

Gita -vivR^itti (Sri Raghavendra Tirtha's):--

``R^ishhaya manavo devA manuputro mahaujasaH |
kalAH sarve harereva saprajApatayaH smr^itAH |
ete svAMshakalAH puMsaH kR^ishhNastu bhagavAn.h svayam.h ||"

iti bhAgavate | (bhA. pu. I.3-27/28)

R^ishhyAdIn.h aMshayutatvenoktVA varAhAdIn.h svarUpatvenAha |
tushabda evArthe | anyastu visheshho na kutrApyavagataH |
aMshatvaM tatrApyavagatam.h ``udbabarhAtmanaH keshau" iti |
mR^iDayanti iti cha bahuvarchanaM chAyuktam.h | na hyantarA.anyaduktVA
pUrvamaparAmR^ishhya tatkriyochyamAnA dR^ishhTA kutrachit.h || 41 ||

"The R^ishhi-s, the Manu-s, and the devatA-s, the kings who are the sons of Manu, are all, along with Brahma, to be known to be energized by Hari, only; the forms [of Vishnu] like Krishna, are the self-same Lord," thus says the Bhagavata.

Having stated that the sages, etc., are endowed with the energy of the Lord, the incarnations like araha, are stated to be His own self-same nature. The word `tu' is used in the sense of `eva'. There is no other specialty that could be indicated by the use of `tu'. Even for him the same would be indicated, as in the statement `udbabarhAtmanaH keshau' (he plucked his hairs). By `mR^iDayanti', the use of the plural would be inappropriate (if Krishna alone were the Bhagavan). Indeed, it is never seen that having stated something vastly different later, without considering what has been stated, some use is indicated of the previous. || 41 ||

Jay Tirth explains further in prameya-dIpika TippaNI --

aMshayuktatvenoktVA kala ityanena kala eva kalAH | na svarUpatvena |
`ete svAMshakalAH" ityanena svarUpAMsharUpA eva kalAH | na tu
pUrvavadupachAreNeti | nanvatraite varAhAdyAH paramapurushhasya
aMshA eva | kR^ishhNatvaMshI bhagavAn.h svayamiti pratIyate |
tatkathamuktavyAkhyAnam.h ? anyathA tushabdAnupapatterityata Aha
-- `tushabda' iti | tatashchAyamarthaH | ete varAhAdyAH puMsaH
svAMshakalAH | ko.arthaH ? kR^ishhNaH paramapurushho bhagavAn.h
svayameva eta iti | kuta etaditi chedudAhR^itashrutisaMvAdAt.h |
arthAntarasya saMvAdAbhAvAchchetyAha -- `anyastu' iti |
varAhAdayo aMshAH, kR^ishhNo.aMshI ityevaMrUpaH | ito.apyeyaM
visheshho na yukta ityAha -- `aMshatvaM' iti | tatrApi
kR^ishhNe.api |

As their being endowed with fragments or energy is stated, the ones stated as `kalAH' are only energized; they are not the self-same Lord. By `ete svAMshakalAH', the ones stated to be the self-same amsha-s are the real kala-s. They are not merely stated as previously merely for the

sake of usage. [An objector asks:] But in the Bhagavata, other incarnations such as Varaha, etc., are only small parts of the Supreme Being. Krishna is the original form, the Lord Himself, thus is the standard meaning. So how is this stated purport? This would make the word `tu' useless in meaning -- to answer this, it is stated, `tushabda', thus. The following is the meaning of the same: these incarnations such as Varaha, etc., are all svAMshakalA-s (the self-same natures of the Lord). So what is the meaning? Just as Krishna, the Supreme Being, is the Lord Himself, so are these. And why should this be so? -- on account of its agreement with the Shruti cited in this context (by Srimad Acharya). The lack of sensibility of the other interpretation is also stated: `anyastu', thus. By this is meant the interpretation that Varaha, etc., are the fragments, and that Krishna is the original, thus. That here, the specialty is not appropriate, such is indicated, `aMshatvaM', thus. By `tatrApi' is meant, "even with Krishna" (it would have to be said that He is only a fragment and not the whole).

kiM chAsmin.h vyAkhyAne kR^ishhNasyaikasyaiva prakR^itatvAt.h
`indrArivyAkulaM lokaM mR^iDayanti yuge yuge" ityuttaravAkye
bahuvachanaM nopapannamityAha -- `mR^iDayanti' iti | nanu
bahuvachanaM pUrvoktaiH varAhAdibhiH sambadhyate, na kR^ishhNena,
iti chenna | `kR^ishhNastu bhagavAn.h svayam.h" iti vAkyArthena
vyavahitatvAt.h | vyavahitasyApi punaH sannidhAnAya
parAmarshAbhAvAt.h | sati gatyantare.adhyAhArAyogAt.h |
asa.nnihitenAnvayabodhasya kvApyadarshanAditi bhAvenA.aha -- `na hi'
iti | `kriyA" iti prakR^itApexayoktam.h | nanu sannidherapi
yogyatA balavatIti chet.h ? satyam.h | sannidhimanatikramya
yogyAnvayastUktaH || 41 ||

Also, in your interpretation, since only Krishna is considered the special subject of discussion (for being the only Original Form), in the subsequent statement `indrArivyAkulaM lokaM mR^iDayanti yuge yuge', the use of the plural is inappropriate, thus is stated -- `mR^iDayanti', thus. However, the plural applies to the earlier Varaha, etc., (the fragments rather than the total), and not to Krishna, thus say you? -- no, that is not right. Because the statement `kR^ishhNastu bhagavAn.h svayam.h' is found interposed. And to take the subject as that of the previous statement, even given the presence of the interposed one, is inappropriate. If we take (adhyAhAra) `ete' -- (these) here, the phrases which are apart are not to be read together. With this opinion the bhAshhya says, `na hi' -- when something is said in between, considering the previous one, one cannot see that it will be linked to the present topic. In the bhAshhya, kriyA is stated to specify the present situation. The gist is that not just kriyA (action), but in any distant adjective (visheshhaNa) relation is not seen in language. [An objector says: While doing anvaya (interpretation), one is required to consider sannidhi (proximity) and yogyatA (propriety). Even when sannidhi is not available, yogyatA is a must, and in fact,] yogyatA is a stronger consideration than sannidhi. So giving prominence to sannidhi alone is not acceptable. So say you? Let it be so. Without giving up sannidhi, we will demonstrate yogyatA. yogyatA with sannidhi is better in comparison with yogyatA without sannidhi.

When it is said that Krishna is the amshi (the whole), and that Varâha, etc., are amsha-s, there is another problem -- in the subsequent verse of the Bhâgavata, it is said: `indrArivyAkulaM lokaM mR^iDayanti yuge yuge' -- when there is trouble from enemies of Indra, "they" protect Yuga after Yuga. Here, the verb mR^iDayanti is in the plural form, and so also should the subject be. Yet, in your interpretation, we came across only Krishna for the subject. For mR^iDayanti (they protect) -- a plural, the subject should be plural and an interpretation with the singular subject-word `kR^ishhNa' is also not possible for this reason. It cannot be said that the referent is the plural "fragments" referred to earlier: when some subject is brought in between, for the meaning after this subject, the reference given before cannot be used. If you say that propriety rather than proximity is a concern in interpretation here, then we say that we will demonstrate propriety without sacrificing proximity, so that that argument does nothing to save your interpretation.

Any Other interpretation contradicts sruti, so can't be considered

1) MahOpanishad (1.1) says " yekO ha vai nArAyaNa aasIt" {"Only nArAyaNA existed (in the beginning ie during praLayam)}". This means that, the "person" nArAyaNA (who ha inseparable_ attributes viz. chit <which is eternal ie. can't be destructed > and achit <which is eternal>, which were in their sookshma state during the praLayam, was the only one > existing). Logically speaking, SB can't be contradictory to Narayan Upnishad and Mahopanishad. SB is even accepted as natural commentary on Vedant-Sutra.

2) In the previous two verses (1.3.26-27), Suta says that the number of incarnations of Sriman nArAyaNa (Hari) are innumerable like thousands of rivulets flowing from a river & goes on to say that RishIs & devas (demigods), Manus & prajApatis are all amsAs of Lord Hari.

Now the question arises as to whether, all these incarnations (rishis, manus and others) are actually "svayam bhagavAn" i.e. nArAyaNa Himself. To clarify that, sUtar is telling in the verse 1.3.28 that rishIs, anya dEvatAs (dEvAs), manus and others (above mentioned avatArams") are not "svayam bhagavAn" (not " nArAyaNA Himself), but KrishNa is bhagavAn Himself. So, obviously, Suta muni wants to reiterate that rishis and others are only amsAvatArAs (ie. They are not same as nArAyaNa) and are different from Narayan's svayam avatArams (like KrishNa).

In svayam avatArams like nrusimha, rAma, krishNa, it is the same person(nArAyaNA) who is taking different forms. But, in amsAvatArams, nArAyaNa simply bestows extraordinary powers to a jIvAtma to achieve certain things (but, this is also counted as a type of "avatAram", though it is not PerumAL who is directly taking the avatAram, as in the case of svayam avatArams).

Coincidentally, some verses before to this Suta listed Balraam and Krishna as 19th and 20th incarnation of Sriman Narayan. So, any meaning should be related to context.

Question: why was "KrishNa" selected here and said as "krishNAstu bhagavAN svayam" and not "rAmA is bhagavAn svayam" OR "nrusimha is bhagavAn svayam", etc, though krishNa, rAma, nrusimha are all the same nArAyaNa (poorna avatArams; svayam bhagavAn; not amsAvatArAs) ??

ANS: sUtar chose "KrishNa" because all the sages were very much eager to know a lot about KrishNA ie. the focus of their questions was with that avatAram. Also, KrishNA is well known for the shadguna paripoornam. Also, the sages being KrishNA's ardent devotees (ie. who wishes to relish the pastimes KrishNA ; pretty obvious from their questions to sUtar), should be doubly assured that their darling KrishNa is nevertheless "svayam bhagavAn" SrIman nArAyaNa and is not a amsAvatAra (namba krishnan svayam bhagavAn; manu, rishi, pruthu ...avAlalAm pOla amsAvatAram illai). they eagerly asked Sage sUtar to especially describe that avatAram in detail in which bhagavAn as KrishNa alongwith BalarAma did various super human acts. They also wanted to know the person unto whom dharma has taken shelter off after the departure of KrishNa to Sri VaikuNTham.

"ete" can be interpreted using **CHHatri Nyayam:**

It is described as follows : "chatrinO gacchanti" a group of people having umbrellas are going. Actually, not everyone in that group needs to hold an umbrella. This usage, though addresses the group as a whole, it doesn't convey that everyone in that group has an umbrella. Thus, according to "chatri nyAyam", eventhough the addressing be done to the whole group, as if everyone has the same characteristic (eg: holding the umbrella), still, it needn't convey that everyone in that group has that characteristic ie. the intention is to just refer to those who actually possess that characteristic (holding an umbrella), though addressing is done to the whole group as such.

Lets see how "chatri nyAyam" is employed in this verse (1.3.28). All avatArams of the type Nrusimha , RAma are Poorna avatArams only, since they are taken by the same person nArAyaNa. Eventhough all the poorna avatArAs (no umbrella) seems to be grouped with that of many other avatArams (anupravesa / amsAvatAra etc; with umbrella) by the word "ete", its actual import from the application of "chatri nyAyam" is that the word "ete" refers only to the amsa avatArams (with umbrella). So, the comparison of KrishNAvatAram is strictly not with all the avatArams that has been listed before, but only with other amsa avatArams. The word "ete", though addresses the whole group of avatArams that has been listed so far, the intention is to refer to only those avatArams that are amsAvatArams (with umbrella). If one fails to recognize the "chatri nyAyam " employed, it leads him/her into a contradiction .

<http://www.ramanuja.org/sv/bhakti/archives/apr2000/0185.html>

<http://www.dvaita.org/shaastra/gita/bg1041.html>

<http://www.ramanuja.org/sv/bhakti/archives/nov99/0037.html>

