

Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam

Canto One

With the
Sārārtha-darśinī commentary

by

Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartī Ṭhākura

Canto One – Chapter Eighteen

The Brāhmaṇa's Curse

Mahārāja Parīkṣit Cursed by a
Brāhmaṇa Boy

Section – II

Sūta Gosvāmī and the sages discuss
about nectarean glories of hearing
about Krsna (9-23)

|| 1.18.13 ||

tulayāma lavenāpi
na svargaṃ nāpunar-bhavam
bhagavat-saṅgi-saṅgasya
martyānām kim utāśiṣaḥ

Let us not compare (na tulayāma) even a particle (lavena api) of devotee association (bhagavat-saṅgi-saṅgasya) to Svarga (svargaṃ) or liberation (apunar-bhavam), what to speak of (kim uta) any _____ blessings in this world (martyānām āśiṣaḥ).

We speak of the glories of the great ocean of association of
such devotees as you, from whatever realization we have.

We should not compare the results of karma, attainment of
Svarga, or the results of jñāna (liberation) with a small particle
of association of devotees (**bhagavat-saṅgi**).

We will not even compare the blessings of this world, such as
a kingdom, with that.

That is because by association with devotees the sprout of bhakti,
which is most rare, appears.

Let us not compare even the full results of karma and jñāna with a
particle of association of devotees doing sādhana-bhakti.

What then to speak of extended association, and what to speak of
association with a devotee having bhāva, the result of sādhana,
and what to speak of association with a devotee having prema?

Imperative form is used to indicate impossibility.

One does not compare a mustard seed to Mount Meru!

The plural tense indicates that no one can disprove this fact
since this is the consensus of many persons.

Bhagavat-saṅgi-saṅgasya is mentioned in the following verse:

na tathāsyā bhaven mohō bandhaś cānya-prasaṅgataḥ |
yoṣit-saṅgād yathā puṁso yathā tat-saṅgi-saṅgataḥ ||

Man's bondage and bewilderment (**asya mohah ca bandhah**) is not due to (**na tathā bhavet**) attachment to objects (**anya-prasaṅgataḥ**) as much as (**yathā**) it is due to his association with woman (**yoṣit-saṅgād**) and to his association with men (**yathā puṁsah**) who associate with women (**tat-saṅgi-saṅgataḥ**). SB 3.31.35

This verse says that more than association with women,
association with those who associate with women (tat-saṅgi-
saṅgataḥ) is condemned.

Thus the intention of the verse is to show that association of
the devotees of the Lord is more praiseworthy than association
with the Lord.

|| 1.18.14 ||

ko nāma trpyed rasavit kathāyām
mahattamaikānta-parāyaṇasya
nāntam gunānām aguṇasya jagmur
yogeśvarā ye bhava-pādma-mukhyāḥ

What knower of rasa (kaḥ nāma rasavit) could be satisfied (trpyed) with the topics (kathāyām) of the Lord who is the sole, supreme shelter (ekānta-parāyaṇasya) of the greatest devotees (mahattama)? Even those who are masters of yoga (yogeśvarā) and the devatās headed by Brahmā and Śiva (ye bhava-pādma-mukhyāḥ), cannot find an end (na antam jagmuh) to the spiritual qualities of the Lord (gunānām) who is without material qualities (aguṇasya).

“It is true that association of devotees is praiseworthy because without that one cannot attain a taste for hearing about Kṛṣṇa.”

We have attained that taste!

~~Then what should we say about continuous association?”~~

With that intention they speak this verse.

If a person is knowledgeable about rasa, how can he be satisfied with the discussion of that person who is the sole and supreme shelter of the greatest devotees?

This indicates the great sweetness of Kṛṣṇa.

His great power is then indicated.

Those who are masters of yoga, they also cannot find an end
to the spiritual qualities of the Lord who is without material
qualities (agunasya).