

GITA UNIVERSAL

BOOK 4

SCIENCE OF LIVING



Bhagavad Gita

The conversational teaching

By
Sri Krishna

Exegesis:
SV Krishna*

**YAM BRAHMA VARUNA INDRA RUDRA MARUTAH
STUNVANTIH TAVAIH
SA ANGA PADA KARMA UPANISHADAIH GAAYANTI YAM
SAMAGAAH
DHYAANA AVASTHITA TAT GATENA MANASAA PASYANTI
YAM YOGINO
YASYA ANTAM NA VIDUH SURA ASURA GANA DEVAAYA
TASMAIH NAMAH**

* Dr. SV Krishna, Ph. D. Retd Principal, Andhra University, Tf5, Viswakala Apts., Doctor's colony, Peda Waltair, Visakhapatnam, 530017, India. 91-891-2550120

Contents

Operating Manual of Living	1
A note about transliteration	6
Introduction	7
	7
Am I qualified to write on Bhagavad Gita.....	15
Acknowledgements	22
Some Minor Linguistic and literary details about Gita:	23
Prologue	25
First Hexad	29
Chapter 1.....	29
Arjuna Vishaada Yoga	29
Chapter 2	41
Saamkhya Yoga	41
Buddhi	55
Chapter 3	82
Karma Yoga	82
Chapter 4	109
Dnyaana Yoga	109
Chapter 5	136
KARMA SANYAASA YOGA.....	136
CHAPTER 6.....	153
ATMA SAMYAMA YOGA	153
PART 1	153
Part II	167
PART III.....	174
Second Hexad	180
Chapter 7	182
Vidnyaana Yoga	182
Chapter8.....	197
Akshara Para Brahma Yoga	197
Undescribable Day and night	209
Chapter9.....	216
Raja Vidya Raja Guhya Yoga.	216

Chapter10	231
VIBHOOTI YOGA.....	231
Chapter11	256
VISVA ROOPA SANDARSANA YOGA	256
Chapter 12	272
BHAKTI YOGA	272
Chapter 13	298
Kshetra Kshetradnya Yoga	298
<i>Dnyana</i>	309
Varnaasrama Dharma	318
Continuation of 13.10.....	325
Dneya	331
Prakriti and Purusha	340
Chapter 14	351
GUNA TRAYA VIBHAAGA YOGA	351
Chapter 15	365
Purushottama praapti Yoga	365
Chapter16	384
DAIVA ASURA SAMPADVIBHAAGA YOGA	384
Daiva disposition	385
Asura Disposition	390
What will befall of such?	394
The gates for predator's entry	398
CHAPTER 17.....	403
SRADDHA TRAYA VIBHAAGA YOGA.....	403
Satvika's Yadnya.....	409
RAJASA YADNYA	411
Tamasa Yadnya	411
Sareeram Tapa.....	413
Vaangmaya Tapa:.....	416
Maanasa Tapa.....	417
Daana	418
OM	420
TAT	421
SAT	421
Chapter 18.	423
MOKSHA SANYAASA YOGA.....	423
Lord's Opinion.....	426
Dnyana:	432
Karma (Actions/functioning):	433
Karta (the doer):	434
Buddhi	436
DHRITI.....	436
Caste.	444
Caste in Ancient scriptures.....	445
Jaabaali Satya Kaama.....	447
Mahi Dasa (Aitareya)	447
Maha Bhaarata	448
Return to 18.42.....	451
Epilogue	468

Bharata Vaakya:	474
Appendix 1	477
About the Author of Bhagavad Gita.....	477
Appendix 2	479
The Concept of Atma.....	479
Origen's theory of Logika, Soul or Atma (from On the First Principles by Origen):	484

A note about transliteration

Indian languages, in general, have phonetic or syllabic scripts. It is thus impossible to transliterate or write the Sanskrit words in Roman script. Hence some adjustments are needed. One of the letter that occurs quite frequently in Indian liturgy and is of prime importance is **ॐ, ॐ or in**

Nagari script ॐ, ॐ. We use for these Dnya and Dnyaa.

There are three letters whose pronunciation is confusive even for Indian people. Bengalis whose language Bengali is very close to Sanskrit pronounce all the three of them almost with the same sound. They are ॐ,

ॐ, ॐ; स, ष, श. We use S for both स and श, and Sha for the other one. We

suggest the reader to keep a copy of Bhagavadgita with him/her for clarification between the contexts of Sa. I stuck to this simple method rather than putting vinculum and such extra symbols on letters and add to confusion. My apologies for the inconvenience.

Author

Aacaarya Samudrala

Introduction



*DNYANENA TU TAT ADNYAANAM ESHAAM NAASITAM ATMANAH TESHAM
AADITYAVAT DNYANAM PRAKAASAYATI TATPARAMA – 5.16*

Bhagavad Gita is the greatest book on earth. Its greatness emanates from the fact that Bhagavad Gita does not deal with a or, any religion. At, or towards the end of the teaching, the chief character Lord Krishna asks his student Arjuna

*ITI TE DNYANAM AKHYAATAM GUHYAAT GUHYATAMAM
MAYA
VIMRISYA ETAT ASESHENA YAT ICCHASI TATHAA KURU
18.63*

Not to believe blindly what he taught; but thoroughly analyze what has been taught and do as per the conclusions of the analysis. This, after teaching for nearly 18 chapters and 600 Slokas in which the teacher dealt with material from every nook and corner of Vedanta and theosophy, is definitely nonreligious. The Book does not give in to commandments or Fatwas or dictates with dire consequence awaiting the one who does not obey, abide his edict or violate the contract he has entered into with this lot. Yes, this is vastly, grossly and drastically different from any theistic religious choreography and orchestra. Bhagavad Gita, therefore, does not enforce, teach or even suggest superstition that is the core characteristic and strength of all religions. Further it does not *monopolize the Supreme Being for humans*; on the other hand, it asserts that all beings in this universe are of same significance to the Supreme Being

(which it believes exists and is unique). This equality in the Supreme Being's outlook is taught in many Slokas of Gita: and not only that, *Gita's conclusion is that release is only for those who develop and obtain this equality*. We give a sample of this aspect of Gita.

SAMAM SARVESHU BHOOTESHU TISHTANTAM
PARAMESVARAM
VINASYATSU AVINASYANTAM YAH PASYATI SA PASYATI
13.28

SAMAM PASYATI SARVATRA SAMAVASTHTAM EESVARAM
NA HINASTYATMANAA ATMAANAM TATO YAANTI PARAAM
GATIM
9. 29

We explain these Slokas in the relevant chapter; right now we point out that the Lord declares in these Slokas only the one who can find the equality in all beings, the common factor being the imperishable, alone knows; and that one (alone) is fit for Paraam Gatim – the ultimate Bliss or Repose or Moksha.

This makes the concept of egalitarian society and Dialectic materialism look like nursery stuff for a six thousand year old kid. Marxism or communism is subsumed by Gita in a more universal context, not confining to human society or the planet of Earth. In the context of Gita, which is also the back drop of Vedanta – to be distinguished from the *Karma Kanda and Ishta-Poorti of Poorva Meemaamsa*, polytheism is denied and henotheism is at best ignored, though not encouraged.

Common Misunderstandings

There are abundant misunderstandings and misinterpretations of the content of Bhagavad Gita. I have seen right from my childhood Bhagavad Gita being referred to in English as "*The Divine Song*". The inaccuracy in this translation is likely to snow ball into a grossly distorted scenario. First, Bhagavaan (Bhagavat = pertaining to, or of, or by Bhagavaan) is not God or Deo or Theo in the

Western sense. Bhaga is the set of six qualities: Sourya, Teja, Veerya, Bala, Ksahma, Dnyana and Sama.. Any being that has all of these six attributes is Bhagavaan. The word Divine is, thus, misleading or Semitizing¹. Second, the word Gita is used for a lyric in the present day parlance. The original purpose of a lyric was to convey a message in a rhythmic and melodious set up. In the past, Gita was a conveyer of a message of sublime content, not necessarily in lyrical form. Lyrical and sonorous aesthetics are byproducts or derivatives of the exalted nature of the matter proper and the meter Gita has been set to by the team, which recorded the conversation between the teacher Krishna and the taught Arjuna (Krishna-Arjuna Samvaada). The team consisted of three characters: Dhrita Rashtra, Sanjaya and Krishna Dvaipaayana Vyasa. Thus calling it as Divine Song, produces a caricature of God singing all by himself (solitarily) in wilderness or reaping a harvest of his own sowing. May be a Wordsworth will be pleased by such picture; but it is certainly ungainly in a 'Divine' context.

World, particularly the west, brainwashed by religions, is allergic to Ancient Indian culture. Several of their scholars studied the scriptures of ancient India driven by the sole motivation and objective of cavil and ridiculing them. To the one who is made to believe that God favors human (man, not woman) and the rest of creation is an after thought of God, meant for the entertainment of His Favorite, it is just impossible to grasp the spirit of equality that forms the core of Ancient Scriptures of this land. How can any Semitic believer accept a serpent or snake² (which is accused of tempting Eve to eat the forbidden fruit) being revered as much as an apple tree or a Himalayan mountain? A tester example is available in Sir Monier Monier Williams' Sanskrit – English Dictionary. The knight converts Brahman (Brahmin) into a religion,

¹ Semitizing = Turning Gita look like a Semitic text of God's decrees and commandments.

² Incidentally, the words Serpent and snake have their etymological roots in Sanskrit or as the westerners would have it PIE.

Brahminism, *in which there is no proselytizing*. Nothing can be farther from truth in the context of ancient scriptures. This dictionary has more bloomers than one can count. We, therefore, devote quite some time resolving the issue of Brahmana or Brahmin and caste by birth in 13th and 18th chapters (and on several other occasions).

Another misunderstanding is found in the so called *Karma Siddhanta*. As understood by westerners and contemporary Indians too, Karma Siddhanta is a sort fatalism in which every activity of the present birth is dictated by the Karma of the past or earlier births. By, not a unusual, logic this theory encourages one not to do any work (action) and add to the already heavy burden of Paapa acquired. If one is destined to eat today by the Karma of earlier birth, he will eat, else fast. Do not lift a finger in an effort acquire food. The ridicule of such logic and Siddhanta is obvious. To the westerner bent on cavil, this ridicule is a windfall of Bonanza. Bhagavad Gita and any Upanishad that constitute Vedanta do not support such action less zombies; in fact they condemn such attitude squarely and treat it as contemptible. Life should be action packed and not romanticized or hallucinated in fantasies. Enticing one into action from an Androgynous mode is an objective of Gita (cf. 2.2, 3). The inevitability of a conflict is due to difference of opinion between any two beings; and the difference transforms into dispute, anger and Wrath. War is an outcome of wrath. In the case of humans war is thrust on one who has no intention of fight. This is given by Jesus in the following lines³:

Jesus said,

“Perhaps people think that I have come to bring peace in the world. They do not know that I have come to bring conflict to the earth; fire, sword, war. For five people will live in a house

³ Saying 16, The Gospel of Thomas (Gnostic teachings of Jesus, banished from the New Testament when it was written-edited in 396 CE.

*It will be three against two
And two against three,
Father against the son
And son against the father
And they will stand alone.”*

In the Biblical or Semitic context this could not be understood as it should be; and hence may not make much sense. But read it again in the context of Kurukshetra and Bhagavad Gita. It is not one's intention not to fight that avoids war. War or fight is almost a natural outcome of human mentality. Note particularly the last three lines and compare them with the desolation of Arjuna in the very first chapter. These lines of Jesus are derivable from 10.4,5. Krishna did not want a fight; he did his best to avoid it. But when it has become inevitable and is imposed on Arjuna, Arjuna has to fight; it has become his duty to do so. 'This is not the time for showing the other cheek; show the other side' was Krishna's call. These are exactly the words of Jesus too, though he was portrayed differently in a needless and superfluous attempt to show his zeal for peace. Jesus like Krishna taught peace – peace within and not a synthetic and temporary arrangement.

Peace within is obtained by 'looking inside' or knowing the inside. What lives inside a body is the entity for which the body is made. Hence, the insider must be the ruler of the body. Knowing the insider is Dnya in Samskrita. It has been carried to west (likely, along the ancient silk route) like Palestine, Asia Minor and Greece and has become Gno (And when it reached England, it became (*k*) now)). Krishna starts his teaching proper with the description of the insider called Atma⁴ (not identical with the soul of Semitic religions). A large amount of teachings by Jesus are devoted to the same aspect of knowing the insider or Dnya or Gno. Such teachings are duly called Gnostic. When the New

⁴ See the Appendix on Atma

Testament was 'compiled' nearly 400 years after the teacher Jesus passed away, the contemporary zealots (not the biblical sect of Zealots) decided that Gnostic teachings of Jesus are not compatible with the Christianity **they** wish to propagate and, therefore, be destroyed. As it is said in Bhagavad Gita (2.23), Truth can not be destroyed by physical means of burning or burying. The Gnostic teachings surfaced in the last two centuries. These run parallel to the thoughts in Gita and Vedanta. A separate three volume series "Coptic Gita" is compiled by me. This shows that Vedanta and Gita are not and cannot (be) confined to India; they are universal.

Even amongst the Indians differences of opinion about Bhagavad Gita galore. Many differences arise out of the dispute on the relation between the Supreme Being and the entities called Atma. A physical body is active or Cetana as long as Atma resides in it. Some schools hypothesize that Atma in the body is the same as Parama Atma – the Supreme Being covered by Adnyana or nescience⁵. Some posit that these two are different entities, will remain different and the job of the Atma in the body is to regain its original state of blemishless balanced Bliss. The third opinion is that the Supreme Being whose shape can not be geometrically or materially defined has for its body all Atmas and more. A part of the body does not separate from the body and function. Hence in a Visishta or qualified manner, Atma is attached to Parama Atma. But for this small detail, they go with the second line of thinking. The differences between these three theosophies may look innocuous and ignorable. But as one studies Bhagavad Gita in the perspective of any one of these three theosophies would find himself vastly removed from the one following any of the other two. The first school of thinking is called Advaita, the second is Dvaita and the third is Visishta

⁵ Probably, this hypothesis was an attempt to obtain or atleast assure the people that all are equal in stature as every one has Parama Atma inside. However this sense of equality was never visible in the actions of the followers of this theosophy. Their behavior remained Orwellian – All are equal; but some are more than equal

Advaita. Advaita (goes with the name of Aadi Sankara), in order to legitimize their hypothesis of the Supreme Being (the one who knows every thing and sees everything and is the soul and substance of Dnyana - antonym of nescience) is overcome by nescience, introduces, the concept of Maya of their own brand. Maya is illusion; and as per them everything, except the Supreme Being is Maya. How the Supreme Being, the master of everything can be entrapped by Maya (which must be under his control) is rarely asked and never explained. Many verses of Bhagavad Gita contradict this Maya Vada (it translates to illusory debate). Chapter 11 of gita rejects this hypothesis of Maya or illusion. I will not go into the merits and demerits of these theosophical hypotheses and their consequences. For most part I follow the Visisht Advaita approach and at times differ from it too.

We need to make one point clear. In Bharata Varsha and Khanda (the land which constituted Bharata) *there was never a religion in the form of revelations*. Bharata Khanda was very large before it fragmented into smaller entities, may be around 2000 BC. It was a free land (sthaan) where no one dictated any other on the way he/she should communicate with the Supreme Being. Hinduism and the Hindu Religion were the manufactured products of Westerners, particularly the Europeans after they were religionized. Hindu perhaps was a word which meant glorious, dignified and beautiful woman in ancient Persian and classical Arabic. The theory that Sindhu (the river) was pronounced as Hindhu by Arabs is creative nonsense of the western mercenary historians. Bharata Khanda extended beyond the Sindhu river to the west and beyond the Himalayas and their brethren ranges to the north. Gandhara was one of the kingdoms of Bharata Khanda. Legend has it that Bharata Khanda had 56 large kingdoms. All were attached together by Dharma or more precisely Sanaatana Dharma. Sanaatana Dharma was a collection of realizations of thinkers who had only the welfare of

beings in mind, with God just an axiom. One may therefore argue that Sanaatana Dharma overlaps atheism of a sort. Bouddha was not God-centric but is Dharma⁶. Zorastranism of ancient Persia *is* Dharma; and rulers of Persia⁷ were Dharma followers and not religious bigots. How else could the great king Cyrus⁸ personally supervise the construction of The Temple in Jerusalem that was destroyed by Babylonians? Bhagavad Gita thus can not be a book of Religion, least of all the nonexistent Hinduism. We stick to the phrase “**Sanaatana Dharma**” through this writing and reject Hinduism as its synonym.

⁶ Some Buddhists to be distinguished from Bouddhas, feel that Dharma means only Buddhism

⁷ Persia is Parsva (land or part of Bharata Khanda that is to a side). Presently, Persia has the name Iran derived from Aryan.

⁸ Cyrus is the Grecian name of the original Persian Khuroch, which is a regional distortion of the word Kharoci, meaning lighter of Skies or Sun. Lighter of the sky also distributes light (Dnyana). Dnyana is good and Adnyana is bad, Hence Cyrus may be interpreted as carrier of Good. The language and script ‘Kharoshti is thus directly related to Khurosh or Kharoci or Cyrus. One of the earlier scripts of Sanskrit was Kharoshti.

End of Preview.

Rest of the book can be read @
[http://kinige.com/book/Gita+Universal+Series](http://kinige.com/book/Gita+Universal+Series+Book+4+Science+of+Living+Bhagavadgita)
[+Book+4+Science+of+Living+Bhagavadgita](http://kinige.com/book/Gita+Universal+Series+Book+4+Science+of+Living+Bhagavadgita)

*** * ***