Śrī Brhad-bhāgavatāmrta

by Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī

Volume-2

Śrī-goloka-māhātmya

The Glories of Goloka



Jñāna: Knowledge



Without the functions of the mind (mano-vrttim vinā), the functions of all the senses (sarve indriyāņām vrttayah) are useless (aphalāḥ), for even if one acts (kata api), one's deeds will be as if never performed (īhā akrta iva syād), because the self will be unable to perceive them (ātmany anupalabdhitaḥ). The same point is reargued here, but by negative logic. When the mind is inattentive, the senses may be active, but they cannot establish real contact with their objects.

Each sense has its own proper object—form for the sense of sight, texture for touch, and so on.

The purpose of the senses is achieved when they contact their objects and perception occurs.



Perception, however, requires the active participation of two other agents as well—the mind and the living soul.

If the mind is not focused on a sense receiving input from an object, no sensation will reach the self, and no conscious perception will arise.



It is not direct perception through the eyes, because the Supreme Lord stands outside the scope of the activity of the senses



If the Lord (ced), out of compassion for His devotees (bhaktavātsalyād), sometimes (kadācid) reveals Himself to their eyes (dṛśoḥ dṛśyatām yāti), that vision actually occurs (taj jātam) by the power of the mind (jñāna-dṛṣtyā iva); one only imagines (abhimānah) the eyes to be the seers (param dṛśoḥ).

But didn't devotees like Dhruva and Prahlada see the Supreme Lord) Gran konevels Question directly with their eyes? Aren't those devotees famous for having seen the Lord in person? Pizzatiyana cinguelles Yes, the Lord made Himself visible to those great devotees out of fatherly affection, to fulfill the purpose of their eyes.

But in fact, Pippalāyana says, the devotees beheld those revelations through pure consciousness, not through the physical eyes.

Because the scope of our physical sight is narrow, with our eyes we are unable to perceive an object that has no limits.

Why then are Dhruva, Prahlāda, and others famous for having had the Lord's darśana?

And why is He famous as bhakta-vatsala, He who shows affection for His devotees?

It is because in each case the devotee, the jīva soul, identifying with his own senses, presumed, "I am seeing the Lord directly with my eyes."

That those devotees thought that way is evidence that the Personality of Godhead was kind to them.

And that the sense of sight fails to perceive what is beyond its scope does not mean that the eyes are utterly useless.



2.2.93 t<u>asya kāruņya-śaktyā vā</u> drśyo 'stv api bahir-drśoh tathāpi darśanānandah sva-yonau jāyate hrdi

And even if by the power of His mercy (tasya kāruņya-śaktyā vā) He becomes visible (drśyah astu) to external eyes (bahir-drśoh), the bliss that arises from seeing Him (tathāpi darśana ānandaḥ) has its natural source in the heart (sva-yonau jāyate hṛdi).

But isn't the Supreme Lord, by His personal energies, free to do anything He wants?

Yes, but miracles are for the ultimate benefit of the conscious soul, rather than for the soul's inert senses.

The power of the Lord's compassion could indeed make the physical eyes able to perceive Him, if He so desired; but the fruit of that perception, the pleasure felt from it, would still come from where pleasure, pain, and anxiety are always born—the mind.



2.2.94 anantaraṁ ca tatraiva vilasan paryavasyati mana eva mahā-pātraṁ tat-sukha-grahaṇocitam

That bliss later continues (vilasat paryavasyati) in the heart (tatra eva) even after the Lord is no longer visible to the eyes (anantaram ca). Thus the worthy receiver (ucitam mahā-pātram) of that bliss (tat-sukha-grahana) is the mind alone (mana eva). After an audience with the Lord, when He is no longer visible to the eyes, the pleasure of having seen Him lingers in the heart: "Oh, with my own eyes I saw the Personality of Godhead! I saw Him right before me!"

That the ecstasy of seeing the Lord continues in the heart after the eyes can no longer perceive Him indicates that the ecstasy resided only in the heart all along.

Why, then, presume the eyes to be the seers?

<u>On the other hand, sight is one of the knowledge-acquiring senses.</u> So why should it be unable to generate and sustain pleasure? 1 Question The answer, according to self-realized authorities, is that the most suitable agent to receive the pleasure of seeing the Supreme Lord is the mind.

The mind is analogous to the most reliable minister of a king, a minister who alone in the king's entourage can be entrusted with the care of a most precious object.



As much as the mind (yāvat mānasam) becomes peaceful (prasāda udayād), to that extent (tāvad) its pleasure grows (tat sukham vardheta). No external sense (na ca anyad bāhyam indriyam) can feel such expanding pleasure (vardhitum īśīta). Commentary: It may be argued that the mind is limited in scope, like the other senses. $\int_{prode-Parsa} against definition of the sense of the sens$

That is true, but when the mind becomes cleared of contamination, the Lord, being satisfied, is prepared to bestow His full mercy.

The soul's pure consciousness, reflected in the mind, is then able to sustain the image of the Supreme Lord.

The external senses are unable to do this.