The word “sect” used with regard to the Gauṛiya vaishnavas can give the wrong impression of a completely homogeneous and distinct group.\(^{127}\) Certainly veneration of Caitanya is a distinguishing feature, but the great master Caitanya left no literary heritage to form the basis of a standard group of teachings which could define his followers as a group.

Shortly after the passing away of Śrī Caitanya, an orthodox set of teachings

---

\(^{126}\) Sārārtha-vaṛṣini maṅgalācaraṇa 1.

\(^{127}\) For a review of the diversity within the Gauṛiya sect and the struggles between orthodox and heterodox see Dimmock(1966), T.K. Stewart (1986) and Haberman (1988: 94-114), Entwistle 1987 p. 136ff. (p.150 etc. give evidence of the fluid nature of the boundary between sects). Section 3 and Section 4 of this present work also document diversity of opinion within the sect.
was developed in the literary works of Sanātana, Rūpa, and Jīva. When Maharaja Sawai Jai Singh II was soliciting opinions from Gaurīya pandits, the pandits generally quoted the authority of Rūpa, Sanātana, and Jīva. Thus in North India at the time of Viśvanātha Cakravarti, a simple definition of orthodoxy in Gaurīya Vaishnavism was to be a follower of Rūpa, Sanātana, and Jīva.

Viśvanātha Cakravarti wrote numerous commentaries and interpretations of the works of Rūpa, Sanātana, and Jīva, which would place him squarely within the orthodox tradition of Gaurīya Vaishnavism. Moreover, with time Viśvanātha’s interpretation of their work became the standard interpretation. In this way Viśvanātha’s interpretation was the standard interpretation of Gaurīya orthodoxy. It is therefore difficult to avoid the conclusion that Viśvanātha was an orthodox Gaurīya vaisṇava, since he practically defined what it meant to be an orthodox Gaurīya.

Klostermaier has suggested that Viśvanātha “became a follower of Nimbārka and spent the rest of his life in Vṛndāvana writing many important works on bhakti from the Nimbārka standpoint and became this movement’s chief theologian.” It has been remarked earlier that Viśvanātha enjoyed remarkable popularity amongst the Nimbarkī group. Nevertheless, regardless of the possibility that some of Nimbarkī’s followers may have adopted Viśvanātha, there is more than enough evidence to safely conclude that Viśvanātha Cakravarti was first and foremost a Gaurīya.

Indications of the spiritual lineage of Viśvanātha are found in several places amongst his works. The most explicit are Viśvanātha’s series of guru-aṣṭaka prayers which appear in his collection of prayers known as Stāvāmrtā-lahārī. He

---

129 Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum (Kapaddvara Documents) #1521, 1519, 1501.
130 The other great authority quoted was Śrīdharā Swami, whose influence in the sect will be examined in Section 4.4 below.
131 A short description of Viśvanātha’s works appears below in section 2.7.
133 Klostermaier 1974 p. 97.
134 Section 2.5.
dedicates a set of eight verses to each link in his initiatory chain going back to Caitanya.

The first prayer, *Guru-carana-smaranāśṭakam*, makes specific reference to *Rādhā-ramaṇa Cakravarti*\(^\text{136}\). In the *Parama-gurvaśṭakam*, Viśvanātha refers by name to *Kṛṣṇa-caraṇa Cakravarti*.\(^\text{137}\) The next set of eight verses is dedicated to Gaṅgā-nārāyaṇa Cakravarti as *para-t-para-guru* and these are followed by prayers offered to the renowned Narottama Dāsa and Lokanātha Goswami, who was a contemporary follower of Caitanya.\(^\text{138}\)

Therefore the succession from Caitanya, as indicated by Viśvanātha himself, can be depicted thus:\(^\text{139}\)

Lokanātha Goswami  
Narottama Dāsa  
Gaṅgā-nārāyaṇa Cakravarti  
Kṛṣṇa-caraṇa Cakravarti  
Rādhā-ramaṇa Cakravarti  
Viśvanātha Cakravarti  

There is a condensed version of this same *guru-parampara* in the *maṅgalācarana* to the *Rāsa-paṇcādyāya* section of Viśvanātha’s commentary on the tenth *skandha* of the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*. In one short *śloka* Viśvanātha offers homage to the whole line of gurus:

\[
śrī-rāma-krṣṇa-gaṅgā-caraṇān natvā gurūn uru-premnaḥ  
śrīla-narottama-nātha-śrī-gauraṅga-prabhun naumi
\]

\(^{136}\) “śrī-rādhā-ramaṇam mudā guruvaravām vande.”

\(^{137}\) “sa kṛṣṇa-caraṇa-prabhuḥ pradiśatu sva-pāda-nṛtam.”

\(^{138}\) Entwistle 1987 p. 143-144.

\(^{139}\) A form of this lineage appears in Klosternaier (1974: 97), but omitting Rādhā-ramaṇa Cakravarti and Kṛṣṇa-caraṇa Cakravarti.
This is a type of short-hand: the word “śrī-rāma” stands for Rādhā-ramaṇa Cakravarti; the word “krṣṇa” stands for Kṛṣṇa-carana Cakravarti; the word “gaṅgā” stands for Gaṅgā-नārāyaṇa Cakravarti; the word “narottama” indicates Narottama Dāsa; the word “nātha” stands for Lokanātha; and “śrī-gauranga-prabhu” refers to Śrī Caitanya.

This exact lineage is also found in the traditional biography, Narottama-vilāsa. Considering that the author of that book, Narahari Cakravarti, says that his father was in turn a disciple of Viśvanātha, one would expect Narahari’s family to have had an interest in this spiritual lineage. The Vṛndavana-dhamanurāgāvalī also follows this traditional version.

There is another more cryptic reference to this succession in Viśvanātha’s work, Sankalpa-kalpa-drūma. There, Viśvanātha invokes several mañjarīs in a succession of prayers imploring divine grace. Viśvanātha’s disciple Kṛṣṇadeva wrote a commentary on this book, in which he gives the “inner” meaning of these

---

140 Narottama-vilāsa: Ch. 13. Concerning the lineage Narahari says:

prabhu priya pāṛṣada gosvāmilokanātha, yahāra caritra cāru jagate
vikhyāta
tāṅra priya śīṣya narottama premamaya, yāra khyāti jagate ṭhākura
mahāśāya
tāṅra śīṣya gaṅgā-nārāyaṇa cakravartī, parama paṇḍita yenha prema
bhakti mūrtī
tāṅra śīṣya cakravartī śrī kṛṣṇa carana, prema maya rāma-krṣṇācāryera
nandana
śrī rāma carana cakravarti śīṣya tāṅra , sarvāṁśe pravīṇa ati suddha
bhakti yāṅra
tāṅra priya śīṣya viśvanātha dayāmaya, yāṅra janma kāle haila sabāra
vīsmaya

With regard to his father’s initiation, Narahari says:

vṛndāvana haite yabe gaura-deśa āilā, se’i kāle vipra jagannāthe śīṣya
kailā
jagannātha viprera ānanda atīśaya, pā’iyā ṭhākura viśvanātha padāśraya
...
hena jagannāthera nandana muṇi chāra....

141 Vṛndāvana-dhamanurāgāvalī: Ch. 32 (Gokulānanda Mandira section)

142 A mañjarī is a particular type gopi, the female cowherd girl-friends of Kṛṣṇa. For a description of the place of the mañjarī in Gauḍīya theology see Haberman (1988: 108-114).
invocations: ¹⁴³

When he (Viśvanātha) says, “O Tulasī Mañjarī”, he is addressing his guru using his guru’s siddha-deha name, the name of his perfected form ¹⁴⁴ ....When he says, “O Raṅga Mañjarī”, he is addressing his grand-guru by his siddha-deha name. “O Prema Mañjarī” refers to his great-grand-guru. “O Vilāsa Mañjarī” refers to his great-great-grand-guru, Śrī Narottama Ṭhakkura Mahāśaya. And “O Mañju-lālī Mañjarī” refers to his great-great-great-grand-guru, Śrīla Lokanātha Goswami.

This list gives an idea of the mystic identities ascribed to each person in the spiritual lineage and confirms the view that there are five generations between Viśvanātha and Śrī Caitanya, the founder of the sect.

¹⁴³ Saṅkalpa-kalpa-druma v.89-92.

¹⁴⁴ An eternal form and identity in which the bhakta participates in the līlā of Kṛṣṇa.
2.7 Works

The following is a bibliography of works ascribed to Viśvanātha Cakravarti (in alphabetical order). It is a thorough list of all works ascribed to Viśvanātha, but is not meant to be a complete list of every edition of those works ever published. Rather, it is a list of all editions used in this dissertation as well as a catalogue indicating the most conveniently available editions of each work. As most of the recent editions are out of print, these editions have been supplemented with older editions available in the British Museum [BM], the India Office Library [IOL], and the National Library of India [NLI]. In a few cases where no publication could be found, manuscript references from Aufrecht or the New Catalogus Catalogorum [NCC] have been given.

The earliest available record of Viśvanātha’s works comes from the Narottama-vilāsa (early 1700s). It is not a comprehensive list; the author simply writes, “racilen bahu granth”, or “he composed many books”. Narahari Cakravarti then picks out a few works for particular praise: the Sārārtha-darśinī commentary on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, the Sārārtha-varṣinī commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā, the commentary on Kavi-karṇapura’s Ānanda-vṛndāvana-campu, the commentary on Rūpa Goswami’s Ujjvala-nilā-maṇi, and “wonderful books such as the Kṛṣṇabhāvanāmṛta”.¹⁴⁵

The Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvalī (c. 1843) also says Viśvanātha “wrote many books”, but mentions only one work in passing: a commentary on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa.¹⁴⁶

Several traditional lists of Viśvanātha’s works have been published:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(Year)</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Original Works</th>
<th>Commentaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.S. Sarasvati</td>
<td>1922 p.54</td>
<td>22 works mentioned</td>
<td>11 original works/11 commentaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidyāvinoda</td>
<td>1951 p. 66</td>
<td>27 works mentioned</td>
<td>12 original works/15 commentaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haridāsa</td>
<td>1957 p.</td>
<td>24 works mentioned</td>
<td>11 original works/13 commentaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāsa</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁴⁵ Narottama-vilāsa: Chapter 13. He also mentions a work called the “Caitanya-rasāyana”, which we are told Viśvanātha never finished after being so instructed in a dream by Caitanya himself.

¹⁴⁶ Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvalī Chapter 32:27: “tīṇi taha śrīmat bhāgavata hi pai ṭikā kari prakāsa. tahi rahicē puni viśvanāth ne granth anek banāē”
These works form a sort of kernel of conventionally accepted works. The present work has critically analysed these lists and has profited from wider catalogue references, manuscript evidence, textual references, as well as recent publications.

2.7.1 Independent Works:

**Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu-bindu** (synopsis of Rūpa Goswami’s *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu*).
- included in *Bindu, Kiraṇa, Kanṭā*, ed. & tr. by Murali Mohana Goswami. Calcutta: Vāni Press, 1913 [IOL 3396] [BM 14055.a.3.(i)].
- included in *Bhakti-vartma-pradarsaka-grantha*. Calcutta 1915 [BM 14060.bb.11.(1)].

**Bhāgavatāmṛta-kaṇṭā** (interpretive synopsis of Rūpa Goswami’s *Laghu-Bhāgavatāmṛta*).
- included in *Bindu, Kiraṇa, Kanṭā*, ed. & tr. by Murali Mohana Goswami. Calcutta: Vāni Press, 1913 [IOL 3396] [BM 14055.a.3.(i)].
- included in *Bhakti-vartma-pradarsaka-grantha*. Calcutta 1915. [BM 14060.bb.11.(1)]
Camatkāra-candrika\[147\] (a description of four short līlā between Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa).
- ed. & tr. (Bengali) by Haridāsa Dāsa, Navadvīpa: Hari Bol Kuṭīra, 1940.

Gaura-gaṇa-svarūpa-(tattva-)candrika (revealing siddha identities of members of the Gauḍīya sect). Referred to by D.S. Dāsa, who seems to follow Haridāsa Dāsa.\[148\]

Gaurāṅga-līlāmṛta or Gaurāṅga-smarana-maṅgala-stotram or Gaurāṅga-smaranaika-daśaka (meditations on the aṣṭa-kālīya-līlā of Śrī Caitanya).
- included in the Sādhana-pāsana, with translation in Bengali verse. Calcutta, 1901 [NLI 180.Nc.90.24.].

Kṛṣṇa-bhāvanāmṛta (1347 verses describing aṣṭa-kālīya-līlā of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa).
- ed. & tr. by Madhusūdana Adhikārī with commentary by Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya. Hoogly, 1918 (perhaps identical with the above) [NLI 180.Nc.91.94.]

---

\[147\] According to S.K. De (1961: 47, 603) this work is sometimes attributed to Kavi-karṇapura, but was most probably written by Viśvanātha.

\[148\] D.S. Dāsa 1992 p. 10; Haridāsa Dāsa 1957 p. 1537. Haridāsa attributes this work to Viśvanātha, giving references to a manuscript of the Pāṭabārī Punthi. He also notes a work called the Gaura-ganoddeśa-dīpikā, which he says has been falsely attributed to Viśvanātha.
Madhurya-kadambini (analysis of various symptoms and characteristics of bhakti).
- included in Bhakti-vartma-pradarśaka-grantha. Calcutta 1915. [BM 14060.bb.11.(1)]
- ed. & tr. (Hindi) by Śyāmadāsa. Vṛndāvana: Braja-gaurava-Prakāśana.

Mantrārtha-dīpikā (explanation of the kāma-gāyatī mantra).
- referred to by Haridāsa Dāsa (1957: 1718) and D.S. Dāsa (1992: 11).149

Prema-sampuṭa (description of a lilā between Rādha and Kṛṣṇa).
- ed. & tr. (Bengali) by Śyāma-lāl Goswami. Vṛndāvana, 1905 [BM 14060.b.17.(3)].
- ed. & tr. (Hindi) by Harikṛṣṇa Pandit. Mathura: Kṛṣṇadāsa, 1946 [180.c.94.90].

Rāga-vartma-candrikā (an analysis of rāgānugā-bhakti).
- included in Bhakti-vartma-pradarśaka-grantha. Calcutta, 1915 [BM 14060.bb.11.(1)].
- ed. & tr. by Prāṇa Kiṣora Goswami. Howrah: Vinod Kiṣora

---

There is another work called the Harināmārtha-dīpikā, which is referred to anonymously by Haridāsa Dāsa (1957: 1813) and which is attributed by the VRI catalogue to Viśvanātha (#4424, #1362). The first two volumes of this catalogue are notoriously inaccurate, and thus this attribution should probably not be accepted without first-hand inspection of the manuscripts in question.
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**Goswami, 1965.**


- **ed. and tr. (Hindi) by Bhaktivedānta Nārāyaṇa Mahārāja. Mathurā: Gauḍīya Vedānta Samiti, 1993.**

---

**Rūpa-cintāmaṇi**

There would seem to be two works of similar name, one describing the auspicious markings on the feet of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa (contained in the *Stavāṁṛta-laharī*), and the other describing the feet of Caitanya and Nityānanda (independent). Haridāsa Dāsa gives references to both works.  

---

**Sādhya-smarana-kaumudi** (an analysis of the means and goals of bhakti).

- **Aufrecht (Vol I p. 707).** This work is not widely known, and there are no printed editions nor references to it in the traditional lists of Viśvanātha’s works. The colophon clearly mentions “Viśvanātha Cakravarti”. The subject matter is noted in considerable detail in “Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts”, and it is quite consistent with the works of Viśvanātha. The reference is to a manuscript in Berhampore in the Murshidabad district, not far from Saidābād, the town where Viśvanātha spent his youth. It is perhaps a work of his younger days, in which case it would be a seminal work of the Kiraṇa, Bindu, Kaṇā trilogy.

---

150 Haridāsa Dāsa 1957 p. 1740. Manuscripts of this name are noted in Aufrecht (Vol I p. 504) and more manuscripts are held in VRI.


152 Haridāsa Dāsa (1957: 1797) does refer to this particular work, but without giving an author. He also notes that the work is closely based on the works of Rūpa Goswami.
SECTION 2.7 - Works

Stavāmrta-lahari\(^{153}\) (a collection of prayers)

The following works are considered part of Stavāmrta-laharī but have also been published independently:

\textit{Svapna-vilāsāmṛta}.\(^{154}\)

\textit{Sāṅkalpa-kalpa-drūma}
- included in the Sādhanopāsana, with translation in Bengali verse. Calcutta, 1901 [NLI 180.Nc.90.24].
- ed. & tr. (Bengali) by Rādhikā Nātha Goswami with the commentary of Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya. Vṛndāvana: Devakī-nandana Press, 1902 [IOL 3477]

Gītāvalī (considered as part of the Stavāmrta-laharī by some and as independent by others).\(^{155}\)
- NCC, vol. 6 p. 41.

---

\(^{153}\) Full lists of contents of this collection are given by Vidyāvinoda (1951 p. 66) and B.S. Sarasvati (1922 p. 54). Both list twenty-eight prayers. Vidyāvinoda includes Gītāvalī as part of the Stavāmrta-laharī, but Sarasvati lists it as an independent work. Several other poems from this collection are published independently (such as the Sāṅkalpa-kalpa-drūma and the Svapna-vilāsāmṛta), and they are listed within this entry in smaller font.

\(^{154}\) Vidyāvinoda (1951 p. 66) includes it in the Stavāmrta-laharī, whereas in the introduction of his own edition of the Svapna-vilāsāmṛta Haridāsa says that it is not part of Stavāmrta-laharī.

\(^{155}\) Vidyāvinoda 1951 p. 66; B.S. Sarasvati 1922 p.54.
Svakīyātva-nirāsa-parakīyātva-pratipādana\(^{156}\) (argument in favour of parakīyā)

Ujjvala-nilā-maṇi-kirāṇa (synopsis and interpretation of Rūpa Goswami’s Ujjvala-nilā-maṇi)
- included in Bindu, Kiraṇa, Kaṇā, ed. & tr. by Murali Mohana Goswami. Calcutta: Vāni Press, 1913 [IOL 3396] [BM 14055.a.3.(1)].
- included in Bhakti-vartma-pradarśaka-grantha. Calcutta 1915 [BM 14060.bb.11.(1)].

Vraja-rīti-cintāmaṇi (a description of the Braj region through devotional eyes).
- ed. & tr. (English) by Kuśa-kratha Dāsa. Alachua: Kṛṣṇa Institute, 1981.

---

\(^{156}\) This work is not found anywhere else other than in this edition. Its authenticity is supported by Haridāsa Dāsa (1957:1619 & 1808), who notes manuscripts of this work in Vṛndāvana and Jaipur, which he also attributes to “Cakravartipāda”.

2.7.2 Commentaries:

on the *Alaṅkāra-kaustubha* of Kavi Karṇāpura called "*Subodhini*".
- ed. & tr. (Bengali) by Rāma-nārāyaṇa Vidyā-ratna, with commentary by Viśvanātha. Berhampore: Rādhā-raṇaṇa Press, 1900 [IOL San.D.185] [BM 14053.ccc.25] [NLI 180.8c.89.2].
- ed. by Puri Dāsa with the commentary of Viśvanātha. Calcutta: Haridāsa Śarmā, 1953 [NLI 180.Pb.95.5].

on the *Ānanda-vṛṇḍāvana-campu* of Kavi Karṇāpura.
- ed. by Mukundadeva Śāstrī with the commentary of Viśvanātha. Mathura, 1898 [BM 14070.dd.8].

on the *Bhagavad-gītā*, called "*Sārūrtha-varṣini*".
- new edition of Kedaranātha Datta [see above], ed. by Kuṇjavīhari Vidyābhūṣaṇa. Calcutta: Kuṇjavīhari Vidyābhūṣaṇa, 1926 [IOL San.B.1076].
- new edition of Kedaranātha Datta [see above], ed. by Bhakti-vilāsa-tīrtha Swami. Māyāpura: Śrī Caitanya Maṭha, 1947...1991 [NLI...
(The Author)

180.Jc.94.86]. Referred to as “BVT”.


- ed. by Kṛṣṇadāsa Bābā with commentaries of Viśvanātha and Baladeva. Rādhā-kuṇḍa: Gaura Hari Press, 1966. Referred to as “KDB”.


on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, called “Sārārtha-darśini”.

- ed. & tr. by Rāma-Nārāyaṇa Vidyābhūṣaṇa with commentaries by Śrīdharā, Jīva, and Viśvanātha, (Skandha 1-6) Berhampore: Rādhā-ramaṇa Press 1882 [IOL 1055] [BM 14018.dd.3]. (Skandha 1-10) [NLI K/180.Ja.88.1].


- (10th Skandha) ed. & tr. by Śacī-nandana Goswami, (5 vol.) Calcutta: Devakī-nandana Press, 1910 [NLI].


- (10th Skandha) ed. by Śītāla Prasāda. Calcutta, 1912 [NLI 180.Jb.91.81].
- ed. by Kṛṣṇa Śaṅkara Śāstrī with eight commentaries. Vārāṇasī: Saṁsāra Press.

on the Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu of Rūpa Goswami, called “Bhakti-sāra-pradarśini”.

on the Caitanya-caritāmṛta of Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Kavirāja.
- ed. with Bengali interpretation by Mākhana Lāla Dāsa Bhāgavata-bhūṣaṇa with Sanskrit commentary by Viśvanātha. Calcutta, 1908 [BM 14123.g.24.].

on the Dāna-keli-kaumudi of Rūpa Goswami, called “Mahātī”.

on the Gopāla-tāpani-upaniṣad, called “Bhakta-harṣini”.
- ed. & tr. by Rāma Nārāyaṇa Vidyāratna with the commentaries of Viśveśvara and Viśvanātha. Berhampore (Murshidabad): Rādhā-ramaṇa Press, 1883 [IOL 283].

on the Harṣa-dūta of Rūpa Goswami.
on the *Manah-śikṣā* of Raghunātha Dāsa Goswami.

- Aufrecht (Vol III p. 92).\textsuperscript{157}

on the *Prema-bhakti-candrika* of Narottama Dāsa.

- ed. by Rāmadayālu Ghoṣa with the Sanskrit commentary of Viśvanātha. Calcutta 1896 [BM 14123.e.20].

on the *Ujjvala-nilā-maṇi* of Rūpa Goswami, called “Ānanda-candrika”.

- ed. & tr. (Bengali) by Rāma-nārāyaṇa Vidyāratna with the commentaries of Jīva and Viśvanātha. Berhampore: Rādhā-ramaṇa Press, 1889 [BM 14053.d.49] [NLI 180.Nb.88.3-4; 180.Nb.88.5].

on the *Vidagdha-mādhava-nāṭaka* of Rūpa Goswami.


\textsuperscript{157} This work does not appear in any of the traditional lists of Viśvanātha’s works, but it is however a very likely work for Viśvanātha to have commented on. The manuscript notes say clearly, “with a commentary by Viśvanātha Cakravarti”. The manuscript in question deserves closer study.
2.7.3 Unavailable / Doubtful Works:

**Aisvarya-kādambinī** - This work is referred to in the beginning of the second ‘shower’ (read ‘chapter’) of the *Mādhurya-kādambinī*. There Viśvanātha writes, “In this work there is not a full dissertation on dualism and monism (dvaitādvaita), but those who seek such a thing will find it in another work called *Aisvarya-kādambinī*. But neither manuscripts nor printed editions have ever been noted for such a work. There is a second work, by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, also called *Aisvarya-kādambinī*, which was completed in 1779. As Viśvanātha probably passed away some 50 years prior to that, Viśvanātha’s reference must be to some other work called *Aisvarya-kādambinī*, probably composed by Viśvanātha to complement his *Mādhurya-kādambinī*. Or perhaps he simply intended to do so, but never actually composed the work.158

**Caitanya-rasāyana** - This work is referred to by Narahari Cakravarti in the *Narottama-vilāsa*. We are told that after Caitanya appeared to him in a dream, Viśvanātha never finished this work and never explained why.159

**Brahma-saṁhitā-ṭikā** (commentary unpublished /unavailable).160

**Lalita-mādhava-nāṭaka-ṭippani** (the attribution to Viśvanātha is questionable).161

---

158 The *New Catalogus Catalogorum* wrongly attributes a manuscript of the Aisvarya Kādambinī to Viśvanātha Vidyābhūṣaṇa. The manuscript in question (Notices #2513) is a manuscript of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa’s work.

159 *Narottama-vilāsa*: Chapter 13:
śrī caitanya rasāyane varṇiten yāhā, nā haila grantha pūrṇa na varṇila tāhā.

160 No trace of this work has ever been reported, but there is a fairly strong tradition as to its existence: B.S. Sarasvati 1922 p. 54; Vidyāvinoda 1951 p. 66; Haridāsa Dāsa 1957 p. 1370 & 1672; Kapoor 1984 p. 462; D.S. Dāsa 1992 p. 13; but not in S.Sen 1935 p. 259.

161 A commentary (*ṭippani*) exists for this play, but Haridāsa Dāsa [1957 p. 1745] remarks there is nothing at all in the text to indicate Viśvanātha composed this commentary. Viśvanātha certainly did write a commentary (continued...)
Smaraṇa-krama-mālā ("directions for meditating on and mentally worshipping Kṛṣṇa, Gauracandra and his followers").

Aufrecht I p.745. This work is not widely known and there are no printed editions nor references to it in the traditional lists of his works. Very little detail is given in the "Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts", so it is difficult to say whether or not Viśvanātha Cakravarti actually wrote it. The colophon clearly mentions "Viśvanātha Cakravarti". Yet the scanty details given in the Notices point to a much simpler verse style than is Viśvanātha’s norm. It may be a work of his very early days, or it may be an appropriation of the author’s name by Sahajiyā sects.

Gopi-premāmṛta - This work is also not noted in any of the traditional lists except by S. Sen who, given his vast experience with Bengali manuscripts, must have sighted some obscure manuscript of this work. NCC has a manuscript of this name which is said to be an excerpt from a Purāṇa. Haridāsa Dāsa has a reference to a work of this name, which is a description of the glories of the Hare-kṛṣṇa mantra in a Puranic-style conversation between Pārvatī and Śiva. It is not likely to be an authentic work of Viśvanātha.

161 (...continued)
on the sister-play Vidagdha-mādhava, and there is a tradition that Viśvanātha did indeed compose this commentary, yet there are also competing traditions which would say this commentary was composed by a disciple of Jīva Goswami, Rādha-kṛṣṇa Dāsa. These remarks are repeated (almost verbatim) by Kṛṣṇadāsa Bābā in the introduction to his 1967 edition of this play. This work is not mentioned by S. Sen (1935: 259)


164 Haridāsa Dāsa 1957 p. 1504.
2.7.4 Vernacular Works of “Hari-vallabha”

ANTHOLOGY:

**Kṣaṇadā-gīta-cintāmaṇi** (an anthology of vernacular poetry compiled by and contributed to by Viśvanātha).


As mentioned in section 2.5, it seems certain that Viśvanātha Cakravarti wrote vernacular poetry using the pen name “Hari-Vallabha”. Generally scholars and devotees agree that Viśvanātha wrote several Braja-būlī poems using the name “Hari-vallabha” or “Vallabha”. These poems appear in the **Kṣaṇadā-gīta-cintāmaṇi**, an anthology of Bengali vaiṣṇava lyric poetry compiled by Viśvanātha.\(^{165}\) This compilation, one of the earliest known of its kind, contains three hundred and nine poems by forty-five different poets. Of these, forty have the “signature” of “Hari-vallabha”, and thirteen have that of “Vallabha”, and these fifty-three poems are universally attributed to Viśvanātha Cakravarti.\(^{166}\)

It was noted that the earliest reference to this “Hari-vallabha” is by Narahari Cakravarti, writing one generation after Viśvanātha in his **Narottama-vilāsa**:

\[ \text{Śrī Viśvanātha’s (other) name is “Hari-Vallabha”. This is clear from the way he signs his songs, which all learned men acknowledge.}^{167} \]

Thus, there is a good deal of support for the idea that the Braja-būlī poems of the **Kṣaṇadā-gīta-cintāmaṇi** were written by Viśvanātha Cakravarti.


\(^{166}\) Sen 1935 p. 258; see Haridāsa Dāsa 1957 p. 1483 for slightly different figures.

\(^{167}\) **Narottama-vilāsa** Ch. 13:

\[ \text{śrī viśvanāthera nāma śrī hari-vallabha gītera ābhoge vyakta kahe vijnā sabā.} \]

As mentioned previously, this work was written shortly after the death of Viśvanātha Cakravarti.
Viśvanātha Cakravarti could also be the author of some Braja-bhāṣā poems in a second anthology of vaiṣṇava poetry, also called Kṣanadā-gīta-cintāmaiṇi. This second anthology consists only of Braja-bhāṣā poetry, including poetry from Sūra Dāsa, Nanda Dāsa, and Haridāsa Swami. As this anthology mostly consists of poetry by Manohara Dāsa, it is thought to have been compiled by Manohara Dāsa.\(^{168}\)

In this anthology there are several Braja-bhāṣā poems by “Hari-vallabha” and “Vallabha”, one of which is dedicated to Caitanya, and N.C. Bansal remarks that there is no Gauḍīya poet of that name other than Viśvanātha Cakravarti.\(^{169}\)

In addition to these poems, there is the Braja-bhāṣā translation of the Bhagavad-gītā by Hari-vallabha, which some have suggested could also have been written by Viśvanātha Cakravarti under the name of Hari-vallabha. This Braja-bhāṣā Gītā is noted by Callewaert and Hemraj, and the date of composition is given as 1714, with the possibility of a similar work having been composed in 1643.\(^{170}\)

This being the case, a bhāṣā work written in 1714 by Hari-vallabha would appear very much like a work of Viśvanātha Cakravarti since we know that Viśvanātha was still alive and active in 1713,\(^{171}\) and we also know that he composed vernacular poetry in the name of Hari-vallabha.

As the Kṣanadā-gīta-cintāmaiṇi appears incomplete, there is a tradition that Viśvanātha wrote much of his vernacular poetry toward the end of his life. The date of 1714 would indeed correspond to the tail end of Viśvanātha’s life.\(^{172}\)

---


\(^{170}\) Callewaert and Hemraj 1984 p. 167 & 169. It would seem that there is some confusion about the date “satrah sai ekottara” which if read as VS1701 would give 1643-4, but if read asVS1771 would give 1714 (Bansal 1980: 303 fn.).

\(^{171}\) Wright Collection document #17 (Habib1996 p.135); see Table One above, section 2.2.1..

\(^{172}\) Haridāsa Dāsa 1957 p. 1843; Darśanācārya 1976 p. 225; D.S. Dasa p.10, 126. Only a “pūrva-vibhāga” (“Eastern Section”) was composed by Viśvanātha, which leads one to think that three other sections were planned but never produced. The “ocean” of the Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu is divided into four quarters starting with the “Eastern Section”, and it would seem that Viśvanātha planned a similar structure for this work. (continued...)
R.K. Varma also mentions “Hari-vallabha” as the author of a “Hindi verse” translation and commentary of the *Bhagavad-gītā*. However, Varma says that this Hari-vallabha was active from around 1643, which does not match with our Viśvanātha Cakravarti, as we postulate that 1643 was about the time of Viśvanātha’s birth.

Callewaert and Hemraj mention a manuscript dated 1711, and they quote B. Tiwari as saying that there are two separate works, one composed in 1643 and another in 1714.

Whatever the case may be, until the date is clear, it is difficult to decide on the authorship of the work. Were it to have been written in 1714, then it would very likely be a work of Viśvanātha Cakravarti. If the date of composition is 1643, it is highly unlikely to be so. More work needs to be done in this area, starting with a thorough inspection of manuscripts.

In this regard, it should be noted that the Pothikhana Collection of the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum in Jaipur holds some six different works in the name of “Hari-vallabha”, including a “*Bhagavad-gītā Bhāṣā” and parts of a “Bhāgavata Bhāṣā”. The Vṛndāvana Research Institute also holds a partial manuscript copy of a Braja-Bhāṣā *Bhagavad-gītā* by Hari-vallabha as well as numerous sections of a Braja-bhāṣā *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* by the same author. The existence of a Braja-bhāṣā *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* by the same author is a significant detail, given the Gauḍīya predilection for this work.

172 (...continued)

However Haridāsa Dāsa (1957: 1484) says that the second Kṣanadā-gīta-cintāmaṇi, which was mentioned above in relation to Manohara Dāsa, is in fact just the “paścima-vibhāga” (“Western Section”) of the same Kṣanadā-gīta-cintāmaṇi. Now Manohara-dāsa and Viśvanātha were contemporaries (see Entwistle 1987: 186) and it is just as possible that they collaborated on this work, with Viśvanātha compiling the Eastern Section (Bengali) and Manohara Dāsa compiling the Western Section (Braja-bhāṣā).


174 See section 2.2.1 above for date of birth. Varma’s date for this work could be the same doubtful date “satrah sai ekottarā”.


Section 3: The Era

3.1 Disciples

In section 2.4 above mention was made of a document of 1712 which described the "Gokulānanda-ji kuṇja" at Rādhā-kuṇḍa.\(^1\) This would seem to have been an "āśrama" type situation, with a group of students under the tutelage of Viśvanātha Cakravarti. That document lists the names of five students present in the kuṇja in 1712: Kṛṣṇadeva Bhaṭṭācārya, Prāṇa-vallabha, Sadānanda Dāsa, Narahari Dāsa, and Kīnkara Dāsa.

One cannot take this as a definitive list of students, as these are simply the list of signatories to that document who were living at the Gokulānanda-ji kuṇja. Others may well have been living there but may not have been involved in the matter of that document. And other students would have lived elsewhere. We have seen that the author of Narottama-vilāsa describes his father becoming a disciple of Viśvanātha in Saidābād, presumably more than thirty years before the 1712 list. It would seem that Viśvanātha acted as guru for a very long time and that the list of his students would be fairly considerable.

Certainly tradition has it that Viśvanātha had a sizeable following of students, as is evident from the following enthusiastic passage by Narahari Cakravarti:

"Who in Vṛndāvana does not revere Viśvanātha Cakravarti? He remained always absorbed in the sweet emotions of bhakti as he accepted numerous disciples. All of his disciples became great devotees.\(^2\)"

Three famous Gauṛīya authors refer to themselves in their writing as disciples of Viśvanātha Cakravarti: Kṛṣṇadāsa Dāsa, Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami, and Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya (also mentioned in the 1712 document). Each of these will be dealt with separately below.

---

\(^1\) Vṛndāvana Research Institute, microfilm T1: 25.

\(^2\) Narottama-vilāsa: Ch. 13:

\[ \text{viśvanāthe keba nā ādare vrndāvane sadā bhakti-rase magna latyā śiṣya-gane} \]

\[ \text{viśvanātha cakravarti śiṣya kaila yata, sakale 'i ha'ilena mahā bhagavata} \]
3.1.1 Krṣṇadāsa Dāsa

Krṣṇadāsa Dāsa is the author of numerous Bengali translations of the works of Viśvanātha Cakravartī. At the end of his translation of Viśvanātha’s *Mādhurya-kadambini* Krṣṇadāsa Dāsa explicitly mentions Viśvanātha Cakravartī as his guru:

“This work, the *Mādhurya-kādambini* has blessed the world. It was spoken by Śrī Krṣṇa Caitanya through the mouth of Cakravartī. Thus lowly Krṣṇa Dāsa utters the translation of the sixth nectar shower [chapter], meditating upon the feet of his guru, Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartī.”

Krṣṇadāsa Dāsa is said to have composed Bengali translations of the following of Viśvanātha’s works: *Camatkāra-candrika*, *Mādhurya-kādambini*, *Rāga-vartma-candrika*, *Bhāgavatāmya-kāṇā*, *Bhaktirasāmya-sindhu-bindu*, and the *Ujjvala-nilā-manī-kirāṇa*. Also attributed to Krṣṇadāsa Dāsa is a verse translation and elaboration of Viśvanātha’s *Gaurāṅga-smarana-maṅgala* known as *Gaurāṅga-lilāmṛta*.

---

3...śrīla viśvanātha-cakravartī guru tāhāra carana dhyāne
sāsta amṛta-vṛṣṭi tāra bhāṣā dīna krṣṇā dāsa bhane.

-quoted from Haridāsa Dāsa (1957: 1188).

4 Haridāsa Dāsa ibid.
3.1.2 Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya

The document of 1712 mentioned above describes Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya as one of the students of Viśvanātha Cakravarti in the Gokulānanda-ji kuṇja. Thus the documentary evidence suggests that Kṛṣṇadeva lived there in the kuṇja in Rādhā-kuṇḍa with Viśvanātha, most probably as some kind of initiated disciple.

In the traditional sources, there is a more colourful description of how Kṛṣṇadeva came to be living in the kuṇja of Viśvanātha:

A champion scholar from the East named Sārvabhauma Pandit arrived [in Braj] one day. He had heard of the name of Viśvanātha Cakravarti. Having been victorious in all directions, he travelled with a retinue of horses, elephants, and riches. Many male and female slaves attended him. [He proclaimed:] “I will become the servant of whosoever can defeat me. But as of yet I have never met anyone from whom to take initiation...”

Finally he arrived in Rādhā-kuṇḍa and came upon Viśvanātha Cakravarti bathing at the kuṇḍa. He asked Viśvanātha “Do you know where Viśvanātha is?” Viśvanātha replied “Who knows where he is! Just ask me whatever you wanted to ask him.”

“But I want to debate with him.”

“That’s all right. Just debate with me. Don’t stall.” And he sat down right there on the bathing ghāṭ and said, “You just answer what I say.” They debated at great length and the very person whom the pandit had come to defeat defeated him in debate. Thus Sārvabhauma Pandit became Viśvanātha’s disciple and distributed all his wealth. For some time the pandit remained there and applied his mind to serving his guru.....

Although somewhat theatrical, this tradition certainly suggests that there was a formal relationship of initiation between Kṛṣṇadeva and Viśvanātha. Also,

5 Section 3.1.

6 Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvalī Ch 32 (Sarvabhūmi Pañḍit Caritra):
“sarvabhūmi pañḍit pūrv ī yak dig-vīja ī āyau... ...ko ī din bha’ē tabē gur sevā mē man āina u.”
Kṛṣṇadeva seems to have had a good reputation as a scholar before becoming Viśvanātha’s disciple.

Whatever the case may be, Kṛṣṇadeva did not remain in Rādhā-kunḍa for very long after 1712. By early 1715, he was in Jaipur receiving a grant of the income of the village of Baḍodyā on behalf of the deity Rādhā Vinoda-ji. The matter of a charitable grant for Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya was raised ("araj pahūc") in April of 1715,7 and the order (hukam) was given that he should receive the revenue from the autumn harvest (Oct-Nov) of 1715. The official documents (pravāno) were finalised in August of 1716.8

The grant given to Kṛṣṇadeva was a particular type called “punya udik”, meant to ensure the sustenance of religious figures. In Kṛṣṇadeva’s case, the total taxation revenue from the village of Baḍodyā (Rs. 1,375 p.a.) was allocated to him. According to Horstmann, the particularity of a punya udik grant was that the benefactor had previously made a solemn vow (sankalap) in ritual fashion taking a palm full of water (udak) and other auspicious ingredients such as sesame seeds.9

In this case, Maharaja Jai Singh had previously dedicated the revenue of the village to the supreme lord (parameśvara) in the holy place of pilgrimage, Prayāga, at the confluence of the Ganges and Yamuna Rivers; this would tend to support the ritual nature of the act.10

This grant marks the beginning of a long public career for Kṛṣṇadeva in Jaipur as one of the theological counsellors of Jai Singh II.11 In fact, it was a period of rapid expansion in the relationship between the whole Gauḍiya sect and the state of Amber/Jaipur. It was shortly after this, in 1716, that Sawai Jai Singh dedicated the village of Gholān to the service of Rādhā-Gokulānanda-ji, the deity worshipped

---

7 Cait sudī 11 samvat VS 1772 {Sunday 14th April 1715 AD}.
8 Bhāḍvā sudī 11, VS 1773 {Friday 28th August 1716 AD} from Jaipur State Archives NP vol. 17 p. 811. Volume 19. p 247 mentions a pravāno in Asoj budi 10 samvat 1772 {26th June 1715}, but this is probably an earlier step in the administrative process connected with the issuing of a pravāno. See Horstmann (1999: 49-61) for a description of the process.
10 Māh budi 14 VS 1771 {Sunday 3rd February 1715 AD}, Jaipur State Archives NP vol. 17 p. 811. However, volume 19 p. 247 says “Bhāḍvā budi 8 samvat 1771 kā ne śrī parmeśur mimit sankalap huvo” {Sunday 2nd September 1714 AD}.
by Kṛṣṇadeva’s guru Viśvanātha Cakravartī. Horstmann feels that 1713 marks a turning point in the influence of the sect in Jaipur, remarking that at this time Govindadeva-ji emerged as the presiding deity of the royal house of Kachavāhā.  

In 1715 when Kṛṣṇadeva received his grant for the worship of the deity, the city of Jaipur was only jungle, and Govindadeva-ji had just arrived in the Kanaka Vṛndāvana site on the Mān Sagar lake between Amber and the future Jaipur.  

Kṛṣṇadeva’s grant was somehow connected with the worship of the deity Rādhā-vinoda (also called “Vinodī-lāl-ji”). This is evident from the fact that the priest who maintained the temple in Kṛṣṇadeva’s absence applied successfully to have the grant transferred into his own name.  

Kṛṣṇadeva had established a temple for Vinodī-lāl high on a hill overlooking the Jai-nivāsa gardens, which eventually formed the heart of the new, city. Subsequently this temple was transferred to the Rāmānandī sect, and eventually a deity of Sītā-Rāma was installed there. That temple still exists today on the hill behind the Purāṇī Bastī in Jaipur.  

However, for thirty years (1715-1745) Kṛṣṇadeva was officially the mahānt of this Rādhā-vinoda-ji temple and played an influential role as advisor of Jai Singh II. The inquisitive maharaja of Jaipur commissioned a series of three works from

---

12 ibid., p. 19  
14 Pravāṇo saptī Kārtik budi 8 VS 1802, Jaipur State Archives NP vol 17 p. 248.  
16 A.K. Roy 1978 p. 191-2. Roy also mentions in passing this connection with the old Rādhā-vinodī-lāl temple. The documents speak of a temple of Sītā-Rāma, whereas Roy reports that this temple holds Jānakī-Rāma deities. The other major Rāmānandī temple of Sītā-Rāma is in Galtā.  
17 Kṛṣṇadeva had a second residence in Kāmā (near Rādhā-kuṇḍa in Braj) and was there connected with the Madanamohana temple as indicated by Horstmann (1999: 22). The Kṛṣṇadeva-related documents published by Habib (1996) all come from the Madana-mohana collection. The documents available from the Jaipur State Archives link him with the temple of Rādhā-vinoda (sometimes called Rādhā-Vinodī-lālā).
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Krṣṇadeva: Karma-vivṛti, Jñāna-vivṛti, and Bhakti-vivṛti. These works teased out the implications of three important aspects of the Gauḍīya vaiṣṇava faith, namely, works, knowledge, and devotion.

In 1723 Krṣṇadeva also composed the ecumenical work, Siddhaṁtaikyapraṅāśika, which seems to have been directly commissioned by the maharaja in his quest to establish some unity amongst the rival sects. A contemporary record suggests that the group of four works represent a kind of collaboration of the two men:

Siddhaṁtaikyapraṅāśika, Karma-vivṛti, Jñāna-vivṛti, and Bhakti-vivṛti - in these four books Krṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya, at the behest of His Royal Highness, has synthesised all holy books, and we are in full agreement with whatever is in those works.

The king was interested in how the devotional religion of Caitanya was to be practised in harmony with the established norms of Hinduism and within the social structures of the day. On one occasion the Mahārāja seems to have solicited an official opinion from the Bhaṭṭācārya on whether devotees were still eligible to perform the works of karma-yoga. The Bhaṭṭācārya replied,

A person may be a fit candidate to perform the activities of pure bhakti according to the rules and regulations of scripture, and yet if his faith has not become strong, he may still retain a very slight candidacy for the activities of the path of karma. This is the opinion

18 Mss # 2641, 2642, 2645, 2694, 2695, 2701 in the Jaipur Pothikhana Catalogue (Bahura 1976: 226).

19 Horstmann 1994b p.58, 1996 p. 193 fn29, 1999 p. 22 fn79, and forthcoming. In Bahura’s catalogue, the Siddhaṁtaikyapraṅāśika is not listed as one of Krṣṇadeva’s works but simply as a work commissioned by Jai Singh (Bahura 1976: 124). However, the contemporary records below confirm that the work was authored by Krṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya.

20 Letter of deliberation, Āśvin sudi 5 VS 1789 (24th September 1732), document held at SKS, reproduced by Bansal 1980 p. 501. A similar statement is found from the son of Krṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya in the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum KD # 1523, dated Baisakh budi 11 VS 1793 (6th April 1736).
of Śrī Kṛṣṇadeva Bhaṭṭācārya.\textsuperscript{21}

This was in fact a very diplomatic response to his patron who was both a bhakta of Govindadeva and a king interested in the social and ritual activities of karma-yoga. This accommodating stance had already been spelt out in fine detail by Kṛṣṇadeva’s guru, Viśvanātha Cakravartī, in his commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā which is the object of the current dissertation.\textsuperscript{22}

The City Palace Museum in Jaipur holds records of the maharaja’s private correspondence. These records show that on several occasions the maharaja canvassed the opinion of Kṛṣṇadeva Bhaṭṭācārya on theological matters such as the duties of devotees or more philosophical questions such as the basis of bhedābheda philosophy espoused by the Gaupya sect.\textsuperscript{23}

In 1719 and 1735 Jai Singh sent Kṛṣṇadeva to Bengal to canvass the opinion of Gaurīya vaiśnavas on controversial theological topics. Jai Singh was trying to establish some kind of religious and moral consensus, and he sent Kṛṣṇadeva Bhaṭṭācārya to the courts of various maharajas to discuss draft resolutions with the court pandits. A.K. Roy cites the documents of a conference around 1719 in which Kṛṣṇadeva was the sabhāsad, “the assistant-chairman of the assembly”. After the decision of the assembly had been reached, Kṛṣṇadeva was deputed to Gaūra-deśa (Bengal) to present the conclusions of the assembly. The Nawab of Muršidabad presented the matter to his court pandits, who rejected the proposal and sent their conclusions back to Jaipur with Kṛṣṇadeva.\textsuperscript{24}

Some time later, in 1735, the Bhaṭṭācārya was again sent out to represent the opinions of Sawai Jai Singh. On this occasion the court pandits of Vishnupur wrote back saying that they were “agreeable to the decisions of Rajadhiraja Jai Singh, so kindly sent here. Other facts will be explained by the Rev. Bhaṭṭācārya.”\textsuperscript{25} It would

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum: Kapaddvara Documents # 1517 (undated). (reproduced by Bahura & Singh (1988) plate 143).
\item \textsuperscript{22} See Viśvanatha’s comments on verse 3.26.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum: Kapaddvara Documents # 1504, 1517, 1525, 1526.
\item \textsuperscript{24} A.K. Roy (1985: 85) says that the documents of a conference in this connection were registered on 17 Phalguṇ BS 1125 (15\textsuperscript{th} February 1719 AD).
\item \textsuperscript{25} Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum KD Documents # 1504. Translation of G.N. Bahura.
\end{itemize}
appear that Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya was sent out to collect these sammati-patra for Jai Singh. He was also trusted to verbally convey the conclusions.

There are many such sammati-patra in the personal letter collection of Jai Singh. The maharaja seems to have been particularly interested in getting confirmation for his religious proposals from the courts of other vaiṣṇava kings. As well as the above examples, there are also statements of opinion from “the Pandits and considerate learned persons of the court of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Candra Nṛpati of Burdwan”, from twenty three pandits of the court of Raja Kṛṣṇa Candra Rai of Navadvipa, from thirty vaiṣṇavas of Navadvīpa, and from Śrī Kṛṣṇa Rāma Sharmā of Saidābād. It is conceivable that Kṛṣṇadeva was instrumental in canvassing many of these opinions.

Jaipur was not the only place of residence for Kṛṣṇadeva. It would appear that he shared his time between Jaipur and Braja. In 1716, he purchased a haveli (residence) in Kāmān, a town in the north-east of Braja near Barsānā and Nandagāo. He seems to have enjoyed the favour of the prince in charge of Kāmā, Maharaja Jait Singh, because the maharaja ordered the clerks of the revenue office to exempt Kṛṣṇadeva from one fourth of the sale price of the haveli.

Kṛṣṇadeva was not a recluse; in fact he acquired quite a portfolio of property. A year later he purchased the shop and house next door with the assistance of Madhusūdana, the revenue officer of the Govindadeva-jī temple. He also owned properties in Barsānā and Vṛndāvana.

In 1723 the Bhaṭṭācārya received another grant of land to supplement his already healthy income. We have already noted that Kṛṣṇadeva received subventions from the maharajas of Jaipur and Kāmā. This time he received a “madad-i ma’ ash of 51 bighas” from Bādām Singh. In June of the previous year Bādām Singh, leader of the rebellious Jāt race of Braja, had capitulated to Jai Singh,


27 Decree of Jait Sing 18 Ramazan AH 1130 (ibid and SKS). The block was 246 square gaj (1 gaj = approx 1 yard). The sale price was Rs. 163/12 annas, from which a discount of Rs. 41/15 annas was taken. The eastern boundary was shared with Seth Lāl and Bhagavn Seth, the south side with the Sarai Road, the north side with Lālu Banāhnu Tambodi, and the west side with Gokul Banāhnu and Rām Brahman’s place.


29 Ibid.
which ushered in an era of peace and prosperity for the region.\textsuperscript{30} Kṛṣṇadeva seems to have been one of the first to benefit from this new atmosphere.

The grant received was a “\textit{madad-i maʿashi}” (literally “income assistance”), a type of grant inherited from the Islamic tradition, which was offered to religious people to give them a source of income. In this case it was a grant of 61\textit{ bighas} of cultivable land (approx. 30 acres) in the district of Mangotla, from which Kṛṣṇadeva would receive revenue without being able to evict the existing cultivators.\textsuperscript{31}

In 1725 the personal minister (\textit{divān}) of Jai Singh II gave Kṛṣṇadeva official sanction to procure red stone from imperial quarries in Bayānā to restore a temple of Rādhā-kānta-ji in Vṛndāvana.\textsuperscript{32}

In that same year Kṛṣṇadeva returned to Jaipur several times, perhaps in connection with some official work for the maharaja. He was received in court on two occasions, and in accordance with the traditional formal protocol was offered cloth to the value of eighty-five rupees.\textsuperscript{33} That represented quite a substantial sum, considering that a few years previously he had purchased a residence in Kāmān for 150 rupees.

It was around this time that Kṛṣṇadeva wrote several of his books. Horstmann gives 1723 as the date of composition for the \textit{Siddhāntaikya-prakāśika}. That group of four works commissioned by the maharaja does not appear to have been widely circulated in the greater Gauḍīya community, as sectarian lists of his works do not mention them.\textsuperscript{34}

The Dhaka University holds a ms of Kṛṣṇadeva’s \textit{Padāṅka-dūtam} which is dated 1723.\textsuperscript{35} According to Haridāsa Dāsa, the work was composed in that year in

\textsuperscript{30} V.S. Bhatnagar 1974 p. 164-5.

\textsuperscript{31} Horstmann 1999 p. 35-6.

\textsuperscript{32} Documents from Habib 1996 p. 146. This is more likely to be the fort-like red stone temple of Rādhā-kānta in Jao (Jāvat or Yāvata) not far from Kṛṣṇadeva’s place of residence, Kāmān (Entwistle 1987: 386). Such a temple is not known in Vṛndāvana.

\textsuperscript{33} Jaipur State Archives DK, vol 15 p. 122.

\textsuperscript{34} Haridāsa Dāsa 1957 p. 1190; D.S. Dāsa 1992 p. 96-98. The four works, namely \textit{Siddhāntaikya-prakāśika}, \textit{Karma-vivṛti}, \textit{Jñāna-vivṛti}, and \textit{Bhakti-vivṛti}, are discussed above.

\textsuperscript{35} MS # 200A, dated 1645 ŠS (Parvin [1994: vol 2]).
Navadvīpa (Bengal). This may well have been on one of Kṛśnadeva’s trips to Bengal as religious envoy of Sawai Jai Singh. The Padāṅka-dūtām is an original literary work of the dūta-kāvyā genre, similar in format to Rūpa Goswami’s Harīsa-
dūtām.

Haridāsa Dāsa mentions that Kṛśnadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya wrote commentaries on Viśvanātha’s Kṛṣṇa-bhāvanāmṛta, Rūpa’s Vidagdha-mādhava, Baladeva’s Prameya-ratnāvalī, and possibly Kavi Kārnāpura’s Alāṅkāra-
kaustubha. D.S. Dāsa adds to that list a commentary on Viśvanātha’s Stavāmṛta-
laharī, as well as a commentary on Baladeva’s Aiśvarya-kādambinī. The authenticity of the latter work needs to be questioned, since Kṛśnadeva had passed away by at least 1749, but Baladeva’s Aiśvarya-kādambinī was not composed until 1779.

Haridāsa Śāstrī has published an edition of Viśvanātha’s Saṅkalpa-kalpa-
druma with a commentary by Kṛśnadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya.

By 1732, Kṛśnadeva’s fame amongst the Gauṛīya community was well established. It was in that year that a royal assembly in Sawai Jai Singh’s court declared the teachings of Rūpa Kavirāja heretical. On that occasion, when the assembly wanted to give examples of orthodox Gauṛīya theology, Kṛśnadeva was cited as an authority along with other illustrious Gauṛīya teachers such as Rūpa, Sanātana, and Jīva. Obviously the involvement of Jai Singh in the production of four of Kṛśnadeva’s works made those particular works eminently quotable in a debate held in Jai Singh’s own assembly hall. Regardless of that political factor, it is fairly clear that Kṛśnadeva was regarded by his peers as an authority on Gauṛīya

---

37 Haridāsa Dāsa 1957 p. 1190. Some of these works are “signed” by “Vedānta-vagīśa”, which is said to be a pen-name used by Kṛśnadeva.
38 For the date of Kṛśnadeva’s death see below. The date of the Aiśvarya-
kādambinī is clearly spelt out in the colophon: “... bhū-viyat-sindhu-
śaśāñka-śake...” (= ŚŚ1701 = 1779AD). The final verse of the Aiśvarya-
kādambinī mentions that the work was composed by the grace of Sārvabhauma Prabhu. Again, given the date of composition and the date of death of Kṛśnadeva, that reference must be some posthumous tribute to Kṛśnadeva, or it may mean that this work had been suggested by Kṛśnadeva before he passed away but not actually composed until some time later.
39 “iti śrī-kṛśnadeva-sarvabhauma-bhaṭṭācārya-kṛtā saṅkalpa-kalpa-
drumasya ṭikā samāptā.”
By 1735 we see that Krṣṇadeva’s son, Rāma-nātha Deva Śarmā, had also emerged as a public figure in Jaipur. In April of that year Rāma-nātha addressed a letter to Jai Singh concerning the treatises compiled by his father and Jai Singh. It would seem that by this stage, Krṣṇadeva’s son had already begun to share some of the responsibilities and offices which had been assumed by his father. Krṣṇadeva’s position seemed ready to be passed down from generation to generation.

However, the last years of Krṣṇadeva’s life did not run so smoothly, and his position seems to have disappeared completely. A certain amount of political intrigue is to be expected with the transfer of such large amounts of money and prestige. In this case we do not have the full story, only fragments as they appear in the various applications made at court.

In 1745, a year or so after the death of Jai Singh II, a petition was tabled through the long-serving diwan of the Jaipur court, Rāja Ayamal. Evidence was produced that now Virajānanda was doing the sevā for Rādhā-vinodī-lāl, and therefore Virajānanda requested that the grant which had previously been given to Krṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya should be transferred to his own name. This petition was accepted, and by the force of a royal parvāno, Virajānanda received that income from autumn (month of Kartik) of 1745. He was successful in getting transferred into his own name not only the village which provided the income but also the temple gardens and land.

Just a few months later, the new mahant, Virajānanda, returned to the court with another petition. Since the last application, apparently “Thākura-jī” (Rādhā-vinodī-lāl) had gone to Vṛndāvana, and Virajānanda had decided to establish deities of Sītā and Rāma in their place. He therefore requested that the grant which he had just transferred from Krṣṇadeva’s name to his own name should now be associated

---

40 Bansal 1980: 504-6; Haberman 1988 p. 103. Dr. Bansal kindly gave me a copy of the document of the settlement of the assembly. It is dated September 1732 AD (Āśvin sudṛ 5 VS1789). Details in section 3.2 below.

41 Jaipur State Archives NP vol. 19 p. 247

42 Jaipur State Archives NP vol. 19 p. 248, Parvāno sabatī Kāttī budi 8 VS1802 {18th October 1745}.

43 Jaipur State Archives NP vol. 17 p. 812. “bhog kā gā'v vā bāg vā dharti”
with the new deities of Sītā-Rāma rather than with Rādhā-vinodī-lāl.\footnote{44}

His request for a new parvāno detailing the new arrangement was accepted, and the new deities under his charge now received the full income from the village of Baḍodyā (Rs. 1375 p.a.).

What exactly was happening on Kṛṣṇadeva’s side during all this is not at all clear from the available evidence. The next we hear from that side is in 1749, when Vṛndāvana Bhaṭṭācārya, Kṛṣṇadeva’s grand son (dohitā) appeared in the Jaipur court and explained that Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya had passed away. Vṛndāvana Bhaṭṭācārya laid claim to the grant which had previously been given to his grandfather.\footnote{45} It thus appears that Kṛṣṇadeva Bhaṭṭācārya and his son, Rāma-nātha deva Śarmā, had both died. Now the son of Kṛṣṇadeva’s daughter was the eldest male heir and was in a position to claim the grant.

We had observed above that in 1735 Rāma-nātha, the son of Kṛṣṇadeva, was emerging as a successor, and we would have expected Rāma-nātha to claim his father’s post. But it appears that Rāma-nātha died before his father, because he made no such claim on his father’s post. It was Rāma-nātha’s sister’s son, Kṛṣṇadeva’s grandson, who made the claim.

It is not exactly clear when Kṛṣṇadeva passed away. From the documentary evidence produced above, however, it appears that he died between 1745 and 1749. In 1745 Virajananda claimed Kṛṣṇadeva’s right to the income of the Vinodī-lāl temple simply because he was the one now doing the service. No mention is made of Kṛṣṇadeva having passed away.\footnote{46} The deity was then recalled to Vṛndāvana, and only in 1749 does Kṛṣṇadeva’s grandson appear on the scene reporting the death of his grandfather and claiming the hereditary grants:

\footnote{44}“Ab ṭhākur-ji śri bindrāban-ji padhāryā” - Jaipur State Archives NP vol. 19 p.248. No precise date is given, simply: “ibtadāy samvat 1802 the hāsil havālo karbo kījyo mukaraṛā gā’v tan 1375 ko I.” which could be anytime between the previous decision (October 1745) and March 1746 when the new calendar year began.

\footnote{45}Jaipur State Archives ibid p. 249 and vol. 17 p. 814: “vindrābhān bhaṭṭacārij hazur ḍyō so ibtadāya sākh syālū samvat 1806 the pravāno sabati karābo kā umedvār so...”

\footnote{46}A similar situation is described below in Section 3.1.3, where Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami’s post is successfully claimed by one Viśvambhara because Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami had left his post and Viśvambhara was the one actually doing the service. Vidyābhūṣaṇa subsequently claimed the post back.
By power of the royal edict of Kartik k. 8, 1802, (18\textsuperscript{th} October, 1745AD) the mahant in question [Virajananda] received the revenue of the village because he was performing the service for Śrī Rādhā-vinodī-lāl. Then Thākur-ji [Vinodī-lāl] graced Vṛndāvana with his presence, and in his place Mahant Virajananda established the deities of Sītā-rāma in the temple, and he desired to get a royal order re-made [for revenue for the new deities]. This was issued from 1745 with respect to the village in question of the value of 1375 r/. In the meantime, a written statement was issued to the effect that the village in question had been granted to Virajananda. Then Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya passed away, and his grandson, Vṛndāvana Bhaṭṭācārya, came to court and laid a claim for the revenue of the village from the winter crop of 1749...\textsuperscript{47}

Even though the letter of 1735\textsuperscript{48} suggests that Kṛṣṇadeva’s son Rāma-nātha was by then active in Jaipur affairs, there is nowhere in the very detailed documents

---

\textsuperscript{47} Jaipur State Archives NP vol. 19 (tālukā Havelī) p. 248. Also vol.17 p. 813-814.

”...āge gā’v majkūr mu’āfik pravāno sabatī karār kārtī budi 8 samvat 1802 the Ṭhākur-ji śrī rādhā vinodī lālī kī sevā me’ mahant majkūr kai havāle karī āh tab su pāve chā so. ab ṭhākur-ji to śribindrāban-ji padhāryo ar ṭhākur-ji śrī sitārām ji mahant viarājānand-ji mindar me’ birajmān kiyo so pravāno fer karāyo cāhe so ibtādāy samvat 1802 the hāsīl havālo karbo kiyo mukarāra gāv tan 1375 ko 1. farad hu’i jyo bīc me’ mahant virajānanda-ji ne diyo cho so. ab kisandev sārbhōm bhaṭācāraj kälvās huvo ār dohīto birandāban, kisandev sārbhōm bhaṭācāraj ko, hazūr āyo so ibtādāya sākh syālū samvat 1806 the pravāno sabatī karābo kā umedvār so...”

Dr. Prof Horstman has mentioned to me in personal correspondence that there are documents in the possession of the present Rāmanandī mahant which might indicate earlier dates for this affair (ca. 1722). Not having access to those documents for this project, I have not been able to attempt to reconcile them with the Jaipur State Archives documents which clearly date these events around 1745-1749. Further research will no doubt clarify the matter, and in turn uncover new questions.

\textsuperscript{48} Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum KD # 1523, dated Baisakh budi 11 VS 1793 (6\textsuperscript{th} April 1736).
any reference to the estate of Kṛṣṇadeva passing to Rāma-nātha. When Kṛṣṇadeva’s grandson claims the grants of the Vinodī-lāla temple, he claims them on account of the death of his grandfather.

From the scant evidence available, it is not clear why Kṛṣṇadeva left his post vacant in Jaipur, especially if he had a grandson and perhaps a son who were fit to carry on. One could assume that he originally planned to return. Also, the arrangement and relationship between Virajananda and Kṛṣṇadeva is very uncertain. Whether or not Kṛṣṇadeva approved of Virajananda taking over the grant in 1745 is not explicitly mentioned in the documentary evidence, but it seems plausible that he did not approve at all, because only months later the deities were recalled to Vṛndāvana.

In any case, the Jaipur state administration was now in a fix. It had transferred Kṛṣṇadeva’s grant over to Virajananda, and had tied the grant up with the worship of the Śita-Rāma deities. It had even handed over the temple land and gardens. And now a descendant of Kṛṣṇadeva had appeared on the scene wanting to re-claim his grandfather’s grant. This claim was upheld by Īśvara Singh, the son and successor of Jai Singh II. Thus from 1749 Kṛṣṇadeva’s grandson was able to receive the income from the villages of Baḍodyā, Karjolī, and Lohar Baro.49

We noted above that the type of grant which Kṛṣṇadeva was enjoying was a punya udik. As a general rule, the punya arath and punya udik grants were granted in perpetuity, and thus it is not surprising that the grandson of Kṛṣṇadeva should have been able to re-claim the grant. What was perhaps unusual about this decision was that the post of mahant was passed on through a female descendant. In the Gaurīya sect, a daughter had no rights of succession, nor her son.50

In late 1750, Mādho Singh came to the throne in Jaipur, and Vṛndāvana Bhaṭṭācārya came to the court shortly afterwards to have his grants ratified by the new monarch, as was the custom for all grant-holders upon the coronation of a new

---

49 Jaipur State Archives NP vol. 19 p. 249, vol. 17 p. 814, and NP Ṭhākura-dvāra volume p. 66. These documents seem to have been drawn up in VS1806, with the arrangement coming into effect with the winter harvest of VS1806 (1749 AD): “ḥukam huvā ibtadāy sākh syālu samvat 1806 the. pravāno sabti likho mukararā gā'v tan darovast ek l. pravāno sabtī karār miti bhādvā budi 4 sāl samvat 1805” (note: this is the harvest year) {2nd August 1749}.

50 This fact was explicitly stated in the documents concerning one Gopinātha (Habib 1996: 140), who came to Vṛndāvana to claim his maternal grandfather’s position, but whose claim was not accepted. Instead, the lineage was traced through the male relations of his grandfather.
Meanwhile, a disciple of Virajānanda named Bālānanda had succeeded to the position of mahānt of the Rāmānandī Sītā-Rāma temple, and he began to have a strong influence on the new king.

The court records of the time show that the new maharaja held Bālānanda in great esteem:

On Cait budi 8, VS 1809 {27th March, 1753} the maharaja himself went to the camp of Bālānanda to pay him his respects, and gave him his offering of ten Mohars and two coconuts. The maharaja received the blessings of Bālānanda and gave him his offering of ten Mohars and two coconuts. The maharaja received the blessings of Bālānanda and a “dupatta” and “Prasāda”. Thereafter, the maharaja used to go to Bālānanda every year to give his offerings and receive Bālānanda’s “Prasāda”.  

Shortly after Mādho Singh ascended the throne, Bālānanda-ji contested the previous monarch’s decision to return the grants to Kṛṣṇadeva’s grandson. As leading student and heir of Virajānanda, Bālānanda claimed the grants for himself. The matter was settled in favour of Bālānanda-ji. From the winter harvest of 1752 onwards, the revenue from three villages, Baḍodya, Karjolī, and Lohar Baro, was awarded to Bālānanda-ji for the worship of Ṭhākura Sītā-Rāma-ji.  

This is the same Bālānanda who later became a very influential leader of the Rāmānandī sect in Jaipur and Braja. He is said to have mobilised the Rāmānandī ascetics into small armies. Bālānanda became a very significant player in Jaipur

---

55 This surely did not happen in 1713 as described by G.S. Ghurye (quoted in A.K. Roy 1978: 192). As documented above, Bālānanda-ji did not succeed Virajānanda-ji as mahānt until around 1749. Other details are (continued...)
politics. Some say that he even became the guru of Maharaja Madho Singh, but a formal guru/disciple relationship probably did not develop until the next generation, i.e., between Govindananda and Pratap Singh.\footnote{Horstmann [forthcoming] p.143.}

There is no evidence that Kṛṣṇadeva’s grandson got anything in place of the grants which were transferred to Bālananda’s name.\footnote{Jaipur State Archives, NP vol. 24 p. 445-6.} The deities of Rādhā-vinoda seem to have received another grant, albeit a few years later, in 1760.\footnote{Phālguṇ suḍi 3 VS 1817 {9th March 1761} - Jaipur State Archives NP. vol. Thākuradvārā p. 67.} The grant this time was an “inām”, or “gift”, which is more a reward than a grant. It is perhaps of a lower category, because it is not given in perpetuity.\footnote{Horstmann 1999 p. 37. In private correspondence Professor Horstmann informed me that documentation of this grant in the Daftar Mavajana Khurd characterises this grant as a bhog grant (to provide food offerings etc. for a deity), which in the circumstances would be more logical.}

According to A.K. Roy, it was in this year that Vinodī-lāla-ji returned to Jaipur.\footnote{A.K. Roy 1985 p. 61. Of course Roy assumes that this is Rādhā-vinoda’s first trip to Jaipur. The documentary evidence cited above makes it abundantly clear that Rādhā-vinodī-lāla had previously been in Jaipur from before 1715 until 1745.} It is not known exactly where the temple was situated at that time. It seems likely that the temple was in the Purāṇi-bastī (Old Quarter) near the Chandpol Gate. In the Jaipur State Archives there is an ambiguous reference in 1761 to Rādhā-Vinodī-lāla residing in the Purāṇi-bastī (Old Quarter) in Jaipur.\footnote{Jaipur State Archives NP, Thākuradvārā vol. p. 72. (“āgai virājaman kasbā savāṭ jaipur mai purāṇi basaṭi mai chā”).} There is also a reference in 1780 to the king and Bālananda-ji meeting at Chandpol on the way to the Vinodī-lāl temple.\footnote{Jaipur State Archives DK vol. 31 p. 681 (quoted in Horstmann [forthcoming] p. 151.).} According to oral tradition, eventually a high government official donated his own residence opposite the Tripolia gate to Vinodī-
lāla. That is where the deities presently reside.

Maharaja Mādho Singh does not seem to have been inimical to the Gaurīya devotees, and it would be prudent not to read too much into the limited detail available to us in the archival documents. The “competition” between the Gaurīya sect and the Rāmānandī sect is also a subtle question which cannot be fully described within the scope of the present work. Nevertheless, it is certain that the Gaurīyas in general and Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya in particular benefited during the reign of Jai Singh II. However, Mādho Singh’s favour towards Bālānanda seems to have swung the balance back in favour of the Rāmānandī sect, and the temple on the hill in the south western part of Jaipur seems to have been a symbol of that sea-change.

---

64 Cf. the favourable treatment of Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami during this period (section 3.1.3 below).

65 For which see Horstmann (1994b), (1999: 6) and (2000). In this regard Horstmann also refers to an unpublished MA thesis of Clementin-Ojha on the rivalry between sects in Jaipur. This important work has since been published as Le Trident au Palais: Une Cabale Anti-vishnouite dans un Royaume Hindou à l’Epoque coloniale, Paris 1999.
3.1.3 Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Another famous disciple of Viśvanātha Cakravarti was Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. Baladeva refers to himself as Viśvanātha’s student in different places of his commentary on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa. For example, at the close of the first chapter he writes:

Thus ends the first chapter of the Vaiśṇavānandini commentary written by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, student of Viśvanātha Cakravarti.66

Further on, in the tenth skandha, when Baladeva pays respects to those who gave him inspiration in writing his commentary on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, he mentions Sanatana, Śrīdhara, and Viśvanātha.67

It is unlikely that the relationship of teacher and student between Viśvanātha and Baladeva was ever formalised by a mantra initiation. Traditional sources suggest that the basis of the relationship was that Baladeva studied the Bhāgavata-purāṇa under Viśvanātha. Tribute to Viśvanātha appears often in Baladeva’s commentary on the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, but such tribute is not found elsewhere in Baladeva’s works.

Baladeva’s formal mantra initiation is traditionally said to have been from within the Mādhva sampradāya. Traditional sources seem to agree that Baladeva was born in the Bāleśvara district of Orissa in a village near Remuna. He is said to have been educated in grammar and rhetoric on the banks of the Cilkāhrad River, after which he travelled to Mysore, where he studied the Mādhva philosophy and eventually became a sannyāsī in that order. From there he returned to Orissa and settled in a Mādhva monastery in Puri. Baladeva is said to have come in contact with the Caitanya sect in Puri and become a student of Rādhā-dāmodara Goswami.68

Some time later, Baladeva came to Vṛndāvana, where he is said to have

---

66 Vaiśṇavānandini commentary on Bhāgavata-purāṇa 1/1 close: “iti viśvanātha-cakravarti-śiṣya-baladeva-vidyābhūṣaṇa-racitāyāṁ vaiśnavānandinyāṁ tīkāyāṁ prathamo ‘dhyāyah”.


studied the *Bhagavata-purāṇa* under Viśvanātha Cakravarti. When exactly Baladeva came to Vṛndāvana is not known, but it would appear that it was some time after 1712. In 1712, the Gaurīya ascetics living in Vṛndāvana and Rādhā-kunḍa were asked to give their opinion on the correct behaviour for renunciants, and some sixty prominent Gaurīya ascetics signed the declaration, including both Viśvanātha Cakravarti and Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya.

However, Baladeva’s name does not appear on that list at all. Both archival documents and sectarian tradition link Baladeva very strongly with the temple of Rādhā-Śyāmasundara.69 However, in that document of 1712 we find no mention of Baladeva among the devotees living in the *kuṇḍa* of Śyāmānanda Gosāī.70 This is not decisive evidence, because he may have been absent at the time of that debate, but it certainly raises the possibility that Baladeva had not arrived in Vṛndāvana by 1712.

Moreover, as Baladeva’s death is documented in 1793, it is unlikely that he would have been born any earlier than 1700. In addition to this, tradition ascribes to him quite a full youth before arriving in Vṛndāvana: studying grammar in Orissa, training as a Mādhva *sannyāsī* in Mysore, returning to settle in Puri, becoming influenced by the Gaurīya sect there, studying under Rādhā-dāmodara Dāsa there, and then finally travelling to Braja.

In the absence of any positive evidence, it is difficult to propose a date for Baladeva’s arrival in Braja before 1730, taking into account that it is likely that he was born after 1700 and that it would take him thirty years to achieve everything ascribed to him by tradition before coming to Vṛndāvana.

Such a proposition finds indirect support in the absence of references to Baladeva in available documentary evidence until 1741 and the absence of any dated works before 1764.71 Of course, earlier dates are possible, but we simply do not have evidence of them.

One of the earliest works written by Baladeva would seem to be a commentary on the *Brahma-sūtras* commissioned by the maharaja of Jaipur. In the personal library of the maharajas of Jaipur we find a manuscript of a terse sūtra-wise

---

69 Documents will be cited below. Traditional evidence is reported by D.S. Dāsa (1992) and Caturvedi (1976: 233).

70 Nor is there mention of any of the aliases which are advanced for Baladeva: Govinda Dāsa, Ekāntī-govinda Dāsa, Dāmodara Vipra (cf. the above mentioned traditional accounts).

71 Details below.
commentary on the Brahma-sūtras called the Brahma-sūtra-kārikā-bhāṣya. The manuscript bears no date, but it seems obvious it was commissioned by Jai Singh II, who ruled between 1700 and 1743. Jai Singh commissioned a similar work in 1730. It is likely that around this time, the maharaja amassed the formidable collection of Brahma-sūtra commentaries by various teachers from different sects which is still present today in the Pothikhana at Jaipur. It was perhaps at this time that the absence of a Gauṅya commentary on the Brahma-sūtras came to the maharaja’s attention and he commissioned Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāṇa to provide one.

Another work which seems to have been written in this early part of Baladeva’s career is the Prameya-ratnāvalī. The work itself bears no date, but there is a commentary on this work traditionally attributed to Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya, who died sometime before 1749.

Incidentally, provided the attribution of this work to Kṛṣṇadeva is correct, then one can be sure that the Govinda-bhāṣya was also composed before 1749, as the Govinda-bhāṣya is mentioned in the first line of that commentary on the Prameya-ratnāvalī:

A commentary on the Brahma-sūtras called the Govinda-bhāṣya was composed by Baladeva, the pure devotee of Govinda (Govindaikānti), later known as “Vidyābhūṣāṇa”. Then some of his disciples asked him about the philosophical underpinnings of that commentary, so he

---

72 Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, Pothikhana Catalogue # 6079.
73 Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum Pothikhana Catalogue # 5850.
74 Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum Kapaddvara Catalogue # 1519. If the Gopīnātha mentioned in this letter is the nephew of Gopī-ramaṇa who died in 1718 (Habib 1996: 140), then it would appear that as early as 1718 Jai Singh was considering commissioning a commentary on the Brahma-sūtras from the Gauṅya sect. More details can be found in section 3.2 below.
75 The commentary closes with a verse which describes its author as “Vedānta-vāgīśa”. Tradition within the Gauṅya sect says that this is a pen name of Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya (Haridāsa Dāsa 1957: 1191 & D.S. Dāsa 1992: 95).
76 Refer to section 3.1.2 above.
Although there is no available documentation concerning Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa’s life before 1741, it seems reasonable to assume that he was a very influential figure from quite early on in his career.

In 1741, Maharaja Jai Singh visited Vṛndāvana and met personally with “Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami”. Vṛndāvana seems to have been Baladeva’s place of residence around this time. On the occasion, the Swami organised a feast (mhaco), and Jai Singh presented Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami with one hundred rupees.  

The feast, or “mhaco” (i.e mahottsava), mentioned in this document may well have been a particular feast prepared after the death of a religious dignitary. If that were the case, the meaning would be “Vidyābhūṣaṇa performed the mourning ceremony for the goswami”. It is possible that Goswami Vidyābhūṣaṇa became the mahant of the Govindadeva temple in Vṛndāvana after this function.

A letter of 1742, written by several distinguished mahants to Jai Singh, describes Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami as being responsible for the service of the Govindadeva temple in Vṛndāvana. Moreover, it seems that by this time Baladeva was already a recognised leader of the Gauḍīya sect, since in the same letter the custodian of the Govindadeva temple in Jaipur assured Maharaja Jai Singh that he and the other mahants would consult Śrī Vidyābhūṣaṇa before appointing new mahants.

77 Kāntī-mālā commentary on Prameya-ratnāvalī verse 1: “vidyābhūṣaṇāparanāmnā baladeva-śrīgovindaikāntinā brahma-sūtreṣu govindabhāṣyābhidhānaṁ vyākhyānaṁ viracitam. atha kaiśicī chiṣyair bhāṣya-prameyāni paripṛṣṭah sa tāni saṅkṣepa....”. Details on the significance of the different names are given below.

78 Jaipur State Archives NP vol. 5 p. 525: “Gusā‘ī Vidyābhūṣaṇ. Samvat 1798: miti jēth sudi 10 ne` behalā the vidyābhūṣan vyandarāban-jī me` gusā‘ī ko mhaco kiā. ti ne 100” {25th April 1741 AD}.

79 For this information I am grateful to Shivchand Tivari of the Jaipur State Archives, Bikaner,

80 It is very interesting that Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa should be described as Gusā‘ī (Goswami), when it is said that he was not born of Brahmin parents (e.g., Elkmann 1986: 26).

81 Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum Kapadvara Catalogue # 1531 Baisakh budi 6 VS 1799 {14th May or April 1742}. The above details are (continued...)
The documentary evidence of the time also links Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa to the Rādhā-Śyāmasundara temple. This temple was situated in Vṛndāvana near the kuṇja of Jīva Goswami. Baladeva’s connection with this temple can be traced through Rādhā-dāmodara, his guru from Puri, who was initiated in the line of Śyāmānanda, the founder of the Rādhā-Śyāmasundara temple in Vṛndāvana.

The Rādhā-Śyāmasundara temple in Vṛndāvana had been receiving pecuniary assistance from the Amber state since 1711. In that year, Jai Singh’s younger brother, Vijai Singh, made a grant in favour of Rādhā-Śyāmasundara-ji in Vṛndāvana. This was during a short period in which Vijai Singh had usurped power from his elder brother and was issuing royal edicts in his own name.

There is no evidence that Baladeva was at all involved with these grants during this early period. As discussed above, evidence of his involvement has thus far only been found from 1741 onwards, and it is quite likely that Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami did not even arrive in Braj until well after 1711.

The sanad of 1711 is evidence of Vijai Singh’s general support for the Gaurīya community, as it names three Gaurīya deities (Govinda, Gopīnātha and Śyāmasundara-rāya) and assigns three villages (Dāhārā, Sālīmpur, and Balherō) to
them. From the Jaipur State Archives document, it is clear that this was not a shared
grant, but that each temple received one village. The third village, Balhero, was
assigned solely to Rādhā-śyāmasundara.

By 1712-1713 Jai Singh had re-claimed his position as monarch of Amber
and imprisoned his younger brother, Vijai Singh.\(^8^5\) Jai Singh immediately re-issued
a grant under his own authority for Govindaji’s village, Salīmpur.\(^8^6\) A few years
later, in 1720, Jai Singh also decided to re-issue under his own authority the grant
pertaining to Rādhā-śyāmasundara’s village, Balhero. He took the opportunity to
exchange the village of Balhero with the village of Somlāḍāgar.\(^8^7\)

After the death of Jai Singh II, the grant was renewed by his son Īśvarī Singh
in 1745. Shortly afterwards it was reported to the Divān at Jaipur that Vidyābhūṣāṇa
Swami had been performing the service for Rādhā-śyāmasundara, but had for some
reason suspended his service and had gone off with the grant documentation
(parvāṇo). Viśvambhara Adhikārī had taken up the post of head priest in
Vidyābhūṣāṇa’s absence, and in 1749 successfully applied to have the grant
documentation re-issued in his own name.\(^8^8\)

The available archival documents give no explanation as to why
Vidyābhūṣāṇa Swami stopped performing the service for Rādhā-śyāmasundara, nor
do they give any indication of when he started that service and exactly when he
stopped it. A statement by Horstmann (1996: 186) adds more information:

....there is a document of V.S. 1799/ A.D. 1742 which informs us that
Vidyābhūṣāṇa was in charge of the service of Śrī Govindadeva in
Vṛndāvana (sevā vidyābhūṣāṇa karai chai).

Thus it would seem that Vidyābhūṣāṇa was the head priest of two temples in
Vṛndāvana: Govindadeva and Rādhā-śyāmasundara. At some time before 1749, he
relinquished the service of the Rādhā-śyāmasundara temple and retained only his
service to Govindadeva. It is tempting to speculate that he had been serving Rādhā-

\(^8^5\) Bhatnagar 1974 p. 87.
\(^8^6\) Jaipur State Archives: NP Pragnā: हिन्दों, गैव: Sālimapura p. 957;
Sāvana budi 14 VS1769 {31th August 1712} parvāṇā Āsoj sudi 9 VS1771
{21st June 1714}.

\(^8^7\) Jaipur State Archives: NP (pragana हिन्दों) p. 951, Parvāṇo sabtī Pos
sudi 8 1777 (8th December 1720).

\(^8^8\) Ibid.: Parvano sabtī Māgaśra sudi 2 VS 1806: “sevā vidyābhūṣāṇa karai
chai so mokāf kiyō ar pravāṇo le uth gayo” {11th December 1749}. 
śyāmasundara for some time and that after being appointed mahant of the Govindadeva temple he suspended his responsibilities in the service of Rādhā-
śyāmasundara.

Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami certainly held some position of prominence in Vṛndāvana. In 1751 the new Maharaja of Jaipur, Mādho Singh, received him as “Goswami Vidyābhūṣaṇa of Vṛndāvana” and, as his father had done ten years earlier, offered him a hundred rupees and a valuable cloth as a parting gift.89

Even though Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa had ceased personally doing the service for the Rādhā-śyāmasundara deity in Vṛndāvana and was acting throughout this period as mahant of the Govindadeva temple in Vṛndāvana, nevertheless Vidyābhūṣaṇa’s name continued to be associated with the temple of Rādhā-
śyāmasundara.

In fact, around this time it seems that Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa opened a second Rādhā-śyāmasundara temple, this time in Jaipur. We noted above that the charge of the Rādhā-śyāmasundara temple in Vṛndāvana had been transferred to Viśvambhara around 1747, after Vidyābhūṣaṇa had discontinued his service there. In 1751, around the time of Vidyābhūṣaṇa’s visit to Mādho Singh, the matter again came before the divān of Jaipur, who determined that Viśvambhara should keep the revenue from the village of Somlādāgar for the service of Rādhā-śyāmasundara in Vṛndāvana and that Vidyābhūṣaṇa should be allotted the revenue from a village called Narasinghapur for the worship of “Vijai Śyāmasundara-ji who resides in the Vidyābhūṣaṇa temple in the city of Jaipur.”90

89 Jaipur State Archives, NP (nām jāt gusā’t) p. 452. “bābat vidā kā bakhasyā”.

90 Jaipur State Archives, NP, (pragnā Hīndaun, tapa Khoх, gāv Narasinghapur) p. 258-9. The documentation of these two grants is somewhat intertwined and can be a little opaque at times. The above entry comes under the heading of the Vṛndāvana temple (“bābat bhog thākura śrī śyāmasundara-ji virājmān śrī brindāvan-ji”), presumably because the divān was asked to settle the revenue question between Viśvambhara and Vidyābhūṣaṇa.

It is clearly stated that Viśvambhara was awarded the revenue of the village of Somlādāgar to worship Rādhā-śyāmasundara in Vṛndāvana. At first glance it seems contradictory that Vidyābhūṣaṇa also continued to serve Thākura-ji and that he was also given the revenue of a different village, Narasinghapur (ibid p.260). A letter of the same year (ibid p.261) confirms that Mahant Vidyābhūṣaṇa received this village because he was performing the worship of Śrī Śyāmasundara-ji. However, later

(continued...
The fact that this temple came to be called the “Vidyābhūṣāṇa Mandir” means that at some period of his life Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāṇa spent considerable time there in Jaipur. It also indicates that he was a well-known personality, because Gauḍīya temples were invariably named after their presiding deities, but in this case the establishment was named “Vidyābhūṣāṇa Mandir” after its presiding devotee.\(^9^1\)

In 1754, a devotee named Rām-lāl was registered in the Jaipur court documents as “Rāma-lāl, mahānt (of) Vidyābhūṣāna’s Śrī Śyāmasundara-ji.”\(^9^2\) Rāma-lāl received a gift from the maharaja in the course of a traditional rite of succession of mahants called the mātami.\(^9^3\) The document does not specify whether “Thākura Śyāmasundara-ji” was in Vraḍhavana or in Jaipur. However, it seems obvious that this was the Jaipur temple because the mahānt of the Vraḍhavana temple was Viśvambhara, not Rām-lāl as mentioned here. In fact, the reference to this temple as “Vidyābhūṣāna’s Śrī Śyāmasundara-ji” was probably enough to distinguish the Jaipur temple, as opposed to the Vraḍhavana temple, which was under the care of Viśvambhara.

The very fact that Rām-lāl was “the mahānt of Vidyābhūṣāna’s Śrī Śyāmasundara-ji” would suggest that Vidyābhūṣāna Swami did not himself

---

\(^{90}\) (...continued)

\(^{91}\) There is no trace of this temple in the present day Jaipur city. The archival material repeats many times that it was in the city (kasthā) of Jaipur. I have not been able to establish the whereabouts of the Vidyābhūṣāna temple despite asking many of the old Gauḍīya vaisnāvas of Jaipur. Nor could the Devasthāna Vibhāga in Jaipur offer any assistance.

\(^{92}\) Jaipur State Archives, Tojī Dastur Kaumvār, Bundle 34 (Dastur Śyāmī) doc # 368, Bhādvā buḍī 13 VS 1811 {15\(^{th}\) September, 1754}. “mheńt rām lāl, vidyābhūṣan kā ṭhā[kur] śrī syāmasundar-ji.” This could also mean “mahānt Rām Lāl, (disciple ) of Vidyābhūṣāna (of the) Śyāmasundara-ji (temple).”

\(^{93}\) For a discussion of the mātami see Hortstmann (1999: 9fn & 37).
personally perform the service even though the Rādhā-śyāmasundara deities and temple in Jaipur were still somehow considered as Vidyābhūṣaṇa’s. The Vidyābhūṣaṇa Mandir would thus seem to be an institution bearing his name, and over which he had control, but the worship there seems to have been organised by a local mahant, in this case Rām-lāl.

As for Vidyābhūṣaṇa himself, he seems to have still been occupying the post of head priest at the Govinda-ji temple in Vṛndāvana. In 1755 and 1756, he made two official visits to the then Maharaja of Jaipur, Mādhava Singh, and was received as “Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami, of the Govindadeva-ji temple”.94 As part of the traditional formalities, Baladeva received some valuable cloth as a gift. Despite maintaining a presence in Jaipur and arranging for the worship of Vijai Rādhā-śyāmasundara there, nevertheless Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami was still clearly identified with the Govindadeva temple.

It is not absolutely clear what post Baladeva held at the Govindadeva-ji temple, as it is also assumed that the post of mahant was handed down through interrelated Bengali brahmins.95 Nevertheless, the documentary information calls him “Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami, of the Govindadeva-ji temple” and says quite clearly that he was in charge of the service of Śrī Govindadeva temple in Vṛndāvana. That connection is underlined by the fact that Baladeva named his famous Brahma-sūtra commentary Govinda-bhāṣya. In the Siddhānta-ratha, Baladeva’s appendix to that book, Baladeva gives a hint as to why he named that book after the deity of Govindadeva:

Hail to the magnanimous Śrī Govinda, the dear friend of Rādhā, who delights his friends! He decorated me with knowledge and thus made me famous as “vidyā-bhūṣaṇa”. In a dream he indicated [that I should write] that commentary.

The traditions surrounding the composition of this work are discussed in the following section. However, for the purposes of this section it is sufficient to note

---

94 Jeth budi 1 and Phāguna sudi 4 VS 1812 (26th April 1755 & 5th March 1756), Jaipur State Archives, Tojī Dastur Kaumvār, Bundle 34 (Dastur Syāmī) doc # 391. Again the documentation does not clearly state whether this Govindadeva temple is the one in Jaipur or Vṛndāvana. However, on the strength of the Horstmann’s evidence (1996: 186) we can safely assume that Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa was the mahant of the Govindadeva temple in Vṛndāvana.

95 Horstmann 1994 a) p. 84.
that tradition links the composition of this work with the deity of Śrī Govindadeva in Jaipur.

In 1757 during the Holi celebrations there was a horrific wholesale massacre of civilians and sādhus in Mathura and Vṛndāvana. The marauding troops of Ahmed Shah Abdali were let loose to plunder and pillage as they pleased, and they were paid five rupees for each infidel head they delivered to the chief minister’s residence in Mathura. One eyewitness report states that “you could only pick your way with difficulty, owing to the quantity of bodies lying about”. 96

Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami was one of the lucky ones who escaped the appalling carnage. What effect the massacre had on his Govindadeva temple in Vṛndāvana is not documented, but one would imagine that as the most prominent Hindu shrine in the whole area, it must have attracted special attention. In fact, sādhus were singled out for special treatment:

Everywhere in lane and bazar lay the headless trunks of the slain; and the whole city was burning...I saw a number of Bairagi and Sanyasi huts huddled close together... In each hut lay a severed head with the head of a dead cow applied to its mouth and tied to it with a rope around its neck. 97

Three years later in 1760, it was reported to the court in Jaipur that Viśvambhara, the head priest of the Śyāmasundara temple in Vṛndāvana, was no longer performing the service in the temple properly, nor was the deity being offered the requisite daily food offerings. 98 Mahant Vidyābhūṣaṇa had stepped in and taken over the service there, and thus it was decided that the revenue grant for the service of Rādhā-Śyāmasundara, which had been registered under the name of Viśvambhara since 1747, should be re-registered under the name of Mahant Vidyābhūṣaṇa starting from the autumn harvest of 1760. 99

There are a number of letters preserved in the Jaipur State Archives written

---

96 Samin, translated and annotated by Irvine (1907: 60-63), quoted in Entwistle (1987: 197-8), who also gives other sources.
97 Ibidem.
in Sanskrit by “Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami” to Mādhava Singh. All these letters bear the invocatio (letterhead) “Śrī Śyāmasundaro Bhagavān Vijayate” or some variation of that formula. Therefore, it would appear that these letters were written in the period after 1760 (when Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa resumed the service of Rādhā-Śyāmasundara) and before 1768 (when Mādhava Singh passed away).

These are mostly formulaic letters, offering stock passages of praise to the monarch, such as:

Hail to His Royal Highness Mādhava Singh, whose mind is like a bee drinking the nectar of the lotus flower feet of Śrī Śyāmasundara, whose enemies are like owls trying to imitate the sun-like intensity of his arms...[etc for ten lines]. Ever may Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami, your Highness’s well-wisher, simply contemplate his worshippable deity. All is well here. At the time of worship here we always wish the same for you there with your family.... Please accept this bhagavat-prasāda and letter I have sent. Written on the sixth day of the dark fortnight of the month of Sahas [Mārga-śīrṣa].

Similar letters were sent by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa on special festive days such as Vijaya Daśāmi (Dussherra) and Dholotsava (Holi). On such occasions Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami sent special prasāda from the celebrations of that day or some cloth that has been used by the deity in the course of the festivities.

It is thus evident that Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa was careful to maintain his relationship with the maharaja. The existence of many other similar letters from other temples addressed to the maharaja would suggest that this was a traditional practice for the head priests under the patronage of the Jaipur state.

In 1764 Baladeva completed his commentary on Rūpa Goswami’s Stava-mālā. Although Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa was a prolific writer, only a handful of his

100 Jaipur State Archives Kharitā bundle 4/1 documents # 139, 175, 211.
101 This is a term used by Horstmann (1999: 45) following Bresslau and Busse. As Horstmann is the only person to have attempted such an analysis for the Rajasthani documents, and as she has done it particularly well, I have followed her terminology.
102 Jaipur State Archives Kharitā bundle 4/1, document # 75.
103 Jaipur State Archives Kharitā bundle 4/1, documents # 139 and 211.
104 Ibidem, various documents.
works are dated, and this is the earliest dated work currently available.105

The literary works generally attributed to Baladeva are very broad in scope, and they are evidence of great scholarship in many different fields. These include devotional works (such as the Aīśvarya-kādambini), commentaries on devotional works (such as the Bhagavad-gītā, Bhāgavata-purāṇa, and Laghu-bhāgavatāmṛta), many works on Vedānta philosophy (such as Siddhānta-ratna, Siddhānta-darpana, Vedānta-śyāmāntaka, and Prameya-ratnāvalī), commentaries on works of Vedānta philosophy (such as several commentaries on the Vedānta-sūtras), works on poetics and grammar (such as Sāhitya-kaumudi, Vyākaraṇa-kaumudi, Kāvya-kaustubha and Pada-kaustubha) as well as commentaries on works on poetics and grammar (such as Rūpa’s Nāṭaka-candrikā and on his own Sāhitya-kaumudi).106

There are two important works of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāna held in the Pothikhāna of the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum in Jaipur: the Brahma-sūtra-kārikā-bhāṣya and the Tatvā-dīpikā. Neither of these two works are mentioned in academic or traditional lists of Baladeva’s works. It is more than likely that they were both commissioned personally by Jai Singh II and not widely distributed otherwise. Hence they have remained relatively unknown until a catalogue of the maharajas’ Pothikhāna was drawn up recently.107

The first work, the Brahma-sūtra-kārikā-bhāṣya, will be discussed at more length in the following section as it is a significant commentary on the Brahma-sūtras. The other work, the Tatvā-dīpikā, is a Vedāntic ontological work. It is significant from an historical point of view in that it ties together several of the strands of the life of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāna. The Tatvā-dīpikā opens with a simple homage to Śrī Govindadeva: “śrī-govindadeva-pādāravindebhyo namah”. This is yet another confirmation of Baladeva’s connection with the Govindadeva temple.

At the same time, the handwriting of the Tatvā-dīpikā is identical with the handwriting in the letters written by the Vidyābhūṣāna Swami of the Rādhā Śyāmasundara Temple. This dispels any doubt that there might be two Vidyābhūṣānas, one from the Govindadeva temple and one from the Rādhā-Śyāmasundara temple.

105 The Prameya-ratnāvalī was certainly written much earlier than this, as it has a commentary by Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya, who died before 1749.


The Tattva-dipikā ends with mention of Pīṭāmbara Dāsa, who was one of the preceptors of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami. This same Pīṭāmbara is referred to with respect by Baladeva in several of his works, notably at the close of the Siddhānta-ratna, an appendix to the Govinda-bhāṣya. In that work Baladeva says that the ideas of this book were compiled by the grace of Pīṭāmbara. Interestingly, the Siddhānta-ratna begins with a homage to Śrī-Śyāmasundara.

Therefore, the “Mahant Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami” of the Jaipur records is certainly the same as the “Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa” of Govinda-bhāṣya fame. And likewise it is certain that the Mahant Vidyābhūṣaṇa of the Rādhā-Śyāmasundara temple is the same person as the “Goswami Vidyābhūṣaṇa of the Govindadeva temple”.

Baladeva’s contemporary, Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya, explicitly states in his commentary on Baladeva’s Prameya-ratnāvalī that “Baladeva, the pure devotee of Govinda ("Govindaikānti"), was later known as Vidyābhūṣaṇa”.

In 1768 Prthvī Singh became Maharaja of Jaipur, and shortly afterwards


109 Siddhānta-ratna 8.35. There is doubt as to the authorship of this commentary on this book, but there is general agreement that Baladeva wrote the mūla text itself (S.N. Dasgupta 1922: IV 438; A.K. Majumdar 1967: 282; S. Narang 1984: 4; D.S. Dāsa 1992 p. 83).

110 Having responsibility for two temples seems to have been common enough. Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya was connected with both Rādhā-vinoda and Rādhā-madana-mohana (cf. section 3.1.2.).

111 “Kānti-mālā” commentary on Prameya-ratnāvalī verse 1: “vidyābhūșaṇāparanāmmā baladeva-śrīgovindaikāntinā brahma-sūtreṣu govindabhāṣyābhidhānaṁ vyākhyānaṁ viracitam.”

It is hard to say how much one can make of the phrase “vidyābhūșaṇa-apara-nāmā”, which literally means “whose later name was Vidyābhūṣaṇa”. The word “apara” can also mean “other”, so the phrase might simply mean “whose other name was Vidyābhūṣaṇa”. The former interpretation reflects the tradition that Baladeva received the epithet “Vidyābhūṣaṇa” as a result of the fame he received after composing the Govinda-bhāṣya. That tradition finds its origin in the verse from Baladeva’s Siddhānta-ratna (8.31) quoted above: “vidyā-rūpam bhūṣaṇam me pradāya...”. 
in 1770 he renewed all of Baladeva’s land grants, as was the custom each time a new maharaja came to the throne.\footnote{Jaipur State Archives NP vol. Thākura-dvārā I p.645 and II p. 607-8; vol 18, p. 263; vol. Hindon p. 954. All the grants for the various villages were prepared on Pos südi 2 saṁvat 1827 {19th December 1770 AD}.} Baladeva Vidyabhūṣaṇa seems to have gone personally to Jaipur to oversee the process. The maharaja received him as “Vidyabhūṣaṇa Goswami of Vṛndāvana” and marked the occasion by offering Vidyabhūṣaṇa a gift of one hundred rupees, just as his father and grandfather had done before him.\footnote{Jaipur State Archives NP Vol. Kaumvār, Jāt Gusāi p. 493. This entry is registered under saṁvat 1828, but it quotes the same treasury sanction date (Pos südi 2) as reported in the previous footnote in saṁvat 1827. The difference of one year may be due to the former being a phasli sāl, although the prefix sāl is not found in the documents. The gift seems to have been offered two weeks after the settling of the grants, i.e., on Māgaśra budī 14.}

By this time, Vidyabhūṣaṇa Swami must have become a very senior member of the community. We noted above that even as early as 1741 he was already being consulted regarding the appointing of new mahants and that he himself was the mahant of the Govindadeva temple in Vṛndāvana. In 1771 his reputation can only have been all the more enhanced after having held the position of mahant at the temples of Govindadeva and Śyāmasundara for another thirty years and after composing so many books. In 1777 we see that his signature was sought as a witness to an administrative document from the archives of the Madana-mohana temple.\footnote{Vṛndāvana Research Institute Microfilm T2 document # 66: “atra sākṣi mahant vidyā bhūṣaṇa-ji”. Unfortunately, the photocopy I made during fieldwork of this project turned out to be unintelligible, and I had made no other notes on this document other than that the matter was in Rajasthanī and the document was dated VS 1834.} He seems to have been acting in the capacity of a “community elder”.

Vidyabhūṣaṇa Swami continued writing well into his old age, as we have two dated works from 1779 and 1781: the Aśvarya-kādambinī and the Kāvya-kaustubha respectively.

The Aśvarya-kādambinī ends by saying:

By the grace of Sārvabhauma Prabhu let this vast rain-cloud (kādambinī) of opulence (aśvarya) gather quickly in order to extinguish the fire-like suffering of those sādhus whose hearts are like...
parched and faded lotuses due to the lack of a description of the opulence of the (soothing) moon of Braja, Kṛṣṇa.\footnote{Aīśvarya-kādambini colophon: “\textit{aīśvarya-prakīrtitarād vṛajā-vidhoh kṛṣṇasya ye sādhavaḥ stāpāgni-pratilīḍha-hṛt-sarasāṇaḥ mlāyanti śuṣya-tviṣaḥ, teśaṁ tāpa-vimardanāya viśādā śrī śaivabhuma prabhoh kārunyād uditeyam āśu bhavatād aīśvarya kādambini”}.}

The reference to Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācāryya is a little puzzling since the work is dated 1779 and, as noted above, Kṛṣṇadeva’s death is documented some thirty years previously, between 1745 and 1749.\footnote{D.S. Dāsa refers to a commentary on this work written by Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya. If the date of composition is indeed 1779, then it is impossible for Kṛṣṇadeva to have written a commentary on this work since he had been dead for over thirty years. If he did actually write a commentary, then the date of composition must be wrong. Or if that date is right, then the records documenting his death must be inaccurate. The commentary was most likely written by somebody else.} When Baladeva says that the work was composed “by the mercy of Sārvabhauma Prabhu”, it must refer to the inspiration for the work. Perhaps it refers to something from thirty years beforehand, perhaps an unfinished manuscript by Kṛṣṇadeva or a suggestion by Kṛṣṇadeva implemented posthumously by Baladeva.\footnote{Entwistle 1987 p. 213. Horstmann [forthcoming] p. 140.}

There are no more historical records pertaining to Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāna other than those which record his passing away in 1793. The last twelve years of his life are thus undocumented. After the death of Mādho Singh I in 1768, a sequence of minors came to the Jaipur throne, causing instability and underhand diplomacy to develop.\footnote{Entwistle 1987 p. 211.}

Moreover the Empire, in which Jaipur had thrived since the time of Akbar, was now in tatters, and the rise of Maratha power in Northern India began to marginalise the rulers of Jaipur. By 1789, three years before the death of Vidyābhūṣāna Swami, the Marathas had established complete control over the Braj region and had begun to replace the system of \textit{jagir} land grants which the ruling house of Jaipur/ Amber had built up in the area over the past two centuries.\footnote{Entwistle 1987 p. 211.} This was the effective end of an era of patronage of the temples of Braja by the Rajput
nobiles. By this time, the British were well-established in East India and were waiting in the wings for their opportunity, which would come some twenty years later.

The passing away of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa is recorded in the following document of 1793:

**Protocol Charity for Swamis**

In the name of: Sādū Caran, disciple of Mahant Vidyābhūṣaṇa, *mahant* of the Thākura Śrī Śyāmasundar-ji [temple].

Year: VS 1850 {1793 AD}.

Dated: the fourteenth day of the bright fortnight of the month of Bhādvā

{the nineteenth of September}

Place: Sawā’ī Jaipur

Mahant Vidyābhūṣaṇa passed away, and at his condolence ceremony the abovementioned [Sādū Caran] stood in the Govindadeva-ji temple and had a Tulsī-wood necklace tied around his neck and also received a fine decorative cloth to the value of ----.

Mahant Sādū Caran gave a shawl to His Majesty as an offering. The sum of Rs. 1836, a.2 p.3 was settled.121

This document does not record the date on which Mahant Vidyābhūṣaṇa passed away; it simply records the date of his *mātami tīkā*, literally the “condolence anointing” ceremony. This is a ceremony which both “mourns” (mātami) the death of a *mahant* and anoints the successor with a special marking on the forehead (tīkā). Therefore, the document tells us that Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami passed away shortly before this. The document states explicitly that the events took place in Jaipur. As

---

120 After Independence a government department of the Rajasthan state government called the Devasthāna Vibhāga took over responsibility for all the temples previously supported by the Rajput maharajas. The Gokulānanda / Rādhā-vinoda temple in Vṛndāvana was still until recently officially under their care.

121 Jaipur State Archives, Tojī Dastur Kaumwār Bundle 34 document 117.
Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami was the *mahant* of two temples in Vṛṇḍāvana, one can only assume that he passed away there and that after the mourning formalities had been completed there, his successor, Sādu Caran, made his way to Jaipur to have the grant documents relating to the Rādhā-Śyāmasundara temple transferred into his own name. Thus one would expect Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami to have died a few months earlier.

Traditional evidence would tend to support this, as a ceremony commemorating the passing away of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa is observed within the Gauṛīya community every year on the Jyeṣṭha ʻṣukla 10, which is about two and a half months before the date recorded above for the mātami ʻṭikā ceremony. It is an interesting reflection on the cyclical nature of “traditional history” that the precise day of the lunar calendar was marked, but the year was not marked. The day is important for traditional calculations of mourning periods and yearly observances, but the precise point on a time line does not seem to have been a priority.

In any case, from a combination of archival evidence and tradition, it would appear that Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa passed away on the Jyeṣṭha ʻṣukla 10 VS 1850, or the nineteenth of June, 1793 AD.

The document of 1793 quoted above gives us some interesting details on how a mātami ʻṭikā ceremony was conducted. A few months after the passing away of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami, his successor made the trip to Jaipur, and a ceremony was held in the Govindadeva-ji temple there. We may infer that the priests of the Govindadeva-ji temple were in charge of the ceremony of anointing a new *mahant*. Horstmann suggests that the custodians of the Govindadeva temple had long been considered responsible for the administration of land grants on behalf of other temples in Vṛṇḍāvana.

We also noted above that in 1742 the *mahant* of the Jaipur Govindadeva temple in Jaipur gave an undertaking that before appointing new *mahants* he and others would consult with Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami, the *mahant* of the Govindadeva temple in Vṛṇḍāvana. This confirms that the priests of the Govindadeva temple in Jaipur were usually involved in appointing a new *mahant*, as suggested in the document describing the mātami ʻṭikā of Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami.

The phrase “mātami ʻṭikā” indicates that an integral part of the ceremony was the anointing of the forehead with a marking of religious significance (ʻṭikā). In this

---

122 D.S. Dāsa 1992 p. 82.
123 Horstmann 1999 p. 123.
case, that āśā seems to have been applied by the priests of the Govindadeva temple in Jaipur. This would signify that the new mahant had been recognised by his peers as successor to Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami.

Moreover, Sādū Caran was asked to stand in the Govindadeva temple whilst Maharaja Pratāpa Singh ("Śrī-ji") attached a necklace of Tulsī wood to his neck and offered him a piece of fine decorative cloth. These are the items of customary charity protocol (dastūr) recorded in the maharaja’s dastūr records of the occasion. These actions would signify that Sādū Caran had been recognised by the state as successor to Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami concerning the revenue grants in favour of Rādhā-śyāmasundara in Vṛndāvana.

In return, the new mahant offered the maharaja a dūsālo, a kind of thick woollen shawl, and it was decided that the new mahant should give an “offering” (nījrānā) of 1,835 rupees. The sum of money referred to here is the mātamī matlabā, a kind of death duty, which Sādū Caran would have been required to pay as the successor to an estate. The sum due was calculated in differing percentages according to the type of revenue grant. In this case, religious grants in the personal name of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa would have been taxed at half the ordinary rate, and revenue grants for the food offerings to the deities Rādhā-śyāmasundara would have been taxed at one quarter. The full sum due was calculated at eighteen hundred and thirty six rupees, two anna and three paisa. This is a fabulous sum for those days, but it gives an idea of the extent of the estate of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami.126

Worship of the Rādhā-śyāmasundara deity in Vṛndāvana continues to this day, as does worship in the Govindadeva temple in Vṛndāvana. However, as was mentioned above, there is no sign of the Vidyābhūṣaṇa Mandir in Jaipur at present. What happened to that establishment will remain unknown until new evidence comes to light.

There is some indication that the Vijai Śyāmasundara deities installed by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa in Jaipur in his Vidyābhūṣaṇa Mandir were eventually taken to Vṛndāvana and installed beside the original Rādhā-śyāmasundara deities there. There are two large sets of Rādhā-śyāmasundara deities in the Rādhā-śyāmasundara temple in Vṛndāvana at present, and the oral tradition handed down within that temple has it that the larger of the two sets was installed by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa.

---

125 Horstmann 1999 p. 37.

126 To give some idea of the relative size of the estate, we can compare the tax assessment of 1,835 r./ on Baladeva’s estate to the assessment of 6,846 r./ on Bholānāth, who inherited the estate of the Govindadeva temple in 1935 (some 142 years later).
The current head priest of that temple also claims that Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāṇa was cremated and his ashes buried in the temple grounds there. Directly at the foot of the back wall of the present temple structure there are three small mounds and a small cenotaph. The mound just to the right of the cenotaph is said to mark the *puṣpa samādhi* of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāṇa.¹²⁷

¹²⁷ Oral evidence of Kṛṣṇa Gopālānandadeva Goswami of the Rādhā-śyāmasundara temple in Vṛndāvana. According to Mr Gopal Ghosh, librarian of the VRI and long-time resident of Vṛndāvana, there has been a fair amount of shuffling of the cenotaphs connected with the temple of Rādhā-śyāmasundara in Vṛndāvana.
3.2 Religious Debate in Jaipur During the Reign of Jai Singh II

The biographical details of Viśvanātha, Kṛṣṇadeva, and Baladeva have been presented above. Within the Gauḍīya sect there is a quite detailed tradition with regard to the participation of Viśvanātha and his two famous students in a religious debate in Jaipur. Because that traditional account draws together all three of these religious dignitaries, the next section of this study is devoted to an analysis of that traditional account and religious debate in general during the reign of Sawai Jai Singh.

The reign of Sawai Jai Singh was characterised by very public religious debate, often instigated by the maharaja himself. Jai Singh appears to have been a religious-minded man. Certainly his devotion to Govindadeva was celebrated, and he is known to have theologically favoured the Gauḍīya sect, but there is no indication that he ever became a formal follower of the Caitanya sect. He seems to have remained independent and open-minded. As a monarch, he seems to have remained even-handed and his predilection for the Gauḍīya sect does not seem to have translated into disadvantage for other religious groupings. There is evidence that he supported a broad range of Hindu institutions.

Overall Jai Singh seems to have been broad-minded and genuinely inquisitive. He showed a personal interest in the religious issues of the day. The Kapaddvara records of the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum show how Jai Singh actively sought opinions on issues of religious practice and theology and at the same time gave instructions to certain sects on principles of ethics and morality. Many such religious issues were discussed in the assembly hall of Jai Singh.

3.2.1 The Story of A Debate

Within Gauḍīya circles there is a widespread tradition that Viśvanātha’s students took part in a religious debate in Jaipur/Amber, where they impressed the maharaja with their learning and saved the honour of their sect. The story of this debate is a story which has been mostly passed down orally within the sect itself, and as such has developed numerous variations and has naturally been embellished.


130 Bahura and Singh 1988.

A colourful version of these events is found in Gopāl Kavi’s Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvali, which was composed in 1843, and thus represents the oral tradition as it had developed about one hundred years after the events. As a basis for discussion on this topic, Gopāl Kavi’s portrayal of the event is here quoted in full.\footnote{Narahari Cakravarti’s Narottama-vilāsa (ca. 1700-50) includes some biographical details of Viśvanātha Cakravarti, but makes no mention of Viśvanātha Cakravarti’s connection with Jaipur and certainly makes no mention of any conference.}

Meanwhile a fresh dispute arose between the four sampradāyas. The Rāmānandīś and the followers of Viṣṇu Swami and Harivyāsa claimed that the deities of Govinda, Gopinātha and Madana Mohana should be served by them. Then King Sawai Jai Singh said to the Gauḍīyas, “Bring one of your pandits here before me.”

The Gauḍīyas replied, “We have a lot of pandits in Braj. [For example] there is Viśvanātha Cakravarti in Rādhā-kuṇḍa.”

The king then sent off a carriage to fetch him. He sent off a letter to the four sampradāyas telling them of the matter. The officer came to Rādhā-kuṇḍa in his carriage and said, “Sawai Jai Singh himself has summoned you to Jaipur.”

Viśvanātha Cakravarti did not want to go, saying, “No, after renouncing the world how can I leave Braj?....”

Hearing this, his disciple Sārvabhauma said “I can go to Jaipur”.

.... Sārvabhauma vowed to go and take part in the discussion on the scriptures and to restore the Gauḍīya sampradāya to its high position. The guru was then very satisfied and said “Just go there and you will be triumphant”.

So, off he went to Jaipur with pot in his hand and only a
tattered cloth draped over his shoulder. He would not sit on the carriage, but went only on foot. As he arrived in Jaipur, everyone ran to get a glimpse of him. Upon seeing his renunciation the king spread out his own shawl [for him to sit on], but he refused the seat, saying that the king is a manifestation of God in this world. He just stood there effulgently showing his power.

Then the king called all the head priests and pandits of the four sampradāyas to come and meet him in debate.... Debating with them one after the other he defeated the four sampradāyas. Then the king fell at his feet and said “Be gracious and make me your student.”

Sārvabhauma said, “One shouldn’t think that there is any difference between us, the four sampradāyas are one, and this defeat and dispute were really needless.”

[aside] At that time Rādhā-govinda had arrived in Galtā, and Gaurāṅgī, Vallaḥā-kānta and Vraja-mohana had built a temple for them.....

The king touched the pandit’s feet and said, “Please accept something from me.”

The pandit replied, “I am a renunciant, I don’t need any boon”, and he did not take anything. [However] he said, “The deity Śrī Vinodī-lāla has now fled to Karauli. He used to be the worshippable deity of our lineage when He graced Vṛndāvana.”

The king said, “First, please be merciful and stay in Jaipur [for a while] with us. Grace us with your presence here.”

Then the king wrote a letter to Karauli and sent it with some attendants. They said, “The king has sent us here to take Vinodī-lāl. Please give Him to us.”

So they gave Vinodī-lāla, but did not give Rādhā....

[When they arrived,] Sārvabhauma exclaimed, “How is it that you have brought Thākura-jī without Thākurānī!”

[And the king sent a message back saying], “I sent you a letter asking you to send us Thākurānī!”

[The priests from Karauli replied] “But you didn’t write ‘Rādhikā-vinodī’ [you only wrote ‘Vinodī-lāla’]. And a supplicant only has one opportunity to ask. After leaving he can’t come back.”

Upon hearing this, the king just gave up and eventually went home happily.

That helpless Thākurānī stayed there [in Karauli] next to [the deity called] Madana-mohana, and Thākura Śrī Vinodī-lāla was
installed in Jaipur. Here [in Vṛndāvana] in the temple of Viśvanātha’s Gokulānanda-ji, there is a Vijai Rādhikā Vinoda-ji [a deity made in the image of Rādhā-Vinoda].

This traditional account was written over a hundred years after the events, and successive generations of enthusiastic raconteurs partial to the Gauḍīya sect seem to have added to some kind of a historical kernel. As remarked above, there is a tradition within sectarian sources regarding a conference or debate involving the Gauḍīya pandits being summoned from Vṛndāvana by the maharaja to defend the sect. It is important to note in this regard that several different versions of this story exist within the Gauḍīya sect, and other versions of a similar story exist within Rāmānandī sources.

3.2.2 Variation within the Tradition

There are numerous variations of this traditional account. For simplicity, we will deal with them under just two categories: variations in the participants involved and variations in the cause of the argument.

Many variations of this story revolve around the presence or absence of either Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭacārya or Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami. The above nineteenth century account by Gopāla Kavi does not mention Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa at all. According to that account, Kṛṣṇadeva went to Jaipur/ Amber alone. Twentieth century followers of the sect, such as Bhakti Siddhānta Sarasvati and Haridāsa Dāsa, report the tradition that both Kṛṣṇadeva and Baladeva went to the conference together. A.K. Roy has mentioned this version in his History of Jaipur City.

D.S. Dāsa reports a version in which both Kṛṣṇadeva and Baladeva go to a conference in Jaipur, but this version puts Baladeva very much at centre stage. This description of Baladeva recalls some of the details attributed to Kṛṣṇadeva in Gopal Kavi’s version quoted above. For example:

\[ Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvalī Ch13. Sarvabhūmi Paṇḍita Carita: “itma i cāri sāprādāy mē kuch uṭhayau vivād navīna u..... punī thākur gokulānand-ji viśvanātha ke jo ha i.” \]


...Baladeva carried a water pot in his hand, draped a torn quilt over his shoulders, and he wore a loincloth covered with a simple outer wrap. Entering the Royal Court alone in such a dress he inquired of the king how he might help...  

Numerous other accounts speak only of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa in connection with this conference. In these accounts there is no mention of Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya.  

Another source of variation in this story is the cause of the dispute. Gopāl Kavi’s version quoted above says simply:  

Meanwhile a fresh dispute arose between the four sampradāyas. The Rāmānandīs and the followers of Viṣṇu Swami and Harivyāsa claimed that the deities of Govinda, Gopinātha and Madana Mohana should be served by them...  

Many accounts do mention this challenge to the Gauḍīya right to worship the Govindadeva deity or a challenge to the authenticity of the sect as a “sampradāya”. Others trace the dispute to a philosophical difference with the Rāmānandīs over the worship of Govinda before Nārāyaṇa, which then developed into an argument as to why the Gauḍīyas had no commentary on the Brahma-sūtras. S.K. De and G.N. Bahura suggest that lack of a Brahma-sūtra commentary was the very reason the Gauḍīya sect’s validity was being questioned. 

Yet others report that the real cause of the dispute was the Gauḍīya’s support of the “immoral” parakīyā-vāda philosophy, which says that Kṛṣṇa enjoyed amorous
pastimes outside of wedlock.\textsuperscript{142} This gave rise to objections to the worship of Rādhā. S. Narang (following Kṛṣṇadāsa Bābā) refers to all three of the above issues.\textsuperscript{143} And A.K. Majumdar feels that the Gauḍīyas themselves initiated the dispute, because they wanted to eat in a separate line from the other sampradāyas when prasāda was distributed in temples.\textsuperscript{144}

B.S. Sarasvati’s version portrays it as an internal argument within the Gauḍīya sampradāya over their sectarian affiliation:

The caste goswamis [of the Gauḍīya sect] had completely forgotten their own loyalty to the Śrī Mādhva-sampradāya. Being ignorant of the true facts of the disciplic succession, and being disrespectful to vaiṣṇava Vedānta, they had fallen into such a degraded condition that Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa was obliged to write a separate commentary on the Vedānta-sūtras, according to the Gauḍīya vaiṣṇava philosophy. This was done just to refute their false conclusions.\textsuperscript{145}

Faced with this remarkable diversity within the tradition, historians have been naturally drawn to investigate and clarify the situation. After relating one version of the events, A.K. Roy concludes that “it is difficult to say how far this story of religious debate in Galta is true.”\textsuperscript{146} Elkmann acknowledges the variety within the tradition, but concludes that Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa did attend a conference and seized the opportunity to introduce Mādhva doctrine within the sect.\textsuperscript{147} Entwistle also accepts that some kind of debate took place, but suggests “the real cause of the dispute was rivalry between the Gaudiyas and Ramanandis for the patronage of Sawai Jai Singh.”\textsuperscript{148} Horstmann is more circumspect, acknowledging the scant nature of the documentary evidence in this regard:

The paucity of evidence resists a conclusive interpretation of this and

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{142}{Mital 1961 p. 67.}
\footnotetext{143}{S. Narang 1984 p. 5. Kṛṣṇadāsa Bābā 1954 p.5.}
\footnotetext{144}{A.K. Majumdar 1969 p. 269.}
\footnotetext{145}{B.S. Sarasvati 1922 p.61 (translation by D.S. Dāsa 1992 p. 8)}
\footnotetext{146}{A.K. Roy 1978 p. 171.}
\footnotetext{147}{Elkmann 1986 p. 46.}
\footnotetext{148}{Entwistle 1987 p. 193.}
\end{footnotes}
3.2 - Religious Debate

a number of other events of the second decade of the 18th century. It might be expedient not to lose sight also of events which do not surface at all in the documents. Around 1718 Jai Singh sought to settle conflicts between rivalling *vaishnava* sects, presumably not so much as an arbitrator but rather as an interested party. After this, he seems to have especially favoured the Caitanyas, as is evident from a treatise commissioned by him and written in 1723 by Kṛṣṇadeva Bhaṭṭācārya, a theologian affiliated to the Madanmohan temple and a recipient of many favours from the Mahārājā.\(^{149}\)

The following analysis of archival material will suggest that we are not talking about one conference at all, but several, in fact many, conferences and disputes during the period of the reign of Jai Singh II. I will argue that the traditional account bundles several different issues and events into a single story, which then “represents” historical events but at a certain distance from actuality. The oral tradition would thus be viewed as a mixture of “edited highlights” and “theatrical re-enactment”.

All of the above-mentioned disputes were important issues at the time, and the Gaurīya devotees certainly became very influential in Jaipur/Amber during this period. Archival evidence definitely supports this. But I will argue that the influence of Gaurīya religious dignitaries at the court in Jaipur was not the result of one single event but rather of many successive events.

A single dramatic debate is portrayed in the traditional verbal accounts passed down amongst Gaurīya devotees. I will suggest that this traditional account is probably a conglomeration of several events, several debates involving different people at different times. The variety found in the oral tradition regarding the subject of “the” debate would thus represent aspects and issues from many different debates which were going on at the time. The diversity of the oral tradition *as a whole* would represent a diversity of events which took place during the reign of Sawai Jai Singh and his successors.

3.2.3 The Players: Kṛṣṇadeva and Baladeva

The first issue to consider is the relative age difference between Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya and Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. Although we do not know Baladeva’s

\(^{149}\) Horstmann 1999 p. 22. Horstmann’s remark is in the context of a snap visit to Karoli by Govindadeva in 1719.
date of birth, we do know that he passed away in 1793.\textsuperscript{150} Being very generous, we could say that he lived for over ninety years and that he was born around 1700. Now we also know that Kṛṣṇadeva was already established in Jaipur/Amber in 1714, as he received State support for the Vinodi-lāl temple in Jaipur in March of 1715. Furthermore, Jai Singh was posted in Malwa from October 1713 till the end of 1715.\textsuperscript{151} Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya for his part was still in Rādhā kuṇḍa in the autumn (Oct-Nov) of 1712.\textsuperscript{152} Therefore, if there were to have been a meeting between Jai Singh and Kṛṣṇadeva which led to Kṛṣṇadeva receiving his grant for the Rādhā-vinoda temple, such a meeting would have to have been at sometime in the period between October 1712 and October 1713.

Even if Baladeva were born around 1700 (and it is likely that he was born after that), he would have been just over ten years old in 1712. It is not at all likely that he would be representing anyone in a debate. Moreover, Baladeva was not born into Gaurīya Vaishnavism; he came into the Gaurīya fold in Vṛndāvana much later in life. As mentioned above in section 3.1.3, tradition has it that he left home at an early age, and studied grammar and rhetoric on the banks of the Cilkahrada River in Orissa. His next place of residence was in Mysore, where he studied Veda and eventually took initiation as a Mādhva sannyāsi. From there he moved back to Orissa, where he settled in a Mādhva monastery in Puri. There he eventually came under the influence of a Gaurīya teacher, Rādhā-dāmodara, and in the end became his student. Sometime later he set off for Vṛndāvana and is said to have studied the Bhāgavata-purāṇa under Viśvanātha Cakravarti.\textsuperscript{153}

It is highly unlikely that Baladeva accomplished all that by the age of ten. Nor is that an age to be writing a commentary on the Veda-sūtras. In fact, he probably did not accomplish all of that before the age of thirty, in which case it is highly unlikely that he would have even arrived in Vṛndāvana by 1720. That being the case, Kṛṣṇadeva first went to Jaipur by himself, and if there had been any assembly in 1712 which led to his receiving patronage for Vinodī-lāl (as per the account in Vṛndāvana-dhāma-nurāgāvalī), then Kṛṣṇadeva would have participated in that debate by himself.

Whatever the exact circumstances of Kṛṣṇadeva’s rise to fame at the court of

\textsuperscript{150} See section 3.1.3 above.

\textsuperscript{151} Bhatnagar 1974 p. 115-119.

\textsuperscript{152} VRI microfilm document T1: 25 dated “saṁvat 1769 māsa śara-t-kālina-pauṛṇāmast”. For details see section 3.1.2 above.

\textsuperscript{153} S.N. Dasgupta 1922 IV p. 438; Haridāsa Dāsa 1957 p.1292; Elkman 1986 p. 25.
Jai Singh, there is no evidence to suggest that Baladeva Vidyabhūṣaṇa was involved at this early stage.

The account of the Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvalī has certainly been dramatically embellished. For example, there is no evidence that Jai Singh ever officially became Kṛṣṇadeva’s disciple. Nevertheless, the kernel of the traditional account in the Vṛndāvana-dhāmānurāgāvalī matches the scenario suggested in the archival records, as it describes an event where Kṛṣṇadeva goes to “Jaipur” (Amber) alone and establishes the Vinodī-lāl temple there.

Moreover, the timing finds support in that account, as Gopāla Kavi mentions the deity of Govindadeva being present near Galtā at the time of the incident. En route from Vṛndāvana to Jaipur, the deity of Govindadeva stayed at the mouth of the Galtā Valley in the village of Rūpaheṇa from 1707 till 1713.

That is not to say that Baladeva did not go to Jaipur or participate in debates, or write his commentary on the Vedānta-sūtras. There is plenty of documentary evidence of his influential public life in Jaipur, but at a much later period, from around 1740 until 1793, in which year his death is documented.

It was mentioned above that there was a certain amount of divergence in the oral tradition about the participants of the supposed debate. All possible configurations appeared: Kṛṣṇadeva alone, Baladeva alone, as well as Kṛṣṇadeva and Baladeva together. The documentary evidence indicates that Kṛṣṇadeva went to Jaipur/Amber long before Baladeva and had very fruitful contact with Sawai Jai Singh very early on. Given this, we can begin to understand how the traditional account has merged the stories of these two influential Gauḍīya dignitaries and merged the two stories into a single striking event.

3.2.4 Debates and Conferences

Below we shall analyse some of the issues said to be involved in “the” debate. It will be evident that the growth in the influence of the Gauḍīya dignitaries at court actually grew gradually over a number of years with a succession of incidents, debates, and issues, rather than a single event.

The various issues referred to in traditional accounts as the causes of “the dispute” were almost certainly all the subject of debates in Jaipur, and the variations in the tradition probably refer to different debates which over time merged into one story. In that sense the traditional story with its variations should be seen as

---


156 See section 3.1.3 above.
representative of events that took place over the whole period.

Religious debates and conferences were quite common at the time, and we find reference to numerous such assemblies not only from Gauḍīya sources but also from Rāmānandis, the followers of Swami Haridasa, and the followers of the Rādhā-vallabha sampradāyas.\textsuperscript{157}

Both Mital and Haynes give 1723 as an approximate date for a conference on affiliation of sects to traditional sampradāyas.\textsuperscript{158}

Another theological conference is mentioned by Bansal and Haberman with regard to the philosophy of a certain Rūpa Kavirāja, who lived in Rādhā-kuṇḍa at the beginning of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{159} Previously, in 1711, Jai Singh had instructed Anup Singh not to let Rūpa Kavirāja return to Rādhā-kuṇḍa as he had stolen some goods and fled. In 1713 Rūpa Kavirāja was allowed to return with a large group of other devotees.\textsuperscript{160}

In 1732 a Jaipur theological council was held in the assembly hall of Sawai Jai Singh to investigate the philosophical stance of Rūpa Kavirāja, and a determination was made in front of all the parties concerned.\textsuperscript{161} A number of the aspects of Rūpa Kavirāja’s philosophy were declared heretical: his theory of four dhāma and four sādhana, his theory that Gokula and Vṛndāvana were different, his theory that sādhana and sādhya were different, and his theory that samārhārati and mahābhāva were dependent on creating a parakīya self-image.\textsuperscript{162}


\textsuperscript{158} Haynes 1970: 121-3; Mital 1968 p. 210. The date 1723 is arrived at through inference, as it corresponds to Jai Singh taking up the governorship of Agra.

\textsuperscript{159} Bansal 1980 p. 504-6; Haberman 1988 p. 103. Dr. Bansal kindly gave me a copy of the document of the determination of the assembly. It is dated Āśvin sudēr 5 VS1789 {24\textsuperscript{th} September 1732}. Haberman’s date of 1727 may be an oversight, or perhaps it is based on different documents.

\textsuperscript{160} Documents in Habib (1996: 155-6). Refer to section 2.3 above for details and document references.

\textsuperscript{161} Document of Āśvin sudēr 5 VS1789: “śrī mahārājādhirāj ke sabhā me hām sab nirdhār kiyo....”

\textsuperscript{162} ibidem: “iyā mat yo viruddh mat iha hai : dhām cāri....”. A good summary of these teachings of Rūpa Kavirāja can be found in Haberman (continued...)
SECTION 3.2 - Religious Debate

It was declared criminal to study or teach the works of Rūpa Kavirāja. In refuting Rūpa Kavirāja, the assembly appealed to the authority of Rūpa, Jīva and Sanātana Goswamis. They also mention Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya and in particular the works he composed for the maharaja.

Thus it is clear that such official debates were certainly being held in the assembly hall of Sawai Jai Singh. And certainly the important Gaurīya theological advisors (such as Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya in this case) were consulted as authorities. I am suggesting that the oral tradition which refers to “a” debate in Jaipur is actually representative of a series of debates which are documented in the records of the period.

3.2.5 Issues: Parakīyā vs. Svakiyā

In 1719 another major debate took place in Jaipur/ Amber over the parakīyā vs. svakiyā dispute. We noted above that some versions of the story of “the debate” in Jaipur cited this parakīyā question as the contentious issue which caused the debate. Before examining the historical details of the 1719 conference on the parakīyā question, we should first describe some of the theological issues involved.

The Bhāgavata-purāṇa describes Kṛṣṇa as enjoying intimate pastimes with young cowherd girls of Braja who were married or engaged to other cowherd men. To the orthodox Hindu this was unacceptable behaviour and not a good example to be set by God. The basic Gaurīya stance on this may be illustrated by Jīva Goswami:

Although the cowherd girls of Braja are actually Kṛṣṇa’s in the highest sense (i.e. svakiyā), nevertheless in the līlā manifest in this world (prakāta-līlā) they seem to be married to someone else (parakīyā).

That is to say, the Gaurīyas considered the gopīs to be ṣaktis of Kṛṣṇa, or manifestations of Kṛṣṇa’s own power. Thus in that higher sense they belonged to him, or in other words were “svakiyā”. Jīva continues:

162 (...continued)

163 Svakiyā means “belonging to oneself”, and parakīyā means “belonging to someone else”. Applied to a woman svakiyā means “one’s own wife” and parakīyā means “married or belonging to someone else”.

164 Prāti-sandarbha Section 278: “atha vastutaḥ paramasviyā api prakāta-līlāyāṁ parakīyāmāṇāḥ śrī-vraja-devyāḥ.”
In the Bhāgavata (10.33.35), when we hear a phrase like ‘the gopīs and their husbands’, we should understand that this is said only in a pragmatic or earthly sense and not in the higher sense. From the higher perspective they are his svarūpa-śakti, or his integral potencies. This has been established here in the Krṣṇa-sandarbha and in many other places as well.\textsuperscript{165}

This was a typical Gaurīya acintya-bhedābheda solution where two contradictory statements are simultaneously true. The gopīs are both parakṛtyā for the purposes of the earthly prakaṭa-lilā yet svakṛtyā in their inherent nature. Thus the Gaurīya stance was a twin proposition, both svakṛtyavāda and parakṛtyavāda.

But arguing both cases left them open to objections from orthodox Hindus who could not accept such “immoral” behaviour from God. Also, the rasa-śāstras which provided the framework for Rūpa Goswami’s analysis of bhakti did not speak in glowing terms of mādhurya-rasa with unmarried women.\textsuperscript{166} Therefore, the parakṛtyā aspect was softened by many teachers of the sect. Thus, for example, Rūpa Goswami in some of his works stressed the “belonging to Krṣṇa” aspect more, by depicting a wedding of Rādā and Krṣṇa\textsuperscript{167} or by interpreting the union of Krṣṇa and the gopīs as a gāndharva wedding.\textsuperscript{168} And Jīva Goswami in some instances played down the “belonging to someone else” aspect by saying that the gopīs’ marriages to other cowherd-men were illusory and the gopīs themselves had been replaced by illusory forms.\textsuperscript{169}

Whether Rūpa and Jīva were more inclined to either side of the twin proposition is an interesting dissertation in itself, but it is too broad a question for the scope of this work.\textsuperscript{170} Suffice to say that in the period under study Viśvanātha Cakravarti was advocating the parakṛtyā proposition without compromise. Viśvanātha’s stance was to accept at face value the descriptions of extra-marital

\textsuperscript{165} Prūti-sandarbha Section 279: “atra ca tat-patīnām iti tat vyavahāra-drṣṭī-mātreṇoktam na tu paramārthadṛṣṭīyā. tad-drṣṭīyatu śri-krṣṇasandarbhe tāsāṃ svarūpa-śaktitvam evātra paratra ca sthāpitam.”

\textsuperscript{166} S.K. De 1961 p. 205 gives references.

\textsuperscript{167} Rūpa Goswami’s Vidagdha-mādhava Act 10.

\textsuperscript{168} Ujjvala-nilā-mañi: “gandharva-rītyā svākārāt svāyātvam iha vastutāḥ”.

\textsuperscript{169} Krṣṇa-sandarbha Section 150.

\textsuperscript{170} S.K. De (1961 p. 205, 348-50, 410-11) mounts the case that they supported the parakṛtyāvāda.
affairs in the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*, but to say that the bad connotations of “extra-marital” did not apply to Kṛṣṇa:

If previous ācāryas spoke very poorly of the character of a paramour [i.e., of parakṛtya relations], that was in connection with an ordinary person, because for an ordinary person being a paramour is immoral (vaidharmya), irresponsible, and a source of suffering because it takes the person to hell.... In literary studies such a person is spoken of very poorly, and they are considered unfit to be the main figure of a literary work. This, however, could not be the case with Kṛṣṇa, as he is the creator of religion and irreligion. In fact, he is the creator, sustainer and destroyer of everything. He is glorified as the original person, who can destroy everything with the lifting of an eyebrow. He is God himself, the supreme person, who enjoys līlā in the human form. Nor can this fault of “extra-marital” be levelled at the gopīs, because they are the manifestation of his hlādinī-śakti (potency of joy), which is the supreme of all his great potencies.... Even the janma-līlā is considered eternal because somewhere or other Kṛṣṇa is always somehow appearing [so these prakāṭa līlā are eternal and not illusory].... If they were illusory, how long will they go on for? Take the rāsa-līlā. It is the crown jewel of all līlās, and if the extra-marital parts were to be rejected as illusory, then the whole thing would have to be rejected, because from beginning to end, the major emotion is extra-marital love.... We have never heard of any rāsa-līlā happening between husband and wife.\(^{171}\)

However, in 1719 opposition to the parakṛtya half of the Gauḍīya proposition was registered in Jaipur, and it seems that Jai Singh himself was not impressed by this apparent sanctioning of “immorality”.

The documentary evidence adduced by A.K. Roy\(^{172}\) describes how Jai Singh presided over a conference in Jaipur and came down in favour of the svakṛtyavāda proposition alone: Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa were always married, and there were no extra-

---

\(^{171}\) *Ānanda-candrikā* commentary on Rūpa’s *Ujjvala-nilā-maṇi* 1.18.

\(^{172}\) A.K. Roy (1985: 84-7). The documents were published by S.R. Miśra (1922: 131ff) as well as in Sāhitya Pariṣad Patrikā (1899,1901). Only Roy’s work was available for the present study, but in the future these full transcripts should be fully analysed to shed more light on this important event.
marital affairs. Such a position is hardly surprising for a Hindu ruler who made efforts to tame the sadhus of Braja by ordering that they were not to accumulate guns or keep women. In order to encourage these "sadhus" to marry and conform to the traditional norms of grhastha life, Jai Singh started a colony called Vairāgyapura to provide land for such newly married (ex-)sadhus in Mathura.

A.K. Roy adds that as part of the terms of Jai Singh’s decision against parakīyāvāda, Kṛṣṇadeva was deputed to take the findings of the Jaipur assembly to pandits elsewhere. But in Bengal the question was again debated in the court of Jafar Khān, and the maharaja’s “only svakīyāvāda” proposition was defeated. The documents recording this second conference are said to have been issued in 1719.

The court pandits of Navadvīpa were also consulted on the question of parakīyā and svakīyā. The learned pandits of Rājā Kṛṣṇa-candra replied to Jai Singh that “Rādhikā, although apparently parakīyā, was eternally svakīyā.”

In the course of these events, it seems that Jai Singh also solicited an opinion on the parakīyā issue from the head priests of the four big Gaurīya temples in Vṛndāvana and Jaipur. In the maharaja’s private collection we find a letter signed and sealed by all four of them, in which they adopt a diplomatic stance:

Śrī Sanātana, Rūpa and Jīva Goswamis all agree that Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa līlā is parakīyā in the manifest līlā of this world, but svakīyā in the unmanifest [eternal] līlā of the other world. But because the līlā are eternal, then both svakīyā and parakīyā are equal, and both are the height of rasa. This is because the emotion felt for Kṛṣṇa (Mādana-

---

173 Sawai Man Singh II Museum, Jaipur: KD Records #1284, 1483

174 Bhaṭṭanāgar (1976: 342) refers to a letter dated 1727 from Jai Singh’s minister to the Jaipur town planner, Vidyādharā. There is a misconception that Jai Singh somehow influenced Jagannatha, the head priest of Govindadeva’s temple, to break with tradition and marry (Roy 1978:164, Entwistle 1987:192). The work of Horstmann (1996: 187-8) and Habib (1996:132-159) show quite clearly that some priests had been marrying since the first generation after Rūpa Goswami. What changed around the time of Jagannātha was that the rule of inheritance by primogeniture became entrenched.

175 17 Phalgun 1125 BS (February 1719), A.K Roy ibid. See section 3.1.2 above for details of Kṛṣṇadeva’s role as envoy of Jai Singh.

176 Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, KD Records #1507.
mohana) is to be analysed in a similar way to natural love [and parakiyā and svakiyā are both accepted in analyses of everyday love]. Because all līlā are eternal, it is quite fitting that if one worships svakiyā līlā one will attain the līlā of the Lord. And it is just as fitting that if one worships parakiyā līlā, one will also attain the līlā of the Lord. And this state of parakiyā is created by yoga-māyā so that Kṛṣṇa can taste parakiyā-rasa. Therefore it is said that Abhimanyu simply thought he was the husband of Rādhikā. Words are used in this sense, “He considered himself as a husband, but was not really so”, just as when we say that somebody fancies himself as a pandit. Rūpa Goswami has confirmed this in his parakiyā-līlā-prārthana poem in the Stavāvalī.177

There is a small work by Viśvanātha Cakravarti, which seems to have been composed as part of this controversy. The Govindadeva temple in Jaipur has a manuscript copy of a two-part work called “Svakiyā-nirāsa Parakiyā-pratipādana”, or “Rebuttal of the Svakiyā Philosophy and Establishing the Parakiyā Philosophy”.178 This is a work of a much more polemic nature than what we are accustomed to find from Viśvanātha Cakravarti, and would seem to be Viśvanātha’s contribution to this debate. Were that to be the case, and if the abovementioned date of 1719 is correct for the documentation of the defeat of svakiyāvāda, then this would be an indication that Viśvanātha Cakravarti was still alive and active around that time.

We noted above that within Gauṛīya tradition there are multiple versions of the story of a debate in Jaipur. The different variations in the tradition probably represent several different conferences, each on a separate issue. One of those issues was the issue of parakiyā vs. svakiyā. This was certainly an issue at the time, and the documentary evidence points to very direct participation of Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya and the indirect participation of Viśvanātha Cakravarti. These facts are very clear from the documentary evidence. This parakiyā issue is one of the variant issues mentioned in the oral tradition of “the” debate in Jaipur/Amber. This is an example of one element of the story or one variant of the story which represents some kind of a “real” historical event. The story of this event has been merged with other events in the story of a single debate in “Jaipur” (with multiple variations).

177 Maharaja Sawai Man Singh Museum, KD Records # 1521.
178 Haridāsa Dāsa 1957: 1619, 1808.
3.2.6 Issues: A *Brahma-sūtra* Commentary

Another issue which appears frequently as a variant in the oral tradition is the issue of the authenticity of the Gauḍīya *sampradāya*. Here again this was an important issue of the period, and there is every indication that at some stage there was a formal debate on the subject. Reference to this issue in some versions of the traditional story is therefore another example of an important aspect of the period being represented in the traditional account and its variations.

We have already noted evidence from the Rādhā-Vallabha *sampradāya* that Jai Singh held an assembly or series of conferences around 1723 trying to get the myriad of new *bhakti sampradāyas* to conform to the traditional moral and social norms of the established *vaishnava* sects. Elkman suggests that it was at one such conference as this that Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāṇa was asked to defend the authenticity of the *sampradāya* and compose a commentary on the *Brahma-sūtras*. We have, however, noted that elements of the traditional account and its variations have been drawn from several separate issues, separate events, and separate debates. In this case, too, it can be shown that the affiliation of the sect and the composition of the *Brahma-sūtra* commentary were important issues of the period, but not necessarily limited to a single debate or event.

Certainly Jai Singh was very interested in the *Brahma-sūtras*, and his personal manuscript library contains multiple copies of the *Sūtras* as well as twenty five different commentaries on the *Sūtras* by *ācāryas* of a variety of different sects and persuasions. These include a couple commissioned by Jai Singh, one of which was by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāṇa. One such work is dated 1730, so it was perhaps around this time he noticed that the Gauḍīya sect had no direct commentary on the *Brahma-sūtras*.

The maharaja’s correspondence mentions the *Brahma-sūtras* several times. One letter to the maharaja from the head priest of the Gopīnātha temple in Jaipur

---


180 Elkman 1988 p. 43.

181 Catalogue entries 5850 and 6079 (Bahura 1976: 63-64). This work is different from Baladeva’s *Govinda-bhāṣya* and it is puzzling why this “*Karikā-bhāṣya*” has been ignored by the many studies dealing with his Vedānta philosophy. From a philosophical point of view it does not seem significant, but it is a work that needs to be published and analysed for its historic value, particularly in tracing the development of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣāṇa’s philosophy.

182 1787 VS.
explains that the Gauriya sect did not have a commentary on the Brahma sūtras, because the Bhāgavata-purāṇa was regarded as the natural commentary. Of course, this was not a sūtra by sūtra commentary, and therefore the Goswami agreed “that the Maharāja should commission a sūtra-wise commentary with quotations from the Bhāgavata.”

It seems reasonable to conclude from this that the lack of a Gauriya Brahma-sūtra commentary was somehow perceived as a shortcoming by the maharaja, who was a well-wisher of the sect. Thus he planned to request a Gauriya pandit to compose such a work.

The maharaja seems to have gone ahead with his idea, because he did commission such a work from Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. The maharaja’s personal library holds a manuscript of a work called the Brahma-sūtra-kārikā-bhāṣya, or the “Commentary on the Text of the Brahma-sūtra”. The maṅgalācaraṇa reads thus:

Vidyābhūṣaṇa bows down to Vyāsa and, upon the order of his majesty, composes this commentary on the lucid text of the Brahma-sūtra.

At the end of the work, he re-iterates:

I, who am called “Vidyābhūṣaṇa”, have composed this commentary on the text of the sūtras according to the instructions of his majesty.

It would seem reasonable to infer that Baladeva composed this Kārikā-bhāṣya commentary on the Brahma-sūtras before he composed his better known Govinda-bhāṣya commentary on the Brahma-sūtras. Several details point to this conclusion.

Firstly, had Baladeva already written the extensive Govinda-bhāṣya, there would hardly seem any point in Jai Singh commissioning Baladeva to write a commentary on the Brahma-sūtras. Nor would the head-priest of the Gopinātha-jī

---

183 Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, Kapadvara document # 1519 (synopsis of G.N. Bahura).
184 Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, Pothikhana ms # 6079.
185 natvā vyāsaṁ sarva-siddhi-pradeśāṁ dattānuñjāḥ śrīla rājādhīrajāḥ bhāṣyam vidyābhūṣaṇo brahma-sūtreśv acchārtāḥbhūḥ kārikābhir vidhatte
186 śrīmad-rājādhīrājānāṁ ājñayā racitaṁ mayā, vidyābhūṣaṇa-saṁjñena kārikā-bhāṣyam āśritaṁ....
temple have agreed that there was a need for a sūtra-wise commentary. The Govinda-bhāṣya is already a comprehensive sūtra-wise commentary on the Brahmasūtras.

Secondly, it is very surprising that there is no copy of the Govinda-bhāṣya in the personal library of Sawai Jai Singh. As mentioned above, the maharajas’ Pothikhāna holds some 60 manuscripts of the Brahmasūtras with twenty-five different commentaries, several of which had been commissioned by Sawai Jai Singh himself, including the Karikā-bhāṣya by Baladeva. Were the Govinda-bhāṣya to have been written as the culmination of some debate before Jai Singh, one would have expected the inquisitive maharaja to have procured himself a copy.

Thus it seems that the concise Karikā-bhāṣya was the work which Baladeva composed at the request of Jai Singh II, and the more comprehensive Govinda-bhāṣya was composed some time later, perhaps after the passing away of Jai Singh.  

Here again the varying elements of the traditional story regarding “the debate” in Jaipur appear to represent several events which occurred during the period. The traditional account with all its variations, rather than being looked upon as true or false, should be viewed as bringing together disparate events and issues of the time. The traditional account with all its variations is certainly representative of many real events and issues of the period, but it not a precise record of a single historical event.

For example, Baladeva certainly wrote a commentary on the Brahmasūtras for Jai Singh which remedied the Gaurīya’s lack in this regard. He also composed a much more comprehensive work, the Govinda-bhāṣya at a later date. The traditional account merges the two events and then combines this “event” with other real events and issues to form a kind of shorthand summary of the whole era in a single narrative.

3.2.7 Issues: Authenticity and Sectarian Affiliation

A related issue which comes up in traditional accounts of “the debate” is that of the authenticity and identity of the Gaurīya sect. As noted above, traditional accounts from several different sects speak of pressure from Jai Singh for the new bhakti sects of Braj to affiliate with one of the established vaisnava sects. At one such conference, the ascetic followers of Swami Haridāsa are said to have declared affiliation with the Nimbārka Sampradāya, whereas the Goswamis in charge of the

---

187 For reasons outlined in 3.1.3, it is seems likely that the Govinda-bhāṣya was composed before the death of Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya (before 1749).
temple of Bāṅkī Bihari did not accept this affiliation and opted for the Viṣṇusvāmi sampradāya.\(^{188}\) Thus traditional sources describe this conference as the final separation of the two groups who had initially begun as followers of Swami Haridāsa.

Sources from the Rādhā-vallabha sampradāya also mention a conference on affiliation called by Jai Singh. Cācā-ji Vṛndāvanadāsa (writing in 1763) says that the problems regarding their affiliation began after Jai Singh’s appointment as governor of Agra (1722-3).\(^{189}\) Jai Singh had been faujdār of Mathura as early as 1713 and active in the campaign in Braja against the Jats in 1716-17, but from 1722 he took control of the whole subah of Agra and more importantly subdued the Jats. In the new atmosphere of peace and prosperity, it seems he turned his mind to the social and cultural welfare of the area.

Rādhā-vallabha sources describe how the then mahant, Rūpa Lāla, refused to affiliate his sect with any of the existing four sampradāyas and refused to attend the conference where he was supposed to defend the views of the sect.\(^{190}\) As a result of this defiance, Cācā-ji Vṛndāvanadāsa reports that Rūpa-lāla and his family were persecuted by the maharaja and obliged to leave Braja.

Tradition within the Gauḍīya sampradāya also speaks of an assembly called to discuss their own sectarian affiliation. We have been analysing the traditional account of “a debate” involving Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa or Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya, and found that it probably represents several such debates. This is another example. It seems clear from various sectarian reports that there was an assembly or series of assemblies on this subject of sectarian affiliation, and doubtless the Gauḍīya sampradāya was also asked to prove its credentials. However, it is better to see this debate as a separate issue, discussed on a separate occasion to the other issues mentioned above.

It is generally accepted that Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa was responsible for affiliating the Gauḍīya sampradāya with the Mādhva sampradāya. The evidence for this is in the formal lineage found at the beginning of his work Prameya-ranāvalī and at the beginning of the Sūkṣmā Tīkā to the Govinda-bhāṣya. Also there are several works, such as the Prameya-ranāvalī, in which Baladeva introduces formal elements of the Mādhva philosophy into the Gauḍīya system. This is generally seen as part of the need to affiliate the new bhakti sect with one of the established

\(^{188}\) Entwistle 1987 p. 194; Mital 1968 p. 464; Haynes 1974 p. 120.

\(^{189}\) Mital 1968 p. 423.

\(^{190}\) Ibid. p. 422.
Certainly the affiliation of the Gaurāya sect had been the object of debate for some time before Baladeva. From the time of Caitanya himself, there is evidence of the existence of a tradition linking the sect to the Mādhva sect. But as a general rule the main Gaurāya theologians neglected the subject, preferring to say that Caitanya was an avatar of Kṛṣṇa, and as such he was the “sampradāya-sahasrādhistai” or the “presiding deity of countless sampradāyas”. The argument goes thus: the disciplic lineage of a vaisnava sampradāya is meant to show that the teachings have been passed down from Viṣṇu. Since Caitanya is an avatar of Kṛṣṇa himself, one need only show one’s connection to him.

However, as we have seen, around the time of Jai Singh II there was pressure on all the new devotional sects in Braj to show some authenticity by associating with one of the established sampradāyas. Arguments based on Caitanya’s divinity would not have been acceptable to those outside the sect.

Around this time Viśvanātha Cakravarti produced a work called Gaurāṅga-gaṇa-svarūpa-tattva-candrikā, largely based on Kavi-kaṇapura’s Gaurāṅga-gaṇoddeśa-dipikā, in which Viśvanātha supports the affiliation to the Mādhva sect which appears in Kavi-kaṇapura’s work.

There is another work called “Sampradāya-bodhini” attributed to Manoharadāsa-ji, a contemporary of Viśvanātha. It describes in detail the lineages of the four standard sampradāyas and links Caitanya to Mādhva via Mādhavendra Puṇi in the

---

191 More details on this issue are to be found in section 4 below. For the moment we will limit our discussion to those elements relevant to the period of religious debates in the court of Jai Singh II.

192 Elkman 1986 p.33-5 reviews the available evidence on the subject and presents the examples of pupillary lineages in the works of Orissan poets contemporary to Caitanya and in Kavi Kaṇapura’s Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dipikā.

193 Jiva Goswami in his Sarva-samvādinī commentary on the maṅgalacaraṇa of the Tattva-sandarbhā. It is interesting that Jiva talks about “countless sampradāyas” (literally “thousands of sampradāyas”) when orthodox tradition only speaks of four. This is particularly significant when Jiva himself is somehow proposing independent origin for the Gaurīya sampradāya.
same way as the *Gaura-ganoddesa-dipikā*. The Gauḍīya lineage is said to be based on the evidence of Gopāla-guru, a contemporary of Caitanya, whose Sanskrit verses are quoted. Also mentioned as evidence is a work by Devakī-nandana Kavirāja, a grand disciple of Nityānanda. The *Sampradāya-bodhini* also refers its readers to Vṛndāvana dāsa’s Caitanya-bhāgavata.

Whatever the origins of this work might be, the final verses of the Gauḍīya section indicate that there was some controversy on this issue:

> Amongst all the pramāṇas we call “aitihya” evidence obtained from previous generations, and what we hear from them is certain: from the very east of Gauṛa Deśa (Bengal) all the way to here (Vṛndāvana) everyone both young and old says that they are from the Mādhva sampradāya. O community of devotees! When you hear new modern theories on this, don’t get doubts in your mind, (remember that) the opinions of old are supreme.

Thus, debate on this issue should not be seen as limited to one conference but rather as an on-going issue; nor is there any reason to believe that opinion within the Gauḍīya sect was homogeneous. We have noted above that not everyone in the Rādhā-vallabha and Haridāsa sects was happy to compromise their independence. There is evidence of rather public debate within the Gauḍīya sect, too.

The following letter to Jai Singh II from Śyāma-carana Dāsa, the head priest of the Gopinātha temple, shows strident opposition to compromising any of the sect’s independence:

**Hail Gopinātha!**

In order to manifest his most confidential secrets, and in order to

---

194 The origin and date of this work have been questioned. Kṛṣṇa-dāsa Bābā in his publication of the work says that it was taken from a ms of VS1707 (1650 AD). This date is not consistent with the other works of Manohara-dāsa-ji which are dated from 1696 to 1719, some seventy years later (Entwistle 1987: 186fn). The later period is, however, precisely the period in question when the issue of affiliation came to a head. It is possible that there were two Manoharas. The 1713 document (Table One, Section 2.1) mentions a “Manohara Dasa” who seems to have been the most senior devotee in the Gopinātha-kuñja, as well as a “Śrī Manohara Ray” who was somehow linked to the Govinda-kuñja.

195 “Sampradāya-bodhini” v. 70-72.
savour them himself, Lord Kṛṣṇa, the prince of Braja, became manifest in this world in the form of Caitanya Mahāprabhu and Kṛṣṇa’s emanations, partial manifestations, and weapons manifested along with him as his companions. This conclusion has been reached by his companions with evidence from such books as the venerable Bhāgavata and Mahābhārata, by the fact that he demonstrated a six-arm form, and because he experienced such elevated states of divine love. Therefore it is the power of Mahāprabhu alone which is the source of our *sampradāya*. Scripture says that all *sampradāyas* culminate in Bhagavān alone. Therefore, since Mahāprabhu is himself directly Bhagavān, there is nothing defective with our *sampradāya* culminating in Mahāprabhu. On the other hand, those who suffer the defect of lacking faith and accept that he belonged to some other *sampradāya* have in fact become hostile to him. Such people are condemned by us and are worthy of punishment. Enough said on that.\(^{196}\)

Although this letter is not dated, it seems that Śyāma-caraṇa was the head priest of the Gopīnātha-ji temple from 1696 to somewhere around 1730.\(^{197}\) The catalogue entry for this letter speaks of an annexure from both Śyāma-caraṇa and Gopīnātha. This Gopīnātha would appear to be the grandson of Gopi-ramaṇa, who came to Braj around 1706 in a dispute over the succession to the custodianship of the Rādhā-dāmodara temple. He died before 1718 of smallpox, and if he is connected with the above letter, then the date of the letter must be between 1706 and 1718.\(^{198}\)

This is the same period noted above for Manohara-dāsa-ji and Viśvanātha Cakravarti, who both had written in favour of the Mādhva connection. Certainly the issue was being debated widely at the time, and it seems that Jai Singh was active in seeking diverse opinions on the subject. In his personal library there are even two

\(^{196}\) Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum KD # 1519. "śrī-gopīnātho jayati. svātyanta-rahasya-prakaṭanārthāṁ svayam tadāsvādārthāṁ ca.......daṇḍyalāḥ ca bhavantītyalam iti prasaṅgena."

\(^{197}\) He received the inheritance of his uncle Gopāla Dāsa in 1696 (documents in Habib 1996:158).

copies of a short work entitled “Caitanya-guru-parampara”.

Elkman (1986: 43) suggests that Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa took part in a debate on Gaupya affiliation some time between 1720 and 1723. That date seems to coincide nicely with the evidence adduced above, however two objections to the participation of Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami arise from material discussed earlier in this dissertation.

The first is a concern at Elkman’s taking the traditional account too literally, when it has become apparent through this study that the traditional account merges separate issues involving different people at different times into one dramatic debate. Notwithstanding that, it is certainly possible that one of the issues, namely sectarian affiliation, was addressed at that time by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa.

The second is a concern over the age of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. As mentioned in section 3.3, Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa’s death is documented in 1793. Being generous, we have allowed that he might have lived to the ripe old age of ninety, which would have made him a maximum of seventeen years old in 1720. It seems a very young age at which to be representing a sampradāya, especially when we must allow him time to be educated, be trained as a Mādhva ascetic, take vows of sannyāsa in that sect, convert to the Gaurīya sect, and be trained by both Rādhā-dāmodara in Puri and Viśvanātha in Vṛndāvana. I have therefore expressed the opinion that we should not expect him to come to the limelight until the 1730’s, and until now the earliest available documentary evidence related to "Vidyābhūṣaṇa Swami" is from 1741.

These misgivings are simply based on the balance of probabilities, but to be fair to Elkman, it is nevertheless theoretically possible that Baladeva lived to the age of 100, in which case he would have been twenty-seven in 1720. Of course, that would be a more plausible age for Baladeva to be representing the sampradāya in Jaipur, but such a scenario requires him to live to an exceptionally old age and is thus less likely. The tradition from the sect does not give any indication as to how long he lived. Were he to have lived to sixty-five, a more plausible life expectancy, then he would not even have been born in 1720.

---

199 Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum Pothīkhāna mss # 5170, 5172. Time constraints did not allow investigation of this work in the course of the present project. Future research will no doubt identify this as a very significant document.

200 The lack of documentation in connection with Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa during this period thwarts any attempt at a definitive answer to this question. As we have dated documentation with regard to Krṣṇadeva (continued...)
Regardless of the details and time of Baladeva’s involvement in the debate on affiliation, it is certain that Baladeva was a key player in the discussion and offered a sophisticated solution by effecting a rapprochement between the Gaūrīya sect and the well-established Mādhva school. As mentioned previously, the idea of this connection was not new, but in his writings Baladeva managed to formalise it and add a philosophical element to the connection which had hitherto not existed.

A literal reading of the traditional story is not helpful as it groups together too many issues into the same story. For example, by combining the debate on sectarian affiliation with the composition of the Govinda-bhāṣya, it is difficult to reconcile Baladeva’s motivations. If he was affiliating the sect with the Mādhva sampradāya, what was the use of this new and independent commentary? Or if the debate was about “the independence of the Gauḍīya sect” then why did Baladeva introduce concepts of Mādhva ontology into his master-piece? These contradictions have puzzled many academics who have read this traditional account literally.

If, however, one sees this traditional story of a religious debate as representative of many debates, issues, and events, then the contradiction is resolved. We have noted that Baladeva composed two different commentaries on the Brahma-sūtras. The earlier, simpler commentary, the Kārikā-bhāṣya, was written specifically for Sawai Jai Singh. It would have satisfied the maharaja’s documented desire for a Gauḍīya commentary at a time when he was collecting and commissioning Brahma-sūtra commentaries from all manner of Hindu sects. This commentary “upheld the glory of the Gauḍīya sect” at a time when its chief patron perceived a lacuna.

The Govinda-bhāṣya was no doubt composed at a later date, and it is an original synthesis of Gauḍīya theology and Mādhva ontology. This new and independent work would have been pointless as evidence of the sect’s affiliation with the Mādhva sect. Rather, the Govinda-bhāṣya reflects a period after the Mādhva affiliation had been “officially” resolved (perhaps through a simple guru-paramparā list). The Govinda-bhāṣya is evidence of Baladeva incorporating Mādhva concepts into the existing independent ideas of the Gauḍīya theology.

(...continued)

Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya around this time, it is perhaps more reasonable to follow Horstmann’s inference (1999: 22) that it was Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya who carried the Gauḍīya flag in the Amber court in the 1720s.

Details below in section 4.

Hardy 1974 p.36; Elkman 1986 p. 45.
SECTION 3.2 - Religious Debate

The debate on sectarian affiliation is thus a related but different issue, with its own series of debates and conferences which took place in parallel with the composition of Baladeva's two compositions.

3.2.8 The Development of a Tradition

To summarise this whole section, we can see that real issues which were widely debated during the period became merged into one traditional story of a debate in Jaipur with many variations, such as sectarian affiliation, the Gaurīya commentary on the Vedānta-sūtras, the granting of patronage to the Rādhā-vinoda temple, the controversy over svakāyā and parakāyā, the independence of the Gaurīya sect, etc.. Many of these issues were discussed in formal debates and assemblies in the court of Jai Singh and elsewhere. Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya and Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa were both high-profile participants in several of these issues and present as authorities in some of the formal debates. The dates of their involvement span from 1713 to 1793. It is likely that the traditional story depicting a single dramatic debate should be interpreted as consolidating many different incidents and debates on many different issues over a long period involving first Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya and later Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa.

The interpretation adopted in this dissertation is an attempt to reconcile the multitude of variants of the traditional account. Were this interpretation not to be adopted, then one would need to account for the many variations of the story current within the Gaurīya community. Moreover, one would need to explain how most of these variants are supported by separate pieces of archival evidence, and yet there is no evidence of one particular event where all the elements of the story come together at the same time.203

Therefore, this dissertation treats the traditional account as a fusion of several separate issues. Rosen has already identified in these religious authors a tendency to group similar events together into one narrative:

Gaudiya writers, especially in the sixteenth through nineteenth centuries, are not and have never been historians in the western sense of the term. Rather than focusing on chronology, for example, they tend to write in a topical way.... Another example of this can be seen when the Bhagavatam [viz. Bhāgavata-purāṇa] discusses the killing of demons: the events leading to the deaths of Paudraka, Dvivida,

203 Of course, in this case proof by absence of evidence can never be entirely conclusive, as we can never be sure of having all the evidence. However, this dissertation is a reflection of research as it stands at the moment.
Jarasandha, Shishupal, Shalva, and Dantavakra are taken up successively, even though the time periods that separate these deaths are quite considerable. In Vaishnava literature we thus often find that topics are grouped together. Dates and sequence of activity are considered less important. This is the general rule.204

To indulge briefly in speculation on the development of this particular tradition, we might reflect upon a possible manner in which the various stories may have merged.

On the one hand, there is strong evidence for the Bhaṭṭācārya being quite successful in Jaipur very early on, before 1713, at a time when Govindadeva-ji was transiting near Galtā en route to Jaipur. It is possible that he sorted out some dispute at that time. He was certainly a very trusted theological advisor of Jai Singh and presided over many religious debates until 1740.

On the other hand, Baladeva quite possibly came to Jaipur well after the arrival of Kṛṣṇadeva, perhaps even as late as the 1730s. He was also a very influential figure in Jaipur and Vṛndāvana, entrusted with appointing head-priests as well as being commissioned personally by Jai Singh to comment on the Brahma-sūtras. Such was his fame that his temple in Jaipur was known by his own name, “Vidyā-bhūṣaṇa Mandir”, rather than by the name of the presiding deity there.

One could speculate that as a first step, these two influential students of Viśvanātha Cakravarti could quite easily have been associated with each other from the perspective of bhāktas in Braja. It is normal that they would have come to be regarded as contemporaries, even colleagues, since they shared so much in common. Then, in this century, Baladeva’s fame continued to grow because of his illustrious Govinda-bhāṣya, and Kṛṣṇadeva’s fame waned naturally with time.

Thus it would appear that eventually the story was only told in connection with Baladeva. Moreover, as details of specific incidents faded with time, various debates based on various issues seem to have all been subsumed into the one meta-story which served as a vehicle for generations of Gaurīya devotees to learn about the events of a whole era through the medium of a single story.

The approach adopted here in dealing with traditional materials is not simply to confirm or deny the traditional version of events against the criteria of historical verifiability. Certainly the traditional materials must be seen in the perspective of archival documentation. However, over and above this we have tried to explore the tradition with all its contradicting variations and explore what the tradition can tell us not simply about the events but also about the perception of an era.

Moreover, this particular example reveals a good deal about tradition and how to study it. In this case, the question, “Was there really a debate in Galtā?”, is largely irrelevant, or at least simplistic. The relationship between the story and the “historical events” is not a relationship of strict one-to-one-correspondence, but rather one story corresponds to many events. The perspective provided by the archival documents thus provides an insight into the workings of tradition.

Concerning tradition within Judaism, Jacob Neusner remarked that tradition is not capricious:

If an earlier follower of Eliezer alleged that he gave a ruling, a later tradent - one who participates in the formation and transmission of tradition - would likely do one of two things. Either he would refine the substance of that ruling, or he would hand on in Eliezer’s name a ruling either spun out of the principle established in the original saying or closely related to it. I found out that it would be highly unlikely that to Eliezer would be attributed a saying with no roots whatever in the primary and original corpus of teachings assigned to him by the circle of his contemporaries... Tradition in this sense is living, yet, as I said, accurate and careful, mindful of what has gone before. It is not capricious, not subjective, not ahistorical, not indifferent to the facts of the past.\(^{205}\)

A similar situation is evident here, where the story of a religious debate is a tradition which has developed over several centuries. Most of the elements of the tradition and its oral variants are real events and issues of the period, but rather than all taking place in one momentous debate, they were spread out over fifty years or so in a series of events, debates and discussions. The story of the debate may not be exact, even though most of its elements are. The tradition does not invent things out of nothing; it builds a narrative out of several “real” events. In that sense tradition is not “capricious”. It is not built whimsically, but from authentic material of the period.

However that does not make the traditional account “historical”. History and religious tradition are related but different fields. The interest of religious tradition is in perpetuating the religious experience. Some elements of the tradition are no doubt fanciful, and this is a result of an over-zealous desire to perpetuate a particular sect. Such is certainly the case, for example, in the portrayal of Jai Singh becoming a disciple of Krṣṇadeva or Baladeva. But interestingly, even this is not a complete

\(^{205}\) Neusner 1975 p. 33.
invention, just an exaggeration.

But when seen as tradition, this story of a momentous debate appears more like a vehicle for describing a whole period. A traditional story such as this has developed within the community of devotees to communicate the events of a whole period, and importantly to explain the relevance of those events to their contemporary faith. It is not a history. It is not a photograph of a particular event, but rather a painting of the glories of a whole era, a past golden era where the religious, political, and literary influence of the Gauḍīya sect was at its peak.
Section 4: Sectarian Affiliation and Influences on the Text

4.1 Preliminary

The previous section described the atmosphere of religious debate current in Jaipur/Amber during the reign of Sawai Jai Singh II. One important debate was that on the sectarian affiliation of the Gaurīya sect. It seems that Jai Singh himself required the new bhakti sects flourishing in Vṛndāvana to affiliate with one of the established four vaiṣṇava sampradāyas. This was part of a larger program in which the maharaja wished to make the sadhus of Braj conform to mainstream Hindu social behaviour.

And yet the Gaurīya sect had developed doctrines and practice which were quite independent of the established vaiṣṇava schools. Gaurīya Vaishnavism had been moulded on the example of the life of Caitanya and on the devotional interpretation of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa of the advaitan sannyāsi, Śrīdharā Swami. These had in turn been developed into a coherent school of thought by the leading disciples of Caitanya.1

As a general rule the Gaurīya sect had been happy enough to ignore the question of sectarian affiliation, because the founder, Caitanya, came to be considered by his followers as an avatar of Kṛṣṇa. Thus for them the pupillary succession needed only be traced back as far as Caitanya in order to be authentic. After all, from their perspective, the point of affiliation was to trace the teachings back to some divine origin. As a result of this, the goswamis of Vṛndāvana devoted no time to questions of affiliation in their works.

However, a claim to authenticity based simply on faith in the divinity of Caitanya would not have been very persuasive for outsiders. And certainly the state of Jaipur/Amber would not have been filled with the atmosphere of natural respect for Caitanya which the Gaurīya devotees had hitherto enjoyed in Bengal, Orissa, and Braj. Here they would need an official connection to a vaiṣṇava sampradāya which was essential to authenticate the sect in the eyes of other vaiṣṇava schools. A

---

1 S.K. De 21-23. Section 4.4 below shows that even up to the time of Viśvanātha the main traditional authority for Bengal Vaishnavism was still Śrīdharā.
connection of formal initiation would have been considered necessary.\(^2\)

Even the contemporaries of Caitanya had seen a need to refer to a chain of initiations (\textit{guru-parampara}) linking Caitanya back to some \textit{vaishnava sampradaya}. There is evidence of several rudimentary lineages written by contemporaries of Caitanya in Orissa which link some of Caitanya’s \textit{puru-guru}’s with the lineage of Mādhvācārya.\(^3\) Similar lineages are found in the works of Kavi-karṇapaṇu and Gopāla-guru, in the first generation after Caitanya. Elkman also quotes another reference from the Vallabha \textit{sampradāya} which refers to Caitanya’s \textit{parama-guru}, Mādhavendra, as a \textit{sannyāsi} of the Mādhva \textit{sampradāya}.\(^4\)

Thus, there is certainly a tradition within the sect that Caitanya’s lineage could be traced back to Madhva, and that tradition seems to have existed from the time of Caitanya himself. However, there is debate over the authenticity of the purported link between Mādhavendra Puri and the Mādhva sect. For example, S.K. De finds that the succession was probably made up by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa “from hearsay or imagination” for a conference in Jaipur.\(^5\) And A.K. Majumdar considers the lineage “spurious” when compared with the records of the Vyāsarāya Mādhva \textit{matha}.\(^6\)

Elkman, on the other hand, reviews the evidence and arguments of De and Majumdar and dismisses many of their objections, concluding that the lineage was not invented by Baladeva, but rather “had its beginnings in the early years of the Gaurīya \textit{vaishnava} movement”.\(^7\) As for the authenticity of that tradition, Elkman concludes that the link to the Mādhva \textit{sampradāya} is plausible, with Mādhavendra’s

---

\(^2\) The need for initiation into a \textit{vaishnava sampradāya} is expressed in verses attributed to the Padma-purāṇa, which name four \textit{sampradāyas} and which state that mantras are fruitless if they do not belong to one of these four \textit{sampradāyas} (quoted by Elkman 1986: 30 & note).

\(^3\) Mukherjee, as quoted by Elkmann (1986: 33). According to Mukherjee, these Orissan lineages also seem to have been promulgated by a group under pressure to authenticate themselves in a hostile society.

\(^4\) Ibid p. 34.


\(^6\) A.K. Majumdar 1969. This view is repeated by Entwistle (1987: 190fn193) and Hardy (1974: 26). The idea that the link has something to do with a perceived phonetic similarity between Madhva and Mādhavendra seems also a little “spurious”.

\(^7\) Elkmann 1986 p.38.
SECTION 4.1 - Preliminary

mantra initiation coming from a Mādhva guru of the name of Lakṣmīpati, and Mādhavendra’s sannyāsa initiation coming from the Advaitic Puri order.

If this is the case, then Mādhavendra was not a Mādhva sannyāsi, but for the purposes of official affiliation, at least some kind of mantra initiation had taken place. Elkman hypothesises:

Between the time of his mantra initiation and sannyāsa initiation, his views underwent significant change, leading him to feel a greater affinity for the Puri order of Śāṅkara sannyāsins than for the Mādhvas.8

This “Puri order of Śāṅkara Sannyasins” was a group of devotional sannyāsis who followed Śrīdhara Swami’s interpretation of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa.9 In fact, the simultaneously contradictory nature of much of Gaurīya philosophy could perhaps be traced to this marriage of opposites (Mādhva and Śāṅkara) in Mādhavendra Puri.

Notwithstanding the conceivable authenticity of this somewhat delicate disciplic connection, the actual influence of Mādhva philosophy on the Gaurīya school was practically non-existent. In both the Caitanya-caritāmṛta and the Caitanya-candrodaya-nātaka, biographers portray Caitanya as rather indifferent to the Mādhvas:10

I saw many vaiṣṇavas [in the south], but they were all worshippers of Nārāyaṇa; there were also the tattva-vādins [the Mādhvas], but they were just the same, and their philosophy is not perfect. The others were just worshippers of Śiva. A good many were heretics. But, Sārvabhauma, only Rāmānanda Rāy’s philosophy really interested me.

Even those established Gaurīya authors who appear to have supported the disciplic affiliation with the Mādhva sect, such as Kavi Karpāpura, Viśvanātha

---

8 Ibid p. 32.

9 According to Caitanya; s biographer’s, Caitanya greatly esteemed Śrīdhara Swami (e.g., Caitanya-caritāmṛta 1.7.96). The relationship between the Śrīdhara Swami and the Caitanya sect is mentioned by Hardy (1974: 320), and the dates of Śrīdhara Swami are discussed by Gode (1949).

10 Caitanya-candrodaya Act Eight; also Caitanya-caritāmṛta 2.9.270-80.
Cakravarti, and Narahari Cakravarti, did not show any hint of Mādhva doctrine in their writings.\(^\text{11}\)

Direct quotes of Mādhvācārya appear once or twice in passing in the works of Rūpa and Sanātana, and several times in Jīva’s Sandarbas, but proportionally no more than Rāmānuja, and insignificantly compared to Śrīdhara Swami.\(^\text{12}\)

Jīva’s approach is far less polemic than the general tone of the works of the Mādhva sampradāya. As an example we may refer to Jīva’s treatment of the attainment of brahman-realisation in the Bhagavat-sandarbha. He does not enter into an argument with the advaitans on the relative merits of brahman and bhagavān. Rather, he ignores brahman and explains that understanding of brahman will automatically be included in any understanding of bhagavān, because brahman is simply a preliminary featureless realisation of bhagavān. Thus he finds no need to write a “Brahma-sandarbha” and moves straight onto a Bhagavat-sandarbha.\(^\text{13}\)

Jīva accepts brahman-attainment as a preliminary, featureless realisation of bhagavān. He gives some examples of such realisation of “oneness” (tad-anānya-bodhyatā) from the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, but he points out that such realisation is impossible by one’s own efforts and only possible by devotedly worshipping Bhagavān with that aim in mind.\(^\text{14}\)

In this way Jīva accepts a certain type of brahman-realisation as authentic yet only preliminary, and thus he totally ignores it. This is not an approach characteristic of the more polemically-minded Mādhva sampradāya. But it does bear some of the hallmarks of the devotional advaitan followers of Śrīdhara Swami.

Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa is the first Gauḍīya ācārya in whose works we actually find some tangible influence of the Mādhva philosophy. And even then, that influence is mostly restricted to his epistemological works such as the Prameya-ratnāvali, the Siddhānta-ratna, and to a lesser extent the Govinda-bhāṣya. In these works we see traditional Gauḍīya ontology and epistemology merged with the

---

\(^{11}\) Kavi-karṇapura at the beginning of the Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā; Viśvanātha Cakravarti in his elaboration of that same work called the Gaura-gaṇa-svarūpa-tattva-candrikā; Narahari Cakravarti in the Bhakti Ratnākara (5/2169) quoting the much earlier work of Gopāla-guru.


\(^{13}\) Bhagavat-sandarbha Section 7: vyañjite bhagavat-tattve brahma ca vyajyate svayam.

\(^{14}\) Bhagavat-sandarbha Section 6: “...sādhaka-śaktir nāsti... sādhana-bhaktyārādhitasya śrī-bhagavataḥ prabhāvād eva...”
Madhva concepts such as “vīṣeṣa” and the Madhva system of pramāṇas.\textsuperscript{15}

However, the essential Gaurīya system had diverged significantly from the Madhvas on many matters, such as the supremacy of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā, the rasa theory, vaidhī and rāgānugā bhakti, the position of Caitanya, the position of the Bhāgavata-puṇāṇa with the pāṇca-rāṣṭādhyāya, and the emotional emphasis upon congregational dancing and chanting. There is no evidence that Baladeva or anyone else ever tried to reject or “Madhva-ise” any such distinctive elements of the sect, and the Mādhva influence in doctrinal matters seems to have been restricted to some aspects of ontology and epistemology.\textsuperscript{16}

The second part of this dissertation contains a textual edition and translation of the first three chapters of the Sārārtha-varṣīṇī, Viśvanātha Cakravarti’s commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā. This present section will analyse the question of Gaurīya sectarian affiliation in the light of textual evidence from the Sārārtha-varṣīṇī.

The Bhagavad-gītā, being one of the prasthāṇa-traya, has been commented on by nearly all the founding teachers of the major vaiṣṇava sects as well as by Śaṅkara-cārya and Śrīdhara Swami. Therefore, a commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā provides an opportunity to analyse sectarian stances and affiliations across a single common text.

This present section will examine what the text of the Sārārtha-varṣīṇī tells

\textsuperscript{15} Elkman, 1987 p. 40-1. Most of Elkman’s arguments are very sound, but his suggestion (p. 41) that there was some scheme on the part of Baladeva to use the conference in Jaipur as an opportunity to “wield an influence over the Gaurīya community which otherwise might not have been possible” is a hypothesis which we don’t have enough evidence to prove or disprove. Moreover, such a hypothesis relies on a literal reading of the traditional account of the debate in Jaipur. This dissertation raises the possibility that the story of the debate in Jaipur should not be read literally, but rather should be seen as a representative symbol of many debates and issues which took place at the time. Specifically, evidence adduced in 3.1.3 suggests that Baladeva first wrote the Brahma-sūtra-kārikā-bhāṣya for Jai Singh, and then wrote the Govinda-bhāṣya at a later date. Thus the Govinda-bhāṣya with its Mādhva influence was certainly not composed as part of the earliest contact between Jai Singh and Baladeva. As there is no copy of the later work in the Pothi-khana in Jaipur, it is possible the Govinda-bhāṣya was composed after the reign of Jai Singh II.

Sectarian Affiliation and Influences on the Text

us about the controversial sectarian affiliation of the Gauṛiya sect, in particular the claim for affiliation with the Mādhva sampradāya. Section three above described the issue and diverse positions held by both devotees and academics on the question. We noted some prominent members of the Gauṛiya society strongly affirming the independence of the sect and stridently opposing any attempt to link Caitanya with another sampradāya.\(^\text{17}\) Others, such as Kavi-karṇapura, were prepared to admit an official link with the Mādhva sect and yet showed no interest (and even disdain) for the teachings of Madhva. At the other end of the spectrum were people like Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, who not only admitted a link of initiation but also incorporated facets of Mādhva doctrine into his work. Now, we shall investigate the sectarian stance and affiliation of Viśvanātha’s commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā.

\(^{17}\) See the statements of Śyāma-carana-deva Śarmā, head-priest of the Gopinātha temple, in section 3.2 above.
4.2 Invocations

The Sārārtha-varṣini begins with a poetic invocatory verse to Caitanya (gaurāṁśukah sat-kumuda-pramodī...), and no homage is offered to any one else. This is common practice in the works of Viśvanātha and the other great literati of the Gauḍīya movement. Such a practice would indicate that Gauḍīyas traced authority back to Caitanya as the founder of the sect and divine incarnation. In the Sārārtha-varṣini, no homage is offered to Madhvacārya. This would support the idea that the formal affiliation to Madhva’s sect expressed in the works of some Gauḍīya authors, including Viśvanātha himself, was more of a formality used when the sect needed some official affiliation.

The Sārārtha-varṣini has a second invocatory verse which outlines quite explicitly the stance adopted by the author in questions of doctrine (mata):

Although foolish, I desired to taste a drop of the nectar of the Bhagavad-gītā. After having thoroughly studied the statements of the previous [ācāryas], I have in this work relied solely upon the doctrine of my ascetic Lord [Śrī Caitanya]. For this, good people, please show me indulgence.

This second invocation is significant for several reasons. Firstly, it is a frank declaration of hermeneutic stance. It betrays a self-awareness that is not always expressed by traditional commentators.

Moreover, it is significant that the invocation mentions previous ācāryas only generally, and no particular teacher is singled out for particular gratitude. Though not conclusive by itself, this point certainly lends support to the notion that whatever the relationship may have been between the Caitanyites and the Mādhva sect, it was certainly not based on any particular philosophical or procedural allegiance.

The invocation cited above also sheds light on the process of formulating the philosophical stance of the commentary. Viśvanātha Cakravarti states clearly that he has thoroughly studied the previous commentaries written on the Bhagavad-gītā, but that nevertheless he has relied solely upon the doctrine of Śrī Caitanya. Thus we

18 For detail on the invocations to Caitanya at the beginning of Viśvanātha’s works, see section 2.6 above.

19 See section 3.2 above.

20 “prācīna-vācaḥ suvicārya so ‘ham....” See the mangalācarana at the opening of Chapter One of the Sārārtha-varṣini.
find a description of the fine balancing act being performed by the Caitanyites.

On the one hand, they accept and base their statements on traditional teachings, or “prācīna-vācaḥ” (literally “previous statements”). Here we are to assume that Viśvanātha Cakravarti is referring to the previous commentaries sanctioned by antiquity, especially the commentaries of the major vaiṣṇava ācāryas. This would indicate that Viśvanātha and the other Gauḍīya authors consciously consulted and based their works on the teachings of other sects.

On the other hand, Viśvanātha seeks indulgence because when necessary he has overridden the teachings of those previous ācāryas with the doctrine of Śrī Caitanya (yater prabhor eva mate). He retains a respectful stance towards those other great teachers by asking for understanding and indulgence for those instances where he has chosen to ignore their statements.

More detail on this balance is available from a similar statement made by Jīva Goswami in the Tattva-sandarbha. There Jīva says that when explaining the Bhāgavata-purāṇa he follows the commentary of Śrīdhara Swami as a general rule, but only when the Swami’s conclusions match with pure vaiṣṇava tenets. Jīva considers the Swami a great vaiṣṇava who had in some passages introduced monistic philosophy to attract the numerous monists to the glories of Bhagavān. In those cases Jīva says that he would ignore those passages and instead refer to other works of Śrīdhara Swami or to doctrine found in the works of Rāmānuja.\(^{21}\)

Again this is very significant in our attempt to trace the sectarian affiliation of the Gauḍīya vaiṣṇavas. Jīva makes explicit mention of both Śrīdhara and Rāmānuja as authorities to whom he would refer in matters of doctrine.

Just as significant is the fact that Jīva fails to mention Madhvacārya there as a special authority. This is additional support for the notion that the relationship between the followers of Caitanya and those of Madhva was not based on any doctrinal conformity. When Jīva does mention Madhva, it is in the following section (#28), where Jīva outlines his own bibliographical sources. There Jīva says that in most cases he has quoted from sacred scriptures which he has personally sighted. In some cases, however, he has quoted from sources which he has not personally seen but which are mentioned in the works of Madhvacārya and his followers.\(^{22}\)

Thus a pattern emerges where both Viśvanātha and Jīva base their works on several of the previous great teachers, and where Madhvacārya merits no special mention. Moreover, in certain cases, both Viśvanātha and Jīva apply a fresh

\(^{21}\) Tattva-sandarbha, section 27.

\(^{22}\) Tattva-sandarbha, section 28.
interpretation based on their own understanding. In Jīva’s case that understanding is said to be developed in harmony with the spirit of the speaker and compiler of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa (Śuka and Vyāsa).23 In Viśvanātha’s case that understanding is said to be based on “the doctrine of my ascetic Lord (Śrī Caitanya)”.23

This stance of Viśvanātha suggests that he was proposing his commentary as an independent representative of the teachings of his “ascetic lord”, Caitanyadeva. There is not even a token gesture at affiliation with the Mādhva sect. Quite the opposite, Viśvanātha proclaims that despite consulting the commentaries of old, he has made a commentary which represents the doctrine of the Mahāprabhu, Caitanya.

To fully understand this situation one needs to understand the nature of tradition in Indian religion. A new interpretation cannot be totally new, otherwise it would be heretical.24 Caitanya and his followers were not interested in establishing something heretical.25 To the contrary, they saw themselves as remaining within the orthodoxy of the vaiṣṇava faith, but at the same time introducing a new emphasis, or better still, they saw themselves as revealing a deeper understanding of the already existing scriptures and practices. Madhva himself is said to have done something similar when he took initiation within the monistic sect of Śaṅkara to gain authenticity, but then developed a dualistic philosophy from that base.

A comparison with Buddhism would perhaps be useful. From the perspective of Hinduism, Buddhism is considered heretical despite its enormous similarities, because Buddhism rejects outright such fundamental aspects of Brahmanism as the authority of the Vedas and the importance of the caste system. Although Caitanya vaishnavism also effectively rejects both of these notions, the Caitanya school does not openly repudiate them, but rather accepts them, appropriates them with all their status, and then through astute textual interpretation explains them away.

For example, in the Tattva-sandarbha, Jīva Goswami accepts that the Vedas are authoritative and of divine origin but explains that they are not completely available, nor readily understandable, nor do they deal with the highest subject matter. Therefore, he replaces the Vedas with the Bhāgavata-purāṇa as his highest

23 Tattva-sandarbha, section 49.

24 T.K. Stewart 1994 p. 229ff (in a slightly different context) describes how the Gaurīya sect tends to assimilate and incorporate older traditions rather than rejecting them outright. S. K. De (1961: 542-555) describes a similar process with regard to the Gaurīya stance on caste and ethics.

authority. But he does it in such a way as to maintain respect for the Vedas, and to remain within the “Vedic” tradition.

Similarly the invocation of the Sārārtha-varṣini declares that Viṣvanātha does not propose to reject any of the commentaries of the previous great teachers; rather he plans to use them, quote them, acquire them, and build on them.

26 Details in Section 1.3.2 above.
4.3 Acknowledged Quotations of Authorities

Given the approach outlined in the invocations of the *Sārārtha-varṣini*, we should next analyse the actual authorities quoted in the text under study. Viśvanātha Cakravarti does not frequently quote authorities openly in the *Sārārtha-varṣini*. The following is a table of quotations made in a sample of the text (chapters 1-6):

**Table 6: Authors Cited by Name in the *Sārārtha-varṣini* (chapters 1-6).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Quoted</th>
<th>Verse Reference From <em>Sārārtha-varṣini</em></th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śrīdhara Swami</td>
<td>2:44, 2:45, 2.45, 4:6, 4:6, 4:9.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmānujacārya</td>
<td>3:7 4:6, 4:9, 4:9, 4:10, 4:10.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhusūdana</td>
<td>4.6, 4.6, 4.7, 4.9, 4.36.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasvati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhva</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaṅkara</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this table we have clear confirmation of the notion that the Mādhva sect had no particular philosophical or procedural influence on the Gaṇḍīya sect. Madhvācārya is not once cited by Viśvanātha Cakravarti in this six chapter sample passage of the *Sārārtha-varṣini*. Whatever the relationship between the Mādhvas and the Caitanyites may have been by initiation, one thing is certain: there was little if any influence of Mādhva doctrine in Viśvanātha’s flagship *Bhagavad-gītā* commentary.

Moreover, the above table makes it quite clear that Viśvanātha did quote previous ācāryas; he simply did not quote Madhva. Of the four vaisnava sampradāyas, Viśvanātha shows a clear preference for quoting Rāmānuja (six times in the above sample). In fact, Rāmānuja is the only such ācārya quoted by Viśvanātha. It was noted above in section 4.1.1 that Jīva Goswami had mentioned Rāmānuja as his preferred authority in matters which required a thoroughly vaisnava perspective. The above table shows numerical evidence of that principle in action in the work of Viśvanātha.

Also in line with Jīva’s stated policy is Viśvanātha’s predilection for quoting Śrīdhara Swami (six times in the sample). It is clear that Śrīdhara Swami was the
chief textual authority for the Gaurīya vaisṇava sect, and his particular influence on this text will be studied more carefully in the next section (4.4). The above table shows him equal with Rāmānujacārya in terms of number of acknowledged quotations in the six chapter sample of the Sārārtha-varṣini.

Perhaps more interesting is the relative prevalence of quotes from Madhusūdana Sarasvati. Like Śrīdharā Swami, Madhusūdana Sarasvati was another commentator who was ostensibly a follower of Śaṅkara, but whose devotional and theistic attitude must have met with the approval of the Gaurīya vaisṇavas. Madhusūdana is said to have written his commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā called the Gūḍhārtha-dīpikā at the end of the 16th century. In it, Madhusūdana embraced many vaisṇava principles, such as the primacy of bhakti and the non-illusory nature of Kṛṣṇa.27 These passages are quoted by Viśvanātha in his own Bhagavad-gītā commentary.

Nevertheless Madhusūdana was still an advaitan sannyāsi. In fact he was the author of a famous treatise called Advaita-siddhi, which was a direct rebuttal of the Mādhva school’s classic work, the Nyāyānmṛta, an attack upon monistic philosophy composed by Vyāsa Rāya (ca. 1460-1539).28 Certainly Madhusūdana can hardly have been very popular with the Mādhva school.

Under these circumstances, it is not clear why Viśvanātha quotes Madhusūdana; it may well be the case that Viśvanātha is employing the kaimutika-nyāya, or an argument a fortiori. In other words, Viśvanātha might be saying that if a famous advaitan sannyāsi like Madhusūdana agrees with some devotional principle, then what to speak of others?

Whatever Viśvanātha’s motives may have been, it is significant that when we combine the quotations of Śrīdharā and Madhusūdana, they represent a clear majority of quotations. The Gaurīya sect seems to have been very comfortable with this class of devotional advaitan sannyāsis to which both Śrīdharā Swami and Madhusūdana belonged. This is hardly surprising, since Caitanya himself and many of his peers and precursors were also advaitan sannyāsis by initiation.

This is not to say that the Caitanya sect should be considered a Śaṅkara sect; it is most definitely a vaisṇava sect. However, as noted above in section 4.1 their acintya-bhedābheda approach is far more of a synthesis of monism and dualism than the work of Madhva. The devotional advaitan sannyāsis like Śrīdharā and Madhusūdana also attempted such a synthesis from the other direction, which would

---


explain their common ground with the Gaurīyas. Certainly Jīva and Viśvanātha both seem to have had an open approach to these advaitan sannyāsīs. Viśvanātha’s willingness to favourably quote them is quite clear from Table 2.
4.4 The Influence of Śrīdharā Swami

On closer analysis of Viśvanātha’s Sārārtha-vaṁśinī and Śrīdharā Swami’s Bhagavad-gītā commentary, the Subodhinī, a much deeper relationship emerges between the two texts. It becomes evident that Śrīdharā Swami’s work forms the foundation of Viśvanātha’s text.

To fully tease out the relationship between the two texts would be a full dissertation in itself. In this particular dissertation, I am simply trying to detect the influence of any sectarian affiliation in Viśvanātha’s commentary, and to examine this in light of the issues of the period. I propose to analyse a sample of the text and try to quantify the extent of the influence of Śrīdharā Swami on Viśvanātha’s text. A comparative study of the philosophical stance of Viśvanātha and Śrīdharā Swami will have to wait until a later date.

As a preliminary example of what is meant by the influence of Śrīdharā Swami on Viśvanātha, let us examine their respective commentaries on verse twenty seven of chapter three (prakṛter kriyamāṇāni...):

---

29 It is not the intention of this work to contrast the interpretive stance of Viśvanātha Cakravarti with that of famous Bhagavad-gītā commentators, as has been so ably done for Śaṅkara by T.G Mainkar in his Comparative Study of Commentaries on the Bhagavad-gītā. The comparison in this section is undertaken with the sole intention of ascertaining sectarian affiliation. It will not focus so much on the actual philosophies of the various commentators, but rather on identifying how they influence each other. It will not focus on how they contrast, but rather on how they are similar.
Correspondence Between Viśvanātha Cakravarti (VC) and Śrīdhara Swami (SS) for Bhagavad-gītā chapter 3 verse 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VC: nanu yadi vidvān api karma kuryāt tārhi vidvad avidūṣoḥ ko viśeṣa ityāśāṅkya tayor viśeṣaṁ darśayati,</th>
<th>SS: nanu viduṣāpi cet karma kartavyaṁ tārhi vidvad avidūṣoḥ ko viśeṣa ityāśāṅkhyobhayor viśeṣaṁ darśa-yati,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VC: prakṛter iti dvābhyaṁ.</td>
<td>SS: prakṛter iti dvābhyaṁ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC: prakṛter guṇāḥ guṇa-kāryaiḥ indriyaiḥ sarvaśaḥ sarva-prakāreṇa kriyāmanāni yāni karmāṇi,</td>
<td>SS: prakṛter guṇāḥ prakṛti-kāryaiḥ sarva-prakāreṇa kriyāmanāni yāni karmāṇi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC: tāny aham eva kartā karomāty avidvān manyate</td>
<td>SS: tāny aham eva kartā karomāty avidvān manyate....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from the chart of correspondences on the previous page, Viśvanātha’s commentary on this verse is almost word-for-word identical with that of Śrīdhara Swami. Only some very minor differences are evident:

- Viśvanātha replaces a passive construction with an active one: “viduṣāpi karma kartavyāṁ” is replaced by “vidvān api karma kuryāt”.
- Viśvanātha replaces the words “cet” and “ubhayor” with the synonyms “yadi” and “tayor”.
- The word “sarvasaḥ” from the verse is added by Viśvanātha for clarity.
- Viśvanātha uses the phrase “guna-kāryair” where Śrīdhara Swami uses “prakṛti-kāryair”.

Apart from these very minor changes the commentary of Viśvanātha is identical. Of the thirty six words used by Śrīdhara Swami, thirty (85%) are absolutely identical in Viśvanātha’s commentary. Another five words (14%) are the same word with a different grammatical suffix or a synonym. That makes the two commentaries 99% the same.

This example is enough to indicate a very strong relationship between the two commentaries. However, in order to get a real idea of the influence of the Śrīdhara on Viśvanātha, we will need to know more about the frequency of such occurrences. Is this the only such occurrence of a close correspondence between the two commentaries? Are there other, perhaps less literal, correspondences? To get a feel of the numerical strength of such occurrences I compared each word of the two commentaries for chapter three of the Bhagavad-gītā. The results are discussed in the following sections.

4.4.1 Exact Correspondences

In the analysed sample (chapter three), there were two verses in which Viśvanātha’s entire commentary is taken word-for-word from Śrīdhara Swami. These were verses thirteen and twenty-seven. Verse twenty seven has already been discussed above. Their commentaries on verse thirteen run as follows:

3:13
VC: vaisvadevādi-yajñāvaśiṣṭam annam ye ‘śanti te pañca-sūnā-kṛtaiḥ pāpair mucyante. pañcasaṃnāś ca smṛtyuktāḥ “kaṇḍanī peṣāṇi cullī udakumbhi ca mārjanī. pañca-sūnā grhaṁsthasya tābhiḥ svargaṁ na vindati” iti.

SS: ...aisvadevädi-yajñāvaśiṣṭam annam ye ‘śanti te pañca-sūnādi-kṛtaiḥ kilbiṣair
mucyante. pañcasūnāś ca smṛtāv uktāḥ “kaṇḍānī peṣaṇī cullī udakumbhī ca mārjanī. pañca-sūnā grhaśthasya tābhiḥ svargaṁ na vindati” iti....

As in verse twenty-seven, all of Viśvanātha’s commentary is word-for-word identical with that of Śrīdhara except for some very minor differences:

1. Viśvanātha omits the word “ādi” (etc.) from the phrase “pañca-sūnādi-kṛtaib”.
2. Viśvanātha replaces the word “kilīṣaiḥ” with the synonym “pāpaiḥ”.
3. Viśvanātha uses the compound form “smṛtyuktāḥ” instead of “smṛtāv uktāḥ”.

Thus in Viśvanātha’s commentary upon the forty-three verses of chapter three, the commentary on two verses is taken completely word-for-word from the commentary of Śrīdhara Swami. This represents about five percent of the sample.

4.4.2 Substantial Correspondences

Viśvanātha’s commentary on verse three of that chapter contains long passages are identical with the commentary of Śrīdhara Swami. Thus it represents a slightly different relationship, where the commentary of Śrīdhara forms a sort of structure around which Viśvanātha weaves new material. Viśvanātha’s commentary begins with a passage which loosely corresponds to Śrīdhara’s commentary:

3:3
VC: atrottaram. yadi mayā paraspara-nirapekṣāv eva mokṣa-sādhanatvena karmayoga-jñānayogāvuktāu syātām tadā tad ekaṁ vada niścītyeti tvat-praśno ghaṭate...
SS: atrottaram Śrī-bhagavān uvāca - loke ‘sminn iti. ayam arthaḥ - yadi mayā paraspara-nirapekṣāṁ mokṣa-sādhanatvena karma-jñāna-niṣṭhā-dvayam uktam syāt tarhi dvayor madhye yad ekaṁ bhadraṁ syāt tad ekaṁ vadeti tvadīya-praśno saṅgacchate...

In the following sentences, Viśvanātha diverges from Śrīdhara Swami by introducing his own literal interpretation of the word “niṣṭhā” (“nitaram sthitir maryādā”). At the end of the commentary on this verse, there are again substantial correspondences. Viśvanātha uses Śrīdhara’s definition of the Sāṅkhyaś (“sāṅkhyaṁ - śuddhāntah-karaṇatvena jñāna-bhūnikām adhirūḍhānāṁ”), and Viśvanātha paraphrases Śrīdhara’s definition of the Yogis.

Viśvanātha also cites the same two verses from chapter two of the Bhagavad-
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gītā which Śrīdhara Swami quotes to corroborate his definitions of the Sāṅkhyas and the Yogis: "tāni sarvāṇi saṁyamya..." (2:61) and "dharmyāddhi yuddhāt śreya..." (2:31).

So in his commentary on this verse (3:3) Viśvanātha has used substantial material from Śrīdhara’s commentary. Some of it has been taken word-for-word, some of it has been paraphrased and Viśvanātha has quoted the same verses which Śrīdhara had cited. But Viśvanātha has also introduced original material of his own.

Verse twenty four is another example where Viśvanātha’s commentary is a mixture of both original material and a significant passage from Śrīdhara’s commentary:

3:24
VC: ...tātaś ca varṇa-saṅkaro bhavet tasyāpy aham eva kartā syām, evam aham eva prajā hanyāṁ maliniṅkuryām.
SS: ...tataś ca yo varṇa-saṅkaro bhavet tasyāpy aham eva kartā syāṁ bhaveyam, evam aham eva prajā upahanyāṁ maliniṅkuryāṁ iti.

So if we add these verses (3:3 and 3:24) to the above two verses (3:13 and 3:27), we have four verses from a total of forty-three verses in the sample which are either identical to or substantially taken from the commentary of Śrīdhara Swami. This equates to almost ten per cent of sample.

4.4.3 Correspondence in Prefatory Remarks

Viśvanātha has a tendency to copy the prefatory remarks from Śrīdhara’s commentary, but to give his own paraphrase and comment on the words of the verse. The following are examples of this tendency from the sample (Chapter Three):

3:7
VC: etad viparītaḥ śāstriyā- karma-kartā grhastas tu śreṣṭha ity āha: yas tv iti...
SS: etad viparītaḥ karma-kartā tu śreṣṭha ity āha: yas tv iti...

3:11

---

30 For the technical description of the term “Prefatory Remarks”, refer to Part B: “Punctuation and Layout of the Edited Text”. 
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VC: katham iṣṭa-kāma-prado yajño bhavet tatrāha: devān iti...
SS: katham iṣṭa-kāma-dogdho yajño bhaved ity atrāha. devān iti...

3:12
VC: etad eva spaṣṭikurvan karmākaraṇe doṣam āha: iṣṭān iti...
SS: etad eva spaṣṭikurvan karmākaraṇe doṣam āha: iṣṭān iti...

3:14
VC: jagac cakra-pravṛtti-hetutvād api yajñaṁ kuryād evetyāha...
SS: jagac cakra-pravṛtti-hetutvād api karma kartavyam ity āha: annād iti tribhiḥ...

3:20
VC: atra sadācāram pramāṇayati: karmaṇeti...
SS: atra sadācāram pramāyati: karmaṇeti...

3:22
VC: atrāham eva drṣṭānta ityāha tribhiḥ...
SS: atrāham eva drṣṭānta ityāha na me iti tribhiḥ...

3:32
VC: vipakṣe doṣam āha ye tv etad iti...
SS: vipakṣe doṣam āha ye tv etad iti...

The above verses (3:7, 11, 12, 14, 20, 22, and 32) are examples of where Viśvanātha has followed word-for-word Śrīdhara Swami’s prefatory remarks, but has introduced his own material in the remainder of his commentary.

There are other verses in the sample chapter where Viśvanātha abbreviates or expands on the ideas of Śrīdhara’s prefatory remarks:

3:4
VC: citta-śuddhyabhāve jñānānupattim āha: neti.

3:19
VC: tasmāt tava jñāna-bhūmikārohaṇe nāsti yogyatā, kāmya-karmaṇi tu sad-vivekavatas tava naivādhikāraḥ. tasmān niṣkāma-karmaiva kurv ity āha: tasmād iti.
4.4.4 Correspondence in Paryāya-śabda.

Another tool-in-trade of a traditional commentator is the paryāya-śabda, or synonym. The crux of the commentarial style is to rephrase the verse in question into prose and to juxtapose a synonym to each word of the original verse. In the Sarartha-varṣini, Viśvanātha often uses exactly the same synonym as Śrīdhara Swami has used in his Subodhinī commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā. The following examples surfaced in the sample (bold indicates a word from the mūla text of the Gītā):

3:7
VC: *karmendriyāṇi* vāk-pānyādīni nigrhya yo manasā dhyānacchalena...
SS: vāk-pānyādīni *karmendriyāṇi* saṁyamya nigrhya *yo manasā* bhagavad-dhyānacchalena...

VC: ...so mithyācāro dāmbhika
SS: ...so mithyācāraḥ kāpatācāro dāmbhika

3:8
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VC: \[tasmāt tvam niyataṁ nityaṁ \quad \text{sandhyopāsanādi... tava śārīra-nirvāho 'pi}\]

SS: \[yasmād evaṁ tasmān niyataṁ nityaṁ \text{karma} \quad \text{sandhyopāsanādi... tava śārīra-yātrā śārīra-nirvāho 'pi}...\]

3:10

VC: \[...\text{prasaśiṣyadhvam} \quad \text{prasavo vrddhir uttarottaram ativrddhim labhadhvam ity arthaḥ...}\]

SS: \[...\text{prasaśiṣyadhvam} \quad \text{prasavo vrddhir uttarottarām abhivrddhim labhadhvam ity arthaḥ...}\]

VC: \[...iśṭa-kāmadhuk \quad \text{abhiśṭa-bhoga-prado 'stv ity arthaḥ}\]

SS: \[...iśṭa-kāmadhuk iśṭān kāmān dogdhīti tathā \quad \text{abhiśṭa-bhoga-prado 'stv ity arthaḥ}\]

3:12

VC: \[...vr̥ṣṭyādi-dvāreṇa...annādīn...ebhyo devebhyāḥ paṇca-mahā-yajñādibhir adattvā ... sa tu caura\]

SS: \[...vr̥ṣṭyādi-dvāreṇa...annādīn...ebhyo devebhyāḥ paṇca-yajñādibhir adattvā ... sa tu stena caura\]

3:14

VC: \[...annād eva śukra-śoṇita-rūpeṇa pariṇatāt...ṛtvig-yajamāṇa-vyāpāṛatmakatvāt karmāṇaḥ\]

SS: \[...annāc chukra-śoṇita-rūpeṇa pariṇatāt...karmāṇaḥ yajamāṇādi-vyāpāreṇa\]

3:15

VC: \[...kāryam avaśya-kartavyatvena vihitam \text{param mokṣam}...\]

SS: \[...kāryam avaśya-kartavyatvena vihitam... \text{param mokṣam}...\]

3:23

VC: \[anuvartante anuvarterann ity arthaḥ.\]

SS: \[anuvartante anuvarterann ity arthaḥ.\]

3:30

VC: \[mayi karmāṇi sannyasya samarpya \quad \text{nirāśīr niśkāmo nirmamaḥ}\]

SS: \[karmāṇi mayi sannyasya samarpya... \text{nirāśīr niśkāmo...mamata-śunyo...}\]
Thus there are ten verses in the thirty-four verse sample (23%) in which part of Viśvanātha’s interpretation (his choice of synonym or his paraphrasing) is practically word-for-word identical to the *Subodhinī* of Śrīdhara Swami.

Verse thirty-seven also has an interesting passage in which parts of Viśvanātha’s interpretation are certainly based on some distinctive elements from Śrīdhara Swami, but there is not the word-for-word correspondence noted above. Here, Viśvanātha has expressed the same idea in his own words:

### 4.4.5 Correspondences in Quoted Verses.

Another important aspect of the commentarial style is the appeal to authority by quoting a verse from the scriptures to support one’s argument. Again Viśvanātha quotes the same verses as Śrīdhara Swami. In section 4.4.1 above, we noted that Viśvanātha’s commentary to verse 3:13 contains a verse quoted from the *smṛti* scriptures (“*kaṇḍanī peśanī cultī...*”) which had been quoted by Śrīdhara Swami.

In his commentary to verse 3:15, Viśvanātha quotes two verses (“*asya mahato bhūtasya...*” and “*agnau prāstāhutiḥ samyag...*”)31. These very same verses are also found in Śrīdhara Swami’s commentary on 3:15 and 3:14 respectively.

### 4.4.6 Summary of Correspondences

It is clear that there are very close correspondences between the commentary of Viśvanātha and the commentary of Śrīdhara Swami. In the above sections we

---

31 BrU 2.4.10. and *Manu Smṛti* 3.76.
have tried to put some kind of an indicative numerical value on the degree of
closeness. In the test sample (Chapter Three), we identified thirty-five per cent of
the verses in which Viśvanātha’s commentary was either identical to or contained
significant passages from the commentary of Śrīdhara. In addition to that, there was
a considerable group of verses which contained small but distinctive portions of the
interpretation of Śrīdhara Swami. In total, around fifty per cent of the verses from
the sample contained evidence of some kind of influence from the commentary of
Śrīdhara Swami.

In modern academic scholarship, such a close relationship would be termed
plagiarism. Viśvanātha has used verbatim significant passages from Śrīdhara
Swami’s commentary without acknowledging their source. However, it would be
a grave mistake to use today’s academic criteria to judge a work of a different period
and a totally different scholarly milieu. Our present academic convention always
requires “original scholarship” and requires acknowledgement of the source of ideas.
In particular, passages copied word-for-word must be acknowledged.

The art of Sanskrit commentary, however, belonged to a different world, with
different norms and conventions. In section 4.2 above we remarked that “new”
schools of thought in Indian religious philosophy were not eager to be so different
as to be termed heretical. New schools were formed from within orthodoxy. We
noted the example of Madhva himself, who took initiation as a Śaṅkarite sannyāsi
and from that position within the orthodoxy he developed an opposition school of
thought.

Thus a new commentator was not expected to have different views on
everything. He was not expected to have original ideas on everything. To the
contrary, if he could use some of the ideas of the established orthodoxy, his new
school would appear authentic. Thus all the great teachers who wrote Sanskrit
commentaries on the Bhagavad-gītā borrowed extensively from the existing
tradition. Commentators like Śrīdhara Swami, Nīla-kaṇṭha, and Madhusūdana
Sarasvati based their interpretations closely on the metaphysics of the Śaṅkara-
bhāṣya but added some simple but far-reaching revisions, such as the crucial role of
bhakti in attaining liberation. None of these scholars felt the need to constantly
reference the enormous amount of material they used from Śaṅkara’s commentary.32
Evidently this was the convention. It seems one was expected to use significant
amounts of material from one’s own tradition.

Viśvanātha’s extensive use of material from Śrīdhara Swami should be seen

---

32 According to Mainkar’s appendix (1969: ii) Śrīdhara Swami only
mentions Śaṅkara by name once in his entire commentary. Madhusūdana
does so eighteen times and Nīla-kaṇṭha twenty times.
in the light of his own culture, not ours. Using material from previous teachers was standard practice and, far from being contemptible, was greatly esteemed, as it established the commentary within the tradition, within the orthodoxy.

Even Madhva, whose very *raison d’être* was to confront the monistic teachings of the Śaṅkara school, used material from Śaṅkara and his followers. This probably meant that there was a strong tradition which extended well back beyond our two oldest extant commentators, Śaṅkara and Bhāskara. In fact in some instances the tradition is so strong that practically all the well-known commentaries correspond very closely. Take for example the prefatory comments to verse 3.9:
Correspondence Between Major Schools* for Prefatory Remarks to 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śaṅkara</td>
<td>yac ca manyase</td>
<td>bandhārthatvāt karma na kartavyam iti tad asat. katham:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanumān</td>
<td>yat tu manyase</td>
<td>bandha-hetutvāt karma na kartavyam iti tad asat katham:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāskara</td>
<td>yac ca manyante sāṅkhyaḥ sarvāḥ</td>
<td>karma bandhātmakam iti tad asad ity āha:...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīdhara</td>
<td>sāṅkhyaś tu sarvam api</td>
<td>karma bandhakatvān na kāryam ity āhus tan nirākurvan āha:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallabha</td>
<td>sāṅkhyaḥ tv ātmātiriktaśya</td>
<td>bandhakatvam ālocya karma na kāryam iti vadanti. tad tad adhikṛta-viṣayam api na..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ānanda-gīri</td>
<td>&quot;karmaṇā badhyate jantuḥ&quot; iti śmṛṭer</td>
<td>bandhārthaṁ karma. tan na śreyo'ṛthinā kartavyam ityāśaṅkām anūdyā dāṣayati:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mādhva</td>
<td>&quot;karmaṇā badhyate jantuḥ&quot; iti</td>
<td>karma bandhakam śmṛtam ity atā āha:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīla-kaṇṭha</td>
<td>nanu &quot;karmaṇā badhyate jantuḥ&quot; iti</td>
<td>karmāṇāṁ bandhakatva-smṛteḥ katham mumukṣum māṁ tatra niyojayasīti āśaṅkyāha:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśvanātha</td>
<td>nanu tarhi &quot;karmaṇā badhyate jantuḥ&quot; iti smṛteḥ karmāṇi kṛte bandhāḥ syād iti cen na. paramēṣvārārpitaṁ karma na bandhakam ity āha:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Arranged in such a way as to bring out the correspondences.
The table on the previous page shows clearly the correspondences between these teachers of various persuasions. In many other instances, they disagree with each other on major points of doctrine, and many of them only exist as a rebuttal of the others. Nevertheless, they all speak with one voice in this instance. Not only do they speak with one voice, they use the same phrases word-for-word.

We even see Madhva giving the same interpretation as Śāṅkara, and using the same scriptural citation from the Mahābhārata as used by Śāṅkara's prominent disciple Ānanda-giri. It is a shared tradition of interpretation which obviously extended back before Śāṅkara to commentaries which are now lost.

Now none of these commentators acknowledge where they sourced their ideas. There was obviously no convention requiring them to do so. In this case that would hardly seem necessary. There is only one interpretation, and to follow it was normal. It would be more necessary to explain if one intended to depart from it.\(^3\)

In fact, when Viśvanātha actually gives a referenced quote to Śrīdhara Swami's commentary it is usually when Viśvanātha wishes to diverge from Śāṅkara. At that point Viśvanātha cites Śrīdhara Swami by name to support his own interpretation.\(^4\)

And yet the analysis of chapter three above showed that every second verse commented on by Viśvanātha displays some word-for-word correspondence with the commentary of Śrīdhara Swami. But in the same chapter Viśvanātha does not cite Śrīdhara Swami by name once. In the first six chapters Viśvanātha only quotes him by name six times. It is clear that there was a strong sense of tradition among the commentators of the Bhagavad-gītā, and they seemed happy to share that tradition without feeling the need to acknowledge their direct source.

It can hardly be termed plagiarism when every educated scholar must have been well acquainted with the existing commentaries. It is highly unlikely that the subsequent commentators were trying to pull the wool over the eyes of their educated audiences. To the contrary, it must have been quite obvious to any educated reader that much of the material for these new commentaries was part of a shared tradition.

Moreover in the example given above (3.9), it is difficult to say where Viśvanātha sourced his ideas. Was it from Nīla-kaṇṭha, Madhva, or Ānanda-giri? Or was it simply a shared tradition, a "received" understanding of the text, which was passed down textually and orally in religious debate? It is interesting to note

\(^3\) Only Rāmānuja's prefatory remarks on this verse show no correspondence with the rest of the commentarial tradition.

\(^4\) For example in verse 4.9 where Śaṅkara asserts that Kṛṣṇa's bodily form consists of matter (prakṛti), Viśvanātha cites Śrīdhara Swami by name to support his own interpretation of the word prakṛti as "inherent nature".
that in all the correspondences noted above between Śrīdharā Swami and Viśvanātha Cakravarti, hardly one is 100% word-for-word exactly the same. Most have simple little differences of a word or two in each passage. This raises the possibility that Viśvanātha was not always consulting a written text of Śrīdharā’s commentary, but remembering passages from previous study or discussion.

At the beginning of most of these commentaries, one sometimes finds a brief mention of previous commentators. For example, Śrīdharā Swami anonymously refers to Śaṅkara and Ānanda-giri:

I have critically analysed the doctrines presented by the author of the bhāṣya and his commentator and I have written this commentary according to my own understanding.

There seems not to have been any other social requirement to acknowledge a source. Rather it seems that the commentator was expected to use material from an established tradition, and acknowledgement was reserved only for exceptional circumstances. This would seem to reflect a different academic paradigm, where the underlying assumption is that one would follow a tradition.

And certainly from the analysis of the text in this section, Viśvanātha’s commentary is clearly based on the commentary of Śrīdharā Swami.
Influence of Other Commentators

The previous sections established a significant degree of correspondence between the commentary of Viśvanātha and that of Śrīdhara Swami. In the vast majority of cases where there was a very close word-for-word correspondence between Viśvanātha’s commentary and that of Śrīdhara Swami, there was no correspondence at all between Viśvanātha’s commentary and those of Śaṅkara, Mādhva, Rāmānuja, or Nīla-kaṇṭha. This is very significant because it means that the abundant similarities between Viśvanātha’s commentary and that of Śrīdhara Swami can not be dismissed as the “shared tradition” mentioned above, nor can they be attributed to the normal chance similarities one would expect to appear when two people interpret the same text.

There are nevertheless some instances when the close correspondence between the commentary of Viśvanātha and that of Śrīdhara Swami is indicative of a shared tradition between all commentators rather than a special relationship between Viśvanātha and Śrīdhara. Again, it should be stressed that when Viśvanātha’s commentary corresponds word-for-word with that of Śrīdhara Swami there was practically no correspondence at all with any of the famous commentators. The few exceptions to that rule will now be analysed since “the exceptions confirm the rule”. In section 4.4.4 above, the following correspondence was noted:

3:37

VC: \[\ldots kāma eva \ kenacit pratiḥato bhūtvā \ krodha kāreṇa \ parinamātyarthah\ldots\]
SS: \[\ldots kāma eva hi \ kenacit pratiḥataḥ \ krodha hātmanā \ parinamate\ldots\]

Upon wider analysis, the correspondence is found to be much more widespread:

3:37

VC: \[\ldots kāma eva \ kenacit pratiḥato bhūtvā \ krodha kāreṇa \ parinamātyarthah\ldots\]
SS: \[\ldots kāma eva hi \ kenacit pratiḥataḥ \ krodha hātmanā \ parinamate\ldots\]
Śaṅkara: \[\ldots sa eṣa kāmaḥ pratiḥataḥ kenacit \ krodhaḥ saṃpadye\]
Bhaskara: \[\ldots sa eva \ kenacit pratiḥataḥ \ krodhaḥ sampadyate\]
Rāmānuja: \[eṣa eva pratiḥata-gatīḥ pratiḥatiḥetubhūtacetanān prati krodha-rupeṇa parinatō.\]
Nila-kaṇṭha: ...sa eṣa kāmaḥ kenacit nimittaḥ pratihataḥ krodha-rūpeṇa pariṇamate

A simple point is made by each of these commentators: when lust is frustrated it transforms itself into anger. This interpretation seems to be a widely accepted view, a common ground shared by the major schools. Therefore this is a particular case in which the correspondence between Viśvanātha and Śrīdhara does not necessarily indicate that Viśvanātha based his interpretation on Śrīdhara Swami’s. This was simply a widely held view amongst religious philosophers in India. One cannot conclude from this example anything about a specific relationship between Viśvanātha and Śrīdhara Swami, because the influence may have come from any or all of the above commentators.

Of course, given the considerable correspondence documented above between Viśvanātha and Śrīdhara Swami it is likely that even this traditional interpretation came to Viśvanātha through the medium of Śrīdhara Swami.

This example is, however, significant with respect to the relationship between Viśvanātha and Madhva. The various correspondences for verse 3:37 listed above do not include Madhva. Madhva says the point of this phrase is that wherever we find anger we must assume that lust is behind it in some kind of causal role. Thus Madhva positions himself outside the widespread tradition evident above. In fact Madhva says that those who interpret this verse differently to himself have not understood the subtlety of the relationship between lust and anger. Jaya-tīrtha, Madhva’s recognised interpreter, says that Madhva is expressly rejecting Śaṅkara’s interpretation that frustrated lust is transformed into anger.35

And yet despite this warning from Madhva and Jaya-tīrtha, Viśvanātha’s interpretation follows Śrīdhara, Śaṅkara, and others. Not only does Viśvanātha not follow Madhva’s interpretation, but he actually follows the interpretation expressly rejected by Madhva. This would confirm the notion that the influence of Madhva on this commentary of Viśvanātha is negligible. We have also been addressing a wider question of the relationship between the Gaṇapya sampradāya and the Madhva sampradāya in the context of claims of affiliation. The evidence from the text of the Sārārtha-varṣini would tend to confirm the notion that the relationship between the two was only “official” and not based on any doctrinal affiliation.

As shown in section 4.4 above, Śrīdhara Swami exerted by far the strongest influence on the text of Viśvanātha’s Bhagavad-gītā commentary. Madhva seems

---

35 “kāma eva kenacit pratihataḥ krodhatvena pariṇamata iti paresām śaṅkarādīnāṁ vyākhyānāṁ dūṣayati.”
to have no direct influence at all. Perhaps some of the general vaiṣṇava principles expounded by Madhva indirectly influenced Viśvanātha. However even there, Viśvanātha’s commentary often aligns itself more with Śaṅkara than with some of the vaiṣṇava teachers, because Viśvanātha’s commentary is based so strongly on the commentary of Śrīdharā Swami which was in turn based on the commentary of Śaṅkara and Bhāskara.

For example, in verse 3:14 we noted a correspondence between Viśvanātha and Śrīdharā Swami in both interpretation as well as prefatory remarks. This correspondence extends to Śaṅkara and to Nila-kaṇṭha:

3:14 (prefatory remark)

VC: \( \text{jagac cakra-pravṛtti-hetutvād api yajñāṁ kuryād evety āha...} \)

SS: \( \text{jagac cakra-pravṛtti-hetutvād api karma kartavyam ity āha: annād iti tribhiḥ...} \)

Śaṅkara: \( \text{itaś caḍhikṛtyena karma kartavyam. jagac cakra pravṛtti-hetur hi karma...} \)

Nila-kaṇṭha: \( \text{jagac cakra-pravṛtti-hetutvād api karma kartavyam ity āha: annād iti...} \)

Bhāskara: \( \text{jagac-cakra-pravṛtti-hetutvāc cāvaśyaṁ karma kartavyam ity āha...} \)

3:14 (interpretations)

VC: \( ...\text{annād eva śukra-śonita-rūpeṇa pariṇatāt...rtvig-yajamāna-Vyāpārtmakatvāt karmaṇaḥ}... \)

SS: \( ...\text{annāc chukra-śonita-rūpeṇa pariṇatāt...karmaṇaḥ yajamānādi-Vyāpāreṇa...} \)

Śaṅkara: \( \text{annād bhukta-lohita-retah-pariṇatāt... rtvig-yajamānayoś ca vyāpāraḥ karma}... \)

Nila-kaṇṭha: \( \text{annād reto rūpeṇa parinatāt... karme bhyo yāga-homa-dānādibhiḥ}... \)

Bhāskara: \( \text{annād upabhoktād reto-bhūtād... yajamānartvig-vyāpāraḥ karma}... \)

Thus Viśvanātha Cakravarti falls into a group of commentators like Nila-kaṇṭha and Madhusūdana Sarasvatī who base their commentaries on Śrīdharā Swami and Śaṅkara. Surprisingly, it would appear that the Gaurīya vaiṣṇava commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā bears more influence of Śaṅkara than of Madhva.

As another example we may take the interpretation of the word “brahma” in verse 3:15:

3:15
SECTION 4.5 - Influence of Other Commentators

VC: brahma vedaḥ
SS: brahma vedaḥ
Śaṅkara: brahma vedaḥ
Nīla-kaṇṭha: brahma veda 'pi
Rāmānuja: brahma-śabda-nirdiṣṭam parkṛti-parināma-rūpaṁ śaṅiram
Madhva:36 brahma para-brahma

Here again, since Viśvanātha has based his commentary Śrīdhara Swami’s commentary, Viśvanātha aligns itself with the group of advaitan reformers including Nīla-kaṇṭha and Madhusūdana Sarasvati. Ultimately, in detail, Viśvanātha’s commentary resembles that of Śaṅkara more than that of the great vaiśṇava teachers such as Madhva and Rāmānuja.

The correspondences for verse 3:15 listed above clearly demonstrate this. Viśvanātha could quite easily have followed either Madhva or Rāmānuja and thus fallen into line with one of the established vaiśṇava sampradāyas. Instead, by interpreting the word “brahma” as “veda”, he obviously followed Śrīdhara Swami and thus fell into line with the advaitan reformers and ultimately with Śaṅkara. The two great vaiśṇava teachers, Rāmānuja and Madhva, interpret the word “brahma” in this verse as “prakṛti” and “para-brahma” respectively. Again Jaya-tīrtha, Madhva’s interpreter, says that Madhva expressly rejects the interpretation of Śaṅkara and others that “brahma” means “veda” here.37 And again Viśvanātha follows Śrīdhara Swami and effectively ignores Jaya-tīrtha’s warning. It is clear that Viśvanātha’s commentary makes no attempt to follow the Mādhva tradition. It is clear that in questions of theology the Gauṛiya sect made no attempt to align itself with the Madhva sect. Quite to the contrary, the great Gauṛiya theologian Viśvanātha Cakrabarti seems content to loosely align his commentary with the arch enemies of the Mādhva sect, Śaṅkara and the advaita-vedāntists.

And yet, Viśvanātha’s commentary is certainly vaiśṇava in character. Viśvanātha strongly supports the basic tenets of the vaiśṇava faith. He argues for the eternal nature of Kṛṣṇa’s body, birth, and activities (e.g., 4:9). Viśvanātha also advocates the supremacy of devotion (e.g., 3:3) and describes knowledge and action

36 Madhva’s interpretation is much longer, so for ease of comparison I have quoted Madhva’s recognised interpreter, Jaya-tīrtha.

37 “karma brahmodbhavan brahmaṇaḥ vedaṇa prakāśyam iti paresāḥ vyākhyānam asad.”
as two aspects of the same path which leads to liberation (e.g., 3:26). 38 Where does Viśvanātha's vaiṣṇava inspiration come from, if not from the traditional great vaiṣṇava teachers? The most significant source seems to have been the Bhāgavata-purāṇa.

---

38 A comparative study of Viśvanātha's Bhagavad-gītā commentary with those of Śrīdhara, Śaṅkara, Madhusūdana Sarasvati, Nīla-kaṇṭha, Rāmānuja, and Mādhva is a full research project which deserves to be done. I deliberately skim over these important points here, since in the context of this project I have chosen to remain focused on simply identifying the major influences on Viśvanātha's work. The aim of this section is to see what light the Sārārtha-varṣini can shed on the larger historical question of the affiliation of the Gauḍīya sect. T.G. Mainkar (1969: 5-55) compares the stances of these major commentators on these and other important issues. It is interesting that Viśvanātha agrees with the vaiṣṇava acāryas in the broad principles, but with the advaitans in the fine details.
4.6 Influence of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa

An analysis of the source of citations from the sample (chapter three) shows the absolute primacy of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa in Viśvanātha’s commentary:

### Bhāgavata-purāṇa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sarartha-varṣini reference</th>
<th>Quoted verse</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>sva-dharma-stho yajan yajnair...</td>
<td>11.20.10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>vāsudeve bhagavati...</td>
<td>6.17.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>yad upāśrayāśrayāḥ suddhyanti...</td>
<td>2.4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>saṃsthā hetur apāśrayah...</td>
<td>12.7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>svayam niḥśreyasaṁ vidvān...</td>
<td>6.9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>tāvat karmāṇi kurvita...</td>
<td>11.20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>dharmān tyajya yaḥ sarvān...</td>
<td>11.11.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>tyaktvā sva-dharmāṁ caranāṁbhujāṁ harer...</td>
<td>1.5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>vidharmāḥ paradharmāḥ ca...</td>
<td>7.15.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>yat prthivyāṁ vrīhi-yavāṁ</td>
<td>9.19.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>na jātu kāmaḥ kāmānām...</td>
<td>9.19.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Skanda-purāṇa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sarartha-varṣini reference</th>
<th>Quoted verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>aho dhanyo ‘si devarṣe...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mahābhārata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sārārthavarśini reference</th>
<th>Quoted verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>karnaṇa badhyate jantuḥ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Śmṛti”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sārārthavarśini reference</th>
<th>Quoted verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>kaṇḍanī peśanī culī...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manu Śmṛti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sārārthavarśini reference</th>
<th>Quoted verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>agnau prāstāhutiḥ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bṛhad Āraṇyaka Upaniṣad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sārārthavarśini reference</th>
<th>Quoted verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>asya mahato bhūtasya...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bhāgavata-purāṇa was cited by Viśvanātha Cakravarti eleven times in
the sample. Five other scriptures were cited, but only once each. There were citations from the Mahābhārata, Manu-smṛti, dharma-smṛti and Brhad Āranyaka Upaniṣad. The citations from these other scriptures, however, are also cited by some or all of the famous commentators on the Bhagavad-gītā. I.e., they are all verses popular amongst commentators, or “traditional orthodox citations”.

The distinctive feature of Viśvanātha’s commentary is that his main source of authority is the Bhāgavata-purāṇa. Of a total of sixteen citations in the sample chapter, eleven were from the Bhāgavata-purāṇa (69%). The other famous commentators quote extensively from the Upaniṣads, the Vedic saṁhitās, Brahma-sūtras, and the Manu-smṛti. These are the orthodox scriptural authorities for traditional Indian religious debate.

The unique feature of Viśvanātha’s commentary is that it interprets the Bhagavad-gītā in terms of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa. The vaiṣṇava outlook of the commentary is the vaiṣṇava perspective of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa. It is not the vaishnavism of Madhva nor Rāmānuja; it is an expression of the vaiṣṇava principles of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa. This is in keeping with the explicit description of Gauḍīya epistemology discussed in section 1.3.2 above, where Jīva Goswami clearly states that the Gauḍīya sect considers the Bhāgavata-purāṇa as the “Monarch of all means of acquiring valid knowledge”.

In section 4.2 above we also noted how both Jīva and Viśvanātha openly declare their policy: they followed great teachers of the past, but ultimately their overriding concern was to remain in harmony with the spirit of the speaker and compiler of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa (Suka and Vyāsa).

The above analysis of citations in the Sarartha-varṣini indicates their stated policy was indeed implemented by Viśvanātha. In matters of doctrine, the Bhāgavata-purāṇa was clearly the ultimate authority for the Gauḍīya sect as represented by Viśvanātha’s flagship commentary. Śrīdhara Swami’s comments were adopted as the basic structure of the Gauḍīya interpretations, and the epistemological foundations were provided by the Bhāgavata-purāṇa.

Certainly the interpretive task was independent of any established vaiṣṇava

39 The Bhāgavata-purāṇa was not unknown, but was certainly not widely cited by other commentators. Madhva, Śrīdhara Swami and Nīla-kaṇṭha cite it quite often, but nowhere near as much as Viśvanātha and certainly not in the majority of cases. Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja do not cite the Bhāgavata-purāṇa at all.

40 “sarva-pramāṇānāṁ cakravartibhūtam...” Tattva-sandarbha 18.

41 Tattva-sandarbha, section 49.
4.7 Conclusion

In section 3.2 above we noted the vigorous debate at the beginning of the eighteenth century concerning the affiliation of the new bhakti sects in Braja with established vaiṣṇava sampradāyas. That pressure became official state policy of Jai Singh around 1722. We saw that there was an established tradition within the Gaurīya sect of some kind of a delicate link of initiation with the Mādhva sect. Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa (section 3.1.3) seems to have been a particular advocate of officially affiliating the Gaurīya sect with the more established vaiṣṇava sampradāya of Madhva.

In several of his works Baladeva promulgated a disciplic succession linking Caitanya to Madhva. This was based on a tradition that had existed within the sect from the time of Caitanya himself. In section three it was noted that Kavi Karnapura and even Viśvanātha Cakravarti had also referred to this initiatory link with the Mādhva sect.

Thus Baladeva was not suggesting something new by linking the Caitanya sect to the Mādhva sect through initiation. Baladeva’s contribution was to effect a philosophical rapprochement by a synthesis of the two schools of thought. This is mainly evident in his works on Vedānta such as his monumental Govinda-bhāṣya on the Brahma-sūtras.

The evidence from the Sārārtha-varṣini (section 4.4) is important because Viśvanātha was Baladeva’s teacher. The textual evidence from the Sārārtha-varṣini makes it clear that in the generation directly preceding Baladeva, the philosophical influence of the Mādhva doctrine on the Gaurīya school was negligible.

Baladeva’s philosophical affiliation of the Gaurīya sect with the Mādhva sampradāya was more than likely the result of the political situation at the time (section 3.2). It was certainly not the result of any particular, long-standing doctrinal allegiance with the Mādhva school. Viśvanātha’s Bhagavad-gītā commentary, which was a standard bearer of the sect’s theological stance, shows no evidence of any special relationship with the Madhva doctrine. It does contain evidence of a special doctrinal relationship, not with Madhva, but with Śrīdhara Swami and the Bhāgavata-purāṇa.

In the personal letter collection of Sawai Jai Singh, there are several letters sent by various Gaurīya pandits justifying the Gaurīya stance on various issues. Generally these pandits at some point support their arguments with an appeal to authority. The Gaurīya pandits do not refer to Madhva. However time and time again, the name of Śrīdhara Swami comes up. For example:
...We therefore agree that the your Royal Highness should commission a sūtra-wise commentary with quotations from the Bhāgavata-purāṇa. The commentary should be based on the tīkā by Śrīdhara Swami and the Bhāgavata-sandarbha tīkā.\textsuperscript{42}

In the maharaja’s letter collection there are many such references to Śrīdhara Swami and the Bhāgavata-purāṇa as authorities of the Gauḍīya sect.\textsuperscript{43} Explicit statements from Viṣvanātha Cakravarti and Jīva Goswami to the same effect were also noted above (section 4.2). The textual evidence from the Sārārtha-varṣini (section 4.4) also strongly indicates that the main authorities for the Gauḍīya sect were Śrīdhara Swami and the Bhāgavata-purāṇa.

Again the significance of the textual evidence from the Bhagavad-gītā commentary must be stressed. The Bhagavad-gītā is important for two reasons. Firstly, all major schools possess a commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā, so it gives us a common criterion upon which to compare sectarian positions. Secondly, as the Bhagavad-gītā is a “standard text”, one of the prastāhāna-traya, it must be seen as flag-ship work, representative of the sect’s teachings.

In this crucial text we find unequivocal evidence of negligible influence of Mādhva doctrine and significant influence from Śrīdhara Swami and the Bhāgavata-purāṇa. The Jaipur/ Amber state was prominent in the affairs of Braja and was the major patron of the Gauḍīya sect in the 17th and 18th centuries. Political pressure from Jaipur/ Amber should be seen as one of the major factors behind attempts to align the Gauḍīya sect with the Mādhva sect. Evidence from the text of the Sārārtha-varṣini and from contemporary records indicate that in questions of doctrine the Gauḍīya sect had hitherto depended almost exclusively upon the authority of Śrīdhara Swami and the Bhāgavata-purāṇa.

\textsuperscript{42} Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum KD 1519 (a).

\textsuperscript{43} Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum KD 1519, 1519 a), 1521, 1527.
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Appendix:
Translation and Edition of the
Sārārtha-varṣiṇī (chapters 1-3)
A Note on the Textual Edition

The following sources were used in the edition of this text:

Manuscripts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>1709 AD</td>
<td>Jaipur Manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UMS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Udaipur Manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MMS</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Mathura Manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Alwar Manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>VMS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vrindavan Manuscript.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Printed Editions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Editor</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BVT</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>ed. by Bhakti-vilāsa-tīrtha Swami.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KDB</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>ed. by Kṛṣṇadāsa Bābā.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BGP</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>published by Braja-gaurava Prakāśana.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GVS</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>published by Gaurīya Vaiṣṇava Samiti.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manuscripts

1. JMS 1709 AD Jaipur Manuscript.

Location: Jaipur, Rajasthan, in the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, City Palace, Jaipur. It is part of the Khasmohor collection, the "special seal" collection, which is the private collection of the Maharajas of Jaipur.

Reference: The only reference to this manuscript is in the museum catalogue. It is catalogue number 5910.

---

44 Bahura 1976 p. 270.
Date: 1709 AD. The scribe has dated this manuscript thus: "vairī-śatru-saptapṛthvi" "enemy-foe-seven-earth". Read from right to left this gives 1766 VS, where "earth" stands for one and "enemy" and "foe" stand for six. On the cover of that manuscript, someone has written 1733 VS, but I think the more likely interpretation of "vairī" or "śatru" is six and not three. Besides, the manuscript is from the personal collection of the Maharajas of Amber and Jaipur and such a work is far more likely to have been commissioned by Sawai Jai Singh II in 1709 AD than by Raja Ram Singh in 1676. The other date details given by the scribe are unclear: "tapa māsa paṅcama tīthau site 'khilam" The fifth day of the bright fortnight of the hot month. It is not clear which hot month is meant. Assuming that "tapa-māsa" refers to the month of Jyaiṣṭha, this would give us a date of Wednesday, the twelfth of June 1709.

Scribe: Nanu Rāma-candra, perhaps a diminutive name of Tula Rāma, Sawai Jai Singh’s favourite scribe.45

Description: This is a high quality, paper manuscript written in clear “standard” Devanāgarī script. It consists of 118 regular-size folios, written recto verso. Folios 81, 82, and 83 are missing. All folios are written in the same hand. It has been corrected by the original scribe and perhaps a subsequent hand. Corrections are generally added in the margin along with the number of the line in question, and the place of insertion is marked with a semicircular caret-like symbol.

It is set out in dvi-pāṭhī style with the verses of the Bhagavad-gītā in the middle third of each page and the commentary on those verses flanking them on the top and bottom thirds of each page. Every page has two vertical ruled margins on either side.

This is the oldest available manuscript of the Sārārtha-varṣini, dating from within the lifetime of the author. It is also the best quality copy of the text, and together with the Udaipur manuscript, UMS, it formed the basis of my edition. The scribe’s colophon reads:

\[
\text{ati kaṣṭāt samuppanaṁ sarvasiddhānta-samyutam, khala-murkhe na dātavyam evaṁ vadati paṇḍitah. ripu-vairī-sapta-prthvi-mite 'abadake likhitam hi pustakam idam śubhābdake. tapa-māsa-paṅcama-tīthau site 'khilam. nanu-rāma-candra iti viśrutena. iti śrī mahā-mahopādhyāya mahāśaya-śrī-viśvanātha-cakravarti-vinirmittā śrī-bhagavad-gītā-ṭīkāsamāpītā. śrī-govindadevo jayati.}
\]

A wise man will say that (a work such as this), which is the result of much hard work and which contains all received conclusions, should not be given to mischievous fools. This book was written (copied) on the fifth day of the hot month of the year 1766 of the auspicious calendar (=1709 AD) by one known as Nanu Rāma-candra. Thus ends the commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā by the great scholar and gentleman, Viśvanātha Cakravarti. Hail Govindadeva!

I am extremely grateful to Mr. Sahay, the Keeper of the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum for allowing me to photograph this very important manuscript.

2 UMS - Udaipur Manuscript.

Location: Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Udaipur (City Palace, Udaipur), formerly part of the Maharaja of Udaipur’s personal collection.

References: Catalogue of the Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Udaipur, manuscript # 113.

Date: Unknown. The last folio is missing, and with it presumably the scribe’s colophon. There is however a seal on the front folio which reads: “...udaipur-āḍīśa-granthālaya...saṁvat 1931 pauṣa kṛṣṇa...” These incomplete details indicate that the ms was inducted into the Maharaja of Udaipur’s library in January 1875 AD. The library staff said that the library’s collection was greatly increased at that time and that an existing manuscript was probably brought from somewhere else.

Description: This manuscript is written on paper in clear but unartistic Devanagari.

---

46 One hopes that this does not include textual editors and translators.

47 The mention of Govindadeva in the colphon of this manuscript dated 1709 AD is very important evidence of the influence of this deity in Amber/ Jaipur even at this very early stage. In 1709 Govindadeva was still en route to Jaipur/ Amber, most likely at Rūpahēra, at the mouth of the Galtā valley (Nāth 1996). This invocation to Govindadeva on a manuscript in Sawai Jai Singh’s library shows that this deity was already influential in the House of Kachavāhā long before being installed as the presiding deity of Jaipur.
script. Presumably it originally consisted of 118 regular sized folios, but this ms ends at folio 117, and folio 118 is missing.\textsuperscript{48}

Every page has four vertical ruled margins on either side. It is also set out in the \textit{dvi-pāṭhī} style described for JMS. The entire manuscript is written in the one hand, but there are corrections by the original scribe as well as by at least one other person. The corrections are made in the same way as described for JMS.

This manuscript is closely related to the JMS but is not of the same high standard. It contains more copyist errors and is thus a poorer member of a good family. On the front cover someone has added up the number of lines in the manuscript. This suggests the manuscript was copied by a contracted scribe who was paid by the line. However it would appear that he did not always understand the subject matter.\textsuperscript{49}

I am grateful to the staff of the Udaipur branch of the RORI for their assistance in the photocopying of this manuscript.

3 MMS 1851 Mathura Manuscript.

\textbf{Location:} Library of the Shree Krishna Janmabhoomi Sansthan, Mathura.

\textbf{Date:} 1851 AD. The scribe writes: "\textit{samvat 1907 phalguna-māse śubhe śrī-krṣna-pakṣe vadi10 maṅgalavāsare...}" This comes out as Tuesday, the twenty-fifth of February 1851.\textsuperscript{50}

\textbf{Scribe:} Hare Krṣṇa Dāsa Vaiṣṇava.

\textbf{Description:} This manuscript is written on paper in clear bold Devanagari script. It consists of 100 regular sized folios, none of which are missing. It is set out in the \textit{dvi-pāṭhī} style described for JMS. The scribe has a distinctive way of writing the

\textsuperscript{48} The pagination of this ms is exactly the same as that of JMS. Therefore we are safe in presuming that only one folio is missing at the end.

\textsuperscript{49} Irregularities in punctuation suggest that the scribe is not really understanding or paying attention to the meaning of the text. This manuscript also has a small tendency to include regional spellings such as for (e.g. verses 2.60, 2.59, 2.55).

\textsuperscript{50} As the day is specified as a Tuesday this date must be a \textit{punīmānta} date, otherwise it would work out as Thursday the twenty-seventh of March.
The scribe has a tendency of including regional spellings, such as ः for । (e.g. निम्नकाम).

The entire manuscript is written in the one hand. The few corrections seem to be those done by the original scribe as he went. They are generally crossed out and written in situ.

This manuscript has been very carefully copied with a minimum of copyist mistakes, but its source seems to have been a late manuscript of lower standard.

The scribe, Hare Kṛṣṇa Dāsa Vaiṣṇava, makes a point of revealing that he is a devotee and that the copy was made in Śrī Vṛndāvana, on the banks of the river Yamunā. His copy is evidently a work of devotion:

\[
\text{iti śrī bhagavat-gītā samāptā. samvat 1907 phalguna-māse śubhe śrī-}
\text{kṛṣṇa-paṅgā vadi10 maṅgalavāsare śrī vṛndāvana-madhye yamunā}
\text{taṭe hastā aḵṣara hare kṛṣṇa dāsa vaiṣṇava.}
\]

The librarian at the Krishna Bhoomi Sansthana was very helpful in arranging a photocopy for me.

4 AMS 1853 Alwar Manuscript.

**Location:** Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Alwar (City Palace Alwar), formerly part of the Maharaja of Alwar’s personal collection in the Palace Library, Alwar.

**Reference:** Catalogue of the Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Alwar, Manuscript # 1336.

**Date:** 1853 AD. The scribe writes: “miti pauṣa badi - saṁvat 1909 kā kalyānāṁ astu”. As the scribe did not specify the day of the fortnight, no precise date can be given. The approximate date is late January or early February 1853.

**Description:** This manuscript is written on paper in clear but scrawled Devanagari script. It consists of 96 regular sized folios. It is set out in the dvi-pāṭhī style described for JMS.

---

51 E.g verse 2.8 चिन्तनस्य for चिन्तनस्य. Other examples at 1.11 अविचित्त, 2.20 स्वायत्, 2.28 चिन्त्र.

52 Verse 2.48 or 2.58.
The entire manuscript is written in the one hand. The few corrections seem to be those done by the original scribe as he went. They are generally crossed out and written in situ.

This manuscript is closely related to the MMS, but is not of the same standard. Being written just two years later than the MMS, it is quite possible that it was copied from the MMS or copied from the same manuscript as the MMS. It contains more copyist errors and is thus a poorer member of a poor family.

The scribe quite commonly uses regional spellings, writing ः instead of ः (e.g. निस्कम) and s] instead of ः (e.g. सूच्य) He also writes ः for ः (e.g. श्यामक) On occasions he even writes ः instead of ः (e.g., श्यामकायामिश्रित्य). In the colophon, the scribe has added up the number of lines in the manuscript. This suggests the scribe was paid by the line. It seems that the scribe was more concerned with getting his payment right than getting the manuscript right:

\[
iti śrī bhagavad-gītā samāptā. miti pāuṣa badi - saṁvat 1908 kā kalyāṇam astu. śloka saṅkhyaḥ tīkā kī pāṇkī 2130 i kī sasaitisakā śloka 3061 mūla saṅkhyaḥ 756 saṅkhyaḥ 3815.
\]

The staff at the Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, in Alwar were very helpful in arranging a photocopy for me.

5 VMS - Vrindavan Manuscript.

Location: Vṛndāvana Research Institute, Microfilm collection.

Date: Undated.

Description: This manuscript is written on paper in clear Devanagari script. It

53 Verse 2.41.

54 Verse 2.57.

55 Other examples at verses 2.8, 2.14, 2.32. Sometimes the scribes over corrects in the opposite way, changing a legitimate ः to a ः, as in verse 2.48 where he writes ः instead of ः.

56 Verse 2.46.
consists of 108 regular sized folios. The microfilm is fairly clear, but the photocopy made from the microfilm does not clearly show the headings and numbers, etc., which are all written in red ink.

The entire manuscript is written in the one hand. The numerous corrections seem to have also been done by the original scribe. The corrections are made in the same way as described for JMS.

This manuscript is closely related to MMS (and therefore also to AMS). It shares with MMS the distinctive way of writing the *samāsa aksara* र, which is written like a sC.57 I only received this manuscript late in my research, and I only included its readings from chapter three onwards. However, as it belonged to the same grouping as MMS and AMS, it did not provide any new readings, but rather served to confirm the identity of that group of manuscripts.

There is no colophon to speak of:

\[ iti śrī bhagavad-gītā samāptā. śrīr astu. kalyāṇam astu. \]

Dr. Goswami of the Vṛndāvana Research Institute was very helpful in arranging a photocopy for me.

**Printed Editions:**

1 **BVT** 1947 (last ed. 1991) ed. by Bhakti-vilāsa-tīrtha Swami.

**“Śrīmad-bhagavad-gītā”**


**“Śrīmad-bhagavad-gītā”**

---

57 E.g verse 2.8 स्त्रिक्षस्य for स्निक्षस्य. Other examples at 1.11 अवस्थित, 2.20 स्त्रियपि, 2.28 स्त्रियः.
NOTES ON THE TEXTUAL EDITION


3 KDB 1966 ed. by Kṛṣṇadāsa Bābā.

“Śrīmad-bhagavad-gītā”

4 BGP 1987 published by Braja-gaurava Prakāśana.

“Śrīmad-bhagavad-gītā”

5 GVS 1997 published by Gauṛīya Vaiṣṇava Samiti.

“Śrīmad-bhagavad-gītā”
Textual Editing

All the manuscripts and printed editions were collated word by word. Each word of the commentary, but not of the *mūla* text, was collated. This task was made relatively easier by the comparatively short period elapsed since the first composition of the text (ca. 300 years). On average there was only one significant variant reading per line of printed text.

The variant readings were analysed, and a decision was made as to the most appropriate reading. These decisions are the *crux* of textual editing process and they are made on a number of criteria.

Readings are favored if they score well when judged from the point of view of:

- standard spelling
- grammaticality
- semantic appropriateness
- consensus of collated sources
- the relative quality of supporting sources
- examples of the same passage in other works (for quoted passages or cited verses)
- balance and symmetry in the style of the sentence or paragraph

---

58  E.g., 3.28 *sanuṣya* is to be rejected outright in favor of *manuṣya*.
59  E.g., 3.28 *niśkāma-karmam eva* is to be rejected in favor of *niśkāma-karmaiva*
60  E.g., 2.59 “*samārtham*” (instead of “*asamartham*”) is an inappropriate meaning.
61  Other things being equal, a reading only attested in one source will not be accepted.
62  Readings from old good quality manuscript such as JMS has more weight than other sources..
63  An anomolous reading in a quote from the Mahābhārata (e.g., 2.5 “baddhāsmy…” or Pāṇini (e.g., 4.13 “śvārthe ṣyaṁ”) can be verified from a critical version of the quoted work.
64  E.g., 3.34 where parallel passages help to clarify the tangle of readings starting from “*para-stṛ-gātra-...*.”
Readings are not favored if they exhibit any of the symptoms of the natural corruption which results from copyist errors:65

- confusions
- repetitions
- omissions

These corruptions are mostly involuntary mechanical corruptions, as for example, when instead of "vikāsakaś ca" the Braj family reads "vikāsaś ca".66 Sometimes the "corrupt" readings are semi-voluntary, as when a copyist is transcribing at the dictation of another person, and confusions of regional pronunciation can creep in as discussed above with स being written instead of श (e.g. शुर्य).67

Occasionally, however, the corruptions are intentional, as in the second maṅgalacarana verse at the very opening of the work where UMS reads रामानुजस्वामिसंवधिते instead of पाशीनवाच सुविचारे सो. This isolated variant is so flagrantly sectarian that it must be a wilful interpolation. Not all wilful interpolations are mischievous. The printed edition BVT has a tendency to "correct" corrupt readings with "more sensible" readings. Unfortunately two wrongs don’t always make a right, and quite often BVT’s "corrected" readings do not bring it any closer to the original.68

None of the criteria listed above are absolute in themselves and a variant reading is judged on as many of the criteria as possible. Each case is dealt with on its own merits. This is the "art" in textual editing.

In this edition, all variant readings are noted in the first chapter, no matter how banal. In the following chapters, trivial errors are ignored and only variant readings of significance are noted.69 Those variants which attest an alternative meaning or which help to clarify the relationships between the sources have been

65 This is a gross simplification of Katre (1954: 54-62) who identifies nineteen different types and another thirty sub-types.
66 Verse 1.1 (maṅgalacarana).
67 Verse 2.57.
68 E.g., verse 3.41.
69 These are simple, non-sense readings like पार्श्वकल्- for पार्श्वकल्- in UMS 3.2, or absurd punctuation । विशेषतः आ... for । विशेषतः आ... in AMS 3.2.
noted. Even the slightest anomaly in JMS is noted throughout, due to its antiquity and consequent central position in the textual edition.

By applying all these principles of textual editing one can expect to establish a version of the text which is free from the errors which creep into the text through successive generations of copying. One can also expect to be able to identify interpolations. This should bring the edition fairly close to the original text.

There is, however, no guarantee that the resultant edition will be exactly the same as the original. The quality and range of source material are obviously restraining factors. On the other hand, the process of editing will tend to select the most standard, logical, and correct readings. If there were any incongruities or inconsistencies in the original, these will tend to be "edited out". A "non-standard" reading in early manuscripts may be rejected in favour of a standard grammatical form from later sources. In some cases, one would perhaps postulate that the original authorial draft was unclear or erroneous, and the "best reading" may well be a subsequent correction.

Other cases suggest that the original copy contained corrections and that there was some confusion as to what should or should not be included. For example, in verse 2.18 fn 103, there is almost a whole line of text found in UMS which is not found in any other source except JMS, but in JMS the passage has been deleted. The content of the line is so commonplace that one can hardly postulate interpolation. Exceptional cases such as this are difficult to categorise, but they indicate that JMS had been cross-checked with another ms.

The process of collating each word in so many sources is certainly a painstaking affair, but the complexities involved underline the importance of the exercise. The plethora of variant readings which emerge demand analysis. It is particularly imperative to establish which reading to translate if one intends to translate the text.

The printed editions, which would be the natural place to start for any translation contain the greatest number of aberrant readings. Such variants are at best confusing for a translator and at worst can be downright misleading. For

---

70 E.g., verse 3.9 fn. 45, where the non-standard anyam is rejected ( despite finding support in all the mss) in favour of the standard form anyat (found in the later editions).

71 E.g., verse 1.31 fn. 86, where the manuscripts have readings which cannot be easily connected with the context (कृप्यात्मक : JMS, UMS, MMS. कृप्यात्मक : AMS). The reading in the printed editions (कृप्यात्मक) is elegant and stylish, even if it represents a later emendation of the text.
example in verse 2.45, the printed editions have तदनुष्ठाने (tad-anuṣṭhāne) instead of तदननुष्ठाने (tad-anuṇaṣṭhane). This gives precisely the opposite meaning ("practising this" instead of "not practising this"). There are enough challenges for a translator to face without having to deal with aberrant readings like this in the text. The printed editions are riddled with such quirks.\(^{72}\)

Working from a manuscript would be advantageous for a translator of this text, but the erratic quality of the mss demands that several manuscripts be used to verify readings. Even the JMS, which is a very high standard manuscript and which dates from within a few years of the original composition contains a fair share of aberrant readings. The other sources are still necessary in order to fill in those gaps.

This edition has tried as far as possible to avoid conjectural emendation of the text. This edition tries to only use readings transmitted to us through the extant mss. Fortunately the combination of extant mss nearly always allowed the reconstruction of a trustworthy text where all readings included in this edition are attested in at least one of the extant sources.\(^{73}\) Sometimes it was necessary to combine several different readings in the one phrase, so that the phrase as a whole is not attested in any of the extant mss, but each element of the phrase is attested somewhere.\(^{74}\)

This edition is very close indeed to the original text, as it uses a good quality ms (JMS) which dates from just a few years after the original composition. Moreover to correct the few corrupt readings in this ms, there is one closely related ms as well as a relatively independent family of mss. This combination affords an optimum verification for an already excellent source.

\(^{72}\) Another example of a completely reversed reading was noted above in 2.59 "samārtham" instead of "asamartham". In other instances (e.g. 3.16, 3.14) a compounding of inaccurate readings and sloppy punctuation render the meaning almost inaccessible.

\(^{73}\) A possible exception to this is found in verse 3.34 (para-strī...) where for all intents and purposes the reading of UMS has been followed except for its spelling mistake, परिचरण for परिचरण.

\(^{74}\) E.g., see verse two of the opening mangalācarana (pracīna-vācaḥ...) where the last line (yateḥ prabh-or...) as a whole is not attested in any of the mss but all elements are attested in various mss.
Recension of the Text

The time elapsed since the composition of the Sārārtha-varṣiṇī is relatively short (approx. 300 years) and the number of mss available for collation was also quite small (5). Therefore it is probably not worthwhile looking for recensions of the text. Certainly the aim of this scholarly edition was not to establish recensions, but rather to facilitate the task of translation. Nevertheless, the readings of the various manuscripts and printed editions did group together into loose “families”:

---

*Archetype\(^75\)

- *Rajasthani Family Sub-archetype
  - JMS 1709
  - UMS
- *Braj-printed Sub-archetype
  - "Braj Sub-archetype
  - AMS 1853
  - VMS
  - MMS 1851
- *Printed Sub-archetype
  - Printed 1885 (Bengali)
  - BVT 1947 (B), BDM 1950 (B)
  - KDB 1966
  - BGP 1987
  - GVS 1997

---

\(^75\) The terms “archetype” and “sub-archetype” (or “hyparchetype”) are used in the sense of Maas (1958: 5) and Katre (1954: 90). The sub-archetypes are the reconstructed common origin of groups of mss, and the archetype represents the reconstruction of the text to its earliest form possible on the evidence of the extant mss.
The above family groups are established by analysis of the variant readings, which are noted in the footnotes of this edition. The signs of a family are the variant readings shared by a group of manuscripts. When time and time again a group of manuscripts shares variant readings, we conclude that this cannot be the product of chance but rather the result of the manuscripts having a common source. The table below takes Chapter Three as a sample and shows the quantity of shared variant readings:

*Table One: An Analysis of Shared Variant Readings in Chapter Three.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant readings common to AMS, MMS, and VMS (Braj Family):</th>
<th>Variant readings common to all printed editions (Printed Family):</th>
<th>Variant readings common to JMS and UMS (Rajasthani Family):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10(^{76})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example in chapter three, there were twenty-six variant readings peculiar to the three manuscripts AMS, MMS, and VMS. This is hardly likely to have happened by chance. Therefore we group them together, and since they all come from the Braj and Eastern Rajasthan area, they have been labeled “The Braj Family”. In this way we have established three major families.

**The Rajasthani Family**

The Rajasthani family consists of two manuscripts: JMS and UMS, from Jaipur and Udaipur respectively. Together they represent the most reliable source of the text. JMS is the elder and more careful of the two. UMS serves mainly to support the readings of JMS.

The most important relationship between the two texts is in their common readings of passages. Time and time again the Braj family and the Printed family come up with doubtful readings, but UMS and JMS both constantly have a sound readings.

\(^{76}\) This number includes five shared variant readings as well as five readings from the edited text which were only attested in JMS and UMS.
The two mss share precisely the same pagination throughout their 118 folios. That is to say, there is exactly the same amount of text on each folio, and the page breaks come at exactly the same spot in each. This could hardly be by chance and would indicate a strong relationship between the two texts.

As many of the scribal errors in UMS do not appear in JMS, one can safely rule out the possibility that JMS was copied from UMS. However several other possibilities exist to explain the relationship between the two mss:

1) “Father-son” relationship: UMS may have been copied directly from JMS, and in the copying process some errors crept in.

2) “Sibling” relationship: Both UMS and JMS may have been copied from a third ms, and UMS just copied at a lower standard of accuracy.\(^77\)

However, there are instances where JMS has omitted a legitimate word from the text, but that word or phrase is found in the text of UMS, as well as in the other mss and editions.\(^78\) This would rule out the possibility of UMS being a “son” or “grandson” of JMS. It would seem that UMS is a “sibling” (or “nephew”) of JMS.

Another striking relationship exists between the two manuscripts: quite often when text is added in the margin of JMS, that very same text will be completely omitted in UMS.\(^79\) One might speculate that a scribe who is copying a manuscript may not notice or may ignore text added in the margin. Assuming that UMS and JMS are “siblings” (they were copied from the same ms), we would have to say that marginal insertions in the “parent” ms were also inserted in the margin of JMS, but mostly omitted in UMS.

There is a distinct possibility that UMS is a “nephew” of JMS (i.e., UMS was copied from a “sibling” of JMS). The huge number of scribal errors in UMS would suggest that it is the result of a secondary copying.

**The Braj Family**

---

\(^{77}\) Other possibilities are “Grand-father” or “Uncle” relationships: UMS might have been copied from a copy of JMS or copied from a sibling of JMS.

\(^{78}\) E.g., verse 2.8 fn 34 where the whole phrase “न्योक्ता एव खलु” has been omitted in JMS but retained in UMS and all other mss and editions.

\(^{79}\) E.g., verse 3.33 fn 126, verse 3.41 fn 168, 4.10, etc. Another example is in verse 4.35-42 (not included in this dissertation) where JMS adds the verse numbers in the margin, and these very same numbers are omitted from UMS.
The Braj family of manuscripts distinguishes itself from the Rajasthani family through a considerable number of different readings. These peculiar readings are shared by all the members of the Braj family (AMS, MMS, VMS) but not by any of the members of the Rajasthani family (JMS, UMS) nor by the printed family. Chapter three alone yielded twenty-six such occurrences.

Within the family the quality of readings varies greatly. Below is an analysis (again from chapter three) of the copyist errors in the three manuscripts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copyist Errors in MMS</th>
<th>Copyist Errors in VMS</th>
<th>Copyist Errors in AMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this evidence we conclude that AMS is a poorer quality manuscript with less reliable readings.

The relationship between the three mss is not clear. Peculiar readings in all three mss confound any attempt to order them in relation to each other. Both MMS and VMS have been corrected, perhaps at a later date, which is a complicating factor. It seems that none of the Braj mss were copied from another within the group, yet all have a common archetype which is represented in our stemma diagram as a single node from which the whole family proceeds.

The relationship between this family and the printed family is apparent in a small number of peculiar variants which are common to both the Braj family and the printed family. In chapter three (our sample data) seven such variant readings were common to both families. This suggests a more distant relationship, a relationship between the archetypes of both these families, and this is indicated in the stemma diagram.

The Printed Family

The printed family was the most unreliable of all sources. In fact, in and of themselves they were inconsequential in establishing the text. Nevertheless they were collated because they are indirectly useful in establishing the relationships between the text families. Moreover, as these printed editions are the most prominent representations of the text at present, it was important to show just how poor quality the text in these printed editions is. In the third chapter alone (our sample passage) there were forty-four major variant readings of the text which were found only in the printed editions.

As these printed editions are dated, it is fairly easy to chart the relationship between these texts. The BGP edition is the poorest quality. Being quite recent, it
has simply compounded the errors of all its predecessors. There is ample evidence that BGP was copied from the KDB edition which was in turn copied from the Gaurīya Maṭha editions (BVT, BDM). Of these, BDM has made some attempt to correct dubious readings and therefore was distinguished from the other members of the printed family on seven occasions in the sample. The GVS edition is copied from several of these sources.

Interesting variants have developed from the transferral of the text into Bengali script in the first printed edition of 1885 and its subsequent return to Devanāgarī in 1966 by KDB. Although the early printed editions are all in Bengali script, no Bengali mss of the Sārārtha-varṣini have been located. There are strong indications that the first printed editions were made from Devanāgarī mss. For example, in verse 2.21 the printed editions have an alternate reading “janyāpakṣayā” for “janmāpakṣayā”. This is most likely to have happened in Devanāgarī where जन्म and जन्म are likely to be mistaken. This is not the case in Bengali where जन्म and जन्म are quite dissimilar. Thus we postulate a Devanāgarī mss source for the printed family.

Later printed editions were transferred back into Devanāgarī creating some interesting results. The KDB edition was copied from the Bengali Gaurīya Maṭha editions (BDM, BVT), and misreading based on the Bengali script is evident in the new Devanāgarī text. For example in verse 2.22 the three Devanāgarī editions (KDB, BGP, and GVS) all have बद्दुता instead of बद्धुता. This is likely to have come from Bengali बाद्धुता confused with बद्धुता.

Layout and Punctuation of the Edited Text

A textual edition theoretically strives to recreate the original text. However that attempt stops short of recreating the physical layout of the original, even though that original layout is fairly clear. All the available manuscripts are in the dvi paṭṭī format where the mūla text (the verses of the Bhagavad-gītā) is set out in the middle third of each page. The top and bottom thirds of each page are taken up by the commentary on those verses. Since every available manuscript is laid out in this fashion, it would appear that this format was used by the author.

This edition is set out in a more linear fashion with each verse of the Bhagavad-gītā presented individually and followed by the text of the commentary on that particular verse. This format was preferred as more familiar to a global audience and also simpler from the point of view of typesetting.

Verse numbering is another area where this edition makes no effort to re-
create the “original” numbering. The numbers used by the author of the commentary could be fairly easily re-created from the extant manuscripts as there is a good deal of agreement. However, this edition has opted for a regular numbering system where each set of two lines of verse is numbered separately regardless of any grouping of verses together.

Punctuation was very erratic amongst the mss, and no attempt was made in this edition to recreate “original punctuation”. The punctuation of the edition is based on that of JMS and is made with the sole purpose of making the text clearer.

The layout of this edition attempts to emphasise the different elements of the commentary by placing the prefatory remarks of the commentary before the mūla text. The body of the commentary then follows the mūla text. Thus, this edition splits the commentary on a particular verse in two. E.g.: 

Then Kṛṣṇa says, “When one thinks like that and practices tolerating these things, eventually one is no longer distressed by experiencing the objects of sense. When that happens, liberation of the soul is near...

2.16

Immortality awaits that sober person who, undisturbed by these things, is equipoised in both happiness and distress.

“Immortality” means liberation. 81

80 सत्याधिकृत्याः : AMS. सप्ताधिकृत्याः : MMS
81 This lotus symbol is used to demarcate the end of commentary on each verse. If more commentary follows, then it should be understood to be the (continued...
This format is not evident in any of the mss. Rather it is a deliberate attempt to have the format underscore the content. This format is not original but has been used successfully in other editions of commentaries which contain extensive prefatory remarks.\(^{82}\)

The text of the commentary is split at the end of the prefatory remarks, because the prefatory remarks provide the context in which the commentator wants the reader to view the verse. Therefore, in this edition the prefatory remarks precede the mūla text to prepare the reader's frame of mind.

The prefatory remarks almost invariably end with a verb of speech (typically āha) because the commentator is portraying what the original author is wanting “to say”. The commentator attempts to describe what the speaker of the verse is really “saying”.

After the prefatory remarks, the direct commentary on the verse commences with the pratīka. The pratīkā is “the first word of a verse” or “the head word”. The pratīka of the above sample verse, which begins “yam hi na vyathayanty ete....”, will be “yam iti”. Although verse numbers are seen in even old manuscripts, they are not generally used to refer to a verse. The head word, or pratīka, is used to refer to a verse. Thus, commentators use the pratīka to indicate which particular verse they are commenting on.

Commentary on this verse begins “yam iti”, which simply indicates that he is now commenting on the verse that begins with the word “yam”. The commentary which follows the pratīka is of a different nature to the prefatory remarks. The commentary after the pratīka consists largely of paraphrasing and synonyms. Synonyms and interpretations are juxtaposed with the words of the original verse. Classical commentators such as Śaṅkara give synonyms and paraphrases for each word of the mūla verse. The commentary after the pratīka transforms the mūla verse into prose and clarifies any obscure grammatical forms. The focus of this part of the commentary is on each word.

\(^{81}\) (...continued)
prefatory remarks for the next verse.

NOTES ON THE TEXTUAL EDITION

In contradistinction to this, the focus of the prefatory remarks is on the larger context, on larger units within the text as a whole. The prefatory remarks map the development of arguments and themes. They interpret the whole verse in terms of the larger issues of the text. Statements from the original text can be given a particular significance when viewed within a context or in a particular relationship to a preceding verse. That context is introduced in the prefatory remarks before the pratīka.

By separating the prefatory remarks from the commentary which follows the pratīka, this edition separates the pratīka from the verb of speech which invariably ends the prefatory remarks. This can cause some problems because the pratīka itself acts as an ambiguous second object of that verb of speech. In the above example (2.16) the prefatory remarks are grammatically independent. The reported speech which is the object of the verb āha is the clause which ends with the speech marker, “iti”. Nevertheless, the pratīka is a sort of de facto second object of the verb of speech from the prefatory remarks. The gist of such a translation would be “This is what he is saying when he speaks the “yam” verse”.

There is certainly an ambiguous double object involved in these cases, and for that very reason this edition places the mūla text where the pratīka falls in the commentary. This conveys the idea that “He spoke this verse with this thought in mind”. The layout of this edition, however, treats the pratīka as grammatically independent, more like a marker of where commentary on the words of the verse begins. This approach finds support from the punctuation of JMS which has the pratīka preceded by a double daṅḍa. There are other instances where the pratīka has been omitted, showing that the verb of speech from the prefatory remarks is independent. Nevertheless in the original layout of the commentary there is this ambivalent double object of the verb of speech, which is rendered unnecessary by the layout of this edition.

However when the verb of the prefatory remark is not “āha” but “darśayati”, “samharati”, or dr̥dhayati then the independent nature of the pratīka is demonstrated.

Another characteristic of the prefatory remarks is the use of the inceptive particle nanu to introduce a hypothetical objection of an imaginary opponent (pūrva-

---

83 Except where a number of verses are being treated together as in verse 2.56, where dehān iti dvābhyaṁ is not separated from the āha.

84 E.g., verse 3.27.

85 E.g., 2.65.
In this commentary the Viśvanātha Cakravarti ascribes these objections to Arjuna as he listens to the teachings of Kṛṣṇa. In this way he constructs a complex hypothetical exchange between Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna in between the verses.

For example, Viśvanātha Cakravarti introduces verse 2.8 by postulating an objection by Kṛṣṇa to Arjuna’s previous statement:

(Kṛṣṇa then objects,) "But your relationship with me is one of friendship, not respect. How then can I make you my disciple? Why don’t you approach someone you respect, someone like Dvaipāyana (Vyāsa-deva)?"

Arjuna replies:

The coming verse is then portrayed as a response to that objection. In this case, a very vivid and personal picture is painted of the two bantering away between verses.

The prefatory remark is an important tool of the commentator by which he can develop his interpretations and build an argument over a succession of verses or even chapters. The prefatory remark is distinctive from the main body of the commentary by its position before the pratīka and its interpretive (non-paraphrasing) style. The prefatory remark is a characteristic trait of the traditional commentarial style used by famous commentators such as Śaṅkara, Bhāskara, Rāmānuja, and Mādhva.
A Note on the Translation

This translation is an attempt to represent the original Sanskrit text in English. The translation is meant for those who do not know Sanskrit; that is to say, it is not meant to provide a literal word-for-word correspondence to help students of Sanskrit to translate the text. Rather, the English translation of the text is, as far as I could manage, as elegant as the original is in Sanskrit.

In every line, there are notions expressed in the original which cannot or need not be expressed in the translation. There are also just as many times when the translation needed to say far more than the original. I have done whatever was necessary to represent the original text in English.

In addition, as this is a commentary demonstrating the Caitanya sect’s doctrinal position, I have endeavoured to maintain in the translation the viewpoint of its author as he tries to validate his sect’s devotional position.

In formulating this translation, I have benefited from consulting vernacular translations of this commentary, published mostly by adherents of the Gaurīya sect in Braj and Bengal. The Sārārtha-varṣini was paraphrased in Bengali by Kedaranātha Datta in 1886, and that edition was reprinted several times by B.S. Sarasvati and his disciples. A century later, in 1987, a Hindi translation by Kṛṣṇa Viḥārī Miśra was published in Vṛndāvana by Braja-gaurāva Prakāśana (Hari Nam Press). An English commentary on the Bhagavad-gitā, based more or less on the Sārārtha-varṣini, has also been published: The Gītā as a Caitanyite Sees It by Bon Maharaja (1939).86

In this present edition, the mūla verses of the Gītā have also been translated. The Bhagavad-gitā is probably the last book in the world that needs another English translation. However, I felt that the translation of this commentary on the Bhagavad-gitā would have been hard to follow without the verses of the Gītā themselves. The translation of the Gītā verses, however, proved more problematic.

---

86 A few months before the submission of this dissertation, an English translation of the text was published by in Mathura by B.V. Nārāyaṇa Maharaja. Unfortunately my translation work had been completed several years previously, so I did not have the privilege of consulting that work for my translation. In any case, because this present edition is based on several very old manuscripts, there are significant differences between the text of this edition and that of the printed editions, upon which B.V. Nārāyaṇa Maharaja’s edition is based.
than the translation of the commentary. As this translation of the Gītā was meant specifically to accompany this commentary, the Gītā translation had to perform a fine balancing act between reflecting the interpretations of the commentary and not preempting those interpretations. The translations of the verses of the Gītā had to reflect somehow the spirit of the commentary, or else it would make the commentary look beside the point. And yet, if the translations reflected the commentary too much, they would make the commentary look superfluous. Therefore, a fairly neutral "bare bones" translation was therefore called for; but whenever a choice of interpretation was unavoidable, I chose to keep the translation of the verses as close as possible to the interpretation of the commentator. 87

It should be remembered that this translation of the verses of the Gītā is only meant to accompany this commentary. Nevertheless, in the translation of the Gītā verses I have again benefited from the above mentioned editions of the Gītā, as well as some well-respected English translations. These include translations by F. Edgerton (1952), R.C. Zaehner (1969), K.W. Bolle (1979), J.A.B Van Buitenen (1981), R.N. Minor (commentary, 1989).

87 For example, in verse 2.46, several interpretations are theoretically possible. I was unable to express the ambiguity of the Sanskrit verse in my translation. Accordingly, my translation of this verse, follows the interpretation given by the commentator.
Textual Editing Instruments

A single open quote mark ' in the Devanāgarī text marks the spot from which an alternate reading begins. The footnote number in the Devanāgarī text marks the spot where the alternate reading ends. The reading given in the footnote thus represents an alternate reading for the passage in the body of the text starting from the ' mark and ending with that particular footnote number. For example in the passage: प्राप्तिक लोकमोनगोपरीकृतो the alternate reading given in the footnote below is an alternate reading for the passage between the mark ' and the footnote number ⁴³ (in this case the word लोक). Thus the alternate reading सकल in BGP and KDB given in the footnote is instead of the word लोक from the body of the text.

The mark ' will appear immediately next to the footnote number when an alternate reading is to be inserted in addition to what is already in the body of the text. For example in the passage: श्रीनाथाम्बंद्यायिनीगाम नामूलो नापाविलिया the alternate reading in the footnote is to be added to the reading in the body of the text at the point where the footnote number is placed.

The zero sign ø is used in footnotes to show that the passage in the body of the text between the ' mark and the footnote number is not attested at all in that manuscript or printed edition. For example in the passage श्रीनाथाम्बंद्यायिनीगाम नामूलो नापाविलिया the word अन्नमूल न is not attested in UMS.

A single unclosed bracket in the Devanāgarī text indicates the beginning point of a long alternate reading. The end of the variant passage will be indicated by a footnote number which is not directly preceded by a single quote marker (see above).

---

⁸⁸ सकल : BGP, KDB. सकल लोक : BVT, BDM, GVS.
⁹⁰ ø : BGP.
Devanāgarī text in rounded brackets ( ) means that this reading is either found a) in the margin of a ms or b) in brackets in a printed edition.

struck out Devanāgarī text denotes a reading which has been crossed out in a ms.
CHAPTER ONE

Arjuna-viṣāda

1 JMS, UMS, MMS. सैन्यस्यानि : printed. VMS illegible. The chapter headings come as is the custom in Sanskrit texts at the end of the chapter. In the translation I include the chapter name at the beginning of the chapter as is the custom in English texts. This first chapter heading is very uncertain and the choice is really quite arbitrary. In the most reliable manuscripts there is no heading at all. So it is possible that in this particular commentary the first chapter had no heading. I have included a chapter heading simply to match the other chapters. Arjuna-viṣāda is the heading preferred by Belvalkar.

2 रामानुजस्यास्मिस्वाचारिनि : UMS.

3 यते : JMS, UMS, MMS, AMS, VMS.

4 झरणामानस्य : printed.
"May the golden-beamed moon of Śrī Caitanya rise in my mind. That Caitanya-moon makes the lotus-like devotees bloom with joy; the Caitanya-moon eradicates the darkness of this world by its own splendour, by his own holy name. May that Śrī Caitanya increase my attachment for himself."

"Although foolish, I desired to taste a drop of the nectar of the Bhagavad-gītā. After having thoroughly studied the statements of the previous [acāryas], I have in this work relied solely upon the doctrine of my ascetic Lord [Śrī Caitanya]. For this, good people, please show me indulgence."

---

5 This whole commentary on the mangalācarana (from “mahāprabhu-pakṣe...” to “...iti bodhaḥ”) is not attested in any of the printed versions.
6 10 11 12 15 18
Tīkā: [The following is commentary on the first verse of the mangalācarana (gaurāṁśukah...)]. The word “gaurāṁśuka” in reference to Mahāprabhu means “fair in colour” or it can also mean “having reddish clothes”. In reference to Kṛṣṇa it could mean “having yellow clothes”. [In reference to the moon it could mean “having white rays”]. This multiplicity of meanings is possible because the word “gaura” is defined in the Amara-kośa as meaning “pink, white, or yellow”.

This moon gives bliss to the sādhus, the saintly devotees. This moon also causes the best of these kumuda lotuses to unfold.

This moon dispels the darkness of the world with its splendour (“abhikhya”). So too, he destroys the ignorance of all the people who live in this world by his abhikhya. According to the Medinī kośa, “abhikhya” means a “name” as well as “splendour” and “fame”. He destroys ignorance with his name in the form of the mantra, “hare kṛṣṇa hare kṛṣṇa...” He destroys the heavy burden of suffering of the world with his fame, such as his glorious title “The killer of Keśi and Kaṁsa”. And he destroys the darkness with his splendour.

According to Śāka-Pārthiva, Kṛṣṇa-caitanya is that moon, the source of all nectar, and the name of Kṛṣṇa is the living ocean of nectar.

May that moon take charge of my mind and make me attached to himself, because the moon is the controlling deity of the mind. In this way the verse also refers to the moon.

13 ज्ञानय: AMS, MMS.

14 This sentence is only present in UMS.

15 This variety of lotus (kumuda, or the white Nymphaea esculenta) is said to bloom at night in the presence of the moon.
'शासकत्रुपति' २६ 'श्री' २८ 'गोपालपुर्यांमचनीयायर' २६ 'परमांक' २६ 'स्याकुलचक्षु'२५ प्राप्तिधक लोक २५ लोचनगुणरीकित भवानिमन्मज्ञानान्न 'गुजरानुजन' २६ 'स्यान्नांतर्व्याय' २५ 'स्यायन्वितमतम भय निम्क्षायाम ।

'हिंदुट्टर्कन्न' २६ 'दुर्रिज्ञेम्प्रागचरुनिविश्वारहिंटप्रविणियो' २५ पि भृक भारु-साधारणमणुण डूटानामापि स्याबुंधुरामन प्रवाहितारागाहारोभुनामापि मुक्तिविद्यार्क भाषारण्मेव कृत्या स्यान्नांतर्व्याय जनिष्यामाण २६ नायविधायविविद्यव्यवहारथे कोहकोमोहुणी जीवननुव्रती श्रायकृमुनिगणीयान्यायशं कर्न स्थिरयसंन नाहास्येच्छायावादे रणणुर्नुद्वन्तोक्कोषों श्रीमद्विजुणं लक्षणीकृत्य काण्डनित्यांमकसर्वनिदानर्कधर्मपीविद्यार्कनयनं विनविदर्रण्यालंका ।

श्रीगीतान्तर्ख्यामत्तदा २६ 'यायमन्नुर्नूतांत्राघावियं शाञ्जिज्ञामणीकृत्मिति परमपुराणार्थार्थार्थार्थार्थ चपनु। नन्नामाणान्न पटकन प्रथमन निकाकर्मक्षेत्रः द्वितीयन 'भक्तियोगः' नूनीयें २६ ज्ञाननो धीरः ।

ननायानान्न पटकन प्रथमन निकाकर्मक्षेत्रः द्वितीयन 'भक्तियोगः' नूनीयें २६ ज्ञाननो धीरः। ननायानान्न पटकन प्रथमन निकाकर्मक्षेत्रः द्वितीयन 'भक्तियोगः' नूनीयें २६ ज्ञाननो धीरः।

कर्मे दानास्योदस्सरिहृणें २६ चेय्यते॥ भक्तिमेति एव समन्तुकृते । भक्तिस्तु द्वितीया केवला प्रामणोद्वृत्त ।

ननायान यस्य एव परमप्रवत्त ने दृढ़ २६ विध्याधारो ज्ञानान्न अनन्याद्वितियायाय ।

द्वितीय २६ कर्मोदान २६मिश्रेयसिन्धुम्यो विच्छिन्नविष्याय ॥

16 साहाः : printed.
17 ० : JMS.
18 गोपालपुर्यांमचनीयायर : MMS. गोपालपुर्यांमचनीयायर : BVT.
19 परमांक : MMS.
20 ० : BGP, KDB, BVT.
21 सङ्कल्प : BGP, KDB. सङ्कल्पक : BVT, BDM, GVS.
22 ज्ञाननुजन : UMS.
23 ० : printed, AMS, MMS. ग्रंथाय : UMS
24 हिंदुट्टर्कन्न : printed, AMS, MMS.
25 ज्ञानान्न : BVT. ज्ञानान्न : BDM, GVS.
26 ० : UMS.
27 रस : AMS.
28 ० : BVT.
29 कर्मदानक्षेत्रविहरियें : UMS.
30 (कर्मशास्त्र) : printed.
31 भ : BVT.
32 कर्मशास्त्र : KDB.
33 मिश्रेयसिन्धुम्यो : AMS.
Krṣṇa, the son of Vasudeva, is God himself, the supreme absolute with a human-like form. He is directly the supreme absolute. All scriptures agree that his lotus feet should be worshipped. This very same person appeared in this world in Gopāl Purī, Braj, and by his unlimited spiritual potencies he made himself visible to the mundane vision of everyone. He rescued the poor people of this world who were drowning in an ocean of material suffering and plunged them instead into the great ocean of his own love by letting them experience his own beauty and sweetness.

Krṣṇa is famous for being steadfast in his vow to protect the gentle and destroy the wicked. Although this is certainly true, Krṣṇa nevertheless granted his merciful protection even to the wicked who were inimical to him and completely in the clutches of the material illusion. Although it may seem externally that Krṣṇa was killing these wrongdoers and thus alleviating the burden of impiety on the earth, in fact he was granting them ultimate protection in the form of liberation from this world.

But as for those conditioned living beings who would take birth here after Krṣṇa’s departure back to his abode, they would always be afflicted by lamentation and delusion due to their eternal spiritual ignorance. To help these conditioned souls and to confirm the predictions made by the great sages who compiled the scriptures, Krṣṇa spoke the Bhagavad-gītā to his dear friend Arjuna. By the desire of Krṣṇa, Arjuna was plunged into lamentation and delusion in the middle of the battlefield, and then Krṣṇa revealed to him the knowledge of the Bhagavad-gītā.

The Bhagavad-gītā consists of eighteen chapters, and it contains all eighteen categories of knowledge. It is decorated with the jewel of the ultimate conclusion of the Veda, and it directly defines the highest goal of life.

The first group of six chapters explains niṣkāma-karma-yoga (the path of desireless action), the second group of six explains bhakti-yoga (the path of devotion), and the third jñāna-yoga (the path of knowledge). Bhakti has been put in between the two others because it is most confidential, rare, worthy, and it sustains the other two. Therefore it takes the central position. Jñāna and karma are useless without bhakti; they must be combined with some devotion to be acceptable.

\[34\] कथम्पृणःनिश्चिद्धतात्त्विक्येशायाः: printed. कथम्पृणःनिश्चिद्धतात्त्विक्येशायाः: UMS.
कथम्पृणः: भूतात्त्विक्येशायाः: AMS.

\[35\] Namely, four Vedas, six Vedāṅgas, four Upavedas, Purāṇas, Mimāṃsa, Nyāya and Dharma.
As for bhakti, it can be divided into two types: kevala (pure) and pradhānī-bhūtā (primary). The former (kevala bhakti) is inherently powerful and even without jñāna and karma it is pure and potent. This type of devotion is described as akiñcanā (unalloyed) and ananyā (unadulterated). The other type of devotion (pradhānībhūtā bhakti) is devotional service mixed with karma or jñāna. That mixed devotion will be more fully explained later.

The narrator of the Mahābhārata, Śrī Vaiśampāyana, thought that his listener, Janamejaya, might ask him how Arjuna became deluded and lamentful. Therefore Śrī Vaiśampāyana continues relating the story to Janamejaya in the Bhīṣma Parva of the Mahābhārata:

Dhṛtarāṣṭra said, “Sañjaya, what did my sons and the sons of Pāṇḍu do after gathering in the religious area of Kurukṣetra to wage war on each other?”

36 ने : BVT.
37 ø : printed, AMS, MMS.
38 वणणान : UMS.
39 बर्मू : KDB.
40 उपधे : AMS.
41 वो : UMS.
42 १ : MMS.
43 राज्य : AMS.
Dhṛtarāṣṭra says, “My sons (Duryodhana, etc.) and the sons of Pāṇḍu (Yudhishthira etc.) came together at Kurukṣetra to fight (yuyutsavāh). Tell me what they did.”

Now Sañjaya may well object, “You just said they came to fight (yuyutsavāh), so obviously they were getting ready for battle. Why then are you asking me what they did (kim akurvata)?”

To this Dhṛtarāṣṭra replies, “dharma-kṣetre” (“on the field of righteousness”). In the śruti scriptures there is mention of Kurukṣetra as a holy place for offering sacrifice to the gods (kurukṣetram vai deva-yajanam). Thus it is well-established that this place is conducive for performing religious duties. Outwardly Dhṛtarāṣṭra is saying, “By the influence of being at that holy place my unholy sons might give up their hostile attitude and become righteous. As for the Pāṇḍavas, they are by nature peaceful, law-abiding men, so if both sides could come to their senses and understand that it is not good to kill members of their own family, then there could surely be a peaceful solution. And I would be very happy for that.” This is what Dhṛtarāṣṭra is outwardly trying to say to Sañjaya.

Inwardly, however, Dhṛtarāṣṭra is saying to himself, “I just can’t help worrying that maybe the influence of the holy place will in fact bring about a peaceful solution, and then we will be back to the previous political situation in the kingdom, a situation which was troublesome for my sons. Therefore, it is better for us that there be a war, because Arjuna will not be able to defeat our Bhīṣma. So let there be a war.” These are the subtly expressed intentions of Dhṛtarāṣṭra.

With respect to the phrase “dharma-kṣetre”, the word “kṣetra” can also...

---

44 From here to the end of this verse the UMS commentary is written in the margin.
45 चन्दनाभिस्यानि & corrected to चन्दनविश्यानि: MMS. चन्दनानि: BVT.
46 ø : UMS.
47 The source of this quote is unclear. Similar passages are found in the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa (xiv. 1) and the Jābāla Upaniṣad (1.2).
mean “a field” and “dharma” can stand for “dharma-avatāra” or Yuddhiṣṭhira. So “dharma-kṣetra” means the field of Yuddhiṣṭhira. Yuddhiṣṭhira and his family are the crop of rice growing in that field.

Kṛṣṇa is the farmer (kṛṣṭivala) who looks after the field of rice, and when Kṛṣṇa helps the Pāṇḍavas, it is like when the farmer builds little irrigation canals to water the rice crop. Duryodhana and his brothers are weeds which grow alongside the rice. The weeds look just like rice sprouts, but they would grow and strangle the rice paddy; these weeds will ultimately be pulled out by the farmer.

This is the message that the Goddess of speech, Sarasvatī, has sent through Dhṛtarāṣṭra’s words.

1.2

Sañjaya replied: Seeing the Pāṇḍava army drawn up in battle array, the king approached his preceptor and uttered these words:

The word “vyūdhātim” (arranged) in this verse refers to the arrangement of troops in battle formations. The king, Duryodhana, speaks the next nine verses...
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(verses 3-11) with some fear within.

1.3

O my teacher, behold the mighty Pāṇḍava army, set out in formation by your intelligent student, the son of Drupada.

व्यूहां दुपट्टोऽग्रण नव ज्ञाप्य्य भीमना ॥

1.4

When Duryodhana says “by your own student” he is saying to Drōṇa, “You were very foolish, because although you knew that Dhṛṣṭadyumna was born to kill you, still you instructed him in military arts.” When Duryodhana describes Dhṛṣṭadyumna as “dhīmatā” (intelligent), he is saying to Drōṇa, “Your student was very clever because, even though you were his enemy, still he could accept from you the knowledge which would ultimately enable him to kill you. Just you behold all this when it unfolds.”

1.5

circular formation), the asāṁhata-vyūha (the loose formation), or the varāha-vyūha (the boar-shaped formation).

पन्त्युधित्वम् : AMS.
In that army there are the likes of Yuyudhana, Virata, and Drupada, the champion charioteer. They are mighty bowmen who are just as capable in battle as Bhima and Arjuna. There is also Dhṛṣṭaketu, Cekitāna, the powerful Kāśi-rāja, Purujit, Kuntibhoja, and Śaibya. They also have the spirited Yudhāmanyu, the powerful Uttamauja, the son of Subhadra, and the sons of Draupadi. In fact all these men are champion charioteers.

Ṭīkā: At the beginning of these verses the word “atra” (literally “here”) means “in their army”. In their army there are many maheśvāsīs (great archers). A maheśvāsī is someone whose bows (iśvāsā) are so mighty (mahā) that the enemy cannot break them. The Yuyudhana mentioned here is the son of Satyaka. The “son of Subhadra” mentioned here is Abhimanyu. The “sons of Draupadī” are the sons of the five Pāṇḍavas, born of Draupadi, such as Prativindhya.

With regard to the definition of mahā-rathas etc., it is said: “A charioteer who is expert in the science of weaponry and who can fight with ten thousand archers at once is known as a mahā-ratha. One who can fight with an unlimited number of archers is known as an ati-ratha. A warrior who can fight with one archer is called a ratha. A junior charioteer (who fights alongside someone else on the same chariot) is known as an ardha-ratha.”

---

52 चक्षू (चक्षूम) : JMS. चक्षूमाय : BGP, KDB.
53 महान : UMS.
54 श्रुभिमेद्युपतिक्ष : UMS, AMS, MMS.
55 व्यवस्थमात्र : MMS.
56 रथी चक्केन : printed. रथी चक्केन : AMS, MMS.
57 उपरः : JMS.
58 “eko daśa-sahasrāṇi yodhyed yas tu dhanvinām.......”
O Brahmana, now hear from me about our exceptional men, the leaders of my army. For your information, I will tell you who they are: yourself, Bhīṣma, Karna, the victorious Kṛpa, Aśvatthāma, Vikarna, and the son of Somadatta. There are many other great heroes, and they are all willing to give up their lives for my cause. They are all well armed and highly experienced in warfare.

Ṭikā: Duryodhana says “nibodha” which means “please hear from me” or “please know from me”. He wants to fully inform Droṇa, so he says, “samjñārtham” which means “for your complete (sam-) knowledge (jñāna)”.

The “son of Somadatta” mentioned here is Jayadratha.

Then Duryodhana says that all these great leaders are “tyakta-jīvita” (literally “they have given up their lives”). He means, “If dying will help my cause, then they are ready to do so for me.”

But actually Sarasvatī, the goddess of speech, has made Duryodhana speak the truth when he says that they have “given up their lives”. Actually they are
already dead, as Kṛṣṇa says, “I have already killed all these men on the battlefield, Arjuna. Now you just be my instrument for the carrying out of that action.”

Our forces might be deficient, even though our army is under the care of Bhīṣma. Their forces are certainly adequate, for their army is under the care of Bhīma.

Tīkā: Duryodhana calls his own side aparyāptam, or incomplete and he calls the opposition’s side paryāptam, or complete. He means his side might not be capable of competing with the Pāṇḍavas: “Our army is fully protected (abhi-rakṣitam) by Bhīṣma; the Pāṇḍava army is protected by Bhīma. Although our Bhīṣma has a very fine intelligence whereas Bhīma does not, and although our Bhīṣma is a master in the science of weaponry whereas Bhīma is not, still Bhīṣma’s heart is torn between the two camps whereas Bhīma’s is not. Therefore Bhīma’s side, under his care, will be competent to take on our side.”

Tīkā: Duryodhana then says, “Therefore you should all be very careful...
And all of you just try to protect Bhīṣma by remaining fixed in your divisions at all the entrance points to the army.

Then, by remaining fixed at all the entry points to the army, all of you try to protect Bhīṣma.

Talk: “Let all men who have been placed at the ayanas, or entry points into our army stay there and not abandon the positions in which they have been arranged on the battlefield. Let them thus protect Bhīṣma from all sides (abhi-rakṣantu) to make sure that he is not killed from behind whilst busy fighting with others. After all, Bhīṣma’s strength is our very life.”

1.12

And then his grandfather, that mighty patriarch of the Kuru dynasty, delighted Duryodhana by blowing a conch-shell, making a sound as loud as a lion’s roar.

Then the patriarch of the Kuru dynasty [Bhīṣma] was pleased to hear Duryodhana praising him in that way, he was happy and in turn wanted to cheer Duryodhana on by dispelling his fears. Therefore Bhīṣma roared like a lion. The phrase “simha-nāda” is formed according to the grammatical rule “upamāṇe karmāṇi ca” [P. 3.4.45], by which the grammatical suffix namul is added in the sense of comparison.

---

64 अवमेचिनि : BDM, GVS.
65 चन्द्रपंडित अवमेचिनि मार्गेत : GVS.
66 चिन्मता : printed.
67 हम्पे : printed.
68 चन्द्र गणुर्स : JMS.  चन्द्र गणुर्स : UMS.  चन्द्र गणुर्स : BVT, BDM.
Then all of a sudden conch-shells, horns, large drums, clay drums, and kettle drums all began beating and sounding, and all that noise rose into a tumultuous din.

Tīkā: A paṇava is a mārdala, or a clay drum. An ānaka is a pataha, or a type of military kettle drum. A gomukha is a particular kind of musical instrument.}

1.14

नन् पेनेहब्युङ्के महति स्थनसे दिघने।
माधव पाण्डुर्घेष विर्यो शाङ्को प्रव्रतमि।

1.15

पाध्यजन्य हरिण्को देवदत्त धन्नजयः।
पोप्रः दधो महाशाहि भीमकर्मा युक्तदरः।

1.16

अनन्तविजय राजा कुन्नीपुरो युक्त्याङ्गः।
नूकुः सहदेवश्र सूर्योष्मणिपुष्पको।

1.17

कालक्षण परस्परायः विन्याण्डी च महारथः।
वृद्धश्रुझ्नि पिराण्डु शान्तिकिंवामरसी।

69 पखळः: MMS. पँढ़-उः: AMS.
1.18

Then Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna stood upon their huge chariot drawn by white horses and blew their conch shells. Kṛṣṇa blew his conch, called Pañcajanya, and Arjuna blew his shell, Devadatta. O king, the awesome and voracious Bhīma also blew on his mighty conch, named Paundra. King Yudhiṣṭhīra, the son of Kunti, blew on his conch, Ananta-vijaya. Nakula and Sahadeva blew on their conches, Sughoṣa and Mani-puspaka. The fine archer the King of Kāśi, the champion charioteer Śikhandi, Dhrūtadyumna, Virāṭa, the invincible son of Satyaka, Drupada, the sons of Draupadi, and the mighty-armed son of Subhadra all blew on their respective conch shells.

1.19

The tumultuous resonance made heaven and earth vibrate and shook the hearts of Duryodhana’s men.

---

70 अयथा : AMS, MMS, printed (except BVT).
As the arrows were just about to fly, Arjuna, with his monkey flag flying, took up his bow as he looked upon Duryodhana’s troops in formation. At that point, O King, Arjuna turned to Kṛṣṇa and said: O dependable Kṛṣṇa, please position my chariot out between the two armies so that I may see who wants to do battle, so that I may see who I must fight in this clash of arms.

Let me see those who have assembled here willing to fight and please Dhṛtarāṣṭra’s evil-intentioned son, Duryodhana.

At Arjuna’s request, Kṛṣṇa drove the great chariot out and parked it in between the two armies. Right there in front of Bhiṣma, Droṇa, and all the other kings, Kṛṣṇa said: O Arjuna, son of Pṛthā, behold the assembled Kurus.
In this verse Kṛṣṇa is called Hṛṣikeśa, which means “the controller of all sensory faculties”. Although Kṛṣṇa is the controller of everybody’s sensory faculties, nevertheless he has been controlled simply by Arjuna’s faculty of speech. Just see how the Lord can be controlled by love!

The word “gudākeśa” is used to describe Arjuna. This word can be broken up as “gudā-akeśa”, meaning “one who enjoys the sweet affection of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Śiva”. In this analysis “gudā” stands for that soft crystallized cane syrup. The word “akeśa” stands for Viṣṇu, Brahmā, and Śiva because “A” is a name of Viṣṇu, “Ka” is a name of Brahmā, and “Īṣa” is a name of Mahadeva (Śiva). So just as cane sugar only ever manifests sweetness, so too Brahma, Viṣṇu and Śiva only show their sweetness to “Gudākeśa”. Here Śrī Kṛṣṇa, God himself, the finest crown jewel of avatars, has come uner the sway of the love and is obediently following the orders of Arjuna. In such a situation, how can Viṣṇu, Brahmā, and Śiva manifest any majesty? After all they are only guṇa-avatars and as such are simply manifestations of Kṛṣṇa. Rather they only feel satisfied only when they show their affection to Arjuna. This has been explained by Viṣṇu, the Lord of the spiritual realm, when he said, “dvijātmajā me yuvayor didrṣunā...” (“I wanted to see you
two, therefore I [have taken away this] brāhmaṇa boy...

Another interpretation of the word “guḍākeśa” is guḍākā-īśa, meaning “the master of sleep or the conqueror of sleep”. In this explanation too [a similar logic applies]. Arjuna has conquered Kṛṣṇa with love and has brought Kṛṣṇa under his control. But Kṛṣṇa is himself the controller of māyā (material illusion), so it is not surprising that Arjuna should be able to conquer crude sleep which is just a facet of illusion.

Kṛṣṇa parked the chariot opposite and facing Droṇa, Bhīma and all the other kings. From a grammatical point of view, even though the word “pramukhātaḥ” is contained within a compound, it is also understood with the word māhīkṣitām. The word pramukhātaḥ is used in the sense of “pramekte” or “sammukhe” (“facing”).

1.26

There in both armies Arjuna could see his many relatives and friends: fathers, grandfathers, teachers, uncles, brothers, sons, grandsons, friends, fathers-in-law, and well wishers.

Ṭīkā: This verse says that Arjuna could see “sons and grandsons”. This includes the sons and grandsons of Duryodhana [whom Arjuna considered as his own].

1.27

BP 10.89.58. Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna go to visit Mahā Viṣṇu in order to get back the sons of a brāhmaṇa who have died prematurely. Mahā Viṣṇu admits that he stole the children in an elaborate plan to get the darśana of Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna.

1. "AMS, MMS."
When Arjuna, the son of Kunti, thus saw all his relatives arrayed on the battlefield, he was struck by a strong feeling of compassion and began to speak dejectedly:

1.28

O Kṛṣṇa, seeing my relatives gathered here ready to fight I can feel my limbs shaking and my mouth drying up.

Ṭīkā: We have to infer that the verb “drṣṭvā” is referring to Arjuna. He is saying, “As I stand here, I see my relatives...and my limbs are shaking, etc...”

1.29

My body is trembling, the hairs on my body are standing on end, my bow ṇaṇḍīva is slipping from my hand, and my skin is burning.

1.30

O Keśava, I cannot stand here any more, my head is spinning, and I see nothing good coming out of all this.
The word “nimitta” is used here in the sense of “prayojana”, an “end”, a “goal” or a “result”. For example one might say “dhana-nimittako ‘tra me vāso” “I live here with the goal (nimitta) of getting money”. Here, Arjuna says that he will achieve the opposite of his goal (nimittāni viparītāni): “Even by winning the battle and getting the kingdom I will not be happy; quite the opposite, I will be sad and will have deep regrets.”

I don’t see any ultimate benefit at all from killing members of my own family in this battle. Nor do I have any desire for victory, kingdom, or pursuant pleasures.

There are two types of men who are elevated to the sun planet at the time of their death: one is the sannyasi absorbed in yoga, and the other is the soldier who dies going forward on the battlefield.”

Arjuna is thinking, “According to that verse, only the soldiers who die in battle will reap any ultimate benefit (śreyas), whereas there is no pious benefit to be gained by the soldier who does the killing.”

Then Kṛṣṇa might retort, “Granted, but surely the victorious warrior is left with the immediate benefits of winning the battle: fame and the kingdom of defeated party.”

Arjuna answers, “na kāṅkṣe...”. “No, I don’t want victory, kingdom, or pursuant pleasures.”
1.32

कि नो राज्येन गोविन्द कि भोगेदिनिथन वा।
येषािमय कान्हिजन नो राज्य भोगा सुखानि च ॥३२॥

1.33

त इमे ववस्मिना युद्धे प्राणस्वत्त्वं धनानि च।
आचार्यः पितरः पुत्रास्तेष्य च पितामहः ॥३३॥

1.34

मानुला श्रवणा पौला इयाला सम्यनिनसः।
एताह हनुमिच्छामि गतो द्रिपं मथुरादृशं ॥३४॥

What good is this kingdom to us, Govinda? What good are the royal luxuries and what is the good of being alive when all those with whom we desired to share these things are here, ready to sacrifice life and wealth in battle: our teachers, fathers, sons, grandfathers, uncles, fathers-in-law, grandsons, brothers-in-law, and other relatives. O Madhusūdana, I do not feel like killing them, even if they try to kill me.

1.35

अँधिष्का राज्यस्य हेतुः कि नु महील्य।
निहत्य धार्मिक्राज्ञः का प्रीति स्मार्कार्देन ॥३५॥

O Janārdana, we would feel no satisfaction from killing the sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra even in return for a kingdom extending over the entire universe, let alone for this earthly kingdom.

टीका- ननु अद्धियो गर्भव्य अस्मयाणिनयनापि। क्षेतदारापहरी च यद्भेद्व आत्मायिनः ॥ िनि।
आत्मायिनमायनं हन्यायेविचारणूर। नात्मायिनयथे दोषो हन्त्यायतिभारत ॥ इत्यादि यथादिपूर्वः
वय उचित एवेनि नव्रह ॥
\[\text{Tīkā: At this point Krṣṇa might object, “But don’t the scriptures say,}\
\]
\[\text{agnido garadaś caiva śastra-pāṇir dhanāpahaḥ}\
\text{kṣetra-dārāpahart ca saḍ ete ātatāyinaḥ}\
\]
\[\text{“There are six types of aggressors: an arsonist, a giver of poison, an armed attacker,}\
a thief, and one who plunders land and women.”}\]
\[\text{ātatāyinam āyantam hanyād evāvicārayan}\
nātatāyin-vadhe doṣo hantur bhavati bhārata\
\]
\[\text{“One may kill an aggressor without hesitation as soon as he approaches. O}\
descendant of Bharata, there is no fault incurred by one who kills an aggressor.”}\]
\[\text{“Considering all these scriptural statements, Arjuna, surely it is quite}\
appropriate for you to kill these men.”}\]
\[\text{Arjuna replies,}\
\]
\[\text{1.36}\
\text{पापेवाःथ्येवक्ष्माहं येतानात्तानात्ताचिन्दः}\
\text{नर्मामश्रां वयं हनु यार्णराष्ट्रान्यान्यान्यान्} \| 36\|\
\]
O Mādhava, sin will come upon us if we kill these aggressors. Therefore we should not kill our kinsmen, the sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra.

\[\text{Tīkā: “If we kill these men (etān hatvā), then sin will come upon us (asmān).}\
\text{These verses, such as “ātatāyinam āyantam...” come from the artha-śāstra}\
\text{(practical laws), but the artha-śāstra cannot take precedence over the dharma-śāstra}\
\text{(ethical laws). Yājñavalkya states, “The smṛti tradition holds that the dharma śāstra}\
takes precedence over the artha-śāstra.”}^{88} \text{Therefore, we will indeed incur sin if we}\
\text{kill people like our teachers.”}^{88}

---

86 Manu 8.350.(23).
87 Ibidem
88 Yājñavalkya-smṛti: 2.21.
And then Arjuna argues "And I wouldn't even be happy in this life if I were to kill my relatives."

For how can we possibly be happy after killing our own kinsfolk?

But then Kṛṣṇa might ask, "Yes, but then why are they ready to fight?". So Arjuna says,

Even if their minds are infected with lust, and they can't see the wrong in destroying their family and assaulting their friends, still we should know how to refrain from sin. After all, Janardana, we do see clearly the wrong in destroying our family.
With the destruction of the family comes the destruction of timeless family traditions; and with the destruction of those traditions the whole family sinks into irreligion.

टिकः तिष्ठति कुलपतिर्या मात्रात्तेन वहुकालत: प्राप्ता इत्ययः।।

The word “sanātana” (literally “eternal”) here refers to traditions passed down from one generation to another from ancient times.

When irreligion becomes prevalent, the women of the family become corrupted, which in turn creates disregard for the proper rules of marriage according to varṇa.90

टिकः प्रदुष्यति अयर्थ एवं ना वर्धिता प्रवर्तनेनि भावाः।।

The word “pradusyanti” (“they become corrupt”) refers here to adultery. It is the prevalence of irreligion which will cause the women to be engaged in acts of adultery.

This disregard for the marriage rules of varṇa will send the whole family to hell along with the destroyers of that family. For their ancestors also suffer when prescribed offerings of food and water are stopped.

89 कृत्वा इति: printed.
90 लिटरल्य: “the confusion of varṇas”.
The sins of those who would destroy their family cause this disregard for the \textit{varna} rules of marriage. As a result all traditional caste and family principles are lost.

\textit{Tīkā:} In this verse the word “\textit{utsādyante}” means “are lost” or “disappear”.

And people who lose their family traditions inevitably go to hell, O Janārdana - this is what I have heard from Vedic tradition.

Alas! What a pity it is that we have decided to commit this great sin and that we are ready to kill our own relatives out of greed for royal happiness.

I would be happier to face the sons of Dhr̥tarāṣṭra unarmed without offering them any resistance and let them kill me on the battlefield with their weapons in hand.
Sañjaya said: The despondent and distracted Arjuna finished speaking, dropped his bow and arrows, and sat down on his chariot in the middle of the battlefield.

The word “sāṅkhya” here means “on the battle-field” and the word “rathopasthe” means “on the chariot.”

Thus ends the first chapter of the yoga-śāstra, the Bhagavad-gītā Upaniṣad, that conversation between Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa on spiritual knowledge within the Bhīṣma-parva of Vaiyaski’s epic work, the Śrī Mahābhārata, which consists of 100,000 verses.
the first chapter of this Sārārtha-varṣini commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā, which is simply meant to bring joy to the hearts of devotees.
CHAPTER TWO

Sāṅkhya-yoga

Teeka-

आत्मानात्माविचिनानो ज्ञिमोहतमो नुदन्
द्विनथे कृष्णचन्द्रे तन्ह प्रोचे मुक्तस्य लक्षणम् ॥२॥

Tiikā:

In this second chapter Kṛṣṇa-candra removes Arjuna’s lamentation, delusion, and ignorance by distinguishing between the self and the non-self. He thus explains the characteristics of a liberated person.

2.1

संजय उपाच
ने तथा कृपायाविचित्रपुरूणाकलेक्षणम्।
पीठादिनिमं याक्यपुष्पाच मधुसूदने ॥२॥

Saṅjaya said: In this way the despondent Arjuna was overwhelmed with compassion and his flurried eyes filled with tears. Madhusūdana Kṛṣṇa then spoke to him as follows:
2.2

Arjuna, how have you become tainted at this critical time? This is not befitting of a civilised person; it will not lead you to heaven, nor will it be good for your reputation.

Ṭīkā: “This contamination (kaśmalam) is bewilderment (moha). Where has this come from (kutah)? What is the cause of this? How has it come upon you (upasthitam tvāṁ) at this difficult moment of battle?

This is “anārya-juśtam”, i.e. “not indulged in by reputable people”. And it is both asvargyam and akṛśtikaram, that is to say, it will not bring you pleasure in this life or in the next.”

2.3

Do not be a coward, o son of Kunti. It is not befitting of you. Give up this paltry weakness of heart and arise, o vanquisher of enemies.

---

1. सुप्रतिष्ठितलकेरसेवितम्: printed.
2. परंतप: BGP.
3. गच्छित: AMS.
4. नस्माजा: AMS, MMS.
5. मन्त्रकी: printed.
6. Ø: printed. अं: AMS, MMS.
The word “klaibyam” means “the nature of a coward or eunuch (kli‘ba)” and is used here in the sense of “cowardice”. Kṛṣṇa addresses Arjuna as “Pārtha”, the son of Kunti. Kṛṣṇa is trying to say, “Don’t be a coward; you are being a coward and yet you are the son of Kunti. It might be alright for other non-qualified kṣatriyas to behave like this, but this is not appropriate behaviour for a friend of mine.”

But then Arjuna may retort, “Don’t just assume that I am being cowardly or unheroic. I am actually declining to fight Droṇa and Bhīṣma on ethical grounds, for they are my superiors. And I am declining to fight the sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra on compassionate grounds, for they are weaker than me, and as soon as they receive the blows from my weapons they will be killed.”

Kṛṣṇa replies, “This is neither compassion nor ethical discretion! This is lamentation and illusion! And these are indicative of a weakness of heart. Therefore give up this weakness of heart and arise! O “Parantapa”, vanquish these enemies (param-tapa) and engage in the battle!”

Arjuna said: O Kṛṣṇa, slayer of the demon Madhu, how can I possibly fight against Bhīṣma on the battle field? How can I fire my arrows upon Droṇa? O Kṛṣṇa, slayer of enemies, they are both my venerable superiors.

7  śruti : printed, AMS, MMS.
8  “pratibadhna‘ī hi śṛyāḥ pūjya-pūjya-vyatikramāh”
Ch. 2 v. 5

Krṣṇa counters, “But if Bhīṣma and Droṇa are ready to fight you, then surely you can oppose them, can’t you?”

Arjuna responds by saying, “pūjārhaun”. “That is the point, I cannot fight them; they are my venerable superiors (pūjārhaun). I should worship them. I should be devotedly offering flower petals at their feet, not angrily firing sharp arrows at them.”

By calling Krṣṇa “Madhusūdana” (killer of the demon Madhu) Arjuna is saying, “Listen my dear Krṣṇa, you only kill enemies in battle; you don’t kill your guru, Sandīpani, or your friends and relatives, the Yadus.”

Krṣṇa might reply, “But the Yadus are also called ‘the race of Madhu’, so maybe Madhusūdana means ‘the Killer of the Yadus’.”

“No, I am also calling you “ari-sūdana”, the killer of enemies. I am talking about the demon Madhu, who is your enemy.”

Arjuna replies,

2.5

“Alright Arjuna,” Krṣṇa might then say, "if you don’t want to take back your kingdom, then how do you expect to earn your living?"

Arjuna replies,
Even if we have to live in this world as beggars, it would still be much better for us to not kill these noble-minded men who are our superiors. They are still superiors, even though they may be greedy for wealth; if we were to kill them, whatever pleasures we might gain would be stained with blood.

Tīkā: “Ultimately the best thing for us is to not kill our superiors. We will just eat food obtained through begging, even though this practice is not at all recommended for kṣatriyas. We might lose all reputation in this life, but at least our next lives will not be plagued with inauspiciousness.”

Arjuna then refers to Bhīṣma and the other opponents as “mahānubhavaṅ”, or “noble minded men”. By this Arjuna is saying, “These superiors are not to be rejected on the grounds that they are proud, unable to discriminate between right and wrong, and have become followers of evil Duryodhana. Of course the scriptures do say that a guru can be rejected if he becomes proud, is unable to discriminate between right and wrong, or strays off the path of righteousness. But Bhīṣma and the others are “noble minded men”. They have conquered such base tendencies as
quarrelsomeness and lust. How can they possibly succumb to such faults?"

But then Kṛṣṇa will counter, “But has not Bhīṣma himself admitted to Yudhīṣṭhīra, ‘A man is the slave of money, and money is the slave of no-one. Thus it is true, o king, that I have been tied up with money by the Kauravas’? So, Arjuna, although Bhīṣma, Droṇa, and the others were certainly noble-minded men, surely they can no longer be considered as such, because of their greed for money?”

So Arjuna replies, “Yes, that may be true, but nevertheless killing them will only make me unhappy. They may well be greedy for money (artha-kāmān), but whatever opulence I might gain by killing them will still necessarily be stained with their blood.”

In other words Arjuna is saying, “Although they might be greedy for money, still they are my superiors, therefore if I kill them I will be a guru-drohi, or one who injures his superiors. In this way, my enjoyment will have been mixed with evil.”

\[\text{\underline{Tīkā:}}\] Arjuna then thought, “What’s more, even if I were prepared to fight against my superiors I don’t even know whether I would win or lose...

\[2.6\]

Nor do I know which is better for us: if we defeat them or if they defeat us. For we cannot bear to live without the sons of Dhṛtarāśtra, who are standing there opposite us on the battlefield.

\[\text{\underline{Tīkā:}}\] 

---

19. Bhārata Mahābhārata 41.36 (repeated throughout that chapter): “arthasya puruṣo dāso dāsas tv artho na kasya-cit...”

20. त्वापि : printed.

21. जयपराजयोद्योग्येऽि: printed.
Tīkā: “We don’t know which one is better for us: victory or defeat?”

Therefore Arjuna identifies the two sides of the argument, “Either we will beat them, or they will beat us.”

But then in the last line (yān eva...) he thinks, “Even if we win, that victory will, because of its consequences, seem just like defeat.”

Tīkā: Kṛṣṇa might start to think, “Well then, you seem to have made up your mind to live by begging even though you are a kṣatriya and for this you are using well-founded arguments from scripture. So I can’t see any point in my saying anything more to you.”

So Arjuna says,

2.7
कार्पण्यदोपेनपत्तस्यभावः प्रृचाभिम् त्या भर्मसंपादतेन।
यज्ञेष्य: स्वात्रिष्ठिन्यं बुः तस्मे तिष्ठत्सने नह शाधि मां त्या प्रपन्मू।

My natural disposition is now affected by the weakness of compassion, and I have become bewildered as to my duty. Therefore I am asking you to tell me clearly what is in my ultimate interest. I am now your disciple, fully obedient to you. Please instruct me.
“Actually this compassion of mine (kārpanya) is really just me abandoning my heroic nature. They say that the path of duty is very elusive, and that is why even in the performance of my duty I have become bewildered. Therefore you please decide what is best for me and advise me.”

Kṛṣṇa persists, “But if you are going to consider yourself very expert and just raise objections to my advice, then what can I say to you?”

Arjuna placates Kṛṣṇa by saying, “śisyas te ‘ham...”, “I am your disciple, and from now on I will not engage in frivolous objections.”

Kṛṣṇa then objects, “But your relationship with me is one of friendship, not respect. How then can I make you my disciple? Why don’t you approach someone you respect, someone like Dvaipayana (Vyāsa-deva)?”

Arjuna replies:

Nor do I see what could take away this sorrow of mine which is causing my body to dry up and wither away. Nothing can help me, not even winning an earthly kingdom of unchallenged opulence nor even reigning over the demigods in heaven.

---

27 ø : printed.
28 “dharmasya sūkṣmā gatiḥ”.
29 न्यूनांनेविना : BGP, KDB.
30 literally “my senses”
31 ø : AMS.
32 वस्मादिनिमपि : AMS.
"In the whole world I can’t see anyone who can take away (āpanudyāt) this sadness of mine. In the three worlds I don’t know anyone who can help me except you, and you alone, not even Brhaspati, who is far more intelligent than me. This being the case, who can I turn to in my distress?

“As a consequence (yat), this sorrow is drying up my body just as a hot summer dries out small ponds of water.”

Kṛṣṇa might then suggest, “Even though you are sad and distressed at the moment, why don’t you just fight anyway. Then when you have conquered these people and won back your kingdom, you will start to be preoccupied with the pleasures of royal life. In this way you will forget your sorrows.”

Rejecting this idea, Arjuna then says: “Even if I win a trouble-free kingdom here on earth or even sovereignty over the demigods in heaven still this sorrow will make my senses [my whole body] dry up and wither away.”

Śaṅkya said: O vanquisher of enemies, in this way Arjuna, the conquerer of sleep, spoke with Kṛṣṇa, the master of all senses. Finally he told Govinda, “I am not going to fight”, and then fell silent.

---

33 शोकाविनिदित्याणामुच्चोषणं : BDM, BVT, GVS.
34 यशोद : JMS.
35 राज्यभोगानिधिवेदनं : UMS, राज्यभोगानिधिवेदनं : AMS
36 निन्दित : printed, MMS, AMS.
37 समनिदित्याणमेनुलुच्चोषणमेतेऽयः : JMS, ममनिदित्याणमेनुलुच्चोषणमेतेऽयः : UMS.
38 परत्यः : BVT, BDM, GVS.
O descendent of Bharata, there in the middle of the two armies Kṛṣṇa, the master of senses, faintly smiled at the dejected Arjuna and spoke to him as follows.

The word “iva” indicates that Kṛṣṇa was “almost” smiling. Kṛṣṇa, is “Hṛṣikeśa”, the “Controller of all Senses”. Previously, however, it was Kṛṣṇa who was controlled by Arjuna’s friendly words. Now Kṛṣṇa helps Arjuna by bringing Arjuna’s mind under control. In both circumstances Kṛṣṇa is acting out of love alone.

The words “senayor ubhayor madhye” (in the middle of the two armies) suggests that this all took place in full view of both armies. They all saw Arjuna getting depressed and then Kṛṣṇa enlightening him. 39

Ṭīkā: Now Kṛṣṇa says, “Arjuna, you feel sorry about having to kill your relatives, but alas, that sorrow is based on error. And moreover when you say, “How can I
possibly fight against Bhīṣma?" that reasoning is simply based on a lack of knowledge...

2.11

You are lamenting over things you really need not lament over, and yet at the same time you are speaking intelligent words. The really wise do not lament over the living or the dead.

Tīkā: You have been lamenting (“anu-a- sóc-as”) over things which are not worth worrying about (asócyaṁ).

I have been instructing you, and you have been replying with intelligent words. When you say, “How can I possibly fight against Bhīṣma?” this sounds like the speech of an intelligent man. However you are not being intelligent at all, because wise people who really have intelligence do not worry about “that which is
"lifeless" nor do they worry about "that which has life".

‘Lifeless’ (gatiśūn) \(^{49}\) refers to the gross material body because it has no life when the life force leaves it. The wise do not worry about these gross bodies because they know them to be temporary in nature.

‘That which has life’ \(^{49}\) (agatiśūn) refers to the subtle body because it retains the life force even after the destruction of the gross body. Wise men do not worry about the subtle body because it is only destroyed when one reaches liberation. Both subtle and gross bodies have their respective natures and those natures cannot be changed. So the wise do not lament about them.

The ignorant, however, lament when the life force leaves the gross body of their father or some dear one. No need to mention the subtle body; these ignorant people don’t lament for the subtle body because as a general rule they are not acquainted with the subtle body.

Bhīṣma and all these people here are in fact souls. Their souls are accompanied by these gross and subtle bodies. These souls are eternal, and therefore lamentation is not applicable.

You were arguing before that the dharma-śāstra (ethics) takes precedence over the artha-śāstra (practicalities). But I would reply that my arguments come from the jñāna-śāstra (knowledge), and the jñāna-śāstra takes precedence over the dharma-śāstra.” \(^{48}\)

\(\text{Tīkā:}\) Now Kṛṣṇa says, “Or perhaps, my friend, I could ask you this: When people lament upon seeing a loved one die, what is the object of their affection at that time? the body or the soul? Śuka Goswami has said, ‘The dearmost thing for all living entities is their own self, their soul.’ \(^{52}\) Therefore we can conclude that the soul should be the only real object of love.

\(^{48}\) Literally “that from which the life force has gone”.

\(^{49}\) Literally, “that from which the life force has not gone”.

\(^{50}\) किंवः : printed, AMS, MMS.

\(^{51}\) तः : AMS.

\(^{52}\) BP,10.14.50: sarveśām api bhūtānāṁ nṛpa svātmaiva vallabhaḥ.
“Now if that is the case, then it is not right to be lamenting, because the soul is eternal and immortal. There are two types of ātma, or soul: the jīvātma (the living beings) and the paramātma (the supreme soul), but both are eternal and immortal, and neither is a proper object of lamentation...

2.12

Now if that is the case, then it is not right to be lamenting, because the soul is eternal and immortal. There are two types of ātma, or soul: the jīvātma (the living beings) and the paramātma (the supreme soul), but both are eternal and immortal, and neither is a proper object of lamentation...

There has never been a time when I did not exist; nor have you and all these kings ever not existed. Nor in the future will any of us ever cease to exist.

The Indian tradition of logic (nyāya), one aspect of eternity is "prag-abhāvabhāva", "never at any time in the past having non-existent".56

Nor is it the case that any of us (you, me or all these kings) will ever cease to exist...

53 φ : AMS.
54 नित्यावतमा : AMS.
55 अचन्तयेतननामेको : AMS.
56 According to the Indian tradition of logic (nyāya), one aspect of eternity is prag-abhāvabhāva. Before a temporary object is created, that object does not exist. That state is called prag-abhāva, or the non-existence of something before it comes into existence. However for something beginningless, there is never a time before it existed, so there is no prag-abhāva. That is called prag-abhāvabhāva (not having been non-existent). This is one kind of eternity: beginningless (even if one day the object comes to an end).
to exist at some time in the future. Rather we will always just exist. Thus we meet the other criteria for eternity, technically called “dhvamsābhāva” “indestructible”.

In this way the supreme soul as well as the individual souls are all eternal, and therefore it has been demonstrated that there can be no reason to lament for the soul.

In this regard we find statements such as the following in the śruti scriptures: “There is one eternal and conscious being who fulfils the desires of the many other eternal and conscious living beings.”

ТИКĀ: But then Arjuna might object, “Granted, but the body is related to the soul, so surely it can also be an object of our affection. And then family members are related to the body, and grandchildren are related to those family members. Thus they can all be objects of our affection and when they die we can lament.”

To address such objections, Kṛṣṇa says,

2.13

Just as the embodied soul in this body undergoes childhood, adulthood and then old-age, so too does the soul receive a new body (after death). A wise person is not bewildered by this.

57 An other aspect of eternity is dhvamsābhāva, or indestructibility. If something never ends, then it can also be called eternal. The soul is here described as having both these aspects of eternity(dhvamsābhāva and prāgabhāvābhāva).

58 KU 2.2.13, ŚU: 6.13: “nityo nityānāṁ cetanaṁ cetanānāṁ eko bahūnāṁ yo vidadhāti kāmān”.

59 न पुनर्जने : KDB, BGP, BVT

60 नाम: AMS (MMS corrected).
Within this body, the embodied individual soul (dehino) undergoes childhood. And then as childhood finishes, the soul undergoes young adulthood, and then as adulthood finishes, the soul undergoes old age. In the same way, [as this body finishes] the soul receives another body. Those different states of childhood, adulthood and old age are certainly related to the soul, but still we don’t lament for the passing of one stage of life to another, and in the same way we need not lament for the passing away of a body, even though that body has certainly been intimately related to the soul.

“You might reply that still people lament when the soul passes in this body from youthful adulthood to old age. But you should also remember that people rejoice when they pass from childhood to adulthood. So when the old worn-out bodies of Bhīṣma and Droṇa are destroyed, they will both get new fresh bodies, and therefore we should be happy.”

Alternatively one could say that just as the one body undergoes different states from childhood through to old age, so too does the one embodied individual soul undergo different states in successive bodies.

Arjuna might then say, “Yes that is certainly true, but I am not very wise and
my corrupt mind for no reason at all succumbs to illusory lamentation and becomes sad.”

To this Kṛṣṇa replies, “Not just your mind but also the functions of the mind, like the sense of touch, all become corrupt as they experience their respective sensual objects...

Contact with matter creates happiness and distress such as heat and cold. But these perceptions come and go and are always impermanent. Just tolerate them, O descendant of Bharata.

Tīkā: “Mātrā” refers to the particular sensual objects which are perceived by different senses. The word “sparśa” means “contacting” or “experiencing”. So together they mean “experiencing the sensual objects”.

Such sensual experience comes and goes. The same cool water which brings so much happiness in summer will bring distress in winter. Therefore because these sensory perceptions come and go, are uncertain and impermanent, one must simply tolerate them. And tolerating these is a religious duty, since it is prescribed in the scriptures. In the winter month of Māgha one can not think, “It’s too cold, this water

---

67 दनियादायामप्रियन्त्वाच : printed, AMS.
68 शाश्विहितो यथा : printed.
69 भक्तियेष : JMS.
70 भुजुक्कले : printed.
is unpleasant” and thus refuse to perform the prescribed duty of bathing.\textsuperscript{71} The performance of prescribed duty will in due time eliminate all non-sense.

Similarly, the sons, brothers, and other relatives, who give you so much happiness when they are born or prosper, will cause you so much distress when they die. These are temporary, vacillating experiences and you should learn to tolerate them. You should not out of lamentation for them give up your fighting duties, which are prescribed for you in the scriptures. Indeed, failing to perform one’s prescribed duties will eventually have unfortunate consequences.

\begin{verse}
\textit{\textsuperscript{71} The lunar month of Māgha occurs around January in the coldest time of year in North India. At that time of year there are prescribed bathing days such as Gaṅgā-śānā and Kumbha-melā.}
\end{verse}
Tīkā: Now Kṛṣṇa says, “The previous statements were spoken for those on a lower platform of understanding. Actually, as stated in the scriptures, ‘the spirit has no connection whatsoever with this world.’ That is to say, the individual soul has no real link with the subtle or gross bodies nor with lamentation and bewilderment which are also material in nature. Any apparent link [between these material objects and the soul] is only imagined out of ignorance....

2.16

Material illusion has no enduring existence whereas spiritual reality never ceases to exist. Those who see the truth have concluded this about the nature of the two.

Tīkā: “The material body and its ensuing lamentation and bewilderment do not exist within the soul because they are of different nature to the soul. These material things have no enduring existence. Moreover the spiritual reality, the soul with its nature of pure reality, is never destroyed and never ceases to exist. Great sages have come to this conclusion about spirit and matter.

“Therefore there can be no lamentation or bewilderment about the fate of the soul or body of Bhīṣma. The same applies for you, and the other warriors here. As individual souls (jīvāmas) you are all spiritual in nature (satya-tva), and hence eternal. How can Bhīṣma and the others die? And how then can you lament for them?”

---

74 BrĀUp 4.3.15: “asāngo hy ayam puruṣaḥ”.
75 सत्यप्रवस्य : printed.
76 शृङ्गः : AMS.
77 वैहेदिकियः : printed.
78 नाशः : AMS.
Verse 2.16: “The spiritual reality never ceases to exist”.

79 Verse 2.16: “The spiritual reality never ceases to exist”.
80 अविनाशितः: MMS.
81 जीवात्मायः चैत्यंतर्यं: printed. जीवात्मायः चैत्यंतर्यं: UMS.
82 प्रभोक्तः: AMS. प्रभोक्तः: MMS.
83 सृ: AMS.
84 एषो ज्ञानसत्त्वसन्त: AMS. एषो 5-ज्ञानसत्त्वसन्त: MMS.
85 प्राणं: printed.
86 इन्द्रिय: AMS, MMS. इन्द्रिय: printed.
87 निःस्वरूप: BGP, KDB.
88 निःस्वरूपः:AMS, MMS.
89 नदुऽः: printed, AMS, MMS.
\[ \text{̥II yāḥ naḥ dehā}^{90} \text{jiivānām paramāmēyevatadstutikr̥m manuṣyaśīrṣādābhū}^{91} \text{̥svar̥ma dr̥ṣṭhate} \].
\[ \text{nirādhyothābhājāyate nāsato vidhate āyam ityapnōtakam}^{92} \text{ṇūmiyaspect paraṁparastun: ki} \]
\[ \text{nityamān: aha}^{93} \text{āyam ājñātā prāvyāmē}^{94} \text{̥paramparno māyājāyāmā śāyapān: pārāmyāya}^{95} \].

\[ \text{̥II jāgat}^{96} \]

\[ \text{̥} \]

**Tīkā:** The jīvātma (tad) pervades the whole body (sarvam idam) and is indestructible.

Hearing this someone might object, “If the soul is present as consciousness throughout the body, can we not conclude that the soul is temporary just like any ordinary sized object?”

“No, not at all, in the scriptures there are many statements which indicate that the soul is of infinitesimal size:

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa: “Of subtleties, I am the soul.”

The Maṇḍuka Upānīṣad: “This infinitesimal soul (aṇur ātmā) can only be known by pure consciousness. The five-fold life-force attaches itself.”

The Śvetāśvatara Upānīṣad: “The soul is understood to be one ten thousandth the size of the tip of a hair.”

The Śvetāśvatara Upānīṣad: “The soul is even smaller than the point of a needle.”

Nevertheless it is not incompatible that this infinitesimal soul has the power

---

90: केदी : AMS.
91: मनुष्योत्तर्पालिय : AMS.
92: अविन्देशित : UMS. JMS corrected.
93: तुम्भिकोषक्रमेऽ : printed (‘r’ mātrā deleted from AMS).
94: The tradition of Indian logic assumes that only infinitely small and infinitely large objects are eternal. Ordinary sized objects can not be called eternal. Being able to be broken into smaller parts is a way of being destroyed, and thus anything that can be broken into smaller parts can not be eternal. Therefore only the atomic (anu) or the all-pervasive (vibhu or mahat) are considered eternal, because they have no parts. Anything in between (madhyama-parimāna) cannot be eternal.
95: BP 11.16.11: sūkṣmāṇām apy aham jīvah.
96: MaṇḍU 3.1.9: eṣo 'nur ātmā cetasā veditavyo yasmin pṛāṇaḥ pañcadcā samśiveśa.
97: ŚvU 5.9: bālāgra-satbhāgasya satadhā kalpitasya ca bhāgo jīvah sa vijñeyah.
98: ŚvU 5.8: ārāgramātro hy avaro ‘pi drṣṭāh.
to pervade the whole body just as a jewel or a herbal extract when placed on the head or the chest has the power to invigorate the whole body.

Taking birth in various species in heaven and hell is only an imposition of a false designation or identity upon the soul. This re-birth has been mentioned by Dattatreya: “This is what causes the repeated birth and death of the living being.”

Therefore in a subsequent verse the soul is rightly described as “sarvagata” (literally “gone everywhere”) since it takes births in so many different situations.

And thus the soul is described here as “avyaya” which is a synonym for “nitya”, or “eternal”. In the śruti scriptures it is confirmed that the living being is eternal: “There is one eternal and conscious being who fulfils the desires of the many other eternal and conscious living beings.”

Another interpretation of this verse can be arrived at if the word “tad” is said to refer to the supreme soul and the phrase sarvam idam (“all this”) is said to refer to “the whole universe”. The verse would then mean, “You should know, however, that the Supersoul, who pervades the whole universe, is imperishable.”

The verse would then be a reply to the following question: “Three principles are seen in men, beasts, and all other forms of life: the body, the individual soul, and the supreme soul. Two of these principles have been explained in the verse “nāsato vidyate bhāvo...” (namely the body and the jīvātma). Tell us about the third principle, the paramātma.”

To respond to such a request then Kṛṣṇa would speak this verse (avināśī tu...). “You should know, however, that the Supersoul, who pervades the whole universe, is imperishable.”

In this analysis the word “tu” (“however”) is pertinent. It serves to separate this idea from the preceding ideas. This is because the supreme soul described here is inherently different from māyā and the jīva discussed in the previous verses.

---

99 Bhā 11.9.20: yena sansarate pumān.
100 Verse 2.24.
101 KaU 2.2.13, ŚvU 6.13: nityo nityānāṁ cetanāṁ cetanānāṁ eko bahūnāṁ yo vidadhāti kāmān.
These bodies are temporary, but the embodied one within is eternal, indestructible, and unfathomable. Therefore, you should engage in the battle, O descendant of Bharata.

Tīkā: The embodied soul, the jīvātma, is called “aprameyasya” or “unfathomable” because it is so subtle and thus difficult to understand.

Kṛṣṇa says, “Therefore you should engage in the battle.” Or in other words, “It would be inappropriate to give up this fighting which is prescribed for you as a religious duty in the scriptures.”

Tīkā: “Listen my friend, Arjuna, as a soul you can not be the subject of the verb to kill nor can you be the object...

Both he who thinks it a killer as well as he who thinks it killed are

---

102 Verse 2.16: “Material illusion has no enduring existence”.
103 : UMS (deleted in JMS). Translation: “The word “bodies” here refers to the gross bodies, but if one has some knowledge it also refers to the subtle bodies. Now if even these bodies have no lasting existence because of their impermanent nature, then what to speak of those things which are related to these bodies.”.
mistaken. It does not kill and is not killed.

Tīkā: Some might think that it (the jīvātma) can kill, and they will say, “Arjuna is going to kill Bhīṣma”. Others might think the jīvātma can be killed and they will say, “Arjuna is going to be killed by Bhīṣma”. But neither really understands.

Therefore Arjuna, why should you be afraid of the disrepute that might come from the ignorant general populace saying things like, “This Arjuna is going to kill his superiors.”

Tīkā: And then he clearly establishes that the jīvātma, or the individual soul, is eternal:

\[
\text{2.20}
\]

It is not born nor does it ever die. Nor has it ever come into being nor will it ever come into being again. It is unborn, eternal, perpetual, and primordial. It does not die when the body does.

Tīkā: The phrase “na jāyate mriyate” rules out birth or death in the present. And the phrase “na bhūtvā bhavitā” rules them out in the past and future.
Therefore it is described as “ajaḥ” or “unborn”. Because in the past, present, and future the soul is never born, there is no such thing as a time when it did not exist (a *prāg-abhāva*).

The soul is also described as “sāsvataḥ” (or “śāsvat”) which means “existing at all times”. In past, present, and future the soul has no “dvaṁsa”, or destruction.

Therefore, [because it has neither *prāgabhāva* nor *dhvaṁsa*] it can be technically described as “nitya”, or “eternal”.¹⁰⁴

In case Arjuna should think that the soul, being so old, must be afflicted with old-age, Kṛṣṇa says, “No, the soul is “purāṇa”, or primeval. The word “*purāṇa*” includes two notions: *purā* (ancient) and *nava* (new), that is to say that despite being ancient it is still just like new. The proof of this is that the soul does not undergo the six types of transformations [which characterise all temporary things].¹⁰⁵

Arjuna might still object, “Yes but with the death of the body surely there is at least a symbolic death for the soul?” To this Kṛṣṇa replies, “No, the soul does not die when the body does. There is no possibility of even a symbolic death because the soul has no connection whatsoever with the body.”

---

¹⁰⁴ See verse 2.12 with the accompanying footnotes for *prāgabhāva* and *dhvaṁsa*.

¹⁰⁵ Birth, growth, maintenance, reproduction, decay, and destruction.
The word “nityam” is here used as an adverb, in the sense of “always”.

It is stated here that the soul is “avināśa” (indestructible), “aja”, (unborn) and “avyaya” (eternal). All these references are rebuttals of the idea that the soul can be destroyed, born, or wither away.

Kṛṣṇa is saying to Arjuna, “[If we know that the soul cannot die, then] how would it be possible for you to actually kill anyone or for me to incite you to kill?”

Arjuna might object, “Fine, let’s say I approach the fight with the mentality that there is a soul presently in a body called Bhism, and by my fighting, that soul will simply leave that body. Even still, surely you and I would be held responsible for that, wouldn’t we?”

So Kṛṣṇa address that issue:

2.22

Just as one discards old, worn-out clothes before putting on other new ones, so too the embodied living being sheds an old, worn-out body and then receives another new one.

---

106 जन्य अप्काय : printed.
107 त्यस्यन्यन्तिविषयायः : BGP, KDB.
108 हेतु : printed, AMS (MMS corrected).
109 भेष्मे : BGP, KDB, GVS.
110 परिपत्रय : MMS.
111 रिव्य : AMS.
“Is there anything wrong with discarding worn-out clothes in order to put on new ones? Similarly when Bhīṣma leaves aside his present worn-out body and obtains a new divine body, how can you or I be at all blameworthy?”

Then Kṛṣṇa says to Arjuna, “Nor can the soul be troubled at all by the weapons which you fire in warfare...

It cannot be pierced by any weapon, nor burnt by fire, dissolved by water, nor dried out by the wind.

Here the word “śastrāṇi” refers to a weapon like a sword, and “pāvakāḥ” refers to fire-weapon, which people like you can fire. “Āpo” refers to a water-weapon, and “mārutāḥ” refers to a wind-weapon.”

Therefore the soul can be described in these terms:

---

112. **चर्कितः** : printed.
It cannot be pierced, burnt, soaked or parched. It is eternal, ubiquitous, stable, unmoving, and perpetual. It is said to be non-manifest, inconceivable, and unchangeable. So when you understand it in this way, there is no need for you to lament.

Tīkā: In this section there is a fair amount of repetition of both words and ideas concerning the eternity of the soul. The repetition is to emphasise this message to sceptics. For example someone might say, “In this Kali-yuga there is a religious duty, there is a religious duty, there is a religious duty...” And repeating it thus several times will give a very firm and unambiguous understanding that there really is religious duty in Kali-yuga.

Here the soul is described as “sarva-gata” (literally “going everywhere”). This means that by the re-action of its own previous activities, the soul goes into all species of bodies amongst gods, men, and animals.

The words “sthānu” (stable) and “acala” (unmoving) are really a repetition to emphasise the fixedness of the soul. Because the soul is very subtle it is called “avyakta” (non-manifest). And yet the soul is spread throughout the body as consciousness, therefore it is called “acintya” (inconceivable). The soul is also known as “avikārya” (unchanging). This is because the soul is not prone to the six transformations of temporary objects (birth, growth, etc.).

---

113 निर्विर्यन्मूलकः : printed.
114 धिः : printed.
115 निर्धारिण्यप्रयोगां : printed. निर्धारिण्यप्रयोगां : AMS, MMS.
116 निर्विर्यन्मूल्यां : AMS.
Now he says, “Thus far I have been instructing you from the point of view of the scriptures. Now listen attentively as I instruct you from a practical point of view...

2.26

And, mighty-armed Arjuna, even if you think it is forever born or forever dead, there is still no reason to lament.

Tīkā: If you think that the soul is forever born, that is to say, once the body is born the soul remains alive always, still there is no need to lament. Or even if you think the soul is forever dead, that is to say, once the body is dead the soul also stays that way forever, still there is no reason to lament.

“You are “mahā-bāhu”, a mighty-armed warrior capable of defeating your enemies. As a member of the warrior order, battle is by necessity your religious duty. Therefore it is said, “Brahma has established for the warrior order a most gruesome religious duty according to which a brother may even have to kill his own brother.”

117 शास्त्रीयस्त्वादिती : MMS, AMS.
118 प्राक्येयम् : MMS.
119 हन्ताविद् : MMS.
120 नेष्ठि : BGP, KDB.
121 φ : BGP, KDB, GVS.
122 ग्लोकरस्तम्भम् : AMS.
123 BP 10.54.40
Anyone who is born will definitely die, and anyone who dies will definitely be re-born. Therefore there is no need to lament for something which is inevitable.

This body is a result of good and bad activities performed in previous lives. When they are spent, death is certain ("dhruvo"). And re-birth is just as certain, as a result of activities performed in this life.

The word "hi" is here used to mean "because". Because birth and death are certain, therefore there is no reason to lament for something which is inevitable; it is impossible to avoid either birth or death.

Verse twenty (na jayate mriyate....) argues that there is no need to lament for the soul, and verse twenty seven (jatasya hi dhruvo mryur...) does the same with regard to the body. Now Kṛṣṇa deals with both ideas together:

Arjuna, son of the Bharata dynasty, all beings start off as non-manifest, become manifest for a time, and then end up non-manifest again. Why cry over this?

124 निरुक्तोऽन्तिममभूतः : UMS.
125 O : BGP, GVS.
The word bhūtāni in this verse refers to all beings: gods, men, and beasts. All these beings are “avyakta-ādīni”, or “non-manifest to begin with”, that is to say, “non-manifest before their birth”. But even then, because the body’s constitutive material elements (earth, water, etc) exist, both the subtle body and the gross body exist, but only as a causal seeds; they are not directly manifest.

Then in the interim these beings become clearly manifest (vyakta-mādhyāni), and then after their destruction they become non-manifest again (avyakta-nidhāni). At the time of complete destruction of this world, both karma (the results of previously performed actions) and māyā (illusion) still exist. Thus all living beings exist in a subtle form [awaiting the next creation].

So at the beginning and at the end of creation, the living beings are unmanifest; only in the interim are they manifest.

This has been confirmed by the śrutis: “All the moving and non-moving beings come into being when the material energy arouses all the latent causes for their activity”.130

Therefore Kṛṣṇa says, “kā paridevanā?” “What is this grief? What is the reason for such lamentation?” This idea is confirmed by Nārada: “Whether you believe a person to be eternal or not or both or neither, still in any case there is no need for you to lament for people: such lamentation just comes from an affection based on illusion.”131

---

126 BGP: महानन्दय
127 कर्मयात्मकान्योऽदीनां : printed.
128 सर्वभूतान्यादित्योर्वकान्योऽदीनां : printed.
129 योगमय : UMS. या न योगमय : JMS.
130 BhP 10.87.29: “sthira-cara-jātayah syur ajayottha-nimitta-yujah...” This is not a quote from the śruti texts but rather a quote from the prayers of the śruti in the Bhāgavata-purāṇa.
131 BhP 1.13.44: “yan manyase dhruvaṁ lokāṁ adhruvaṁ vā...”
Some behold it with wonder and others speak of it with wonder. Others hear of it with wonder, and yet others cannot grasp it even after hearing about it.

Some behold it with wonder and others speak of it with wonder. Others hear of it with wonder, and yet others cannot grasp it even after hearing about it.

As a reply, in the next two verses Kṛṣṇa says “Don’t lament, but rather fight...”

132 येव : printed.
133 सत्यमेवेवेत्याद : AMS, MMS.
134 सर्वलोकं : printed, AMS, MMS.
135 Ṵ : AMS, MMS.
Arjuna, son of the Bhārata dynasty, there is in every single body an embodied soul which can never be destroyed. Therefore there is no need for you to lament for any living being.

And if you also take into account your sacred duty as a warrior, there is no reason for you to be worried. Nothing is more auspicious for a member of the warrior order than fighting to defend religious principles.

Ṭīkā: Since the soul cannot be destroyed, there is no reason to be afraid of being killed. Moreover if you also take into account your own sacred duty as a warrior there is again no reason to be worried. This is how this verse connects to the previous one.

Ṭīkā: What’s more, Arjuna, in a just war the person who dies is happier than those who are victorious. Therefore, kill Bhīma and the others and make them happier than yourself.
This kind of war is an open door which leads automatically to heaven. *Kṣatriyas* are happy to get the chance to fight such a war.

**Ṭīkā:** This war is an open, unobstructed doorway which leads automatically (“yadrcchayā”) to heaven. That is to say, it is a way to go to the heavenly realms without even practising *karma-yoga* [which is normally the only means of going there].

**Ṭīkā:** In the next four verses Kṛṣṇa outlines the flaws of the opposing case:

2.33

अव चेत्त्वमम धर्मं संग्रामं न करिष्यसि।

नन्तं स्वयम् कीर्तिः च हिन्ना पापमवाघ्यसि। ||33||

But if you refuse to fight this war to defend religious principles, then you will be neglecting your own religious duty as a warrior, you will be ruining your reputation, and you will be implicated in sin.

2.34

अक्कौन्त चापि भूतानि कत्विष्णवः न द्वियाम।

संभावितप्पां चाकर्मिनिर्ममायनिरिच्छने। ||34||

People will forever talk about your disgrace, and for one who has known glory disgrace is worse than death.

**Ṭīkā:** अवयामनंवराम। संभावितप्पानिन्तप्रिन्नितस्तस्य। ||34||

---

139 आपावृत्तमपतत्तारम्: JMS. आपावृत्तमपतत्तारम्: AMS.
140 प्रिन्नितस्तस्य: AMS (corrected in MMS).
The word “avyayām” means that the disgrace will be unending, eternal. The word “sambhavitasya” means a very well respected person. [For such a person disgrace is worse than death.]

Mighty warriors who once held you in high esteem will think that you have quit the battle-field out of fear, and thus you will be disgraced.

Your enemies will say unmentionable things about you, ridiculing your prowess. What could be more painful than that?

They will say unmentionable things about you, such as “Cowardly sissy!”.
‘fika: “But Kṛṣṇa, I can’t even be certain that I will win the war, so how am I supposed to engage in it?”

Kṛṣṇa replies...

Either you will lose and go to heaven, or win and enjoy this earth. Therefore, son of Kunti, arise, determined to fight.

Tīkā: Now he says, “Arjuna, this war is in all respects a religious duty for you, but if you suspect that it might also be a cause of sin for you, then just learn from me the art of acting without incurring sin, and then engage in the battle...

Look upon happiness and distress equally; the same applies for gain and loss as well as for victory and defeat. Take part in the war in this manner and you will incur no sin.
“Look upon happiness and distress equally. The cause of your happiness and distress is gain and loss of the kingdom. Also look equally upon gain and loss. And the cause of your gaining or losing the kingdom is winning or losing this battle, so also look equally upon victory and defeat. That is to say, through analysis come to regard them as the same.

There is no question of sin for you if you have this knowledge of equanimity. This will be explained later in the verse “lipyate na sa pāpena padmapatramivāmbhasā” “Such a person is not touched by sin, just as a lotus is not touched by water.”

I have thus far explained this frame of mind to you in theory. Now
listen as I explain it in practice. By adopting this frame of mind you can escape the bondage of *karma*.

**Tīkā:** The word “śāṅkhya” refers to a complete description (*samyak-khyāyate*). That complete knowledge which thoroughly describes and reveals the truth of things is known as “śāṅkhya”. I have thus far explained within that śāṅkhya school of thought how to adopt this frame of mind. Now listen as I explain it within the school of *yoga*, that is to say within the school of *bhakti-yoga*. By adopting this devotional frame of mind you will escape the bondage of *karma*, i.e., you will escape the cycle of death and re-birth.

---

153 (...continued)
of contexts in which “*buddhi*” occurs, and “intellectual attitude” to my mind connotes in current English a more theoretical position than is intended in the context of the yoga taught in the Gītā. Edgerton (1952) also uses “mental attitude”.

---

154 केस्तन्तसम्मेलितः : UMS.
155 करणीयावृद्धिरेतः : UMS.
156 0 : printed.
157 कर्मयथाविनिर्भरस्ते : MMS.
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The "yoga" referred to in verse 39 is of two kinds: the first being bhakti-yoga, consisting of hearing, chanting, etc., and the second niskäma-karma-yoga, or selfless performance of religious rites and duties. In this section until verse forty-seven ("karmay evädhikaras te..."), only bhakti yoga is described. [Then niskäma-karma-yoga will be described.]

We know that only bhakti-yoga is being described here because in verse forty-five Arjuna is told to transcend material influence (nistraiguru yo bhavarjuna). Now only bhakti is transcendent, and therefore only by bhakti can one become transcendent. This has been established in the eleventh skandha [of the Bhágavata Puráña].

On the other hand, karma-yoga is under the influence of rajas (passion) and jñana-yoga is under the influence of sattva (goodness), and thus neither of them can give transcendence.

The rituals of karma are certainly offered to the Lord, but that devotional component simply prevents the ritual practices of karma from being ineffectual. That devotional component does not mean that such ritual practices should be called bhakti, because bhakti is not the main component.

Besides, if such karma-yoga rituals and duties which are offered to the Lord are to be considered as bhakti, then what will the word karma refer to? Of course you might say that karma could then refer to any ritual activity or duty which is not offered to the Lord. But that does not make any sense because the rites and activities of karma-yoga are completely useless without bhakti. They must always be offered to the Lord. This has been confirmed by Śrī Narada:

"The state of desirelessness is not very attractive if it is devoid of a sense of God; neither is pure speculative knowledge. The same applies even more so to ritual activities which are not offered to the Lord, for they are always troublesome even
if they are performed without personal desire.”

Therefore this current section (v. 40-46) can only apply to *bhakti-yoga*, the transcendental yoga which consists only of the pure devotional activities such as hearing, chanting, and so on and which is the means for attaining the nectar of the feet of the Lord. The material *niśkāma-karma-yoga* will also be described later.

The word “*buddhi-yoga*” thus has two meanings: “*bhakti-yoga*” and “*niśkāma-karma-yoga*”. This is apparent in other places. For example, in verse ten of chapter ten [where “*buddhi-yoga*” means *bhakti*]: “*dadāmi buddhi-yogam tam yena māṁ upayānti te*” (“I give them the *buddhi-yoga*, the wisdom by which they can approach me”). And then in verse forty-nine of this chapter [where “*buddhi-yoga*” means *niśkāma-karma-yoga*]: “*dūreṇa hy avarāṁ karma buddhi-yogād dhanañjayā*” (“Ordinary actions are far inferior to *buddhi-yoga* [selfless religious actions offered to the Lord].”)

For now Kṛṣṇa extols *bhakti-yoga*, the transcendental yoga which consists of the devotional activities of chanting and hearing...

2.40

नेहाभिक्रमनावो प्रस्ति प्रत्ययायो न विधने।
स्वल्पवायस्य धर्मस्य आयने महतो भवान्।

No steps taken in this yoga are ever lost or reversed. Even a little of this practice can free one from the greatest fear.

For now Kṛṣṇa extols *bhakti-yoga*, the transcendental yoga which consists of the devotional activities of chanting and hearing...

2.40

नेहाभिक्रमनावो प्रस्ति प्रत्ययायो न विधने।
स्वल्पवायस्य धर्मस्य आयने महतो भवान्।

No steps taken in this yoga are ever lost or reversed. Even a little of this practice can free one from the greatest fear.
Tīkā: “Even if one only just begins this bhakti-yoga, that bhakti is never lost. And therefore there is also no reversal of that bhakti as there would be in karma-yoga. In the duties and rituals of karma-yoga if something is only started but not completed, then that effort is lost and may even give the opposite reaction. Not so in bhakti.”

Arjuna may object, “A person may well want to perform bhakti-yoga, but surely he can not reap the rewards of bhakti unless he performs it fully and adequately?”

To this Kṛṣṇa replies, “svalpam api...”. “Whatever little bit of bhakti has been performed even at the beginning of the process, that will be enough to free one from the greatest fear, i.e., from the cycle of death and re-birth. This is confirmed in the example of Ajāmila as well as by statements in the scriptures, such as:

“By hearing that name just once, even the tribal Pukkaśa people can be freed from this cycle of death and re-birth.”

This present verse (nehābhikramo...) is supported by another statement made by the Lord:

“O Uddhava, there is not the slightest destruction of any small start made to this religion of mine because it is completely transcendental when performed without any personal desire. This is my firm opinion.”

The reason for this fact is mentioned in that verse: “nirguṇatvāt” “because

---
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it is completely transcendental” and transcendental things can never be destroyed. The same applies here in this verse, too. [Therefore this verse cannot apply to niskīma karma-yoga, since that yoga is not transcendental.]

Nor can one say that niskīma-karma-yoga becomes transcendental when offered to the Lord, because there is a statement of the Lord to the effect that it is “sattvika”, or within the realm of the material quality of Goodness. He says, “The performance of one’s particular religious duties, either selflessly or as an offering to Me, is considered to be under the influence of the material quality of sattva, or Goodness.”

Tīkā: Then he says, “And the finest of all mental attitudes is that which is centred on bhakti-yoga, the path of devotion...

2.41

O son of the Kuru dynasty, in this yoga a resolute and settled mind can be completely focused, but if one lacks resolve, the mind branches out in endless ways.
In this yoga, bhakti-yoga, a resolute and determined mind can be one-pointed. That frame of mind is like this: “My venerable guru has instructed me to perform devotional activities such as glorifying the Lord, remembering him, and serving his lotus feet. These devotional activities are my means of advancement (sādhanā) as well as my end goal (sādhyā). They are my very sustenance, which I can never give up either in the stage of practice or in the stage of perfection. They are my duty as well as my own choice. There is nothing else I have to do, and there is nothing else I want to do - even in my dreams. Thus, it does not matter whether I am in happiness or distress, or even whether the whole universe is destroyed or not; it won’t affect me in the slightest.”

Such focus of a resolute and settled mind is possible only in bhakti. This is confirmed in the scriptures: “Thus one should worship Me with faith, love, and firm determination...”

Then in the second part of this verse (bahu-sākha...) Kṛṣṇa explains that such single-mindedness is not possible in other paths: if one lacks resolve, then the mind is bahu-sākha, or “many-branched”. For example in karma-yoga there is no limit to the number of desires, and thus the intentions of karmis are endless. And the ritualistic means of attaining all these desires are endless, so the procedures and branches are also endless.

So too in jñāna-yoga; in the beginning one must turn one’s attention to nīṣkāma-karma-yoga in order to purify the mind. And then when the mind is
purified, one’s attention must be turned to giving up those religious and ritual activities. And then one must set about developing jñāna. And then to ensure that the path of jñāna actually produces its result, one must turn one’s attention to bhakti. And then, according to the statement, “One should surrender the path of jñāna to Me”\(^\text{194}\), one must turn one’s attention to giving up jñāna.

Thus there are endless mental stances (buddhi) required in the path of jñāna. The jñānis are obliged to follow karma, jñāna and bhakti, and thus they branch out into endless paths.

\(\text{टीका- नस्माद्यव्यसायिन: सकामकार्मिनः सत्यन्दन्तति मद्याह ।}
\)

\(\text{Tīkā: And therefore the irresolute sakāma-karmis (who perform religious rituals and activities for personal gain) are very foolish:}
\)

\[
\text{2.42}
\begin{align*}
\text{यामिमां पुष्पनां वाचा प्रवदन्त्विषिष्ठिनः ।} \\
\text{चेतयादमु: पार्य नान्यदन्तीति वादिनः ॥५२॥}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{2.43}
\begin{align*}
\text{कामामानः स्थारगरा जन्मकर्मफूलप्रधामु ।} \\
\text{क्रियाविवेकवहलानं मोक्षवर्गानि प्रीते ॥५३॥}
\end{align*}
\]

Foolish and greedy men, whose only motivation is to enjoy heavenly pleasures, speak flowery words full of special rituals for obtaining wealth and enjoyment. These flowery words offer higher birth as a reward for ritual action. O son of Prthū, such men who delight in the words of the Veda proclaim that there is nothing else but this.

\(\text{टीका- यामिमामिनः 'पुष्पिनां वाचपुष्पिनां'\(^\text{195}\) विषविकार्मिवायतानः रमणीयां प्रवदन्ति प्रक्षेष} \)

\(\text{चर्चा: प्रकृत्या ह्रदये चेतयां गिन्ते वदन्ति तेन तत्रा वाचा अपवस्थासाधृ व्यवसायानि पुदिन्ति} \)

\(\text{विपीपने दृष्टि नुसीयनायः । नेशु तत्रा असम्बवात् च नेशु नाप्रविधम् इत्यादः । किंमति ने तथा} \)

\(\text{वदन्ति। यतं अविपिटिनं मुखप्रस्तुत हेतु। चेदेस्तु ये दर्शवादः अश्चयं वे चालुक्यस्यव्याजिनः शुक्लम्} \)

\(^{194}\) BP 11.19.1 \textit{jñānam ca mayi samnyaset “And then jñāna should be committed to me”}.

\(^{195}\) \text{वाच पुष्पिनां : UMS.}
They speak flowery words which like a poisonous flowering vine give some immediate pleasure. They propound (pra-vadanti) this message saying that the words of the Veda are the ultimate.

The word "yām" here links these verses up to verse 44 (...tayāpahrta-cetasām...). The people who speak these flowery words as well as those who are seduced by these flowery words are never blessed with a firm resolve of mind. That is to say, because such firm resolve is impossible for them, this teaching is not meant for them.

"Why do they propound these flowery words?"

"Because they are fools (avipaścitaḥ). They are fooled by the embellished statements of the Vedas, such as, "One who follows the vow of cātur-māsyā accrues eternal piety." 196 Or, "We have drunk the soma-rasa and have become immortal." 197 They frivolously say that there is nothing else, that there is not another reality, no controller beyond all that."

"What are these flowery words like?"

"They are "janma-karma-phala-pradām", words which offer higher birth as a reward for ritual action. They are also "kriyāviśeṣa-bahu-lām" words which explain the multitude of special rituals meant for attaining opulence and enjoyment."

And those who are seduced by that flowery language and attached to indulgence and opulence never experience that firm determination of mind 198 to remain in complete spiritual absorption.

---

196 Śata-patha-brāhmaṇa: 2.6.3.1.
197 RG-veda-samhitā: 6.4.11.
198 "buddhi", see footnote to verse 2.39.
Therefore those attached to indulgence and opulence and whose minds are attracted by that flowery language never attain the firm determination of mind to remain in samādhi. Samādhi is one-pointedness of the mind, that is to say, turning oneself toward the one supreme Lord. These people never attain that state.

The verb form in this verse is “karma-kartari”203. Thus Śrīdhara Swami remarks that samādhi simply does not occur for these people.

Then Kṛṣṇa says, “But as for you, Arjuna, don’t be attached to these different methods for attaining the fourfold goal of life [dharma, artha, kāma, and mokṣa]. Just take shelter of bhakti-yoga alone...

The subject matter of the Vedas is material, remaining within the realm of the three material qualities. But Arjuna, you should transcend these three material qualities and be free from all duality. Remain in the company of your own type of people, be self controlled, and do not be concerned about acquisition and maintenance.
मर्यादा 'निषेध'222 या सांस्कृतिक निजकर्म तत्। राजसं फलसंकल्यं हिंसाप्रायादि नामसं। 223
'निषेध' विना नैपूजिकं निजकर्म फलानान्याहिनिन्यायं।²²³
केवल सांस्कृतिक ब्रान्यं रजी 'वैकल्पिकः पु'²²⁴ यत्। प्राकृतं नामसं ब्रान्यं मकः निरुपणं स्मृतम्।
वननु नामात्रेको गायको गायको राजसं हृदयने। नामसं धृतरस्तनं मकःकन्तम् निरुपणम्। सांस्कृतिकः
कारको 'उसकी रागान्यो राजसं स्मृतप्रसं। नामसं स्मृतिविपश्चरो निरुपणं मद्याश्रयः।
'सांस्कृतिक्यायामिकीः'²²⁵ श्रद्धा कर्मश्रद्धा तृतीय श्रद्धा तामस्यायानं निरुपणं।
पथ्य नूतनमान्यस्तमाह्यं सांस्कृतिकः स्मृतं। राजसं चेन्नियप्रेष्टं नामसं चार्तिश्रुतिः।
चकारामित्र्येतिन्नु निरुपणं इन्नै श्रीनाईविध्यवर्णानं यास्त्यायं।
सांस्कृतिकः युक्तमानोऽव विषयोऽन्तर नामसं। नामसं मोहवन्योऽन्तर निरुपणं मद्याश्रयः। इन्नैने
प्रयोगः 'नीतागुणस्तुति सिस्मेगुणस्तुति'²²⁶ प्रदर्श्यं निरुपणं श्यमसं।²²⁷ सामाजिकः
निस्मेगुणस्तुतिक्यायायं निरुपणेष्व 'नितागुणस्तुति'²²⁸ भूतागुणसं कदाचित्तं स्थितं।²²⁹ निरुपणं निरदेशः
उपयुक्तस्यन्तरात्मकम्।

द्वितीय वेलः फलोऽन्तर नामां²³² कर्म च कारकः। श्रद्धायां वृत्तिनिजस्त वृत्तिसं सर्वं एवं हि।
'सर्वं'²³³ गुणमया भावाः। पुरुषवायुविधिताः। हृदयं 'शुभमनुष्याः'²³⁴ नुःवा या पुरुषविधिः।
एततः संवृत्ततः। चुंचुंचुं गुणकमिनिन्यात्मकः। इत्येके निर्देशं। सौम्य गुणा जीवनं चिनन्ता।
भक्तियोगेन मकः निजत्वः मद्याश्रयं प्रचूराय।

तस्माद् भक्तियोगेन निरुपण भूगुणस्यायेन नायायं। अना यायं कर्मे 'बैंकाल्प्यीं' गुणानिर्देशः इति प्रशं
वाक्यने मात्र यो व्यभिचारः। भक्तियोगेन सोहते स गुणान् 'समतेत्येतान्'²³⁵ श्राब्धयायः कल्याणे।
इति। श्रीसांस्कृतिक्यायानां यास्त्याय च। चकारो ज्ञायत्यायारः। मामेव परमेवस्त्रस्यविधिचारणं
भक्तियोगेन ये चेतने 'इत्या'।

222 निषेधः : AMS.
223 गुणः : UMS (JMS added in margin).
224 वैकल्पिकः : BGP, KDB GVS. वैकल्पिकः तु : BDM. वैकल्पिकः : BVT.
225 सांस्कृतिक्यायामिकीः : AMS.
226 गुणस्तुति : printed, AMS, MMS.
227 गुणः : printed.
228 नामः : AMS, MMS.
229 स्थितिः : MMS.
230 नवस्याः : printed. नवस्यचुं : AMS, MMS.
231 अस्याः : JMS.
232 वर्षः : JMS.
233 श्रुतमुखाः : JMS (UMS unclear).
234 स्थाययाः : AMS.
Tīkā: The word “traigunya” has been formed from the word tri-guṇa but it retains the original meaning of related to the three guṇas. The apparent subject matter of the Vedas (karma, jñāna, etc.) remains within the realm of the three material qualities, the three guṇas. When we say this we mean that the Vedas deal mostly with material subjects because a thing is always described by its majority. But of course there are also descriptions of bhakti in the Vedas. For example in the śruti it is said: “Only bhakti leads one to Him”. Also, “One should have supreme devotion for God, and equal devotion for the guru”. Smṛti scripture such as the Pañcarātra as well as Upaniṣads such as the Gītāpaniṣad and the Gopāla-tāpanya all deal only with transcendental bhakti. In fact bhakti can not be authorised unless it is mentioned in the Vedas. Therefore ignore only those rules in the Veda which prescribe the material (traigunya) processes of jñāna and karma. Do not follow them. But as for the rules in the Veda which prescribe the processes of bhakti, those injunctions should absolutely be followed.”

If one does not follow those injunctions then it will be difficult to avoid the following transgression: “Devotional activities, even if performed with complete focus of mind, are simply a nuisance if they are not performed according to the injunctions of the śruti, smṛti, and the pañcarātra scriptures.”

Therefore even though the Vedas are transcendental they deal with both material and transcendental topics. There are saguṇa Vedas and guṇāṭita Vedas. The saguṇa Vedas deal with the three material qualities (guṇas) and the guṇāṭita Vedas deal with that which is beyond the guṇas. But you should be transcendental. You should go beyond these three material qualities by practising bhakti-yoga which is itself transcendental to the three material qualities. And then you will be beyond the dualities of this world, such as honour and dishonour, which are simply products of the three guṇas.

Therefore you should also keep company of your own people (nitya-sattva-stho). That is to say keep company with My devotees.

In this regard, the word “sattva” means “living beings”. So the phrase

The rationale given (svārthye śyaṅ) seems to be a reference to the Vārttika on P. 5.1.24.
“bhaktir evainam nayati”.
Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad 6.3: “yasya deve parā bhaktir yatha deve tathā guruu...”
"nitya-sattva-stho" means "someone who stays with his own people", or in other words "someone who remains in the company of My devotees".

One might want to interpret the phrase "nitya-sattva-stha" as meaning "perpetually situated in sattva-guna", but that meaning would not fit with the statement in the previous line: "nistraigunya bhavārjuna", "Be transcendental to the three material qualities, the three guṇas."

Obtaining something which one does not have is called "yoga", and protecting what one has obtained is called "kṣema". The phrase "nir-yoga-kṣema" means to be free from anxiety for both of these. Because my devotees are completely absorbed in relishing the sweetness of my devotional service, they make no effort for either acquisition or maintenance (yoga-kṣema). And also I am worried about the welfare of my devotees so I take their load. Just as I have said, "I bring what they need and protect what they have".239

"Become master of yourself (ātmavān)." In other words: "Take up this wisdom that I have given you."

In this regard there is in the eleventh skandha [of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa] an analysis of material (traiguṇya) and transcendental (nistraigunya):

One’s prescribed duties come under the sphere of Goodness (sattva-guna), if offered to Me or performed selflessly. If performed with self-interest for the results, they come under the influence of Passion (rajas). If they are for the most part injurious to others, then they come under the influence of Darkness (tamas).240

The word "selflessly" (nisphala) in this verse refers to periodic rituals and duties (naimittika-karma)241 performed without desire for any resultant reward. The eleventh skandha [of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa] continues:

Knowledge of oneness comes under the influence of Goodness, whereas knowledge of difference is in Passion. Materialistic knowledge is under the influence of Darkness. But knowledge of Me is nirguna, or transcendental to these three material influences.

Living in the forest is considered to be in Goodness, whilst living in a town is said to be in Passion, and living in a gambling-house

239 yoga-kṣema vahāmyaham 9.22.
240 BP: 11.25.23 ff.
241 See note to verse 2.49.
Darkness. But living in My temple is transcendental. Acting without attachment is said to be under the influence of Goodness, whereas acting blinded by desire is said to be in Passion, and acting without any discretion is known as Darkness. But acting whilst taking full shelter of Me is transcendental. Faith in self-realisation is under the influence of Goodness, whereas faith in ritual activities is in Passion, and faith in irreligious practices comes under Darkness. But faith in Me is transcendental. Wholesome, pure, healthy food is considered to display the quality of Goodness, whereas food which is meant simply for instant gratification of the senses is in Passion, and impure food which causes pain is food in Darkness.

[No mention is made here of transcendental food, but] according to Śrīdhara Swami the word “ca” in the last line implies, “and food which has been offered to Me is transcendental.”

The eleventh skandha [of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa] continues,

Happiness in Goodness comes from one’s self, whereas happiness in Passion comes from sensual objects, and happiness in Darkness comes from delusion and wretchedness. But happiness that comes from Me is transcendental.

In these verses (BP11.25.23-29) Kṛṣṇa has given examples of material objects (within the three guṇas) and transcendental objects (without the three guṇas). Now Kṛṣṇa would like to establish that his devotees are beyond matter. With that in mind, in the subsequent verses (BP 11.25.30-32) Kṛṣṇa explains how, by practising transcendental bhakti-yoga, his devotees can overcome those material qualities (traiguṇya), if these somehow happen to influence them:

Substances, place, the results of action, the time, knowledge, the activity, the performer of the activity, faith, the circumstance, species, as well as the conclusion are all governed by these three material qualities.

O greatest of men, all states of being in this world, whether directly seen, heard about or just mentally conceived of, all are made up of these three material qualities according to the contact of the living.

242 “ca-kārān man-niveditam tu nirguṇaṁ” - comment on BP: 11.25.28
being with the material elements.

Good sir, all the successive states of existence of a person are dependent on previously performed actions and the influence of the three guṇas. These material influences are born of the mind, and the living being who overcomes them, fixes himself in Me through bhakti-yoga, and attains My state of existence.

Therefore, one can overcome the influence of the three material qualities only by this transcendental bhakti-yoga and by no other means.

In this regard, further on in the Bhagavad-gītā Arjuna asks Kṛṣṇa how to transcend these three material qualities, and Kṛṣṇa replies,

Whoever serves me with unwavering bhakti-yoga, transcends these material qualities, the guṇas, and comes to the spiritual platform.

Śrīdhara Swami comments that in that verse the word “me” is stressed by the use of the word “ca” after it (mām ca yo vyabhicārena...). In other words the meaning is, “Whoever serves me, the supreme Lord, and only me, with unwavering bhakti-yoga...”

Ṭīkā: Yes indeed, what more can one say in praise of this selfless, transcendental bhakti-yoga? Even in the beginning stages of such pure bhakti-yoga, nothing is ever lost nor reversed. And in the eleventh skandha [of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa], it is stated how success is achieved by even a little progress along this path: “O Uddhava, there is not the slightest destruction of any small start made to this religion of Mine because it is completely transcendental when performed without any personal desire.
This is my firm opinion.  

But even if bhakti-yoga is not selfless, even if it is performed with a desire to achieve some personal benefit (sakāma-bhaktī), still it can be included in the category of “vyāvasāyātmika-buddhi”, the stage of a resolute and settled mind. This is now explained with a metaphoric example...

2.46

Whatever functions a well may perform are also fully performed by a lake; [similarly anything and everything that can be obtained] through the various Vedic rituals [is fully obtained] by a wise person who really understands the Vedas.

292 Ch. 2 v. 46
The word “udapāne” is grammatically singular and literally means “in a well”. Here however the singular is understood to represent generically all types of wells. So Krishna is saying “Whatever usefulness there is in wells...” For example there might be one well used for ablutions, another well used for brushing teeth, another for washing clothes, one for washing hair, one for bathing, and yet another for drinking.

Whatever services all these different types of wells provide can also be provided by a big lake. One can perform all these different activities (ablutions, brushing teeth, etc.) in the one place. But there are advantages which need to be noted: doing each activity at a different well involves a great deal of hard work because one must move about to each and every well, whereas all these activities can be done at the lake without any such inconvenience. Also well water can be salty whereas water from a big lake is sweet.

Similarly whatever can be obtained in all the Vedas through all the worship of different demi-gods can also be obtained by a wise person by simply worshipping the one supreme Lord. Such a person is here called “brāhmaṇa”. Another name for the Vedas is brahma, and one who knows the Vedas (brahma) is called a brāhmaṇa. But this brāhmaṇa is also called “vijñataḥ” because he not only knows the Vedas, but he has a special understanding (vi-jñataḥ) that bhakti is the conclusion of the Vedas.

For example, in the second skandha [of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa] it is said, “If one wants to obtain sacred knowledge, one should worship Brhaspati, and if one wants sensual development, one should worship Indra. If one desires offspring, he should worship the Prajāpati, and if one wants to acquire opulence, he should worship Māyā devī, Durga.”

But just after that, the Bhāgavata continues, “Whether one has no desires, all desires, or even the desire for liberation, a wise person should worship the supreme

\[\text{258} \quad \text{उदापाने : UMS.}\\ \text{259} \quad \text{ब्राह्मणोऽकरणा : AMS.}\\ \text{260} \quad \text{Ø : printed.}\\ \text{261} \quad \text{Ø : UMS.}\\ \text{262} \quad \text{BP: 2.3.2-3.}\]
Lord with intense bhakti-yoga.  

Bhakti-yoga is said to be intense when it is not mixed with karma and yoga, just as the rays of the sun are intense when they are not mixed with clouds, etc.

If one tries to have one’s many wishes fulfilled through many different devas, then one’s mind will surely be many-branched. But if one is convinced one can get everything one desires simply from the Lord (Bhagavān), then one can be single-minded, because there is only one focus. That focus is possible because of the excellent qualities of the subject upon which one remains focused (i.e. Bhagavān).

Ṭīkā: And thus now the Lord singles out Arjuna and wants to choose between the paths of karma, jñāna and bhakti for his dear friend. Kṛṣṇa had already explained the paths of jñāna and bhakti in the previous verses, but upon reflection considered Arjuna to be unqualified to follow either of those paths. So now Kṛṣṇa recommends niṣkāma-karma-yoga...

It is fit and proper for you to perform your prescribed activities, but you have no claim over the results of those activities. Do not become liable for the result of your actions, and do not be fond of not doing your duty.

Ṭīkā-  कर्मणिति । मा फलेन्तिनिः । फलाकविधिषिणो ०यत्यन्त्रनासुद्धिचिता भवनि त्यन्त्र प्रायः शुद्धिचित

263 BP: 2.3.10.
264 “buddhi”, see footnote to verse 2.39.
265 लक्ष्य कृत्य : BGP. लक्ष्यकृत्य : printed, UMS.
266 ज्ञानकल्याणाकृत्य : UMS (something deleted and emended in margin of JMS).
267 विपूर्त्य : printed.
268 φ : UMS (JMS added in the margin).
Those who desire the fruits of their labour have impure minds, but I know that you have quite a pure mind, Arjuna, so I am telling you that you have no claim over the fruits of your activities.

“But, Kṛṣṇa, isn’t there invariably always a result to every action?”

“Yes, but that is why I say to you, “mā karma-phala-hetur bhūr”, “Do not become the cause of the result of your actions.” When one acts only out of a desire for the results of an activity, one becomes the cause or initiator of the result of that act [and thus liable for it]. But I am blessing you, “Do not become like that”.

“Don’t ever be attached or fond of akarma. Akarma has two meanings: “not performing one’s own prescribed duty” or “performing sinful forbidden activities (vikarma)”. So again I am blessing you, but I am not just blessing you to be “not fond” of such akarma but actually I am blessing you to be totally opposed to it.”

In the next chapter Arjuna says, “You are bewildering me with statements that are all mixed up.” From this it should be understood that there was no desire to lay out a logical flow of arguments in this chapter. But what is significant is the exchange between Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna: “Arjuna, just as I am here ready to drive your chariot or do whatever you bid, so too you should just be ready to do whatever I bid.”
And now Kṛṣṇa instructs Arjuna on the ways of nīŚkāma-karma-yoga:

2.48

Firmly in yoga, o conqueror of wealth, perform your actions without attachment and be balanced in success and failure. Such equanimity is called yoga.

Then he condemns sākāma-karma, or self-interested action:

2.49

Then he condemns sakāma-karma, or self-interested action:
For mere action (*karma*) is far inferior to this *buddhi-yoga*, the yoga of mental attitude. O Dhanamjaya. Aspire for full shelter in this state of mind; people who work only for the fruit of their labour are miserable.

**Tīkā:** The word “*karma*” in this verse stands for *kāmya-karma*, or self-interested ritual activity. Such *kāmya-karma* is far inferior to *buddhi-yoga*. Here *buddhi-yoga* means selfless ritual duties offered to the supreme Lord (*nīṣkāma-karma-yoga*). In this verse the phrase “take shelter in this state of mind (*buddhi*)” means “take shelter in selfless ritual activity (*nīṣkāma-karma*)”.

Disciplined in this mental attitude, one rids oneself of both pious and impious activities in this world. Therefore engage in this yoga, for it is the real skill in acting.

---

282 “*buddhi*”, see footnote to verse 2.39

283 *nīṣkāma-karmam*: AMS, MMS.

284 *nīṣkāma-karmam*: printed.

285 There are two categories of rituals: optional and compulsory. Optional rituals are called *kāmya-karmas* and they are performed to achieve a specific result in the future. Compulsory rituals are of two types: *nītya* and *naimittika*. *Nītya-karmas* are regular (daily) duties (such as the five types of daily *yajña*). *Naimittika-karmas* are periodic rituals performed on specific occasions (such as those performed at the birth of a child). *Nītya* and *naimittika karma* are compulsory duties and can thus be performed as a duty, without personal desire. *Kāmya-karma* is always performed out of self-interest.

286 “*buddhi*”, see footnote to verse 2.39

287 Ø : printed.
The person who “adopts this frame of mind” (buddhi-yukto) is a “niskåma-karma-yogi”. Intently engage in the above mentioned yoga, because in the performance of all karma, whether self-interested or selfless, yoga means simply performing the activity with neutrality. This yoga is “kauśalāṇ”, or the “expertise” or “skill” in actions.

2.51

The wise, disciplined in this mental attitude, renounce the results obtained through their actions. Thus they are liberated from the bondage of rebirth in this world and go to that place which is free from all ills.

Tīkā: Krṣṇa says, by practising niskåma-karma-yoga and offering it to the supreme Lord you will attain yoga...

2.52

And when your intellect comes out of the jungle of delusion, then you will become completely indifferent to all that is to be heard and all that you have heard [in the Veda].

Tīkā: तवं बुद्धिर्नन्दनस्या बुद्धिर्नन्दनस्या बुद्धिर्नन्दनस्या बुद्धिर्नन्दनस्या बुद्धिर्नन्दनस्या बुद्धिर्नन्दनस्या बुद्धिर्नन्दनस्या बुद्धिर्नन्दन

288 (नम) : MMS.
289 मोहाल चानामेव कौलिन गहने : UMS.
Here the word “buddhi” refers to the internal faculty, the intellect. Krishna says, “When your intellect comes well and truly out of the jungle or thick forest of delusion then you will be indifferent to all the statements that are to be heard [in the Veda] and all the statements that you have heard [in the Veda]. You will say to yourself, “Since my doubts and objections have been removed, what is the use of me listening to all these statements from the scriptures. It is much better for me to spend every second of my time simply performing my sadhana, my activities of spiritual practice.”

When your mind rejects the Vedas and remains still and settled in complete spiritual absorption (samādhi), then you will have attained the state of yoga.

Then your mind will not agree with the various statements you hear in the Vedic and traditional injunctions, and your mind will become detached from them. The reason for this is that it will be niścalā: it will remain “still”. It will have no interest in seeking out those various statements. Rather your mind will remain settled and firm in samādhi, as described in Chapter Six [of this book]. Then you will attain yoga; in other words, by direct transcendental experience you will attain the state of “jivan-mukta”, or liberation in this world.
Tīkā: In the previous verse Kṛṣṇa has talked about the intellect being firmly established in samādhi ("samādhāvacalā buddhis"). After hearing this, Arjuna asks about the distinguishing characteristics of such a yogi...

O Keśava, what are the telling characteristics of one who has firm intelligence and is situated in complete spiritual absorption? How does such a person speak, how do they sit and how are they active?

Tīkā: Arjuna asks "kā bhāṣa? (What is his bhāṣa?)" In this context "bhāṣā" means a characteristic or "that by which something can be described (bhāsyate)".

So Arjuna is asking, "What are the characteristics of a "sthita-prajña", or a person whose intelligence is firm?"

Someone queries: "What kind of person is this sthita-prajña?"

Arjuna adds, "One who is also "samādhi-stha", or fixed in samādhi."

These two terms (sthita-prajña and samādhi-stha) are two different ways of referring to a person who is liberated even in this world.
Then Arjuna asks, “How does such a person speak? In happiness or in sadness, in honour or in disrepute, in glory or in scorn, in fondness or in hatred, how does he speak? What kind of things does he say? What does he say out loud and what does he say to himself?”

Then Arjuna asks, “How does he sit? That is to say, how is he when his senses are not involved in the external sensual objects? And how does he walk? That is to say, how is he when his senses are thus involved?”

Then Arjuna asks, “How does he speak? In happiness or in sadness, in honour or in disrepute, in glory or in scorn, in fondness or in hatred, how does he speak? What kind of things does he say? What does he say out loud and what does he say to himself?”

Tīkā: From this point onwards until the end of the chapter, Kṛṣṇa answers Arjuna’s four questions in the order that they were asked.

2.55

Then Arjuna asks, “How does he sit? That is to say, how is he when his senses are not involved in the external sensual objects? And how does he walk? That is to say, how is he when his senses are thus involved?”

When one gives up all worldly desires in the mind, one becomes self-satisfied within the self and is called a “sthita-prajña”, or a person of firm intelligence.

Tīkā: Kṛṣṇa says, “When one gives up all worldly desires...” (sarvān kāmān). This means that there should be no desire whatsoever for anything at all. When it

298 यावदध्यायसमाप्तिः : printed, AMS.
299 धातमत्सः : JMS.
300 तांत्रकस्मिनान्मेयं : printed.
301 क्रीडेरण्यपविदितः : printed, UMS.
302 आत्मानन्दप्रस्तेन : printed, JMS.
is said that these worldly desires are “in the mind”, this is to show that they are not an inherent part of the self, and thus they can be given up. If indeed these worldly desires were inherent to the self then they could not be given up, just as heat cannot be separated from fire.

It is said “one becomes self-satisfied within the self”. That is to say, within the restrained mind one is satisfied by the self which is formed of pure bliss. Thus one can give up all worldly desires.

A similar verse is to be found in the śruti scriptures: “When the heart is freed from all the worldly desires residing there, then the mortal living being becomes immortal, and experiences the supreme.”

Tīkā: In the next two verses Krṣṇa answers the question, “How does such a person of fixed intelligence speak?”

One whose mind is not disturbed by distress nor excited by happiness, who is not affected by attachment, fear, or anger - such a person is called a sthita-dhī-muni, or “a sage of firm intelligence”.

---

304 Verse 2.54 “…kim prabhāṣeta…”.
305 śūnāṣṭeṣaḥ: printed. śūnāṣṭeṣaḥ: UMS. śūnāṣṭeṣaḥ: AMS.
306 śūnāṣṭeṣaḥ: printed. śūnāṣṭeṣaḥ: UMS, MMS. śūnāṣṭeṣaḥ: AMS.
307 śūnāṣṭeṣaḥ: BGP, KDB, GVS. śūnāṣṭeṣaḥ: BDM. śūnāṣṭeṣaḥ: AMS, MMS.
His mind is not disturbed when faced with all the three types of miseries: firstly, bodily sufferings (adhyātmika), such as hunger, thirst, fever, or headache; secondly, problems caused by other creatures (adhībautika), such as tigers and snakes; and thirdly, natural disturbances (adhīdaivika) such as violent storms.

In all such circumstances his mind is not at all agitated, and he thinks to himself, ‘This suffering is [a result of my] previously performed activities, I just have to experience it.’ Such are his inner thoughts, and if people ask him, then he will also explicitly say it to them. In this way he is not disturbed by any distress.

And from the calm expression on his face the wise can tell that such a person is not disturbed. And the wise can also recognise when someone is cheating with artificial symptoms of calmness. Such a person is called “fallen” (bhṛṣṭa).

Similarly when it is said that the person of firm spiritual intelligence is not over-excited by happiness, it means that he thinks and says things like, “I have to experience this happiness because of my previously performed activities.” And the wise can also recognise the signs of his calmness in happiness.

In the second line (vīta-rāga...) Kṛṣṇa clarifies and demonstrates the different characteristics of a sthita-dhī-muni: it is someone who has no attachment (e.g., to pleasure), who has no fear (e.g., of things that might eat you, like a tiger), and who has no anger (e.g., towards a relative who might kill you).

For example when Ādi Bharata was placed before the goddess Kālī to be sacrificed by the king of Vṛṣalā, he was neither afraid of nor angry at the king.
When confronted with various types of agreeable and disagreeable situations, if one remains free from all affection and expresses neither pleasure nor displeasure, then one’s wisdom has become firmly established.

Tīkā: Here Kṛṣṇa mentions being “anabhisneha”, or “devoid of affection for anything”. That means he has no false affection, i.e., affection based on a false material identity (upādhi). Because he is merciful, there is always a certain amount of affection, but that affection is not based on false material identity (nirupādhi).

When he gets something good he does not show pleasure. For example when people serve him in the conventional ways, such as by offering him food and worship, he does not praise or flatter them by saying, “You are so pious, you are the servant of great souls, may you be always happy!”

Nor when he gets something bad does he show displeasure. For example he does not show hatred to those who are unpleasant to him, who disrespect him or punch him. He does not curse them saying, “You sinful wretch! Fall down to hell!”

The wisdom of such a person is firmly established, or situated firmly within samādhi (complete spiritual absorption). This is called su-sthita-prajñā “well established intelligence”.

Tīkā:
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Tīkā: Now Kṛṣṇa replies to Arjuna’s question: “How does such a person sit?”

2.58

When one can withdraw one’s senses from the sensual objects just as a tortoise retracts its limbs, then one’s wisdom has become firmly established.

Tīkā: The idea is this: one withdraws the senses (e.g., the ears) from the sensual objects (e.g., sound). One simply controls one’s senses and forbids them to go towards the sensual objects. The senses are not allowed to move and are made to remain within. This is how a person of steady wisdom sits still. A good example of this is the tortoise: it retracts its limbs (eyes and mouth, etc.), and of its own volition contains them all within itself.

Tīkā: On hearing this Arjuna may object, “But it is possible even for a fool to stop his senses from contacting the sensual objects if he has to fast or if he is sick. [So is he also “a person whose wisdom has become firmly established?”]”

In reply Kṛṣṇa says,

2.59

Tīkā: On hearing this Arjuna may object, “But it is possible even for a fool to stop his senses from contacting the sensual objects if he has to fast or if he is sick. [So is he also “a person whose wisdom has become firmly established?”]”

In reply Kṛṣṇa says,
A living being who is fasting rids himself of the sensory objects but not of the taste for those objects. However, one who has experienced something higher, even loses that taste.

The commentator says: Someone who is fasting rids himself of the sensory objects but not of the rasa, the taste, or the desire and attachment for those objects (“rasa-varjam”). That is to say the desire for sensory objects does not go away.

But the sthita-prajña, the person of firm wisdom, even loses the desire for those sensory objects once he experiences something higher (param), i.e. the supreme soul (paramatma). Thus there is nothing lacking in this definition of a sthita-prajña. However, if one is unable to realise the self, then one is only a sādhaka, a spiritual aspirant, but not a siddha, a perfected soul.

The commentator says: Kṛṣṇa now says that at the stage of sādhana (spiritual practice) one may not have the power to completely overcome the senses despite great efforts in that direction.

2.60

O Arjuna, son of Kunti, the maddening senses can forcefully carry off the mind of a sage despite all his efforts.

325 अभिलाभ्यत: : printed.
326 विशेष: : UMS.
327 आत्मसाधारणसमर्थ: : printed.
The senses are here described as “pramathīṇi”, meaning “maddening”, or “agitating”.

But one should control these senses, and in the discipline of yoga one should sit fully absorbed in me. For when one controls the senses, then one’s wisdom becomes firmly established.

The word “mat-para” (“fully intent on me”) is referring to “my devotee”. By this Kṛṣṇa is saying, “Without devotion for me there is no possibility of conquering the senses.” This point will be made in many subsequent verses, and it is also confirmed by Uddhava:

Mostly yogis who are trying to discipline the mind in yoga struggle to gain control over the mind and become dejected because they can not become fully absorbed. Therefore swan-like sages should take shelter of your blissful lotus feet.

The last line of the current verse (vaśe hi...) explains the difference between a sādhu (an aspiring spiritualist) and someone who is firmly established in wisdom: the latter has the senses fully under control.
**2.62**

By meditating on the sensory objects one becomes attached to them. From such attachment worldly desire develops, and from those desires anger arises.

**Tīkā:** Here the word “saṅga” means attachment (āsakti). By meditating on the sensory objects attachment grows. And by that attachment an even stronger desire or lust for those objects arises. And when that strong desire is somehow frustrated then anger arises.

**2.63**

Anger produces delusion, and from delusion comes loss of memory, which in turn destroys intelligence. And when intelligence is destroyed one is...
completely lost.

\textit{Tīkā:} From anger comes delusion, the inability to distinguish what should be done and what should not. From that comes loss of memory. “Loss of memory” means one cannot remember the teachings of the scriptures. From that comes ruination of wisdom, which means the end of good behaviour. When that happens, one is completely lost, that is to say, one falls down into the deep well of the cycle of death and re-birth.

\textit{Tīkā:} Now Kṛṣṇa answers the question “How is the person of firm intelligence active?” Kṛṣṇa says, “There is nothing wrong if the controlled senses contact their respective sensory objects, so long as the mind does not dwell upon those sensory objects...

On the other hand, one who is self-controlled becomes serene even while his senses interact with the sensory objects. For his senses are fully controlled by the self, and are free from attraction and aversion.

\textit{Tīkā:} Rāgātin | viśeyo 'vachanā śīthā ātma māno yasya sa | viśeyo vinayagrāhi vachane śīthā

---

336 \textit{āślokoṇitaśvaya}\textsuperscript{śvaya} : printed.
337 \textit{na} : AMS.
338 \textit{Ø} : printed.
339 Verse 2.54 “...vrajeta kim”
340 \textit{rāgāṣṭhiḥ} \textsuperscript{stū} : GVS.
According to the Amara dictionary, the word “vidheya” means “meek”, “obedient”, and “compliant”. Here it means “obedient”. So the phrase *vidheyatma* means “one whose self (i.e. mind) is obedient”.

One who is thus qualified becomes completely peaceful even in contact with the sensory objects. So there is nothing wrong with him coming in contact with these sensory objects. What to speak of there being nothing wrong, actually it is quite a good thing.

Whether renouncing the objects of sense or accepting them, that is to say whether sitting quietly or moving about actively, both states are auspicious for the person of firm intelligence.

*-being thus peaceful, one becomes free from all distress. When the mind is peaceful, then one’s mental attitude quickly becomes stable.*

---

341 कोलौती आत्मा भने वस्त्र छ : UMS.
342 चन : प्रणयो निर्मलिनीप्रकृतिः सम्म : printed.
343 वृ : JMS.
344 स्थिरा भवनीति : BGP, KDB.
345 श्रीनारायणप्रक्षत्वा : BGP, KDB.
engagement at all.

One should note that the peace of mind mentioned in this verse is only possible through the devotional activities of bhakti. Without such devotional activities peace of mind is not possible. This is clear from the example of Vyāsa in the first skandha [of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa]. After Vyāsa had finished compiling the Vedānta scriptures, he was still not peaceful, but his mind became peaceful only through the devotional activities which Śrī Nārada recommended to him.

Tīkā: Now Kṛṣṇa reinforces through negative reasoning what he has just said:

2.66

Such a mental attitude is not possible without being engaged in this yoga. And without this yoga there is also no possibility of inner contemplation, without which there is no question of peacefulness. And without peacefulness how can there possibly be happiness?

Tīkā: A person not engaged in yoga, (i.e., one who has not controlled his mind) does not attain buddhi, this [proper] mental attitude. That mental attitude consists of a sound intelligence focused on the self. The non-yogi, thus devoid of such a sound intelligence, also does not achieve bhāvanā. “Bhāvanā” means inner contemplation or meditation on the supreme Lord. Without thus meditating one cannot attain sānti, or peacefulness. Peacefulness means abandonment of sensual pleasures. And without this peacefulness there can be no happiness, no bliss from

---

346 ḍhāstasya: KDB, BVT, GVS.
347 āpukṛtābhājasā: UMS.
348 pararājasthānānā: UMS. pararājasthānā (च): AMS.
349 aṁśāpyopāsamo: JMS.
When the mind yields to the roaming senses, it carries off a person’s good judgment with it, just as the wind carries away a boat on water.

Therefore, O mighty-armed one, if a person stops his senses from contacting their respective sensual objects, then his wisdom becomes firmly established.
This is a person who restrains the mind. When Kṛṣṇa addresses Arjuna as “mahā-bāho”, or “mighty-armed one”, he is saying that Arjuna should subdue his senses in the same way that he subdues his enemies.

Tīkā: On the other hand, a person of firm intelligence (a sthita-prajña) automatically controls all the senses.

2.69

The night-time of all beings is a time of wakefulness for the ascetic. And the time of wakefulness for everyone else is night-time for that watchful sage.

Tīkā: Intelligence (buddhi) is of two types: ātmāpravāṇā, intelligence directed towards the soul and viśaya-pravāṇā, intelligence directed towards the sensual
Intelligence directed towards the soul is like night-time for all living beings. People who are asleep are oblivious to what happens at night-time. In the same way all the living entities are oblivious to that which is obtained when intelligence is directed towards the soul. But the ascetic, the sthita-prajña, is wide-awake to that reality, he is not asleep. Therefore he directly experiences the bliss which comes from directing the intelligence towards the soul.

And when intelligence is directed towards the sensual objects, the living beings are all awake, fully aware; they directly experience the sensual pleasure, the lamentation, and delusion which come from directing the intelligence towards the sensual objects. They are not asleep. But that is the night-time for the sage: he does experience any of that.

Such a sage is called paśyataḥ, or “watchful”. That means that he observes with neutrality the sensual objects and how they give pain and pleasure to the worldly people. And thus as far as sensual objects for his own enjoyment are concerned, he also accepts them, but in a pure way and only as far as it is appropriately necessary.

2.70

Rivers of water pour into the ocean, and yet its level remains unchanged despite its being constantly filled. If objects of desire come to a person, and yet he remains unmoved like the ocean, then such a person attains internal peace - not the person who always desires to satisfy his desires.

Tīkā: Now Kṛṣṇa defines that purity as “viśaya-graheṇa kṣobha-rāhityam”, or “not getting agitated when in contact with sensual objects”:

\[ \text{viśaya-graheṇa kṣobha-rāhityam} \]

2.70

Aapūryamāṇamchalpranirṇiḥ samuḍramāpi p्रिṣṭānिḥ yudd̄taḥ

NAHNAHAMA YO P्रिṣṭānिḥ SAVE SE ŠAŚNAMĀṇpRoN IKA KAMKAMAI II90II

Rivers of water pour into the ocean, and yet its level remains unchanged despite its being constantly filled. If objects of desire come to a person, and yet he remains unmoved like the ocean, then such a person attains internal peace - not the person who always desires to satisfy his desires.

Tīkā: Aapūryamāṇamāni | Yada 'vāraścīyīdunanto364 nādeya āpā: samuḍra p्रिṣṭānिḥ | Kṛṣṇaṃ? Ā

\[363 \text{viśaya-grahe} : \text{AMS, MMS, VMS.} \]

\[364 \text{vāraścīyīdunanto} : \text{JMS.} \]
In the rainy season river water from flows from everywhere into the ocean. Then what happens to the ocean? The verse says it is “apūryamāṇam”, “it is only ever so slightly filled”. Here the prefix “a-” conveys the meaning of “only slightly”. This means that all that water is unable to fill the ocean. The ocean remains “acalapraṣṭhaṁ”, i.e., it does not overflow beyond its ordinary level.

The word kāma (“desires”) refers here to the various sensual objects. If a person is unmoved when those objects come to him to be enjoyed, just as the ocean is unmoved when the rivers come into it, then that person is a sthita-prajña, a person of firm intelligence. In the same way that it makes no difference to the ocean whether water pours into it or not, so too it makes no difference at all to this person whether he enjoys sensual objects or whether he does not.

This is a sthita-prajña, and it is said here that such a person attains sānti, or peace. This means that he attains knowledge.

Tīkā: But now Kṛṣṇa explains that certain people do not depend on those objects of desire and will not even taste those pleasures:

The person who gives up all those objects of desire, who is active yet disinterested, who is free from possessiveness and false self-conceptions, such a person attains internal peace.
The words “nirahamkāra” and “nirmama” describe someone who does not identify with or feel possessive about the body or anything related to the body.

Tīkā: 

This is the spiritual position. If one reaches this position, one is never again subject to illusion. Even if one comes to this stage only in the final moments of one’s life, one can attain spiritual emancipation.

Tīkā: This is the spiritual position, or the position which leads one to spirit. Even if one reaches this platform just at the time of death, one still attains brahma-nirvāṇa, spiritual emancipation, what to speak of the person who starts from childhood.

Thus ends “Sāṅkhya-yoga”, the second chapter of the conversation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna known as the Bhagavad-gītā Upaniṣad, the scripture of yoga, which deals with spiritual knowledge.
Openly Kṛṣṇa has spoken of jñāna and karma, and indirectly of bhakti, Therefore this chapter is also known as Śrī Gītā Sūtra, "The Gītā in a Nutshell".

Thus I have completed with the approval of saintly sages the second chapter of this Sārārtha-varṣīṇī commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā, meant simply to bring joy to the hearts of devotees.
CHAPTER THREE

Karma-yoga

In this third chapter Kṛṣṇa speaks of selfless action [nīṣkāma-karma] offered to the Lord.

He also explains the spiritual discernment necessary for those desiring to conquer lust and anger.

Arjuna understood from the previous chapter the ascendancy of transcendental, spiritual bhakti-yoga over both jñāna and nīṣkāma-karma yogas. Therefore Arjuna reprimands Kṛṣṇa in a friendly way for urging him to continue to perform his religious duty of warfare. Thus Arjuna reveals his own preference:

---

1 'तः' : printed.
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Arjuna said: O Janārdana, if you consider the path of mental attitude (buddhi) to be superior to the path of religious action (karma), then why, Keśava, are you urging me to take part in this gruesome action?

Ṭīkā: Here “jyāyasti” is used here in the sense of “better”. Arjuna is saying, “If you think that buddhi (determined transcendental bhakti) is better, then why do you urge me to engage in this terrible activity of war? You are called “Janārdana”. Does that mean, “the one who torments (ardana) his own people (jana) by his orders”?

“And yet no-one can violate this order of yours, since you are called “Keśava” or “the one who controls both Brahma and Śiva”. The word “Keśava” consists of three syllables: “ka”, which signifies Brahma, “iśa”, which signifies Śiva, and “vā”, which is the root of the verb meaning “to control.”

2. Ārya: printed.
3. ज्यायसो चेतितम् : AMS, MMS, VMS. ज्यायसो शेषस् । बुद्धिवंसत्वाराहिता भक्तिरित्यथा : UMS.
4. योजयसि : JMS. किं योजयसि : UMS.
5. मूर्ति (रू) इत्यहास्याद : JMS.
6. कृपया प्राप्ता नामिपि : printed. कृपया प्राप्ता नामिपि : AMS, VMS. कृपया प्राप्ता नामिपि : MMS.
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Tīkā: Kṛṣṇa might retort: “Listen, Arjuna, my friend. It is true that transcendental bhakti is superior to everything. That bhakti, however, can only be obtained through the causeless mercy of my exalted pure devotees; it cannot be obtained through human efforts. Therefore I have given you this blessing, “Become transcendental by practicing my transcendental bhakti”.” When that blessing comes to fruition, then you will automatically attain that bhakti by the causeless mercy of my pure devotees. But for now I have said to you, “It is fit and proper for you to perform your prescribed duties…”.

To that Arjuna says, “If that is what you think, fine. But then why don’t you make up your mind about the path of karma, and then clearly say so. Why are you plunging me into an ocean of uncertainty…

3.2

‘व्यामिष्टेन्’ याक्षेण बुधेण मोहयोगं मे।
तदेकं यद नियत्यन्त्र चेयं श्रेयं रहमापुर्याम्।]

It is almost as if you are trying to confuse my intelligence with your mixed-up statements. Please therefore make up your mind and tell me the one thing which will lead to my ultimate benefit.

7 Verse 2.45 “nistraiguṇyo bhavārjuna”.
8 Verse 2.47 “karmāṇy evādhiṇāras te”.
9 व्यामिष्टेन : all mss, BGP, BDM, BVT.
10 इन्तुत्नापिः : BVT, AMS. φ : BGP, KDB.
11 श्रेयं श्रेष्ठम् कर्मम् कौशलम् : BGP, DMS. अन्तः । अन्तः : printed.
12 इति : printed, UMS.
13 नव कर्ममुचित्तिर्मिति: printed. नव कर्ममुचित्तिर्मिति: MMS.
The word “vyāmīśreṇaiva” means particularly (vi-), and totally (-ā-) mixed up (miśra). “You are confusing my intelligence with your statements which contain many different types of meanings all mixed up together.

“First you say to me, ‘It is fit and proper for you to perform your prescribed duties (karma)...’. 15 But then despite that, you use the word “yoga” to speak of knowledge (jñāna). For example, you say, ‘Be balanced in success and failure. Yoga is this equanimity.’ 16 Also you say, ‘Engaged thus in buddhi-yoga in this world, one is aloof from both pious and impious activities. Therefore strive for this yoga, for it is the real skill in acting.’ 17

“And then you speak of the path of pure knowledge saying things like, ‘And when your intellect comes out of the abyss of delusion...’ 18

But from the word “iva” (“as if”) the implication is: “In actual fact Kṛṣṇa, you are very merciful and your statements are not all mixed up, nor are you really trying to confuse me, nor do I really have any trouble in understanding your intentions. But it would be better if you could just clarify your statements.”

This is the deeper significance: “Kṛṣṇa, you say that activities (the path of karma), when performed under the influence of Passion (rajas), are inferior to those performed in Goodness (sattva). Better than that, however, is the path of jñāna, but that too is only in the sphere of Goodness. The path of bhakti, being transcendental, is still superior. Now if you hold that such bhakti is not possible for me, then why don’t you just teach me one thing: the path of knowledge (jñāna), which is in Goodness. At least by that I might be freed from imprisonment in this miserable world.”

14 niṣparṣikha: printed.
15 Verse 2.47 “karmany evādhikāras te”
16 Verse 2.48, “siddhy-asidhyoḥ samo bḥūtvā samatvam yoga ucyate.”
17 Verse 2.50, “buddhi-yukto jahāṭhaḥ ubhe sukṛta-duṣkṛte, tasmād yogāya yuṣyasya yogāḥ karmasu kauśalam”.
18 2 Verse .52 “yadā te moha-kalilaṁ...”
Here is the answer to the question. Kṛṣṇa says, “If I had spoken of karma-yoga and jñāna-yoga as two mutually independent processes for attaining spiritual liberation, then you would have been right to ask me to make up my mind and tell you just one thing. However when I spoke to you of the dichotomy between those who follow karma and those who follow jñāna, that was only a division between those at the preliminary and final stages of the same practice, not a division of two different types of person who can attain liberation...

The Lord said: O sinless Arjuna, I have already explained to you that there are two positions in this world: the position of the intellectuals with their jñāna-yoga, and the position of the yogis with their karma-yoga.

The word dvi-vidhā (literally “two-fold”) is used in the sense of “two types”. And the word “ni-śthā” means a “completely marked position” or a “well-defined limit”. So there are two sorts of positions (niśthā) in this world. These two

19 प्रत्यथिकार्थिकितिप्रायोऽिसः : printed.
20 डिप्रकाराः : AMS, MMS, VMS.
21 अर्धभाष्ययोऽिसः : UMS. ø : printed.
22 ज्ञानमूलकविवेकतम्यमावशः : BGP, KDB. ज्ञानमूलकविवेकतम्यमावशः : BDM, GVS.
23 धम्मिन्द्रशयः : AMS, MMS, VMS, UMS.
positions were already explained ("purā proktā") in the previous chapter, and now he speaks of them again:

"The first position is for the sāṅkhya, i.e. those who possess saṅkhya, or knowledge (this is a somewhat archaic usage). Because they have a purified mind, they have risen to the platform of knowledge. Thus their position is defined through jñāna-yoga. That is to say the boundaries of their behaviour are established by the path of jñāna-yoga. This means that such people are identified in this world by the very fact that they are knowledgeable, as in the passage that begins: "But one should control these senses, and in the discipline of yoga one should sit fully absorbed in Me..."24

"The other position is for those whose mind is not pure and who therefore cannot come up to the platform of knowledge. But, they are following the process for rising to the platform of knowledge. Such yogis are positioned in karma-yoga. That is to say that the boundaries of their behaviour are established by the path of karma-yoga. By "karma yoga" we mean "nimā-karma-yoga", or desireless religious activities, the result of which is offered to Me. Such people are identified in this world by the very fact that they perform such activities. It is just such a karmi who is described in the statement, "For a member of the warrior order nothing is more auspicious than fighting to defend religious principles..."25

"Thus in name only is there a dichotomy between the "karmi" and the "jñāni". Actually by practicing karma-yoga the karmi becomes pure of mind and thus he becomes a jñāni. And then the jñāni, by following the path of bhakti attains liberation from this world."

"This is the complete meaning of My statement." ॥

Tīkā: And now Kṛṣṇa explains that when the mind is not purified, knowledge does not come about:

24 The rule referred to here is "ārṣa adyac". Normally the -ya suffix will be accompanied by vṛddhi of the first syllable only with patronymics and neuter abstracts. Here, however, vṛddhi of the first syllable is found yet the sense is simply that of an adjective "relating to" or "possessed of". Such usage was not common, but was condoned by the very fact that it was used by the Rṣis.

25 Verse 2.61: “tāni sarvāṇi saṁyamya...”

26 Verse 2.31: “dharmyād dhi yudhāc chreyo...."
The state of naiśkarmya, or non-action, is not attained by not performing one's prescribed activities. Nor can one attain perfection simply by renunciation.

The phrase “karmaṇāṁ anārambhād” literally means “by not starting activities”. Here it means “by not performing those activities prescribed in the scriptures”. It is not by failing to perform such scriptural activities that one can attain the state of naiśkarma, i.e., the state of non-action or the state of knowledge. Nor can someone of impure mind attain perfection simply by giving up activities prescribed in the scriptures.

Now Kṛṣṇa says that if a person of impure mind takes up the life of renunciation (sannyāsa) and gives up the ritual activities prescribed in the scriptures, then such a person will nevertheless become absorbed in some practical day-to-day activities:

Nor can anyone really remain inactive even for a second. All living entities are influenced by their own innate material qualities (guna) and are thus helplessly made to perform some action.
Someone may object to this line of argument by saying that a life of renunciation (sannyāsa) is inherently opposed to a person being engaged in both scriptural and mundane activities. So Kṛṣṇa counters that argument in the second half of this verse by saying that everyone is helplessly forced to act, no one is independent.

It is a foolish person indeed who controls his body but continues to contemplate sensory objects in his mind; such a person is called a fraud.

If someone restrains his bodily organs of action (such as the voice and the hands), but simply sits there pretending to meditate and really just thinks of the sensual objects in his mind, then such a person is just a hypocrite and a fraud.

---

29 वैदिकत्विककम्: AMS.
30 विरेचातः: AMS, MMS, VMS.
31 φ: AMS, MMS.
32 “karmendriya” - literally “organs of action” (hands, feet, larynx, genitals, and anus).
33 व्याघ्रन्तिकलेन: AMS.
\textbf{Tīkā}: And now Krṣṇa says, “However, the best position is that of a householder (grhastha), who in contrast to the sannyāsī, performs all the activities prescribed in the scriptures...

3.7

\textit{yastīvindhiyaṁ mohna niyamāryate ुर्जून।}
\textit{कर्मिन्द्रेत्ये कर्मयोगमयस्ते स विहिष्ठायेते।}

\textbf{3.8}

Much better is the person who controls the senses with the mind and, in a spirit of detachment, engages those bodily organs of action in \textit{karma-yoga}, the path of action.

\textbf{Tīkā}: Here the phrase \textit{karma-yoga} refers to scriptural activities. But while performing those activities one should be \textit{asakta}, i.e., one should not aspire for the fruits of the activity. Such a person is better. According to Śrī Rāmānujācārya this means that such a person is superior even to the person situated on the path of knowledge (\textit{jiñāna}) because at least in the path of action (\textit{karma}) there is no chance of him becoming negligent and wantonly careless.

\textbf{Perform your prescribed activities (\textit{karma}), because such activities are better than inaction. If you were totally inactive, you would not even be able to sustain your body.}

\begin{itemize}
\item[$\text{34}$] सामय: AMS.
\item[$\text{35}$] पुष्पाभिलिप्त: UMS.
\item[$\text{36}$] \textit{श्रीरामानुजाचार्याचरण}: AMS, VMS. \textit{श्रीरामानुजाचार्य (१)चरण}: MMS (corrected).\
\end{itemize}
In this context the word *niyatam* means *niyam*, thus Kṛṣṇa is talking of *nitya-karma*, or regular ritual activities.37 “Therefore you should perform those regular ritual activities (*nitya-karmas* such as twilight prayers), for they are better than inaction, better than giving up activities altogether. If you gave up all activities you wouldn’t even be able to maintain your body” 38

At this point someone might object: “The scriptures say, ‘Living beings are bound by the reactions to their actions’ 40 So [if I follow your instructions and follow this path of action] will I not be bound by the reactions to my actions (*karma*)?”

Kṛṣṇa says to Arjuna, “If that is what you are thinking, you’re wrong. You are not bound by any action which is offered to the supreme Lord...

This world is shackled by the chains of activity - but not by sacrificial activity. Therefore you should, free from attachment, act for that purpose alone.

37 See note to verse 2.49
38 φ : printed.
39 φ : AMS. (न) : VMS.
40 Mbh: 12.241.7: “*karmaḥ badhyate jantuh*”
41 निष्काखः : printed.
42 तस्माद् : AMS, MMS, VMS.
The word “yajña” (sacrifice) signifies “religious practices (dharna) offered to Viṣṇu.” Except for such activity done for sacrificial purpose, all other activity binds one to this world.46

“Therefore you should act for that purpose (tadārtham), i.e., you should act in order to perform such prescribed religious activities.”

“But Kṛṣṇa, if such religious activities are done to fulfill one’s own desires, won’t they be binding even if they are offered to Viṣṇu?”

“Quite right. That is why I say that you should also be “mukta-saṅga”, or “free from all attachment”, i.e., “free from the desire for the fruits of your action”.

The Lord said the same thing to Uddhava in the Bhāgavata: “O dear Uddhava, being properly situated in one’s prescribed religious duties and performing sacrificial works without desire for the rewards, one will neither go to heaven nor to hell, provided, of course, that he does not perform any other forbidden activities. Even in this life the pure and sinless person who is properly situated in his prescribed religious duty can attain pure knowledge.”47

The word “yajña” (sacrifice) signifies “religious practices (dharna) offered to Viṣṇu.” Except for such activity done for sacrificial purpose, all other activity binds one to this world.46

“Therefore you should act for that purpose (tadārtham), i.e., you should act in order to perform such prescribed religious activities.”

“But Kṛṣṇa, if such religious activities are done to fulfill one’s own desires, won’t they be binding even if they are offered to Viṣṇu?”

“Quite right. That is why I say that you should also be “mukta-saṅga”, or “free from all attachment”, i.e., “free from the desire for the fruits of your action”.

The Lord said the same thing to Uddhava in the Bhāgavata: “O dear Uddhava, being properly situated in one’s prescribed religious duties and performing sacrificial works without desire for the rewards, one will neither go to heaven nor to hell, provided, of course, that he does not perform any other forbidden activities. Even in this life the pure and sinless person who is properly situated in his prescribed religious duty can attain pure knowledge.”47

The Lord said the same thing to Uddhava in the Bhāgavata: “O dear Uddhava, being properly situated in one’s prescribed religious duties and performing sacrificial works without desire for the rewards, one will neither go to heaven nor to hell, provided, of course, that he does not perform any other forbidden activities. Even in this life the pure and sinless person who is properly situated in his prescribed religious duty can attain pure knowledge.”47

43 भक्तिसङ्खयायाः : printed.
44 श्रीमाण्डलिकम् : printed.
45 यज्ञव : JMS, UMS, MMS, AMS, VMS.
46 Literally: “This whole world is ‘work-bound’ (“karma-bandhana”). That is to say the world is bound by all activities other than those performed for sacrificial purposes.”
47 BP 11.20.10-11.
48 तद्वैक्लान्वितो : printed.
49 कर्माविरागितं : printed.
religious activities. Now if becoming desireless is not possible, then you should not just give up your religious duties altogether. You should still perform your religious duties and offer them to Viṣṇu, even if you perform such activities with some personal desire.” This is what Kṛṣṇa is saying in the next seven verses:

3.10

Long ago the Lord of creation created beings along with sacrificial activities, and said, “By performing these sacrifices you will flourish. May they fulfil all your desires.”

Ṭīkā: The word “sahā-yajña” means “along with sacrifices”. Here this means that long ago the Lord of creation, Brahma, created beings to perform religious duties and offer them to Viṣṇu. Then he said, “By these religious duties you should increase and attain more and more prosperity.”

Considering the fact that the people of this world are full of desires he said, “May this process of sacrifice give you all the things you wish to enjoy.”

Ṭīkā: Then he explains how sacrifice fulfils all desires:

Viśvanātha Cakravarti quotes the grammatical rule, “vopasarjanasya” (P. 6.3.82) to explain why “sahā-” has not been replaced by “sa-“ (i.e., why we have “sahā-yajña” here instead of “sa-yajña”).
Sustain the gods by your sacrifices and let them in turn sustain you. By this mutual sustenance you will all attain the highest good.

Tīkā: The word bhāvayata means to make someone full of bhāva, i.e., to make them full of delight and affection. So Kṛṣṇa is saying, “devān bhāvayata... Please the gods by your sacrifices, and they will please you too.”

Thus satisfied by your sacrifices, the gods will bestow upon you all the enjoyments you desire. But if someone enjoys what the gods give, but does not make offerings to them in return, he is certainly a thief.

Tīkā: These objects of worldly enjoyment are given by the gods in the sense that, for example, the gods produce food grains by sending forth rain. If one enjoys all this, and yet does not offer it all back to the gods through sacrifices like the pāñcīca-
3.13

Good men eat food which has been offered in sacrifice, and thus they are not guilty of any crime. On the other hand those who prepare food simply for themselves are actually eating sin.

\textit{Tīkā:} Those who eat the remnant foodstuffs from sacrificial rituals such as the vaiśvadeva-yajña are absolved from all sins which they may have accidentally committed with the pañca-sūnā. The pañca-sūnā are five objects with which a householder might accidentally kill animals and insects. These pañca-sūnā are listed in the scriptures: "The wooden threshing board, the grinding stone, the fire-place, water receptacles and the broom; these are the pañca-sūnā which stop a householder from going to heaven." 60

\textit{Tīkā:} And then he says, "One should also perform yajña simply because it makes the natural cycle of the universe go round...

\begin{itemize}
  \item The pañca-mahā-yajña are the “five great sacrificial acts”, namely: 1)\textit{brahma-yajña} (study of the Vedas), 2)\textit{pitr yajña} (oblations to the ancestors) 3)\textit{deva-yajña} (worshipping the gods), 4)\textit{bhūta-yajña} (serving all living entities e.g., by feeding cows) 5)\textit{nr-yajña} (serving humanity e.g., by greeting guests).
  \item भूताय-पथं जीति तत सामसामथिः ।
  \item नेन्द्रताय सामसामथिः ।
  \item काङ्क्षा-पाचाय ।
  \item जीति तत सामसामथिः ।
  \item भूताय-पथं जीति तत सामसामथिः ।
\end{itemize}

56 Source unclear. A similar found is found in Manu (3.68).
The living beings subsist on food grains and food grains are produced by rain. Rain is a result of sacrifice (yajña), and sacrifice is produced through ritual action (karma).

The living beings subsist on grains; that is to say the cause of living beings is food grains because the bodies of the living beings are produced from food grains transformed into blood, semen, etc..

Those food grains are caused by rain because grains can only be produced with rainfall. That rainfall is caused by yajña because rain bearing clouds are produced simply from people’s performance of yajña.

And that yajña is caused by karma (ritual activities) because the very nature of yajña requires all sorts of ritual activities such as those ritual activities prescribed for the priests (rtvik) and for the patron of the yajña (yajamāna).

Ritual action (karma) comes from the Vedas and the Vedas come from the Supreme. Therefore the omnipresent Supreme is eternally present in sacrificial acts.
The cause of that karma (ritual action) is brahma (the Vedas) because the impetus to engage in sacrificial activities comes from hearing the directives for such activities in the Vedas. And the cause of the Vedas is aksara, or the Supreme Spirit, since the Vedas come forth from that Supreme. This is confirmed in the sruti scriptures, “The four Vedas, Rg, Yajur, Sāma, and Atharva, are the breath of the Supreme Being.”

Therefore the omnipresent, all-pervading Supreme is present in sacrificial activities (yajña). This means that by performing yajña one attains the Supreme.

In this passage many objects have been mentioned in a long chain of cause and effect starting from food grains leading all the way back to the Supreme. However of all things mentioned, only yajña is mentioned in the scriptures as compulsory. Therefore, yajña is thus the principal topic of the passage.

The smrti scriptures also say, “The oblations offered into the fire go to Āditya. From Āditya comes rain, from rain comes grains, and from grains come the living creatures.”

Tīkā: Krṣṇa explains the adverse reaction which ensues when one fails to perform yajña:
O son of Prthā, the sensual enjoyer who does not contribute to this established cycle is indeed a sinful wretch who lives in vain.

This “cycle” has been set in motion where each successive step leads on to the next. That is to say that from yajña comes rain, and from rain comes food grains, and from food grains come men. From men again we get yajña from which we again get rain and so on. If one does not contribute to this cycle, if one does not perpetuate the cycle by performing yajña, then he is sinful. He is aghāyuh, living sinfully; his life is full of sin, and as a result he sinks down into hell.

Ṭīkā: Kṛṣṇa has thus explained that even a person full of desires should still perform ritual activities even though incapable of performing such ritual activities without personal desire. On the other hand, a person of purified mind who comes to the platform of knowledge (jñāna) does not have to perform any ritual activity whether it be regular daily rituals (nitya-karma) or rituals performed for some specific purpose (kāmya-karma). That is what Kṛṣṇa says in the next two verses:

70 पूर्वपथाञ्जलेन : printed.
71 यज्ञानुसरणेन : printed.
72 पापव्याप्तां को : printed.
73 न परिपारयिति : printed.
74 यज्ञानुसरणेन : MMS. (this reading is corrected in the margin of AMS and VMS.)
On the other hand, the person who takes pleasure within the self, who finds contentment within the self, and who is satisfied only within the self - such a person has no duties to perform.

The word “atma-rati” means one who finds pleasure within the self. As a result, such a person is also “atma-trpta”, or happy with the bliss that he experiences in the self.

Someone might object, “Well surely being satisfied in the self means also deriving some happiness from material objects of sensory enjoyment.”

Kṛṣṇa replies, “No, ātmany eva, I am talking about a person who finds happiness only in the self and not in the external objects of sensual enjoyment. Such a person has no obligation to perform any ritual activity (karma).”

He has no reason in the world to perform action and no reason not to. Nor is there any reason for him to depend on any other being for the attainment of his purpose.

75 n śvāmān : printed. JMS is emended in the margin.
76 वहिष्ठित्यय्योऽऽे : BGP.
There is no reason for him to perform the [ritual] actions; for him there is no result from performing action. And there is no bad reaction for him if he does not perform those ritual actions.

Therefore for the fulfilment of his plans he doesn’t need to depend on any other being whether it be Brahma or the immobile creatures. In the phrase “artha-vyapaśraya”, the word “artha” means “for some purpose”, and “vyapaśraya” means “to be depended upon”. This sense of vyapaśraya is found in many places in the Puranas and other scriptures, e.g.:

vāsudeva bhagavati bhaktim udvahatāṁ nrṇām, jñāna-vairāgya-vīryāṇām neha kaścid vyapaśrayāḥ. 82

Also: “...yadapāśrayāśrayāḥ śuddhyanti...” 83
Also: “sāṁsthā hetur apāśrayāḥ” 84.
In these passages we can see that the prefix -apa- [when added to “āśraya”] does not add any new meaning. ☞

---

77  क्राण्डस्तायदिः : printed.
78  क क्षिद्वाऽऽिः : AMS.
79  आस्यतीतः : AMS, emended in MMS, VMS.
80  युध्यायायः: printed (not BDM). यदपायायः: AMS, MMS. यदपायः( इतयतः : VMS.
81  इन्त्यालयपेत物质यानेवानिकार्थं : printed. इन्त्यालयपेत物质यानिकार्थं : AMS, MMS.
82  BP 6.17.31
83  BP 2.4.18
84  BP 12.7.9
Thus you are not qualified to rise to the level of jñāna (knowledge), and yet a discerning person like you is also not suited to kāmya-karma, or ritual actions performed for self-interest. Therefore you should perform niṣkāma-karma (selfless religious actions)...

Therefore, in a detached frame of mind constantly perform your allotted activities, because by following the path of action in a detached way a person can attain the Supreme.

You should do those actions which are designated [in the scriptures] as obligatory ("kāryam"). Thus you will attain the Supreme, that is to say, you will achieve mokṣa, spiritual liberation.

For people like Janaka have attained perfection simply by this path of action (karma). Even just for the welfare of people in general, you should follow this path of action.
And then he says, “And even if you think that you are qualified to follow the path of jñāna (knowledge), still you should follow the path of karma just to educate the people in this world (loka-saṅgraham...).”

Now Kṛṣṇa explains just how such action will benefit the people of this world:

Whatever a great person does, other people will also do. They will follow the example he sets.

In the next three verses Kṛṣṇa is saying, “I am myself an example of this”:

O Son of Prthā, I don’t have to do anything; in the three worlds there is nothing I don’t have and nothing I need to obtain. Yet still I am engaged in actions (karma).
Because if I was not always engaged in action tirelessly, people everywhere would follow in my footsteps.

Tīkā: The [present indicative] verb form “anuvarante” is used here instead of the [optative] form “anuvartaneran”.

The whole world would fall into ruin if I did not perform action (karma). Thus I would cause confusion and ruin the living beings.

Tīkā: The whole world would fall into ruin, that is to say, they would follow my example and not perform their religious duties, and thus they would become degraded. Confusion of the caste system (varṇa) would ensue, and I would be the cause of it. In this way I would ruin the living beings by making them impure.

Tīkā: Now he sums up by saying, “Therefore even an established jñānī should still

---

89 मंडळी : printed (not BDM).
90 मलिना : AMS, MMS, VMS.
follow the path of *karma*...

3.25

सत्ता: कर्मण्यविद्वांवो यथा कुर्यानि भारत ।
कर्मण्यात्मानार्थकारणमहं ॥३५॥

Desiring the welfare of the world, the wise should follow the path of actions (*karma*) just as the ignorant do; but the wise should do so in a completely detached frame of mind, unlike the ignorant who perform their actions attached to the results.

3.26

न युद्धभेदं जनयेदानां कर्मणिनाम ।
जोषयेत्यथ वर्माणी समाचरं ॥३६॥

One should not try to create doubts in the minds of the ignorant who are attached to the path of actions. Rather a wise person should with discipline engage fully in all such [ritual and religious] activities and thus get other people to appreciate them.

---

91 कर्मणिनामात्मानार्थ (ण) तेन : AMS, MMS, VMS.
92 कर्मण्येव योजयेत् कारेयेन : BGP KDB, BDM, GVS.
93 कर्मण्येव योजयेत् जोषयेन कारेयेन : BVT.
94 तस : JMS. कारेयेन : UMS.
95 यथः यथाप्रत्ययात्मानकरणमुदितविवेककन्यातानु : BGP, KDB.
96 यथः यथाप्रत्ययात्मानकरणमुदितविवेककन्यातानु : BVT, BDM, GVS.
97 यथः यथाप्रत्ययात्मानकरणमुदितविवेककन्यातानु : printed.
Tīkā: One should not try to create doubts in the minds of the ignorant who on account of their impure minds are attached to the path of ritual actions (karma). One should not say things like, “Enough of your silly karma! Why don’t you be like me and make a real success of your life by giving up this karma and performing the practices of jñāṇa?”

Rather one should encourage people to perform the ritual activities of the path of karma by saying things like, “While you are working towards success, just perform selfless ritual action (niśkāma-karma-yoga).”

And at the same time one should become a living example by personally performing all those activities.

Arjuna might object, “But surely the following statement by the Indomitable Lord contradicts what you have just said: “A wise person who himself knows the highest good should not encourage the ignorant to engage in the path of ritual actions (karma), just as a good doctor does not encourage a sick patient to eat rubbish no matter how much the patient wants to.”

Kṛṣṇa would reply, “Yes, that is true. But actually that verse is meant for someone who is teaching bhakti, the path of devotion. Here I am talking about someone who is teaching jñāṇa. Therefore there is no contradiction because jñāṇa, the path of knowledge, requires a purified mind, and to purify the mind, one needs to keep performing niśkāma-karma, selfless ritual activities.”

On the other hand, bhakti is independently powerful, and thus for the path of bhakti there is no such pre-requisite for a purified mind.

So if one is able to create in others a faith in the path of bhakti, then one is also allowed to create a doubt in their minds about the validity of the path of karma which they follow. For as soon as someone develops a firm faith in bhakti, he is no longer suited to the path of karma.

This is confirmed in many places in the scriptures. E.g.:

“One should only continue on the path of karma, until one develops either detachment from this world or faith in hearing and speaking subject matters concerned with Me.”

Also: “If one gives up all religious duties and simply worships Me, he is
certainly the topmost spiritualist.” 98

Also: “Give up all religious duties and simply take shelter in Me.” 99

Also: “If a person gives up his allotted religious duties in order to worship the Lord, and even if he then falls down from that devotional path through immaturity, still no harm is done.”100

It is in the light of such statements that one should consider this verse.

To ka- नन्द यदि विद्वानापि कर्म कुर्यात्सहः विद्वानिविवेयोऽ को विद्रोह इत्यावज्जव नयोर्विच्छेदं दर्शयति ।
प्रकृतिरेण इत्यावज्जवः ।

Tīkā: Arjuna might object, “But Kṛṣṇa, if a man of knowledge must also engage in the path of karma, then how does one tell the difference between a person who has knowledge and one who does not?”

Anticipating such an objection, Kṛṣṇa distinguishes between the two in the following couple of verses:

3.27
प्रकृति: क्रियमाणानि गुणेन कर्माणि सर्वं |
अहकारिकमुहान्मा कर्महिमिति मन्यने ||२७||

In all respects, activities are actually brought about by nature, with its three qualities. Yet people are baffled by their flawed self-conceptions, and they think, “I am doing it all”. 

To ka- प्रकृते: क्रियमाणानि गुणेन कर्माणि सर्वम् |
सर्वप्रकारणं क्रियमाणानि यानि कर्माणि तात्त्विकमेव
कर्ता: करोमीत्विद्वान् मन्यने ||२७||

Tīkā: In this context the phrase “prakṛter guṇair” (“by the material qualities of nature”) refers to the modifications of those material guṇas such as the material body and the material senses. Foolish people think, “I am the only ‘doer’, I am the only one performing my actions. Actually action is in all respects performed by the

98  BP:11.11.32.
99  Verse 18.66.
100 BP: 1.5.17 (translation of second half also supplied).
101 कर्मेनिविवेयः : printed.
102 ø : BGP.
bodily senses which are simply modifications of the material guṇas.

3.28

On the other hand, mighty-armed one, if a person understands the principles behind the various types of action (karma) and material influences (guṇa), then such a person thinks, “The guṇas are simply interacting with the guṇas.” Thus he remains detached.

Tīkā: This verse is talking about one who knows the principles behind the divisions of guṇa and karma. The divisions of the guṇas (material qualities) are three: Goodness, Passion, and Darkness. The divisions of karma (action) are different modifications of these three guṇas: the gods, the bodily senses, and the sensual objects. This verse talks of someone who understands the essential nature of these two.

[When performing action] such a person thinks that the guṇas are simply interacting with the guṇas. I.e., he thinks, “The guṇas in the form of the bodily senses (such as the eyes) are animated by the devas and are interacting with the guṇas in the form of the sensual objects (such as forms and colours).

“However I am neither guṇa, nor any modification of the guṇas. Nor do I have any connection with the guṇas or their modifications in this world.”

By thinking in this way a wise person remains detached.

---

103 गुणकर्मणां चित्मितानि : AMS.
104 सत्त्विकार्यभीत्यन्तः : UMS.
105 देवोन्निधिधिषयमः : AMS.
106 त्वथत्स्तन्तः स्वरूपस्तत्स्तस्तः ्रुगा : printed.
107 गुणा देवाः प्रयोज्यानान्निधिधिषयमः : printed.
At this point Arjuna might object, “But Kṛṣṇa, if the living beings are really separate from and have no connection with the guṇas and all the material modifications of the guṇas, then how is it that those very living beings seem so attached to the material sensual objects?”

Kṛṣṇa therefore now addresses that question...

Baffled by the material guṇas (the three material influences of Nature), people become attached to the material effects of those guṇas. Nevertheless a wise person, who fully understands what is going on, should not disturb those poor people who don’t.

The living beings are baffled by the guṇas, (the three material influences of Nature). The living beings are influenced by these guṇas and become thus bewildered just like a man who is possessed by a ghost. Under the influence of the ghost the man may think that he is that ghost. Similarly, a living being influenced

---

108 पृष्ठभूतसंस्कृ�संस्कृत
by these material guṇas may believe that he is also material, and thus he will become attached to the material sensual objects, which are products of these material guṇas.

A wise person need not disturb such ignorant dim-witted people. There is no need for the wise person to try and get them to change their minds by saying to them, “You are not material, you are the living being which is aloof from all these material influences.”

Rather the wise person should simply try to get the ignorant to perform nīskāma-karma (selfless ritual actions) because such nīskāma-karma is the way to remove the material influences from them.

When possessed by a ghost, a person cannot be exorcised simply by being told, “You are not the ghost, you are a human”. Even repeating this to the person hundreds of times will not return him to normal. Rather one should administer substances which can remove the influence of the ghost, such as herbs, gems and mantras.

3.30

मध्ये सर्वाणि कर्माणि सन्त्रस्याध्यामचेतनसा ।
निराशीनिष्ठायो भूत्वा युक्त्व विगतज्वः॥३०॥

Dedicate all your activities to Me with your mind fully focused on the Supreme Spirit. Give up all personal desires and all sense of proprietorship. Thus you should fight this battle with an undisturbed mind.

टिकः: Here the word “adhyaṭma” is forming an indeclinable compound. The meaning is “concerning the Supreme Spirit”. “Adhyāṭma-cetas” means that the cognitive faculties are directed “towards the Supreme Spirit”. The gist of it is this: “Therefore you should fight and just keep the mind absorbed in the Supreme Spirit and not in the material sensory objects.”

“Give your activities up to Me, i.e., offer them to Me without any personal desire. And be “nirmama”, completely devoid of any sense of “mine”. In this state

\[\text{कंडेश्वर} \text{ वेदांत} \text{समालोक} \text{सारं} \text{उपनिषदः} \text{यजुर्वेदः} : \text{printed.}
\[\text{कंडेश्वर} \text{ वेदांत} \text{समालोक} \text{सारं} \text{उपनिषदः} : \text{UMS.}
of mind you should fight.”

Tīkā: Kṛṣṇa then encourages people to follow the teachings that he has just enunciated:

3.31

Those faithful people who without protest always follow this message of Mine are freed from the reactions to their activities.

Tīkā: And then with the next verse (ye tu...) Kṛṣṇa points out the shortcomings of the opposing view:

3.32

On the other hand, those who protest and do not follow this message of mine, are certainly lost, irrational, and utterly confused by their own knowledge.

116 स्कृतिस्वस्वाभावैः : printed, UMS, AMS, MMS, VMS.

117 महाशोणिष्ठितः: BGP.
At this point Arjuna might object, “But Kṛṣṇa, you are the Supreme Lord. Why do people not fear reprisals from you if they disobey these instructions of yours, just as they would fear reprisals from a king for disobeying his instructions?”

Kṛṣṇa would reply, “Quite true, Arjuna, but actually if people are in the habit of indulging their senses, they are incapable of accepting the authority of the king or the Supreme Lord. It has just become part of their nature. This applies even to a man of knowledge.”

Such are the thoughts Kṛṣṇa has in mind when he says:

Even a man of knowledge acts according to his own particular nature. All beings follow their nature. What can repression achieve?
A man of knowledge (jñānavān), understands that when one commits sin one goes to hell, is punished by the king, and loses his reputation. Despite understanding this, he acts according to his nature (prakṛter sadṛśam), or according to his lower nature produced by performing sinful activity since time immemorial. Thus all beings follow (yāntī) their own nature (prakṛtim).

“I can try to force people [to do otherwise] through scriptural injunctions, and a king can try to do the same. By force niṣkāma-karma, selfless ritual action, can refine those who have impure minds, and jñāna-yoga can enlighten those of pure mind. But even by force these two processes cannot help people who have very impure minds.

Yet even such very sinful-natured people can be redeemed by bhakti-yoga, which they can receive by the causeless mercy of great saints. This is illustrated in the Skanda-purāṇa where it is said, “Blessed are you, o sage among the gods! By just a moment of mercy from you, even a lowly hunter has achieved love of God and in rapture the hairs on his body are standing on end.”

Rules and regulations do not really work for people who have a strong lower nature produced by sinful practices. Therefore, so long as that lower nature remains, one should not allow the senses to do whatever they like...
objects which correspond to the various senses. But one should not let oneself be influenced by either attraction or repulsion, because they are both obstacles on the path of progress.

\[\text{Tīkā: The repetition in the phrase "indriyasya indriyasya arthe" expresses the idea that each and every sense has certain types of objects which stimulate it and each sense can experience attraction or repulsion towards those objects.}
\]

For example, people may feel attraction for illicitly touching and looking at the body of another man's wife, as well as waiting upon her, offering her things as gifts even though such extra-marital connection with women is forbidden in the scriptures. And on the other hand people may feel a repulsion for seeing, touching, serving and offering gifts of money to elders, brahmins, holy places, and guests even though all these activities are prescribed in the scriptures.

---

132 इन्द्रियस्य: AMS, MMS, VMS, UMS.
133 परस्मीयगर्भस्याम्श्वसनास्मात: printed.
134 तत्तत्त्वानि: AMS, MMS, VMS.
135 शाबं: AMS.
136 विघोषणायस्यतः: AMS.
137 O: JMS (added in the margin).
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143 श्लोक: UMS.
This attraction and repulsion are experienced or are particularly present (vyavasthitau) in these sensual objects. But one should not come under the control or influence of that attraction or repulsion.

Or alternatively, one could say that people love looking at women, etc., and they hate anyone or anything which stops them from doing that. Or they love pleasant things like succulent food cooked with lots of ghee and hate unpleasant things such as bland, dry food. Or they love hearing and seeing their own children and hate hearing and seeing their enemy’s children. But a person who is searching after the ultimate goals of life should not be influenced by this love and hate.

**Tīkā:** Arjuna starts to think that his own religious duty, fighting, would be impossible to perform properly without attraction and repulsion; on the other hand other people’s religious duties like non-violence would be very easy to perform. Moreover there should be no real difference between the two since they are both dharma, or religious duties. When Kṛṣṇa thus sees Arjuna wanting to follow the duties of someone else, Kṛṣṇa says to him,

3.35

Better to perform one’s own religious duty badly than another’s duty perfectly. To die in the course of one’s own duty is auspicious, but to follow another’s duty is fraught with danger.
Performing one’s own duty badly’ means performing it with some faults or not being able to complete it. Even that is better than performing someone else’s duty, no matter how well performed or meritorious that duty may be. The reason for this is given in the second half of the verse: “To die in the course of one’s own duty is auspicious, but to follow another’s duty is fraught with danger.”

This is confirmed in the seventh skandha [of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa]: “There are five types of irreligion: sinful acts (vidharma), the religious duty of someone else (para-dharma), pretending to perform religious duties (ābhāsa), performing acts that resemble religious duties (upamā), and deceitful religious duties (chala). A person who really understands the principles of religion should give all these up in exactly the same way as one should give up irreligion.”

Now Arjuna reflects upon what Kṛṣṇa said about people feeling attraction and repulsion (“rāga-dveśau vyavasthitau...”). He then asks Kṛṣṇa why people are attracted to sensual enjoyments like extramarital sexual relationships, even though these things are forbidden in the scriptures:

Śrī Arjuna said: What is it, o descendant of Vṛṣṇi, that drives a person to sin, even unwillingly, as if compelled by force.
Knowing the rules and regulations in the scriptures, a person will not desire to act sinfully. What then is the driving force that causes him to do so against his will? It is as if he is compelled by some force, like a pawn controlled by some higher agent, which makes the sinful desires develop.

The Lord said: It is lust, produced of the material quality Passion, and it is anger. You should know that this is the enemy here, wicked and all-devouring.

It is only lust, in the form of desires for material objects which drives a man to sin. Impelled by it alone a man engages in sinful activities. It is this same lust which manifests itself differently as anger. This same lust, when frustrated, transforms itself into anger.

\[152\] प्रयोजककथा अनिच्छमयीः : JMS.

\[153\] कनृतिकथार्थोऽभिः : AMS, MMS, VMS.

\[154\] इति : AMS, MMS, VMS, printed.

\[155\] कामा : UMS.
It is said here that lust is born of the material quality, Passion. And Dark anger is born of passionate lust.

At this point Arjuna might think, “If I try to satisfy the demands of lust, then perhaps lust will be appeased.”

So Kṛṣṇa says, “No, Arjuna. This lust is “mahāśana”, that is to say, it has a huge appetite. You can never satisfy all the demands of lust. The scriptures say, “All the food, gold, livestock, and women in the world will never be enough, even for one person. Understanding this, one should just be peaceful.”

“Alright Kṛṣṇa, you might not be able to pacify lust by giving it what it wants (dāna), but surely you could use some other methods of diplomacy to win it over: perhaps ‘negotiation’ (sāma) or ‘divide and rule’ (bheda).”

“No, Arjuna, this lust is also ‘mahāpāpma’, or very sinful and savage.”

This whole world is covered over by that lust just as a flame is covered by smoke, a mirror is covered by dust, or an embryo by the womb.

This whole world is covered over by that lust just as a flame is covered by smoke, a mirror is covered by dust, or an embryo by the womb.

---


157 There are said to be four principal methods of diplomacy: sāma (pacifying through negotiation), dāna (giving gifts), bheda (divide and rule), daṇḍa (force).

158 Ø : AMS, MMS, VMS. Added in the margin of UMS.
Tīkā: Here we have examples of the increasing thicknesses of lust which cover the creatures of this world: a light covering, a thick covering, and a very thick covering.

Even though a flame might be covered by smoke, it can nevertheless do its job; for example, it can still provide heat.

But a mirror covered by dust cannot do its job; it cannot reflect an image because its transparent qualities have been covered. And yet the mirror is still there in its natural form; it is just covered over.

An embryo covered by the membranes in the womb also cannot do its job; it cannot stretch out its arms and legs. Moreover it is not even manifest in its natural form.

Similarly when there is only a light covering of lust, one can still remember the ultimate goal of life. When there is a heavy covering of lust one cannot. And when there is a very heavy covering, no consciousness manifests itself at all.

Here the word “idam” (‘this’) refers to this whole world. 

Tīkā- ‘kām ēva’ ीव जीवस्यविदेश्याय 

Tīkā: And now he says, “In fact, lust alone constitutes ignorance for the living being:

The knowledge of the sentient beings is thus covered by this eternal enemy, lust. O son of Kunti it is as insatiable as fire.

Tīkā- आघुर्ता ज्ञानमेंत ज्ञानिनो नित्यवेदिणा। कामयपेन कौन्येय तुष्पूर्णांगनलेन ।।३९।।

159 अक्षोभः : AMS.
160 काम एव हि : printed.
161 सर्वप्रकारणः : BGP, KDB.
The phrase “the eternal enemy” implies that it should be slain by any means. This enemy is ignorance in the form of lust (kama-rūpṇa).

In this context the word “ca” means “like”. Just as a fire is not pacified by ghee, so too lust can never be pacified by indulgence. It is said: “Lust can never be pacified by trying to indulge one’s desires. A fire is only bolstered by feeding it ghee.”

Tīkā: “But, Kṛṣṇa, where does this enemy, lust, reside?”

Kṛṣṇa replies:

The senses, the mind, and the intellect are said to be its dwelling place. By means of these, it obscures knowledge and thus confounds the embodied living being.

Tīkā: These are the dwelling places of this enemy lust; this is its capital, its fortified headquarters. If the senses are its capital city, then its kingdom is the sensual objects, like sound, form, etc.. Lust uses the senses, mind, and intelligence to confound the living being, who lives within the body (dehinam).

\[\text{\textsuperscript{162} \text{\& \text{\textsuperscript{163}}} : \text{AMS, MMS, VMS.}}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{163} \text{BP 9.19.14 : “na jātu kāmaḥ kāmānām....”}}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{164} \text{\& \text{\textsuperscript{165}}} : \text{BGP.}}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{165} \text{\textsuperscript{165}}} : \text{printed.}}\]
Political science says that if you conquer the strong-hold of your enemy, then your enemy will be conquered. The strong-holds of lust are the senses, mind, and intelligence which are each increasingly more difficult to conquer. Therefore Kṛṣṇa now says that the senses should be conquered first because, although they are difficult to conquer, they are still easier to conquer than the mind and intelligence...

Therefore you should first of all control your bodily senses, oh best of the Bharatas, and then just kill off this wicked one which destroys both knowledge and wisdom.

Therefore you should first of all control your bodily senses, oh best of the Bharatas, and then just kill off this wicked one which destroys both knowledge and wisdom.
The phrase, “control your senses”, means that although the irrepressible mind is inclined towards taking off with the money and women of other people, still one should simply not allow the senses be involved in such activities; one should restrain the sensual activity of the eyes, ears, hands, feet, and so forth.

“Just kill this wicked one, this savage lust.” The idea is that if one practices keeping the senses in check, eventually the mind will also become disinterested in those lusty desires.

They say the senses are strong; but the mind is superior to the senses and superior to the mind is intellect; and beyond the intellect is the person.

The senses (indriya) are so strong that they cannot be defeated even by a world-champion. Therefore they are called superior. But superior to them in strength is the mind (manas) because even in dreams, when the bodily senses no longer function, the mind continues to function. Stronger than the mind is the intellect (buddhi) which has the form of knowledge; in deep sleep, when even the mind no longer functions, the intellect in its base form still functions. Yet stronger even than the

---

175 चेन : AMS.
176 चंदनायणिकपस्तु : AMS, MMS, VMS (amended in UMS).
intellect is the person, because when the intellect is stopped by the practice of jñāna-yoga, the person still exists. That person is the celebrated soul, the living being. This is the one who will conquer lust. This soul, the living being, is really the most powerful of all; it can conquer the senses and thus is perfectly able to conquer lust. The gist of this verse is that one should not think the task impossible.

Tīkā: He sums up:

3.43

एवं युक्तं परं वृद्ध्यं संस्तभवानन्मान्मान्मा ।
जहिः अनु महायो हो कामपरं दुरासयम् ॥४३॥

O Arjuna, mighty-armed one, thus understanding what is beyond the intellect and steadying yourself by the self, slay your indomitable enemy, lust.

Tīkā: Understand that the soul, the living being, is beyond the intellect. Know it to be different from all false material identifications. Then by your own self (ātmanā) you should firmly establish your self (ātmanam) and kill this indomitable lust. In other words, destroy this lust, even though it is so hard to conquer.

Thus ends “Karma-yoga”, the third chapter of the conversation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna known as the Bhagavad-gītā Upaniṣad, the scripture of yoga, which deals with spiritual knowledge.
This chapter has described the primary importance of the spiritual process of niṣkāma-karma-yoga and the secondary nature of the end-goal of that process, jñāna (knowledge).

Thus I have completed with the approval of saintly sages the third chapter of this Sārārtha-varṣini commentary on the Bhagavad-gītā, meant simply to bring joy to the hearts of devotees.