

Responsible Publishing

Why and How the BBT Publishes Revisions of Śrīla Prabhupāda’s Books

by The Bhaktivedanta Book Trust (©1998)

(Note: For Table of Contents, call up Bookmarks)



How the Editors Serve Śrīla Prabhupāda’s Books

by Draviḍa Dāsa

After Śrīla Prabhupāda’s disappearance, the BBT has published revised editions of the *Kṛṣṇa* book, *Śrī Īsopaniṣad*, *Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, *The Nectar of Devotion*, and *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*.

In these editions, the editors, after carefully consulting original tapes, manuscripts, and transcripts, restored material the previous editions had lost, obscured, or distorted.

Many devotees ask, “Did Śrīla Prabhupāda authorize such revisions?” “Why were the revisions necessary?” “Didn’t Prabhupāda forbid his disciples to change his books?” “Didn’t Śrīla Prabhupāda declare, ‘Don’t change my words!’?” This paper is meant to address these concerns.

First, some historical perspective.

Śrīla Prabhupāda and His Editors

Śrīla Prabhupāda’s two main English editors for his books were Hayagrīva Prabhu and Jayādvaita Swami. Historically, Hayagrīva Prabhu was Śrīla Prabhupāda’s first editor. As found in *Śrīla Prabhupāda-līlāmṛta* (Volume 2, page 138), here is the history from July 1966 of how Hayagrīva got started:

One morning Prabhupāda told Howard that he needed help in spreading the philosophy of Kṛṣṇa consciousness. Howard wanted to help, so he offered to type the Swami's manuscripts of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*.

Howard: The first words of the first verse read, "O the King." And naturally I wondered whether "O" was the king's name and "the king" stood in apposition. After some time I figured out that "O king" was intended instead. I didn't make the correction without his [Prabhupāda's] permission. "Yes," he said, "change it then." I began to point out a few changes and inform him that if he wanted I could make corrections, that I had a master's in English and taught last year at Ohio State. "Oh, yes," Swamiji said. "Do it. Put it nicely."

So, under the direct instruction of Śrīla Prabhupāda, Howard Wheeler, soon Hayagrīva Dāsa, began his editing career. That means that, with Śrīla Prabhupāda's blessings, he changed Śrīla Prabhupāda's words, fixing the grammar, punctuation, and spelling and making the text read smoothly for modern English-speaking Westerners. Śrīla Prabhupāda did not review every change Hayagrīva made. Instead, he trusted Hayagrīva's good judgment.

And Hayagrīva didn't just work on new manuscripts. With Prabhupāda's blessings he also went back and revised the already-published three volumes of the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, First Canto. Prabhupāda wanted those books also to be "put nicely."

Śrīla Prabhupāda entrusted Hayagrīva with his *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, and he also trusted Jayādvaīta Swami (then Dāsa) when Jayādvaīta Swami later made some revisions to Hayagrīva's work. Here is a remembrance from Jayādvaīta Swami:

The second edition of First Canto appeared during Śrīla Prabhupāda's physical presence. Before it came out, I personally brought to him my revisions of the verses for the first one or two chapters. He at once had me begin to read them aloud in his presence, as he listened with attention.

After I had read the first few verses, he interrupted and asked me: "So, what have you done?" I replied that I had revised the verses to make them closer to what he himself had originally said. Śrīla Prabhupāda responded, "What I have said?" I replied yes. His Divine Grace then said, "Then it is all right." And that was that. The work was approved.

Śrīla Prabhupāda later wrote to Rādhāvallabha Dāsa (7 September 1976):

"Concerning the editing of Jayādvaīta Prabhu, whatever he does is approved by me. I have confidence in him."

Thus, both orally and in writing, Śrīla Prabhupāda approved Jayādvaīta Swami's revisions of the already published First Canto. Moreover, he approved them not by sitting down and going over every change, but by entrusting his editor disciple with

the service, having confidence in his intelligence, care, and devotion. This confidence continued up to the day Śrīla Prabhupāda disappeared.

Bhagavad-gītā As It Is was an extremely difficult manuscript for Hayagrīva Prabhu to edit, circa 1967–69. The transcript itself was flawed because the typists scrambled much of Śrīla Prabhupāda’s Sanskrit dictation and misunderstood some of the English. The Sanskrit editors were inexpert, and Hayagrīva himself was unable to resolve many questions he had on the text. Still, it had to be printed right away; Prabhupāda wanted it.

The Macmillan *Gītā* was great. It helped make me and thousands of others into devotees, and it provided countless hours of instruction and realization. But it was a vast text produced under trying conditions by inexperienced devotees, and so it had a lot of mistakes. It was not entirely faithful to Śrīla Prabhupāda’s original words and meaning. The question is: After Śrīla Prabhupāda’s disappearance, should the book have been left as it was, or should the flaws have been fixed? And if so, by whom?

Well, if anyone was going to perform the delicate task of correcting the *Gītā*, it was the editor who stayed with Śrīla Prabhupāda till the end, Jayādvaita Swami. (“I have confidence in him.”)

Were his corrections justified? Let’s look at some of the words of Śrīla Prabhupāda’s that Jayādvaita Swami restored, and you decide whether this restoration was a great offense against Prabhupāda or a service to him and to all the readers of the *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*, now and in the future, in all the languages of the world.

I’ll give only a few examples, following the logic of “testing one grain of rice to see if the whole pot is cooked.”

Some Examples of Restorations to Bhagavad-gītā As It Is

The first example appears in Chapter 8, Text 11, in the first paragraph of the purport. Some uninformed people allege that this is an instance of making concessions to the Māyāvādīs, *jñānīs*, and *yogīs* by introducing *ṣaṭ-cakra-yoga* from out of the blue. You decide whether this charge is justified or specious. (I’ve left the typographical errors in the original transcript so you can see exactly what the original editors were dealing with, and I’ve placed restored text in boldface where helpful.)

Bhagavad-gītā As It Is, 8.11 purport, paragraph 1

1972 Macmillan edition:

Lord Kṛṣṇa explains that Brahman, although one without a second,...

1983 BBT edition:

Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa has recommended to Arjuna the practice of *ṣaṭ-cakra-yoga*, in which one places the air of life between the eyebrows. Taking it for granted that Arjuna might not know how to practice *ṣaṭ-cakra-yoga*, the Lord explains the process in the following verses. The Lord says that Brahman, although one without a second,...

Original Transcript

Lord Shri K. has recommended Arjuna practice of yoga (*satijacaw*) to put the air of life between the two eeybrows. Taking it for accpetance that Arjuna might not be knowing the process how to practice satojacaw yoga, Lord is trying to explain as far as possinble the porcess in the following words. He says that Brahama although one without second...

Now, besides the original editor's serious omission of a good piece of English text, one of the things that obviously happened here is that the typist couldn't understand the words *ṣaṭ-cakra-yoga* on the tape; so he typed in "satijacaw" and "satojacaw."

In 1968–69 the Sanskrit editors couldn't check the commentated *Gītā* Prabhupāda was referring to while writing his purports, so they just crossed out the mysterious words. In 1983, however, the editors could check the original. So they restored *ṣaṭ-cakra-yoga*, here and also in the previous purport, where, among other words, the following sentence had been omitted: "The practice of *ṣaṭ-cakra-yoga*, involving meditation on the six *cakras*, is suggested here."

The next change has brought the charge that Jayādwaita Swami is trying to hide Śrīla Prabhupāda's instruction that one need not read many books.

BG 10.34, synonyms, translation, and purport

1972 Macmillan edition:

SYNONYM: *dhṛti*—faithfulness

TRANSLATION: I am fame, fortune, speech, memory, intelligence, faithfulness and patience.

PURPORT (2nd paragraph): The six opulences listed are considered to be feminine. If a woman possesses all of them or some of them she becomes glorious. Sanskrit is a perfect

language and is therefore very glorious. After studying, if one can remember the subject matter, he is gifted with good memory, or *smṛti*. One need not read many books on different subject matters; the ability to remember a few and quote them when necessary is another opulence.

1983 BBT edition:

SYNONYM: *dhṛti*—firmness

TRANSLATION: Among women I am fame, fortune, fine speech, memory, intelligence, steadfastness and patience.

PURPORT: The seven opulences listed—**fame, fortune, fine speech, memory, intelligence, steadfastness and patience**—are considered feminine. If a person possesses all of them or some of them he becomes glorious. If a man is famous as a righteous man, that makes him glorious. Sanskrit is a perfect language and is therefore very glorious. If after studying one can remember a subject matter, he is gifted with a good memory, or *smṛti*. And the ability not only to read many books on different subject matters but to understand them and apply them when necessary is intelligence (*medhā*), another opulence.

Original Transcript

SYNONYM: *dhṛtih*—firmness

TRANSLATION: Amongst the women I am Giti sri and boni and memory, intelligence, firmness and excuse all.

PURPORT: Six kinds of opulences like **fame, beauty, good speech, memory, remembrance, endurance, excuse all**—these are considered sevomen. All these six kinds of opulences are considered feminine, so if one produces all of them or some of them he becomes glorious. If one is famous as a righteous man that makes a man glorious. The perfect language is the Sanskrit language. Therefore this language is also very glorious. Remembrance, after learning if one can produce the result of learning that is called *smṛtir*. *Medha*, memory, not only to read many books on many subject matter, but to keep them in the memory and produce them when necessary, that is also another opulence.

There are several items to consider in this text. First is the mistake, in the synonyms and translation, of rendering *dhṛti* as “faithfulness.” Śrīla Prabhupāda had “firmness,” not the same thing as faithfulness.

The old edition goofs by saying about the seven opulences, “If a woman possesses all of them or some of them she becomes glorious” instead of, as Śrīla Prabhupāda had it, “If a person [anyone] possesses all of them or some of them he

becomes glorious.”

In this connection, too, we have the old verse and purport saying that a faithful woman (wife) is glorious. This is of course true—but it has nothing to do with what Śrīla Prabhupāda is saying here! *Dhṛti* means firmness or steadfastness. Though it’s a feminine quality, that doesn’t mean only women can possess it—it’s also one of the *kṣatriya* qualities mentioned in the Eighteenth Chapter. So in this verse, as Śrīla Prabhupāda originally rendered it, Kṛṣṇa isn’t identifying Himself with “faithfulness,” nor in the purport is Śrīla Prabhupāda saying a faithful woman is glorious.

Then there are the obvious omissions—the list at the beginning of the paragraph and the sentence “If a man is famous as a righteous man, that makes him glorious.”

And finally we have the last sentence of the Macmillan purport—an encouragement not to read many books but to know a few thoroughly and quote them. A fine sentiment (when applied to Prabhupāda’s books), but why should Prabhupāda’s actual words and meaning be obliterated in favor of this little lesson from the first editor? Why cast away Prabhupāda’s painstakingly rendered words and immortalize this seriously defective rendering of the purport?

Has Jayādvaīta Swami hidden that one need not read many books, or has he restored Śrīla Prabhupāda’s words and meaning? You decide.

By the way, in light of the last example, it’s interesting to note that the Macmillan edition omits the following critical sentence in the purport to 4.34: “Nor by independent study of books of knowledge can one progress in spiritual life.” (The manuscript said, “Neither by self study of the books of knowledge can help one progress in spiritual life.”)

BG 9.26 purport

The entire first paragraph of the purport to 9.26, chock full of essential nectarean instructions from Śrīla Prabhupāda, is now again part of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*. It was there in the 1968 abridged Macmillan *Gītā*, was somehow omitted in the Macmillan unabridged version, and was then mercifully restored by Jayādvaīta Swami in the revised BBT edition.

The next example concerns 18.31 and 18.32. *Bhagavad-gītā* 18.31 describes intelligence in the mode of passion, and 18.32 describes intelligence in the mode of ignorance. Śrīla Prabhupāda wrote a purport to 18.32 but not 18.31. Somehow, the original editor took the purport to 18.32 and appended it to 18.31. Since Prabhupāda’s purport described intelligence in ignorance, the original editor substituted “passion” for “ignorance” throughout.

BG 18.31 and 32 purport

Macmillan 18.31, purport

Intelligence in the mode of passion is always working perversely. It accepts religions which are not actually religions and rejects actual religion. All views and activities are misguided. Men of passionate intelligence understand a great soul to be a common man and accept a common man as a great soul. They think truth to be untruth and accept untruth as truth. In all activities they simply take the wrong path; therefore their intelligence is in the mode of passion.

1983 BBT edition 18.32, purport

Intelligence in the mode of ignorance is always working the opposite of the way it should. It accepts religions which are not actually religions and rejects actual religion. Men in ignorance understand a great soul to be a common man and accept a common man as a great soul. They think truth to be untruth and accept untruth as truth. In all activities they simply take the wrong path; therefore their intelligence is in the mode of ignorance.

Original Transcript, 18.32 purport

Intelligence in the mode of ignorance is always going on the opposite side. That is, such intelligence accept religions which is not actually religion and they accept non-religion which is actually religion. All their activities are on the direction. They understand a great soul as a common man and accepts a common man as a great soul. They accept truth as untruth and accept untruth as truth. In all activities they simply accept the opposite direction therefore their intelligence is supposed to be in the mode of ignorance.

The placement of this purport under 18.31 and the change of “ignorance” to “passion” constitute a serious editorial failure. Knowing the facts surrounding this purport, would anyone now feel justified in presenting the blunder as “Prabhupāda’s words”?

We could provide many more examples, some of great substance—the restoration of dozens and dozens of Sanskrit quotes in the purports, of the *Gīta-māhātmya* verses in the Introduction, of the whole Hare Kṛṣṇa *mantra* to the purports of 8.6, 8.13, 8.14, and 8.19, of the proper translations and purports for 8.19–20, and of much more. (See Part 5, Jayādvaīta Swami’s letter to Amogha Līlā Dāsa, to find out about other restorations.)

The point here is not to analyze every restoration Jayādvaīta Swami made. That’s neither possible here nor necessary. The point is to show that he was doing what he was supposed to do. He was performing his prescribed duty as Śrīla Prabhupāda’s editor, just as he had done in Śrīla Prabhupāda’s physical presence. With the help of other senior and learned devotees, such as Ravīndra Svarūpa

Prabhu, Garuḍa Prabhu, and Gopīparāṇadhana Prabhu, he performed a difficult but necessary service for Śrīla Prabhupāda, for all of ISKCON, and for all readers of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*.

Restorations by Draviḍa Dāsa

As for myself, I began as a proofreader of Śrīla Prabhupāda’s books and *Back to Godhead* magazine in 1973 and started substantial editing in 1975. That year, under the guidance of Jayādvaita Swami, I edited several chapters of the Fifth Canto and the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* during the famous seventeen-books-in-two-months production marathon. So for the last twenty-three years or so, except for a year spent with the Bhaktivedanta Institute at Śrīla Prabhupāda’s direct request, I’ve been steadily editing BBT books or BTG magazine.

I will ever believe that if I could show Śrīla Prabhupāda the following restorative changes I’ve made to his books, he would approve.

My first examples are from *Śrī Īsopaniṣad*. The restored text is in boldface.

Śrī Īsopaniṣad, Mantra 2, end of purport

1974 edition

Even though such God-centered activities may be half-finished, they are still good for the executor because they will guarantee him a human form in his next birth. In this way one can have another chance to improve his position on the path of liberation.

1993 edition

Even though such God-centered activities may be half-finished, they are still good for the executor, because they will guarantee him a human form in his next birth. In this way one can have another chance to improve his position on the path of liberation.

How one can execute God-centered activities is elaborately explained in the *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu*, by Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī. We have rendered this book into English as *The Nectar of Devotion*. We recommend this valuable book to all who are interested in performing their activities in the spirit of *Śrī Īsopaniṣad*.

Śrīla Prabhupāda’s text from 1960 BTG

Such God centered activities even though half finished still it is good for the executor because that will guarantee one at least human form of life in the next birth so that he gets another chance of improving his position on the path of liberation.

How one can execute God centered activities is elaborately explained in the Bhakti Rasamrita Sindhu by Śrīla Rupa Goswami and rendered into English by us under the title of Science of Devotional Service of the Lord. We shall recommend this valuable book to all who are interested to guide their activities in the spirit of Ishopanishad.

Mantra 8, purport, 2nd paragraph

1974 edition

In the *Brahma-saṁhitā* there is a similar description of the Supreme Lord. He is described there as *sac-cid-ānanda-vigraha*, which means that He is the eternal form fully representing transcendental existence, knowledge, and bliss. The Vedic literatures state clearly ...

1993 edition

In the *Brahma-saṁhitā* there is a similar description of the Supreme Lord. He is described there as *sac-cid-ānanda-vigraha*, which means that He is the eternal form fully representing transcendental existence, knowledge and bliss. **As such, He does not require a separate body or mind, as we do in material existence.** The Vedic literatures state clearly ...

Śrīla Prabhupāda's 1960 BTG

In the *Brahma Samhita* there is a similar description of the body of the Supreme Lord. He is described there as the *Sachidananda Vighraha*. This means that He is the eternal Form fully representing transcendental existence, bliss and knowledge. **He does not require a separate body or mind like us in the material existence.** The Vedic literatures distinguish him clearly ...

Mantra 12, purport, 4th paragraph

1974 edition

Since the living being is materially entangled, he has to be relieved from material bondage entirely, to attain permanent relief on the spiritual plane, where eternal bliss, life, and knowledge exist. It is also stated in the *Bhagavad-gītā* (7.23) that the worshipers of the demigods can go to the planets of the demigods.

1993 edition

Since the living being is materially entangled, he has to be relieved from material bondage entirely to attain permanent relief on the spiritual plane, where eternal bliss, life and knowledge exist. **Śrī Īsopaniṣad therefore instructs that we should not seek temporary**

relief of our difficulties by worshipping the dependent demigods, who can bestow only temporary benefit. Rather, we must worship the Absolute Personality of Godhead, Kṛṣṇa, who is all-attractive and who can bestow upon us complete freedom from material bondage by taking us back home, back to Godhead.

It is stated in the *Bhagavad-gītā* (7.23) that the worshipers of the demigods can go to the planets of the demigods.

Śrīla Prabhupāda’s 1960 BTG

The living being is in the material entanglement and he has got to be relieved from the material bondage for permanent relief in the spiritual plane where eternal bliss, life and knowledge exist. **The *Ishopanishad* therefore directs us that we should not be busy for a temporary relief by worshipping the dependent demigods who can bestow upon us a temporary benefit. But we must worship the Absolute Personality of Godhead Kṛṣṇa Who is all attractive and can bestow upon us complete relief from the material bondage by going back to home back to Godhead.**

In the *Bhagwat Geeta* it is said that the worshippers of the demigods can go up to the planets of the respective demigods.

The next example comes from my favorite chapter of the

Kṛṣṇa book—Chapter 21, “The Gopīs Attracted by the Flute.”

1970 edition

Kṛṣṇa was very pleased with the atmosphere of the forest, where flowers bloomed and bees and drones hummed very jubilantly.

1996 edition

With the arrival of the beautiful autumn season, the waters in the lakes and rivers became as clear as crystal and filled with fragrant lotus flowers, and breezes blew very pleasantly. At that time, Kṛṣṇa entered the forest of Vṛndāvana with the cows and cowherd boys. Kṛṣṇa was very pleased with the atmosphere of the forest, where flowers bloomed and bees and drones hummed very jubilantly.

The previous editors omitted the first two sentences, which come right from the original tapes. These are Śrīla Prabhupāda’s words, a nectarean translation of the first two verses of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* 10.21. Don’t you think Prabhupāda would want them restored?

I’ll wind up with a few examples from the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*. Much of this book was produced at breakneck speed in 1975, during the seventeen-books-in-two-

months marathon. Harikeśa Swami remembers,

“Prabhupāda was well aware that the CC was a rush job and there were tons of mistakes. It was understood from the start (when we were in LA starting the marathon) that the book would be revised in a later reprint.”

You judge whether the following errors should have been left uncorrected forever:

Madhya 19.157, purport

1975 edition

If one thinks that there are many pseudo devotees or nondevotees in the Kṛṣṇa Consciousness Society, one can keep direct company with the spiritual master, and if there is any doubt, one should consult the spiritual master.

1996 edition

Even if one thinks that there are many pseudo devotees or nondevotees in the Kṛṣṇa Consciousness Society, **still one should stick to the Society; if one thinks the Society's members are not pure devotees**, one can keep direct company with the spiritual master, and if there is any doubt, one should consult the spiritual master.

Original transcript

If one thinks in the Society there are many so-called devotees or there are so many nondevotees, **still one should stick to the Society, and if one thinks the Society members are not pure devotees**, he can directly keep company or in touch with the spiritual master. If there is any doubt he should consult the spiritual master.

Śrīla Prabhupāda's instruction contained in the omitted material is essential. By what logic should the law books for the next ten thousand years omit it?

Madhya 9.362 translation

1975 edition

In this age of Kali, there are no genuine religious principles. There are only the Vaiṣṇava devotees and the Vaiṣṇava devotional scriptures. This is the sum and substance of everything.

1996 edition

In this Age of Kali there are no genuine religious principles other than those established by Vaiṣṇava devotees and the Vaiṣṇava scriptures. This is the sum and substance of everything.

Original transcript

In this age of Kali there is no other genuine principle of religion except Vaisnava devotee and the Vaisnava scripture, devotional books. This is the sum and substance of everything.

So, there are no genuine religious principles in this age, and the Vaiṣṇava devotees and Vaiṣṇava scriptures have nothing to do with genuine religious principles. Are we actually going to have devotees quoting this translation to prove that? Without the revised edition of the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, they would be perfectly justified in doing so. You decide if I've offended Prabhupāda by restoring the translation of this verse, whose meaning Caitanya Mahāprabhu Himself says is *marma*, the sum and substance of everything!

Madhya 8.257 purport

1975 edition

They [the demigod worshipers] at least retain their individuality in order to enjoy life, but the impersonalists, who try to lose their individuality, also love both material and spiritual pleasure. The stone is immovable and has neither material nor spiritual activity.

1996 edition

They at least retain their individuality in order to enjoy life. But the impersonalists, who try to lose their individuality, also **lose** both material and spiritual pleasure. **The last destination of the Buddhist philosophers is to become just like** a stone, which is immovable and has neither material nor spiritual activity.

Original transcript

They at least keep their individuality to enjoy life. But the impersonalists, by stopping their individuality, **lose** all kinds of pleasure, either material or spiritual. **The Buddhist philosophers' last destination is to become just like** stone. It is immovable, without any activity, whether material or spiritual.

In the mad dash to edit mountains of text in two months, “lose” became “love,” the proofreader missed it, and a line of manuscript dropped out of sight. And so

this passage became totally meaningless. Some people say it should have stayed that way. We disagree.

And finally, here's my favorite:

Madhya 13.137 purport

1975 edition

[nothing; existing purport belongs to 138]

1996 edition

The mind's activities are thinking, feeling and willing, by which the mind accepts materially favorable things and rejects the unfavorable. This is the consciousness of people in general. But when one's mind does not accept and reject but simply becomes fixed on the lotus feet of Kṛṣṇa, then one's mind becomes as good as Vṛndāvana. Wherever Kṛṣṇa is, there also are Śrīmatī Rādhārāṇī, the gopīs, the cowherd boys and all the other inhabitants of Vṛndāvana. Thus as soon as one fixes Kṛṣṇa in his mind, his mind becomes identical with Vṛndāvana. In other words, when one's mind is completely free from all material desires and is engaged only in the service of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, then one always lives in Vṛndāvana, and nowhere else.

Who would seriously claim that this jewellike purport should be consigned to oblivion?

There are dozens and dozens of similar restorations in the 1996 *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*.

Conclusion

I appeal to all intelligent and sincere devotees to trust, support, and relish the latest BBT editions of Śrīla Prabhupāda's books, with all their valuable corrections and restorations.

For those who still prefer the previous editions, I have this one word of caution: You're accepting a lot of "non-Prabhupāda" as Prabhupāda and missing a lot of what Śrīla Prabhupāda intended those books to say.

Like many devotees, I treasure my Macmillan *Gītā*. It's redolent with the old blissful days of early ISKCON. Especially for anyone who grew up in devotional service reading it, the Macmillan *Gītā* is a priceless memento. I wouldn't trade mine for anything.

But when I want to read what Prabhupāda actually said, I turn to the 1983

edition of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*. The simple fact is that it conveys Śrīla Prabhupāda’s words and meaning more accurately and more faithfully. Likewise with the 1982 *Nectar of Devotion*, the 1993 *Īsopaniṣad*, the 1996 *Kṛṣṇa* book, and the 1996 *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*. Because when Śrīla Prabhupāda’s books are made closer to what Śrīla Prabhupāda said, “Then it is all right.” In fact, it’s better than all right. The closer to Śrīla Prabhupāda, the better.

“Not a Shabby Thing”

by Jayādvaita Swami

What Śrīla Prabhupāda told his editors and publishers about finding and fixing mistakes

Publishers revise their books. It’s standard practice. You don’t perpetuate mistakes. You fix them. Especially when the mistakes are your own (the publisher’s own), not the author’s.

And when publishers make corrections, they don’t litter the page with little footnotes to tell you where all the goofs were. The mistakes simply disappear, with the corrected text in its place.

In the event that revisions are extensive, it’s standard practice to publish an explanation: What was done? Who did it? Why? And that’s it. What should matter to the reader, after all, is the text, not the corrections.

An exception is made in the case of what is called “critical editions.” A critical treatment is usually reserved for ancient and classical manuscripts, in editions intended to enable scholars to minutely study the differences between texts. For example, there’s a critical edition of the Sanskrit *Mahābhārata*, noting in detail the differences between various available manuscripts. There are also critical editions of Shakespeare, noting the differences between the “First Folio,” “Second Folio,” and so on.

If we wanted, we could publish a critical edition for *every* BBT book, showing how the edited version differs from Śrīla Prabhupāda’s original dictation.

Do you think that critical editions are what Śrīla Prabhupāda had in mind for us to distribute?

Were we to publish a critical edition of, for example, *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*,

showing the differences between the first edition and the second, the main service we'd be doing the reader would be to point out to him the hundreds of bloopers and blunders committed in the first edition of the book (see Appendix E: What a Critical Edition of Bhagavad-gītā As It Is Would Look Like). Do you think that would help the reader? Would it bolster his confidence in Śrīla Prabhupāda's books? Does he really need to be told, for example, that the first edition spoke of "a planet of trees"?

Śrīla Prabhupāda gave no sign that he wanted his books published in critical editions.

Did Śrīla Prabhupāda want his books edited? Yes, he did. And are the BBT editors who continue to correct errors in Śrīla Prabhupāda's books acting under Śrīla Prabhupāda's instructions? Yes, they are.

Consider this, from a letter (9 January 1970) to one of Śrīla Prabhupāda's early editors, Satsvarūpa Dāsa, now Satsvarūpa Dāsa Gosvāmī:

We have to do things now very dexterously, simply we have to see that in our book there is no spelling or grammatical mistake. We do not mind for any good style, our style is Hare Kṛṣṇa, but, still, we should not present a shabby thing. Although Kṛṣṇa literatures are so nice that, even if they are presented in broken and irregular ways, such literatures are welcomed, read and respected by bona fide devotees.

However much a mess a book may be, if it glorifies Kṛṣṇa the bona fide devotees will accept it. But Śrīla Prabhupāda clearly and unequivocally instructed that his books should not have mistakes. "We should not present a shabby thing."

Whose responsibility is it to make sure that such mistakes do not appear? It is the responsibility of Śrīla Prabhupāda's editors and his publisher, the BBT.

Śrīla Prabhupāda instructed his editors to be vigilant against errors. He did not want his books to include mistakes due to editorial negligence. Nor did he want doubtful text simply pushed through.

In 1970, when Brahmānanda Dāsa was in charge of ISKCON Press (the forerunner of the BBT), Śrīla Prabhupāda would sometimes review final manuscripts or proofs for the *Kṛṣṇa* book. When on one occasion Śrīla Prabhupāda found an editorial error, he sent Brahmānanda this memorable instruction (17 April 1970):

In KRSNA chapter #87, on page 4, the last line, it is said, "known as budbuvasa, which is manifested by Govinda." I do not know what is this editing. The correct word is Bhurbhuvasah as it is in the Gayatri mantra and everybody knows it. This "budbuvasa" is an extraordinary word, neither it is Sanskrit nor English, so how it has avoided the vigilance of so many editors? So if none of the editors knew this word, why was it pushed? There should be no such negligences like this, nothing uncertain should be pushed. Now

what other discrepancies there may be like this? Or what is the use of such editing?
Everything must be done very carefully and attentively.

What other discrepancies might there have been? Śrīla Prabhupāda expected his editors to find them—and purge them.

The editors did so—but imperfectly, as Śrīla Prabhupāda later brought to the attention of Brahmānanda (on 2 June 1970):

In the present Kṛṣṇa book everything is done nice, but there are many mistakes, but on the whole the work is nice.

Śrīla Prabhupāda was pleased with the book, but he also noted the mistakes. He did not want errors. As Śrīla Prabhupāda had written to Brahmānanda earlier (10 December 69):

In every publication house all printing matters are edited at least three times. So we should be very much careful about grammatical and printing mistakes. That will mar the prestige of the press and the institution.

Six years later, Śrīla Prabhupāda reiterated the same message: The books should not have mistakes. When Rameśvara Dāsa was in charge of book publishing in Los Angeles, Śrīla Prabhupāda wrote to him (20 December 75):

I note that for the new printing of the abridged Gītā, Dai Nippon, there were mistakes. Why there should be mistakes? Mistakes makes the book useless. You must be very, very careful. It will be detrimental to the sales.

At the risk of overloading this paper with quotations, here's one more, from yet another letter to Brahmānanda (22 April 1970):

Regarding the Topmost Yoga, in the blueprint there are many mistakes. I am pointing out some of them as follows:

Page 2 “... decided to kill his sister.” not sisters, because only Devaki was there.

The Lord's compromise was that He had Vasudeva propose to the brother-in-law ...” This sentence is obscure. The actual fact is Vasudeva made a compromise and said to his brother-in-law, “such and such”.

Then everywhere there is yogins, gosvamins, sannyasins, etc. in many places. The “n” is not required—that I have already informed Pradyumna.

On page 17 there is a word “enfuriated”; this is a spelling mistake, it should be “infuriated”.

Then on page 48: “on the bank of the Ganges near Didbee”. This is not “Didbee”, it is “Delhi”.

On page 49 there are so many “gosvamins,” but there should be no “n.”

In this way I have read the book sporadically, not very minutely. I think it should be gone through once more very carefully and all the mistakes that are still existing there should be corrected. **If the books are printed with spelling mistakes and other mistakes, that will be a discredit for our publication. So please see that editorial work is done very nicely.** [emphasis supplied]

Śrīla Prabhupāda had read the book “sporadically.” But to read the book carefully, minutely, and correct all mistakes was a task he assigned to his editors.

And he not only assigned a one-time task, but clearly stated the principle involved: No mistakes. The editing must be done nicely.

It is this standard, stated by Śrīla Prabhupāda himself, that the BBT continues to uphold as the standard for every one of Śrīla Prabhupāda’s books.

Śrīla Prabhupāda’s Books in Translation

by Jayādvaita Swami

“Make it perfect. That is our philosophy.”

Since the BBT now publishes Śrīla Prabhupāda’s books in nearly ninety languages, you might be interested to know what Śrīla Prabhupāda said about the editing of his non-English books.

It is worth noting, perhaps, that the non-English books are translated from the English ones. If the English ones have errors, the non-English ones are likely to repeat them.

As with English, Śrīla Prabhupāda wanted his books published to a high standard in other languages too. As he wrote to Jaya Govinda Dāsa on 3 Feb 1970 concerning French and German:

... you must see that all work is thoroughly correct by mutual checking so that errors of spelling and grammar will not appear in the printing.

Nor should philosophical mistakes be allowed to appear. As Śrīla Prabhupāda

wrote to Tamāl Kṛṣṇa Gosvāmī and Gurudāsa (23 August 1971):

Regarding the Bengali translation by S. Ganguli, it is almost perfect; 90%. But 10% incorrect... He is a new man. Therefore there are little discrepancies with our thoughts. Besides that there are some mistakes in spelling as Sanskrit verses... . Even it is 99% all right, still that 1% must be corrected.

To Hamsadūta Dāsa (20 January 1972), Śrīla Prabhupāda gave the same message:

It is not that we may present anything crude translation and that is acceptable. No, even though the transcendental subject matter of Vedic literature is still spiritually potent despite the crudest translation, still, because we have got facility to make it perfect, that is our philosophy. When I translated Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam I had not the facility so you may notice grammatical discrepancies. But because Mandali Bhadra is now Head of the translating department you have got all facility to translate our books in perfect German language.

Both in English and in the other languages of the world, Śrīla Prabhupāda wanted his editors and publishers to make sure that BBT books would be philosophically faithful and grammatically and linguistically sound.

Editing: Whom Did Śrīla Prabhupāda Trust?

by Draviḍa Dāsa

The revisions for the Second Edition of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is* were done by Jayādvaita Swami. Jayādvaita Swami had served in Kṛṣṇa conscious book production for nearly ten years during Śrīla Prabhupāda’s physical presence. He served first as a typist (one of his early engagements was to retype the entire edited manuscript of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*). Later he served as a transcriber (he transcribed much of the *Kṛṣṇa* book). He then went on to typesetting, proofreading, and editing. He served as an editor for Śrīla Prabhupāda until Śrīla Prabhupāda’s very last days on earth.

Critics of the second edition of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is* are essentially criticizing Jayādvaita Swami. Implicitly or explicitly, they are saying he edited recklessly, heedlessly, without authority. Who does he think he is, to so arrogantly change Śrīla Prabhupāda’s words?

Yet while Śrīla Prabhupāda was physically present, “changing Śrīla Prabhupāda’s words”—that is, editing—was Jayādvaita Swami’s prescribed duty. Śrīla

Prabhupāda trusted him to do it well.

We know of no instance in which Śrīla Prabhupāda expressed anything other than confidence, pleasure, and satisfaction concerning Jayādvaita Swami’s editing.

Devāmṛta Swami remembers:

A year or so later [1976] I was the production manager of the BBT, as well as final copy editor. One day I noticed a pile of manuscript pages on my desk. They turned out to be a mass of *Bhāgavatam* revisions, for a corrected version of the entire First Canto. Jayādvaita had painstakingly gone through the whole canto and carefully compiled many editing changes for an upcoming reprint. Submitting the whole batch to Śrīla Prabhupāda, he expected, as did all of us, that Prabhupāda would personally comb through all the suggested revisions and accept or reject each one. After all, this was the *Bhāgavatam*, the lawbook for thousands of years to come. But Prabhupāda, after acknowledging the whole heap of revisions to his synonyms, translations, and purports, merely returned the mass. Accompanying it was a letter from him saying: “Concerning the editing of Jayādvaita Prabhu, whatever he does is approved by me. I have confidence in him.”

After Śrīla Prabhupāda left, Jayādvaita Swami simply continued his prescribed duty—finding and correcting errors, guarding against needless changes, and making sure that Śrīla Prabhupāda’s books came as close as possible to Śrīla Prabhupāda’s intended meaning and Śrīla Prabhupāda’s original words.

Did Śrīla Prabhupāda trust Jayādvaita Swami? See for yourself.

On 10 February 1970, Śrīla Prabhupāda wrote him:

It is very much encouraging to see you are a good and scrutinizing editor. May Krishna bless you.

In that same letter, in response to questions on how to handle some editing for *The Nectar of Devotion*, Śrīla Prabhupāda told him:

... do it at your best discretion as Kṛṣṇa will dictate from within you. I can rely on you.

Here is another remembrance from Devāmṛta Swami:

Śrīla Prabhupāda was touring the BBT in 1975, to turn up the heat in the famous book production marathon. He came into my office and I explained to him my service as copy editor—doing the final checks on type-composed copy. Next he walked into Jayādvaita dāsa *brahmacārī*’s office. Sitting down on the chaddar of his chief English editor, he declared, “Jayādvaita means *paramparā*.”

On 7 September 1976, Śrīla Prabhupāda sent Rādhāvallabha Dāsa this unequivocal endorsement of Jayādvaita Swami’s work:

Concerning the editing of Jayādvaita Prabhu, whatever he does is approved by me. I have confidence in him.

Even in the famous conversation about “rascal editors,” in which Śrīla Prabhupāda blasted BBT editors and managers for making whimsical changes in his books, Jayādvaīta Swami emerged not only unscathed, but even endorsed by Śrīla Prabhupāda as a suitable person to guard editorial integrity.

In that conversation, in Vṛndāvana on 22 June 1977, Yaśodānandana Swami said to Śrīla Prabhupāda:

They [the BBT editors] were trying to make better English, but sometimes, to make better English, I think they were making philosophical mistakes also. There is no so much need of making so much better English. Your English is sufficient. It is very clear, very simple. We have caught over 125 changes. They’re changing so many things. We are wondering if this is necessary. I will show you today. I have kept the book.

In the course of the discussion, in which Śrīla Prabhupāda blasts “rascal editors” left and right, Tamāl Krishna Goswami mentions:

Your original work that you’re doing now, that is edited by Jayādvaīta. That’s the first editing.

And Śrīla Prabhupāda replies:

He is good.

Svarūpa Dāmodara Dāsa (now Swami) was also taking part in the discussion, and at one point Tamāl Krishna Goswami repeats a suggestion from Svarūpa Dāmodara that Śrīla Prabhupāda’s books be checked and, if need be, revised before being reprinted. Tamāl Krishna Goswami says:

I think Svarūpa Dāmodara’s point, that all the books should now be checked before they’re reprinted again... . And they have to be checked not by some so-called learned Sanskrit man but by a learned devotee. Just like you always favored Jayādvaīta because his Kṛṣṇa consciousness...

And Śrīla Prabhupāda responds approvingly:

Jayādvaīta, Satsvarūpa...

To shoot down Jayādvaīta Swami, critics would have to argue, we suppose, that he *used to be* good but sometime after Śrīla Prabhupāda’s departure went bad.

Yet they have little to argue from. Since Śrīla Prabhupāda’s departure, Jayādvaīta Swami has taken part in no philosophical heresies (and has spoken out against several), he has maintained his spiritual vows, he has served Śrīla Prabhupāda steadily. He has simply continued his prescribed duties.

Which leaves perhaps only one argument left:

We know he’s gone bad, because he changed the *Gītā*.

And what’s wrong with the *Gītā*?

It’s bad, because it was changed by Jayādvaita Swami.

The famous “circular argument”:

A is so because of B.

B is so because of A.

Then what are we left with? This:

Critics: You can’t trust Jayādvaita Swami

Śrīla Prabhupāda: I have confidence in him.

Critics: Jayādvaita Swami is unreliable.

Śrīla Prabhupāda [to Jayādvaita Swami]: Kṛṣṇa will dictate from within you. I can rely on you.

Critics: Jayādvaita Swami is bad.

Śrīla Prabhupāda: He is good.

Critics: His editing is unauthorized.

Śrīla Prabhupāda: Whatever he does is approved by me.

So you have a choice. You can listen to the critics, who supposedly “speak for Prabhupāda.” Or you can listen to Śrīla Prabhupāda himself. Most likely you’ll find this an easy choice.

And what about the other active BBT English editor, Draviḍa Dāsa?

Śrīla Prabhupāda had confidence in Jayādvaita Swami, and Jayādvaita Swami has full confidence in Draviḍa.

Others may choose to trust neither. May they read the old editions—errors and all—and be happy.

The Revision of Bhagavad-gītā As It Is: Answers to a Courteous Inquiry

In 1986, an outspoken critic in West Virginia who was later found utterly deviated from Śrīla Prabhupāda’s teachings was leading a propaganda campaign against the second edition of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*. Having heard these criticisms, Śrīman Amogha Līlā Dāsa Adhikārī, a disciple of Śrīla Prabhupāda’s, took an action entirely befitting an intelligent Vaiṣṇava gentleman: He expressed his doubts in a courteous letter of inquiry to the editor, Jayādvaita Swami. The letter Jayādvaita Swami wrote in response to Amogha Līlā Prabhu should be of interest to anyone with similar questions. It appears below, verbatim.

His Grace Śrīmān Amogha Līlā Dāsa
188 New Chetty Street
Colombo 13, Śrī Lanka
ISKCON Padayatra
Sankirtan Bhavan
P.O. Jhusi
Allahabad 221 506, U.P.
India

[July 1986]

Dear Amogha Līlā Prabhu,

Please accept my most humble obeisances. All glories to Śrīla Prabhupāda.

I am in due receipt of your letter, dispatched June 21, and have noted the contents carefully.

You’ve heard strongly expressed objections to the second edition of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*, and you’ve written to me because you want to investigate the matter more fully.

I’ve been silent about this, so as not to overindulge in the animalistic propensity of defending. But since you’ve raised good questions, it’s my duty to answer.

First: To my knowledge, Śrīla Prabhupāda never asked us to re-edit the book.

As you know, and as we kept in mind while doing the work, Śrīla Prabhupāda staunchly opposed needless changes.

You write that Kirtanananda Maharaja told you I regretted having done the editing and that if I’d known of his feelings or read his paper commenting on the work I wouldn’t have done it at all.

This is a misunderstanding. What I regret is that I didn't have the benefit of Kirtanananda Maharaja's comments while the work was still going on, long before the book was published.

In fact, a full year before the book went to press, I sent Kirtanananda Maharaja a letter telling exactly what I was doing and why [see Appendix B, page 30]. I included a copy of every change I had made in the translations. And I earnestly asked for any comments, questions, or suggestions he might have. To save us from exactly the kind of controversy he has now raised, the letter pleaded that doubts be voiced then, while time was ample and the work was still on our desks.

I sent the same letter not only to Kirtanananda Maharaja but also to every other member of the GBC, most English-speaking ISKCON sannyasis, various other senior ISKCON devotees, and every ISKCON temple president in the English-speaking world.

What I regret, therefore, is that those who now speak out were silent when their wisdom was sought. I do *not*, however, regret undertaking the task of revision, and now I shall tell you why.

As mentioned in the "Note about the Second Edition" that appears in the book, the editors of the first edition are to be praised. They did a fine job of making a tough manuscript ready to print.

They also, however, made lots of omissions, goofs, and blunders, which I see no need to immortalize in print.

I suppose that what disturbs some devotees most is the changes in the translations. As you know, Śrīla Prabhupāda considered the translations less important, and so do I. For me the more important revisions, therefore, are the ones in the purports. Of these there are easily several hundred.

To answer your letter, I spent an hour or so going through the book to pull out some samples for you. To examine them you should have before you a copy of both editions—the old one and the new [or refer to Appendix F, page 46]. To look at the samples carefully may take you a couple of hours. But it's the best way I know to answer your questions, and I'm sure you'll find your time well spent.

Here goes.

There are different categories of corrections.

1. SIMPLE BOO-BOO'S

For example, simple obvious spelling errors. Who would be willing to insist that the reference to the province of "Behar" (old edition, page 185) should not be changed to "Bihar"?

Chapter 16, verses 1–3, purport. Read the first line of the last paragraph in the old edition. Despite what the purport says, the transcendental qualities add up to 26, not 16. Someone typed a “1” instead of a “2,” so the count is off by 10.

2. MISSING EVIDENCE

Here’s something more serious. In the old edition, dozens and dozens of Śrīla Prabhupāda’s Sanskrit quotations—Vedic evidence, *sastra-pramana*—have simply been edited out.

In the Introduction of the new edition, for example, here are some of the quotations you’ll find restored:

pg. 8: *mayadhyaksena prakrti*, etc.

pg. 12: *muktir hitva anyatha rupam*, etc.

pg. 14: *parasya saktir vividhaiva sruyate*

pg. 17: *yad gatva na nivartante*, etc.

pg. 26: *visnu-sakti para prokta*, etc.

pg. 28: *kirtaniyah sada harih*

pg. 30: *tad vijnanartham*, etc.

These are Śrīla Prabhupāda’s words. The Introduction is still available on tape, and you can hear them for yourself.

And if you want something bigger, how about this: The old edition, on page 27, adds a verse Śrīla Prabhupāda didn’t speak (*nehabhikrama-naso ‘sti*) and then leaves out every one of the renowned verses from the *Gītā-mahatmya* with which Śrīla Prabhupāda’s original Introduction concludes.

I’m not even slightly sorry that these verses have now been restored.

Throughout the new edition the editors have restored dozens and dozens of Sanskrit quotations, large and small, the old edition simply scratched out.

For a few more examples, you can look at the purports to the following verses: 2.43, 2.56 (two quotations), 2.63, 9.4, 9.6 (three quotations), 9.7, 9.9, 9.11 (new edition, pg. 469—three quotations), 9.12, 10.15, 11.43 (three quotations). In 11.54, no fewer than eight quotations have been restored.

And there are dozens and dozens more. The verses you now see are not editorial speculations, guesses, helpful additions or any other such nonsense. They are the very words of our *acarya*, jumbled by typists and scratched out by editors in the 1960’s, now restored to their place in Śrīla Prabhupāda’s book.

3. POINTS WITHOUT PINS

Here’s another, related sort of omission. Sometimes when Śrīla Prabhupāda

comments on a Sanskrit word, the editors have kept the comments but edited out the word. For example see the references to *avasam* (9.8) and *udāsīna-vat* (9.9). Or, at the end of the purport to 13.12: “The beginning of knowledge, therefore, is *amanitva*, humility.” To me, these references add immensely to the value of Śrīla Prabhupāda’s purports. With these references, we can clearly see how Śrīla Prabhupāda’s comments directly illuminate specific words of the verse. And, again, these are not editorial whimsies— they’re Śrīla Prabhupāda’s original words.

4. GLOSSES TOTALLY LOST

Sometimes Śrīla Prabhupāda’s comments on a word are *entirely* left out. For example, see his comments on the word *na* (11.54) and *tad-arthiyam* (17.27). And these are but examples—there are more.

5. SANSKRIT SLIPS

Sometimes the Sanskrit editors just goofed.

Example: In 7.18, the Sanskrit quoted in the purport doesn’t match the English translation that follows it. Why? Because the Sanskrit editor supplied the wrong Sanskrit verse. (If you check in Ninth Canto, you’ll see for yourself.) The new edition has it right.

7.25. A tired typist or sleepy English editor may have helped screw this one up. The prayer the old edition attributes to Queen Kunti was never spoken by Kunti at all. It’s from the *Isopanisad*! The new edition follows the original manuscript and sets things right.

9.29. The Sanskrit editor guessed which verse to put in—and guessed wrong. The correction is obvious.

10.4–5. Is *bhayam* (old edition, pg. 498) really the word for “fearlessness”?

13.15. *Sarvatah pani-padam* is not from the *Svetasvatara Upanisad* at all. It’s from the previous verse of the *Gītā*. When the mistake is corrected, you get the brilliant Bhaktivedanta purport of the famous, often misused verse *apani-pado javano grahita*.

6. MANGLED MEANINGS

Sometimes the inexperienced editors just misunderstood the meaning of a Sanskrit verse.

Example (a small one). 5.2. Aside from being a pretty tough sentence to read, the old editing of Śrīla Rupa Gosvami’s verse scrambles the meaning. The verse doesn’t mean that things related to Kṛṣṇa, “though they are material,” should not be renounced. The point is that because they’re related to Kṛṣṇa, they’re not material at all. *That’s* why giving them up, as the Mayavadis do, is dry

renunciation.

7. GENERAL BLUNDERS

Then there's what you might call good old-fashioned screw-ups.

2.1. Have you ever had to explain the last sentence of this purport? “This realization is made possible by working with the fruitive being situated in the fixed conception of the self.” It's just an editorial mistake, and it doesn't make a damn bit of sense.

2.43. In the last paragraph, what are the “four monthly penances”? It should be “four-month penances” (*caturmasya*).

3.35. In the old edition, look at the second sentence of the purport. How often we've heard devotees insist that their prescribed duties must “complement their psychophysical condition.” That may be a good idea. But look in the new book and see what Śrīla Prabhupāda actually said.

7.15. The old purport (bottom of page 383) talks about “the swine who eat the soil.” I always thought that strange. Do hogs really eat soil? What the original text says is “the hogs who eat the *night* soil.” But some editor put a question mark next to “night,” and out it went. What in the world is “night soil”?

Śrīla Prabhupāda knew—it's a polite name for that good old stuff we all know hogs love to eat.

7.15. Two sentences later, a typist has left out a line. If you want to find out what Śrīla Prabhupāda said the foolish worker will untiringly continue to hear of, you have to look in the new edition.

10.27. They once took a “sea journey.” Hardly. Our old friend Neal the typist, the college kid who walked into 26 Second Avenue and volunteered to type, simply heard things wrong. It was “sea churning.” But back in the old days in the storefront, no one knew the real story.

10.29. A “planet of trees”? Fa-aar out! But if the Swami says so, it must be right. Sorry, boys. Śrīla Prabhupāda never said so. It's Neal the typist again. It's a planet of ancestors (*pitās*), or *pitrs* (pronounced “pi-trees”).

10.35. Where has the Lord “already explained” that the *Sama-veda* is “rich with beautiful songs”? Ask Neal the typist. Or else look in the new book and read things right.

13.2. In the old edition (page 621) you'll read “Sometimes we understand that I am happy, I am mad, I am a woman, I am a dog, I am a cat; these are the knowers.” This is straight-out nonsense. It's not right, it's not sacred, and it's not the words of my spiritual master.

15.2. Is the old second paragraph of this purport supposed to stay screwed up and incomprehensible forever?

18.31–32. Back in the 60’s, the editors somehow changed the word “ignorance” to “passion” and put the purport in the wrong place. Should it stay there?

8. TOO HELPFUL

It’s the job of the editor to try to help the reader. But sometimes an editor can be too helpful.

Example: 5.28. In the old second paragraph you’ll find a reference to the *pratyahara* (breathing) process.” On the manuscript you can clearly see that the editor, for the benefit of readers new to *yoga*, has penned in the parenthetical word “breathing.” But *pratyahara* is not the breathing process at all—it’s the process of withdrawing the senses from their objects. The breathing process is *pranayama*. Should this goof be granted sanctity merely for its presence on the page?

15.2. “The Gandharvas (fairies).” The editor is being helpful again. But is Narada Muni really a “fairy”?

9. THE RED-PENNED PURPORT

When our editors back in the 60’s came to a passage too hard for them to figure out, they did what was expedient—crossed it out and kept going. Sometimes it was just a few words, sometimes a sentence or a few sentences, sometimes a whole paragraph.

Sometimes, while trying to prune a paragraph, they cut off valuable fruits and flowers. Sometimes they seem to have thought that Śrīla Prabhupāda was being too heavy. Or sometimes a passage just got inadvertently left out.

Examples:

8.11. The old edition loses the first two sentences of the purport.

8.6, 8.13, 8.14, 8.19. When Śrīla Prabhupāda spoke the whole *mahamantra*, the typist often just typed some shortcut, like “HK etc.” The new edition restores the full mantra: Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare/ Hare Rama, Hare Rama, Rama Rama, Hare Hare. Just see how in this chapter—”Attaining the Supreme”—Śrīla Prabhupāda repeatedly emphasizes the chanting of these 16 holy names.

8.28. In the new edition, start reading on page 445, from “The words *idam viditva...*” and go on till the purport ends. Just see all that has been restored. And appreciate, especially, Śrīla Prabhupāda’s beautiful exposition of how Kṛṣṇa consciousness grows, from *sraddha* up to *prema*.

9.26. The first edition loses the whole first paragraph.

11.52. In the new edition, page 599, on the last few lines of the page, the fool who offers respect only to the impersonal “something” within Kṛṣṇa finally gets what he deserves—Śrīla Prabhupāda’s boot in his face.

13.5. Śrīla Prabhupāda’s gloss on *chandobhih* has returned to the page, the next paragraph now makes proper sense, and the last paragraph has been recovered.

13.19. Two whole paragraphs lost! For me, Śrīla Prabhupāda’s summary of verses 6 through 18 opened up a new understanding of a chapter that had long perplexed me.

16.7. The history of religious editing is not without its humor. Śrīla Prabhupāda’s manuscript clearly says, “One should always be careful to keep his body clean by bathing, brushing teeth, shaving, changing clothes, etc.”

But back in the 60’s, we kept our beards—and trimmed off the word shaving.

You’ve now had a glimpse of the hundreds of omissions and mistakes in the first edition of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*. Should what was lost have stayed permanently lost? Should what was screwed up in the 1960’s have stayed screwed up forever? I leave it to you to decide.

One final point. The first edition of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is* not only preserved errors and omissions but actually *multiplied* them when the book was translated into other languages. What does a translator do with something like “the fruitive being situated in the fixed conception of the self”? A translator faced with a passage that seems wrong or doesn’t make sense does just what the English editors did in the 1960’s—he leaves it contradictory or confusing, he guesses and speculates, or he scratches it out.

If you’d like any more information about the second edition of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*, please feel free to ask.

I’m grateful you’ve taken the care to inquire.

Since both Sridhara Maharaja in Bombay and Ravindra Svarupa Prabhu have asked me for similar information, I’m sending copies of this letter to them.

Mail can reach me here at Jhusi up to September 25. Then I’ll go to Bombay to renew my visa. Padayatra will be starting by then, and our mailing address will be c/o ISKCON Delhi.

Hoping this finds you in good health and a joyful mood,

Your servant,

Jayadvaita Swami

Ongoing Vigilance

What to do if you see editorial errors in Śrīla Prabhupāda’s books

Although the BBT strives to make its books as “clean” as possible, alert readers continue to find genuine editorial errors in BBT books. In particular, BBT translators, who minutely scrutinize the English books, often uncover mistakes.

For example:

In the word meanings for *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* 5.14.28 (on line 4) we find: “*upagūḍhaḥ*—being deeply embarrassed.”

But in the purport (5 lines up) we read: “The word *bhuja-latā-upagūḍha*, meaning—embraced by beautiful arms which are compared to creepers,…”

What happened? It’s a clear and simple error: “embarrassed” should be “embraced.”

Another example:

The Eleventh Chapter of *Teachings of Lord Caitanya* mentions “the Sind province in Siberia.”

Here, once again, a transcriber misheard a word. “Siberia” should be “Sauvira.”

The main BBT English editor, Draviḍa Dāsa, keeps a file of such reported errors, book by book. When books are reprinted, he sees to it that confirmed errors are corrected.

On COM, the BBT e-mail system, a conference called “(BBT) Errors (in) English Books” provides a place where readers can report suspected errors. To report a suspected error, please write to that conference. The e-mail address is errors.english.books@com.bbt.se.

Alternatively, you can report your error by mail or fax:

Draviḍa dāsa

1380 Garnet Avenue

Suite E-270

San Diego, CA 92109

Your report will receive diligent editorial attention.

An Editorial Quiz

In the spirit of good fun, you might enjoy taking this quiz. The questions all come from the first edition of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*.

1. Please explain the meaning of “This realization is made possible by working with the fruitive being situated in the fixed conception of the self.” (2.1, purport)
2. What is the scriptural source for the prayer by Queen Kuntī quoted in the purport to 7.25?
3. What are the “four monthly penances”? (Bg. 2.43, purport)
4. Where is the planet of the trees? (10.29, purport)
5. Where has the Lord “already explained” that the *Sāma-veda* is “rich with beautiful songs”? (10.35, purport)
6. What does the purport to 10.22 have to do with the translation?
7. Please explain why Śrīla Prabhupāda refers to *pratyāhāra* as the “breathing” process. (5.28, purport)

ANSWERS:

1. Forget it. The sentence is meaningless.
 2. Forget it. There’s no such prayer. The verse is from *Śrī Īsopaniṣad*.
 3. The “four monthly penances”? There are no such penances. What was intended were the “four-month penances” (*cāturmāsya*).
 4. If you find it, let us know. There are some people we’d like to send there.
 5. Forget it. The answer is: Nowhere.
 6. Nothing. At least not in this edition.
 7. He didn’t. Some editor penned in the wrong word.
- To see the right versions for all the texts mentioned in this quiz, please read the second edition of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is* or turn to Appendix G, page 67.

Appendix A

A Brief History of the Second Edition of Bhagavad-gītā As It Is

Circa 1980–1982: Preparation

Gopīparāṇadhana Prabhu suggested revisions for the Sanskrit. Jayādvaita Swami revised the English text and confirmed the Sanskrit revisions. Apart from meeting many times with Gopīparāṇadhana Prabhu, he also conferred about the translations with Garuḍa Prabhu, Ravīndra Svarūpa Prabhu, and others.

1982: GBC review

The GBC appointed a board of devotees to review the final revisions to the translations. The board included Satsvarūpa Dāsa Goswami, Hari Śauri Dāsa, and other leaders. The board met for several days in Detroit and refined or approved changes.

1982: Consultation with ISKCON leaders

Jayādvaita Swami widely distributed to ISKCON leaders a full list of the proposed changes to the translations, along with a letter asking for comments.

1983: Second Edition published.

1985: ISKCON GBC reaffirmed its endorsement of the Second Edition.

Appendix B

Consultation with the Leaders of ISKCON

The Second Edition of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is* was published after extensive consultation with the leading Vaiṣṇavas of ISKCON. Long before the book was published, Jayādvaita Swami sent the following letter to all the members of the GBC, most English-speaking ISKCON *sannyāsīs*, various other senior ISKCON devotees, and every ISKCON temple president in the English-speaking world. Along with the letter, he included a list of all the proposed changes for the translations of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*.

Bhagavad-gītā As It Is Second Edition Date: 10/25/1982

From: Jayadvaita Swami

To: Senior ISKCON Devotees

ALL GLORIES TO SRI GURU & GAURANGA

krsnas tu bhagavan svayam

Dear Prabhus,

Please accept my most humble obeisances. All glories to Śrīla Prabhupāda! Everyone wants to know, “When will the new unabridged *Gītā* be coming out?” According to the latest I’ve heard, the BBT plans to begin work on the new *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is* right after Gaura Purnima. The book itself should be available for distribution several months later. I’ve finished revising the purports. The revisions clear up various mistakes and mysteries. (For example, you’ll finally see the last sentence this way in the purport to 2.1: “This realization is made possible when one works without attachment to fruitive results and is situated in the fixed conception of the real self.”)

You’ll also find lots of new material retrieved from the original manuscript, including numerous Sanskrit quotations and even entire paragraphs formerly left out. The Sanskrit department has also carefully gone over the synonyms. (So, for example, the synonym for *asat* in 17.28 will at last say “false” instead of “falls.”)

And finally the translations. In one sense, the translations are the least important part of the book. Other scholars had already translated the *Gītā* before Śrīla Prabhupāda. (Dr. Radhakrishnan’s translation, Śrīla Prabhupāda said, was basically all right.) And Śrīla Prabhupāda always said that the most important thing was his purports. (He even told the original editor for *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is* that he could have some freedom in editing the translations—to convey a poetic flavor—but warned that he should be careful not to make needless changes in his “personal ecstasies,” his purports.)

On the other hand, in some ways the translations are far more prominent. For each verse, those one or two sentences stand out alone, inviting scrutiny. They give us our English version of Kṛṣṇa’s original words. And of course many devotees memorize these translations verbatim. Changes made to the translations stand out. So I want to be especially cautious in making them.

Specifically, I want the senior devotees in ISKCON to have a chance to examine all the changes before the book comes out. I want you to see the changes, to understand what’s behind them, to have a chance to raise questions or make suggestions about them—and, finally, to satisfy yourself that the changes are prudent, legitimate, and worthwhile.

So here they are—all the changes I have proposed for the translations in the new edition.

Some of them, you'll see, are quite small—a matter of a comma, a colon, or a semicolon. Others are major. And all of them are here.

For most of the revisions, I've given only those portions of the verse where the changes occur. This lets you spot the changes quickly. (But you have to compare these sheets to the book itself to see how the revised verse reads.)

Now, you have a right to ask, How and why were these changes made? First of all, why?

Several reasons: Sometimes (most often) to make the text more faithful to what Śrīla Prabhupāda originally said. Sometimes to make it closer to the Sanskrit (coming closer to Śrīla Prabhupāda's original manuscript often made this happen automatically). And sometimes it was merely a question of grammar.

How did we go about the work?

I went through every page of the oldest manuscript we have. (For the first five or six chapters these are Śrīla Prabhupāda's original typed pages, for the middle chapters they're the original transcripts of his tapes, and for the last chapters they're the old retyped manuscripts from which the present book was edited.)

Comparing each verse in the book with the text of the manuscript, I made only those changes that to me seemed worthwhile. I tried to be conservative and not make needless changes. At the same time, I kept in mind that whatever changes we are to make we should make now, so that the book will never need to be revised again.

Gopiparanadhana Prabhu of the BBT Sanskrit Department also carefully examined each verse and made his suggestions, which I consulted throughout.

Whenever difficult questions arose, Gopiparanadhana and I met to consider them, and we consulted the original books Śrīla Prabhupāda consulted when he wrote *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*—the Bengali translations and commentaries by Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura and Śrīla Baladeva Vidyabhusana.

To give you further insight into the reasons for some of the changes we made, here are some examples.

First, here are some of the verses I revised to make them closer to Śrīla Prabhupāda's original manuscript: 2.1–7, 2.13, 2.16, 2.20, 2.24, 2.26–27, 2.34, 2.45–46, 2.48–49, 2.51, 2.55, 2.65–66, 3.1, 3.5, 3.7, 3.10–12, 3.16–17, 3.23–24, 3.30, 3.32, 3.34, 4.15, 4.35, 5.24, 7.29–30. And many others.

In some of the later chapters (especially 17 and 18), the abridged edition gives translations closer to the original manuscript than the unabridged does. So I've preferred those translations from the abridged edition.

As you examine the translations, keep in mind that in some places I have also revised the synonyms or purport, or both. (For example, 9.6. The revised version more closely follows the original manuscript. And note, in the purport, that "Space is not beyond the sky" is nonsense.)

For some verses we added extra words or sentences to translate Sanskrit words left untranslated in the original manuscript. (This is something Śrīla Prabhupāda, while present, approved of our doing routinely on *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*.)

For example:

1.35 *nihatya dhartarastran nah ka pritiḥ syaj janardana* — "O Janardana, what pleasure will we derive from killing the sons of Dhrtarastra?"

7.6 *etad yonini bhutani sarvanity upadharaya* — "All created beings have their source in these two natures."

9.34 *bhava mad bhaktah* — "Become My devotee." (!)

18.54 *prasannatma* — "He becomes fully joyful."

For some verses, the original editor (new at the job and with no access to a Sanskrit department) misunderstood what Śrīla Prabhupāda intended to say. When unsure which way to go, the editor sometimes made a wrong turn.

For example:

1.4 (Yuyudhana and the others are the great fighters equal to Bhima and Arjuna.)

1.18 (The son of Subhadra was "great-armed," not "greatly armed.")

4.26-30 (I had never been able to figure out these verses. Have they ever been clear to you?)

10.12-13 (The editor tried his best to make the translation fit the Sanskrit—but without knowing Sanskrit.)

In Chapter 11, the manuscripts were difficult to understand. Without knowing Sanskrit, the editor had a hard time figuring out the translations and matching them to the synonyms. So this chapter has the most extensive revisions.

Sometimes (very cautiously) we changed the text on the grounds of the Sanskrit alone. (This helps considerably when you try to study the translation with the synonyms.)

Examples:

2.1 (The revised translation loses no meaning, and it clears up the puzzle in the synonyms.)

15.14 (Again, the English wasn't clear but the Sanskrit is: It's the fire, not the air, that digests food.)

Sometimes the person who transcribed the tape heard things wrong or scrambled things. For example:

10.12 (There's no "all-pervading beauty" here. Perhaps what the typist heard was *vibhum*.)

11.5 (There's no "sea" in this verse. Only *pasya* —"Just see!")

14.17 (What comes from passion, Kṛṣṇa says here, is not grief but greed.)

Some verses had problems in grammar (like 2.17, 2.22 & 4.3). And here's something really strange:

In the original manuscript, Chapter 8 text 18 was missing. So the Sanskrit editor supplied the synonyms. But the English editor thought that the translation and purport he saw for text 19 belonged to text 18.

So he put them for text 18 and put in a new translation for 19. (So all this time, our book has had the translation and purport for text 19 in the wrong place, we've had two translations for text 19, and text 18 had been missing!)

In summary:

Now you have some background for the revisions you now hold in your hands. A GBC committee has reviewed the translations, and the whole GBC will have a chance to consider them one last time in March before the book goes to press.

Please examine these revisions carefully. And if you feel you want to say something about them—if you have any questions, suggestions or opinions about any or all of them—please get in touch with me, through the mail or in person, at my address in Philadelphia. (Even if I'm traveling, you can get in touch with me through the BTG offices in Philly.)

This new *Gītā* (along with its translations in other languages) will be the main book our

movement will be preaching from for whatever time we have left in this *yuga*.

Now is the time to make sure we are presenting Śrīla Prabhupāda's *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is* in the most authoritative & fully satisfying way.

And I invite you now to contribute whatever thoughts you have on this work.

Hare Kṛṣṇa.

Hoping this finds you in good health.

Your servant,

Jayadvaita Swami

Appendix C

Endorsement by the ISKCON GBC

In the following resolution (28 February 1985), the Second Edition of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is* is endorsed by the ISKCON GBC:

10. The unabridged, complete edition of the *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is* published by the North American BBT is the most authentic edition closest to Śrīla Prabhupāda's original.

Appendix D

Sample Pages from the Original Manuscript of Bhagavad-gītā As It Is

Here is a sample page of the original manuscript of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is* (7.24-25). It gives you an idea of what the editors had to work with. Spaces in the original that indicated omitted material are shown by _____.

TEXT 24

_____ non manifested _____ personality _____ achieve _____ they think _____ unto
me _____ less intelligent persons _____ Suprme _____ distance _____ without knowing
_____ My _____ imperishable _____ the finest

TRANSLATION

The less intelligent impersonalist they also do not know Me Perfectly and they think me myself, the Sup. Per. of God. Krishna I was impersonal before and now I have assumed the personality. This conclusion is due to their poor fund of knowledge.

PURPORT

Those who are worshippers of demigods, they have been described as the less intelligent persons so not only the worshippers of the demigods are less intelligent, but even the impersonalists who do not believe in the personal existence of the Sup. Lord, they are also less intelligent. Lord K. in His personal form He is speaking before Arjuna and still due to their poor fund of knowledge they will argue that the Sup. Lord has no form ultimately. _____ a great devotee of the Lord known as _____ in the disciplic succession from Ramaacharya he has recited two very nice verses in this connection _____ He says my dear Lord, personalities and devotees like Vas. and Narada they know about You and your Per. of God. by understanding different Ved. Lit. your characteristics, Your Form and your activities, all these they can know and understand that you are the Sup. Per. of God. but those who are in the modes of passion and ignorance they are called asuras or the non-devotees. Such non-devotees cannot understand you. They are unable to understand you. These non-devotees no matter how expert they may be in the matter of discussing Vedanta and Upanishads and other Ved. Lit., it is not possible for them to understand the Per. of God. In the *Brahma Sūtra*? _____ it is stated that the Per. of God. is not understood simply by studying the Ved. Lit. Only by the mercy of the Sup. Lord can the Per. of Sup. be known. Therefore in this verse of B.G. it is clearly stated that not only the worshippers of other demigods they are less intelligent but those who are not my devotee but are engaged in study of Vedanta and other Ved. Lit. Without any tinge of K.C. they are also less intelligent and for them it is not possible to

understand my personal nature. Such less intelligent persons who are under the impression that the Absolute Truth is impersonal they are described as _____ which means one who does not know actually the ultimate feature of the absolute truth. In the S.B. it is stated that the Supreme realization begins from the impersonal Brahman then rises up to the localized supersoul; but the ultimate last word in the absolute truth is the Per. of God.

_____ Modern impersonalists they are still less intelligent even they do not follow Snaka acharya who has admitted that Lord Sri Krishna is the Sup. Per. of God. He has specifically mentioned that K. the Sup. of Per. of God., _____ impersonalists therefore without knowing the Dup. Truth they think K. as the son of _____ and _____ or a prince or that K. is some powerful living entity. This sort of idea is also condemned in the B.G. in the verse _____ only the fools, they regard me as an ordinary person. The thing is that nobody can understand K. without being in devotional service and without developing K.C. The Bhagavat confirms that

Nobody can understand the Sup. Per. of God. K. or his Form, Quality, or Name simply by mental speculation or by discussing Ved; lit. One can understand Him simply in devotional service. _____ When one is fully engaged in K.C. beginning by chanting Hare Krishna etc. it is then and there only that they can understand the Sup. Per. of God. Nondevotees and impersonalists think of K. of having the body of this material nature and all his activities and His Form and everything they are all maya. The impersonalists are known as _____. They do not know the ultimate truth.

Of the statement in the beginning of the 20th verse it is clearly stated _____ those who are blind by their lusty desires they surrender unto the different demigods. It is accepted that there are different demis. besides the Sup. Per. of God. The 23rd verse the same demigods they have got their different planets and the Lord has also got a different planet. It is stated _____ The worshippers of the demis. they go to the different planets of the demis. and those who are devotees of the Lord, K., they go to the K. loka planet. It is clearly stated and still the foolish impersonalists will say that the Lord is formless and that these forms are imposition. Does it from the study of the B.G. it appears that the demis. mentioned and their places mentioned herein, are they impersonal? At least we do not think that they are impersonal. Neither are the demis. are impersonal neither is K. S.P.G. is impersonal. They are all persons only the difference is that Lord K. is the Sup. per. of God. and He has got his own planets as the other demis. have got theirs. Therefore the monist contention that the ultimate truth is formless and that the form is something imposed. It is not imposed. It is clearly stated here. Impersonalists say that all forms of God they are different impositions of forms from the ultimate reality which is impersonal, but the B.G. we can clearly understand that the forms of the demis. and the form of the Sup. Lord they are simultaneously existing and the difference is that the Lord is _____. The Sup. Lord is K. and His form is Eternal Blissful Knowledge. The Vedas confirm that the Sup. Absolute truth is _____ or that it is blissful pleasure and He is _____ and He is the reservoir of unlimited auspicious qualities. And in the B.G. the Lord says _____ although He is unborn still He appears. These are the things that we can understand from the B.G. We cannot understand how the SPG can be impersonal so the imposition theory of the impersonal monist is at least useless so far the statement of

the B.G. is concerned. It is clear herewith that the Sup. Absol. Truth is Personality of Godhead, Krishna.

TEXT 25

**_____ neither _____ I _____ manifest _____ to everyone _____ eternal potency
_____ covered _____ foolish _____ this _____ now _____ do not _____ can
understand _____ such less intelligent persons _____ me _____ unborn
_____ inexhaustible**

TRANSLATION

I am never manifest to the foolish and less intelligent impersonalists because for them I am covered by my eternal potency and therefore and they do not know that I am unborn and infallible

PURPORT

It may be argued that when K. was present on this earth, He was visible to everyone than how it can be said that He is not manifest to everyone? But actually He is not manifest to everyone. When K. was present there were only a few number of persons who could understand him that He is the SPG. Even in the assembly of _____ when _____ spoke against K. being elected the president of the assembly V _____ supported him that He is SPG. Similarly, _____ of the Pandava and few others knew that He was the SUPG. But not others. He was covered to the nondevotees and to the common man therefore in the B.G. you will see that the Pup. Lord says that _____ except His pure devotees all of them considered Him to be a common man like themselves. He was manifest to His devotees only as the reservoir of all pleasure. But to others as well as to the less intelligent nondevotees He was covered by the Eternal potency of the Sup. Lord. The prayer of Kunti in the S.B. it is said _____ that the Lord is covered by the curtain of (yogamaya) and so ordinary people they cannot understand. This yogamaya curtain is also confirmed in the _____ in the 15th it is said like this _____ In this mantra the devotee prays, O my Lord you are the maintainer of the entire universe and your devotional service is the highest form of religious principle. Therefore I pray that you will also maintain me, your transcendental form is covered by the yogamaya. The Brahmajoti is considered as the covering of the internal potency therefore the devotee prays that You may kindly remove this glowing effulgence that the impediment of my seeing you may not be there and I can see your _____ Eternal Form, Eternal Blissful and Knowledge form. The SPG in His transcendental form of Bliss and knowledge is covered by the eternal potency of Brahmajoti and the less intelligent impersonalists they cannot see the SPG on this account. In the S.B. it is prayed by Brahma in the 10th canto 14th chapter. He prays like this: O the SPG, O the superior, O the master of all mystery, who can calculate the potency and your pastimes in this world? You are always situated by expanding your eternal potency so that nobody can understand you. The learned scientists or the learned scholars they can examine the atomic constitution of the material world or even the planets but still they are unable to calculate Your energy and your potentiality although

/Yuo are present before them. The words _____ is very significant in t is verse. The SPG Lord K. is not only unborn but He is _____ inexhaustble. His eternal form bliss knowledge they are all inexhaustible.

Appendix F

Texts to Compare

Jayādvaīta Swami’s letter to Amogha Līlā Prabhu points out many examples illustrating the need for the Second Edition of *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*. Here you’ll find the passages the letter refers to. For each passage, the First Edition (“old”) and the Second Edition (“new”) are presented consecutively.

3.20 (p 185 old, 3 lines down): Being a great devotee of the Lord, he was transcendently situated, but because he was the king of Mithilā (a subdivision of Behar province in India), he had to teach his subjects how to perform prescribed duties.

3.20 (p. 186 new, 5 lines down): Being a great devotee of the Lord, he was transcendently situated, but because he was the king of Mithilā (a subdivision of Bihar province in India), he had to teach his subjects how to perform prescribed duties.

1. SIMPLE BOO-BOO’S

16.1-3 (p. 728 old, last par, purport) All these sixteen qualifications mentioned are transcendental qualities.

16.1-3 (p. 746 new) All these twenty-six qualifications mentioned are transcendental qualities.

2. MISSING EVIDENCE

Intro. (p. 7 old, last line): Lord Kṛṣṇa says, “*Prakṛti* is working under My direction.” When we see wonderful things happening in the cosmic nature, we should know that behind this cosmic nature,

Intro. (pg. 8 new, middle last par): As Lord Kṛṣṇa says, *mayādhyakṣeṇa prakṛtiḥ sūyate sa-carācaram*: “This material nature is working under My direction.” When we see wonderful things happening in the cosmic nature,

Intro. (p. 11 old, mid second par): *Mukti* or liberation means freedom from material consciousness. In the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* also the definition of liberation is given. *Mukti* means liberation from the contaminated consciousness of this

material world and situation in pure consciousness.

Intro. (pg. 12 new, mid second par) *Mukti*, or liberation, means freedom from material consciousness. In the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* also the definition of liberation is given. *Muktir hitvānyathā-rūpaṁ svarūpeṇa vyavasthitiḥ: mukti* means liberation from the contaminated consciousness of this material world and situation in pure consciousness.

Intro. (pg. 13 old, end second par): The complete whole, Personality of Godhead, has immense potencies.

Intro. (pg. 14 new, begin last par): The complete whole, Personality of Godhead, has immense potencies (*parāsyā śaktir vividhaiva śrūyate*).

Intro. (pg. 15 old, end second par): and ultimately we will be able to reach the destination which is beyond this material sky.

Intro. (pg. 17 new, end first par): and ultimately we will be able to reach the destination which is beyond this material sky (*yad gatvā na nivartante tad dhāma paramaṁ mama*).

Intro. (p. 23 old, 3 lines after quoted verse): In the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* the total energies of the Supreme Lord as *Viṣṇu-śaktiḥ parā proktā*, etc., are delineated. The Supreme Lord has diverse and innumerable energies which are beyond our conception;

Intro. (p. 26 new, mid page) In the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (6.7.61) the total energies of the Supreme Lord are delineated:

*viṣṇu-śaktiḥ parā proktā
kṣetra-jñākhyā tathā parā
avidyā-karma-sañjñānyā
tṛtīyā śaktir iṣyate*

The Supreme Lord has diverse and innumerable energies which are beyond our conception;

Intro. (p. 25 old, 3 lines from top): Lord Caitanya also advises this. He says that one should practice remembering the Lord by chanting the names of the Lord always.

Intro. (p. 28 new, mid page): Lord Caitanya also advises this. He says, *kīrtaniyaḥ sadā hariḥ*: one should practice chanting the names of the Lord always.

Intro. (p. 27 old, top of page): This is not a very difficult process. However, one must learn it from an experienced person, from one who is already in the practice.

Intro. (p. 30 new, beginning of last par): This is not a very difficult process.

However, one must learn it from an experienced person. *Tad vijñānārthaṁ sa gurum evābhigacchet*: one must approach a person who is already in the practice.

Intro. (pp. 27-28 old, begin last par): In conclusion, *Bhagavad-gītā* is a transcendental literature which one should read very carefully. It is capable of saving one from all fear.

nehābhikrama-nāśo 'sti pratyavāyo na vidyate

sv-ālpam apy asya dharmasya trāyate mahato bhayāt

“In this endeavor there is no loss or diminution, and a little advancement on this path can protect one from the most dangerous type of fear.” (Bg. 2.40) If one reads *Bhagavad-gītā* sincerely and seriously, then all of the reactions of his past misdeeds will not react upon him. In the last portion of *Bhagavad-gītā*, Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa proclaims:

sarva-dharmān parityajya mām ekaṁ śaraṇam vraja
aham tvām sarva-pāpebhyo mokṣayiṣyāmi mā śucaḥ

“Give up all varieties of religiousness, and just surrender unto Me; and in return I shall protect you from all sinful reactions. Therefore, you have nothing to fear.” (Bg. 18.66) Thus the Lord takes all responsibility for one who surrenders unto Him, and He indemnifies all the reactions of sin.

One cleanses himself daily by taking a bath in water, but one who takes his bath only once in the sacred Ganges water of the *Bhagavad-gītā* cleanses away all the dirt of material life. Because *Bhagavad-gītā* is spoken by the Supreme Personality of Godhead, one need not read any other Vedic literature. One need only attentively and regularly hear and read *Bhagavad-gītā*. In the present age, mankind is so absorbed with mundane activities that it is not possible to read all of the Vedic literatures. But this is not necessary. This one book, *Bhagavad-gītā*, will suffice because it is the essence of all Vedic literatures and because it is spoken by the Supreme Personality of Godhead. It is said that one who drinks the water of the Ganges certainly gets salvation, but what to speak of one who drinks the waters of *Bhagavad-gītā*? *Gītā* is the very nectar of the *Mahābhārata* spoken by Viṣṇu Himself, for Lord Kṛṣṇa is the original Viṣṇu. It is nectar emanating from the mouth of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and the Ganges is said to be emanating from the lotus feet of the Lord. Of course there is no difference between the mouth and the feet of the Supreme Lord, but in our position we can appreciate that the *Bhagavad-gītā* is even more important than the Ganges.

The *Bhagavad-gītā* is just like a cow, and Lord Kṛṣṇa, who is a cowherd boy, is milking this cow. The milk is the essence of the *Vedas*, and Arjuna is just like a calf. The wise men, the great sages and pure devotees, are to drink the nectarean milk of *Bhagavad-gītā*.

In this present day, man is very eager to have one scripture, one God, one religion, and one occupation. So let there be one common scripture for the whole world-*Bhagavad-gītā*. And let there be one God only for the whole world-Śrī Kṛṣṇa. And one *mantra* only-Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare/Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare. And let there be one work only-the service of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

Intro. (pp. 31-33 new): In conclusion, *Bhagavad-gītā* is a transcendental literature

which one should read very carefully. *Gītā-śāstram idaṁ puṇyam yaḥ paṭhet prayataḥ pumān:* if one properly follows the instructions of *Bhagavad-gītā*, one can be freed from all the miseries and anxieties of life. *Bhaya-śokādi-varjitaḥ*. One will be freed from all fears in this life, and one's next life will be spiritual. (*Gītā-māhātmya* 1)

There is also a further advantage:

*gītādhyāyana-śīlasya
prāṇāyāma-parasya ca
naiva santi hi pāpāni
pūrva-janma-kṛtāni ca*

“If one reads *Bhagavad-gītā* very sincerely and with all seriousness, then by the grace of the Lord the reactions of his past misdeeds will not act upon him.” (*Gītā-māhātmya* 2) The Lord says very loudly in the last portion of *Bhagavad-gītā* (18.66):

*sarva-dharmān parityajya
mām ekaṁ śaraṇaṁ vraja
ahaṁ tvām sarva-pāpebhyo
mokṣayiṣyāmi mā śucaḥ*

“Abandon all varieties of religion and just surrender unto Me. I shall deliver you from all sinful reactions. Do not fear.” Thus the Lord takes all responsibility for one who surrenders unto Him, and He indemnifies such a person against all reactions of sins.

*mala-nirmocanaṁ puṁsām
jala-snānaṁ dine dine
sakṛd gītāmṛta-snānaṁ
saṁsāra-mala-nāśanam*

“One may cleanse himself daily by taking a bath in water, but if one takes a bath even once in the sacred Ganges water of *Bhagavad-gītā*, for him the dirt of material life is altogether vanquished.” (*Gītā-māhātmya* 3)

*gītā su-gītā kartavyā
kim anyaiḥ śāstra-vistaraiḥ
yā svayaṁ padmanābhasya
mukha-padmād viniḥsṛtā*

Because *Bhagavad-gītā* is spoken by the Supreme Personality of Godhead, one need not read any other Vedic literature. One need only attentively and regularly hear and read *Bhagavad-gītā*. In the present age, people are so absorbed in mundane activities that it is not possible for them to read all the Vedic literatures. But this is not necessary. This one book, *Bhagavad-gītā*, will suffice, because it is the essence of all Vedic literatures and especially because it is spoken by the Supreme Personality of Godhead. (*Gītā-māhātmya* 4)

As it is said:

*bhāratāmṛta-sarvasvaṁ
viṣṇu-vaktrād viniḥsṛtam
gītā-gaṅgodakam pītvā
punar janma na vidyate*

“One who drinks the water of the Ganges attains salvation, so what to speak of one who drinks the nectar of *Bhagavad-gītā*? *Bhagavad-gītā* is the essential nectar of the *Mahābhārata*, and it is spoken by Lord Kṛṣṇa Himself, the original Viṣṇu.” (*Gītā-māhātmya* 5) *Bhagavad-gītā* comes from the mouth of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and the Ganges is said to emanate from the lotus feet of the Lord. Of course, there is no difference between the mouth and the feet of the Supreme Lord, but from an impartial study we can appreciate that *Bhagavad-gītā* is even more important than the water of the Ganges.

*sarvopaniṣado gāvo
dogdhā gopāla-nandanah
pārtho vatsaḥ su-dhīr bhoktā
dugdham gītāmṛtam mahat*

“This *Gītopaniṣad*, *Bhagavad-gītā*, the essence of all the *Upaniṣads*, is just like a cow, and Lord Kṛṣṇa, who is famous as a cowherd boy, is milking this cow. Arjuna is just like a calf, and learned scholars and pure devotees are to drink the nectarean milk of *Bhagavad-gītā*.” (*Gītā-māhātmya* 6)

*ekaṁ śāstram devakī-putra-gītam
eko devo devakī-putra eva
eko mantras tasya nāmāni yāni
karmāpy ekaṁ tasya devasya sevā*

(*Gītā-māhātmya* 7)

In this present day, people are very much eager to have one scripture, one God, one religion, and one occupation. Therefore, *ekaṁ śāstram devakī-putra-gītam*: let there be one scripture only, one common scripture for the whole world-*Bhagavad-*

gītā. Eko devo devakī-putra eva: let there be one God for the whole world-Śrī Kṛṣṇa. *Eko mantras tasya nāmāni:* and one hymn, one *mantra*, one prayer-the chanting of His name: Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare/ Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare. *Karmāpy ekaṁ tasya devasya sevā:* and let there be one work only-the service of the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

2.43 (p. 128 old, begin 2nd par): In the *karma-kāṇḍa* section of the Vedas it is said that those who perform the four monthly penances...

2.43 (p. 130 new, begin 2nd par) In the *karma-kāṇḍa* section of the Vedas it is said, *apāma somam amṛtā abhūma* and *akṣayyaṁ ha vai cāturmasya-yājinaḥ sukṛtaṁ bhavati*. In other words, those who perform the four-month penances...

2.56 (p. 142 old, 6 lines down in purport): The *sthita-dhī-muni* is always in Kṛṣṇa consciousness, for he has exhausted all his business of creative speculation. He has surpassed the stage of mental speculations and has come to the conclusion that Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa, or Vāsudeva, is everything.

2.56 (p. 145 new, 5 lines down): The *sthita-dhīr muni* is always in Kṛṣṇa consciousness, for he has exhausted all his business of creative speculation. He is called *praśānta-niḥśeṣa-mano-rathāntara* (*Stotra-ratna* 43), or one who has surpassed the stage of mental speculations and has come to the conclusion that Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa, or Vāsudeva, is everything (*vāsudevaḥ sarvam iti sa mahātmā su-durlabhaḥ*).

2.63 (p. 150 old, begin purp): By development of Kṛṣṇa consciousness...

[5 lines down] ... they do not attain to the perfect stage of renunciation. On the other hand, a person in Kṛṣṇa consciousness...

2.63 (p. 153 new, begin purport): Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī has given us this direction:

*prāpañcikatayā buddhyā
hari-sambandhi-vastunaḥ
mumukṣubhiḥ parityāgo
vairāgyaṁ phalgu kathyate*

(*Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu* 1.2.258)

By development of Kṛṣṇa consciousness...

[5 lines after quote] they do not attain to the perfect stage of renunciation. Their so-called renunciation is called *phalgu*, or less important. On the other hand, a person in Kṛṣṇa consciousness...

9.4 (p. 451 old, begin purport): The Supreme Personality of Godhead is not perceivable through the gross material senses. It is said that Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa's name, fame, pastimes, etc., cannot be understood by material senses. Only to one who is engaged in pure devotional service under proper guidance is He revealed.

In the *Brahma-saṁhitā* it is stated, *premāñjanacchurita...* . One can see the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Govinda, always within himself and outside himself if one has developed the transcendental loving attitude towards Him... . [4 lines from end of purport] The creation takes place by the diffusion of His different energies, and, as stated in the *Bhagavad-gītā*, He is everywhere present by His personal representation, the diffusion of His different energies.

9.4 (p. 458 new, begin purport): The Supreme Personality of Godhead is not perceivable through the gross material senses. It is said,

*ataḥ śrī-kṛṣṇa-nāmādi
na bhaved grāhyam indriyaiḥ
sevonmukhe hi jihvādau
svayam eva sphuraty adaḥ*

(Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu 1.2.234)

Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s name, fame, pastimes, etc., cannot be understood by material senses. Only to one who is engaged in pure devotional service under proper guidance is He revealed. In the *Brahma-saṁhitā* (5.38) it is stated, *premāñjanacchurita-bhakti-vilocanena santaḥ sadaiva hṛdayeṣu vilokayanti*: one can see the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Govinda, always within himself and outside himself if one has developed the transcendental loving attitude towards Him... . [5 lines from end of purport] The creation takes place by the diffusion of His different energies, and, as stated in the *Bhagavad-gītā*, *viṣṭabhyāham idaṁ kṛtsnam*: He is everywhere present by His personal representation, the diffusion of His different energies.

9.6 (p. 454 old, top of page): In the *Upaniṣads* it is stated, “It is out of the fear of the Supreme Lord that the wind is blowing.” In the *Garga Upaniṣad* also it is stated, “By the supreme order, under the superintendence of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the moon, the sun, and the great planets are moving.” In the *Brahma-saṁhitā* this is also stated. There is also a description of the movement of the sun.

9.6 (p. 461 new, begin 2nd par): In the *Upaniṣads* it is stated, *yad-bhīṣā vātaḥ pavate*: “It is out of the fear of the Supreme Lord that the wind is blowing.” (*Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.8.1) In the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (3.8.9) it is stated, *etasya vā akṣarasya praśāsane gārgi sūrya-candramasau vidhṛtau tiṣṭhata etasya vā akṣarasya praśāsane gārgi dyāv-āpṛthivyau vidhṛtau tiṣṭhataḥ*. “By the supreme order, under the superintendence of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the moon, the sun, and the other great planets are moving.” In the *Brahma-saṁhitā* (5.52) also it is stated,

*yac-cakṣur eṣa savitā sakala-grahāṇām
rājā samasta-sura-mūrtir aśeṣa-tejāḥ
yasyājñayā bhramati sambhṛta-kāla-cakro
govindam ādi-puruṣam tam aham bhajāmi*

This is a description of the movement of the sun.

9.7 (p. 455 old, 4 lines from end of purport): ...it is done by His will: “Although I am one, I shall become many.” This is the Vedic aphorism. He expands Himself in this material energy, and the whole cosmic manifestation again takes place.

9.7 (p. 462 new, 5 lines from end of purport): ...it is done by His will. *Bahu syām*: “Although I am one, I shall become many.” This is the Vedic aphorism (*Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 6.2.3). He expands Himself in this material energy, and the whole cosmic manifestation again takes place.

9.9 (p. 457 old, begin purport): One should not think, in this connection, that the Supreme Personality of Godhead has no engagement. In His spiritual world He is always engaged. In the *Brahma-saṁhitā* it is stated: “He is always involved in His eternal, blissful, spiritual activities, but He has nothing to do with these material activities.” Material activities are being carried on by His different potencies. The Lord is always neutral in the material activities of the created world. This neutrality is explained here...

[6 lines from end of purport] In the *Vedānta-sūtra* it is stated that He is not situated in the dualities of this material world. He is transcendental to these dualities.

9.9 (p. 464 new, begin purport): One should not think, in this connection, that the Supreme Personality of Godhead has no engagement. In His spiritual world He is always engaged. In the *Brahma-saṁhitā* (5.6) it is stated, *ātmārāmasya tasyāsti prakṛtyā na samāgamah*: “He is always involved in His eternal, blissful, spiritual activities, but He has nothing to do with these material activities.” Material activities are being carried on by His different potencies. The Lord is always neutral in the material activities of the created world. This neutrality is mentioned here with the word *udāsīna-vat*...

[top of p. 465] In the *Vedānta-sūtra* (2.1.34) it is stated, *vaiṣamya-nairghṛṇye na*: He is not situated in the dualities of this material world. He is transcendental to these dualities.

9.11 (p. 460-61 old, bottom page 460): In the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, First Canto, First Chapter, when the sages headed by Śaunaka inquired about the activities of Kṛṣṇa, it is stated that His appearance as a man bewilders the foolish.

[6 lines down on p. 461] ...an ordinary child. His appearance as an ordinary human being is one of the features of His transcendental body. In the Eleventh Chapter of *Bhagavad-gītā* also it is stated, *tenaiva rūpeṇa* etc. Arjuna prayed to see again that form of four hands, and when Kṛṣṇa was thus petitioned by Arjuna, He again assumed His original form. All these different features of the Supreme Lord are

certainly not those of an ordinary human being.

9.11 (p. 469 new, 7 lines down from top) In the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, First Canto, First Chapter, when the sages headed by Śaunaka inquired about the activities of Kṛṣṇa, they said:

*kṛtavān kila karmāṇi
saha rāmeṇa keśavaḥ
ati-martyāni bhagavān
gūḍhaḥ kapata-mānuṣaḥ*

“Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the Supreme Personality of Godhead, along with Balarāma, played like a human being, and so masked He performed many superhuman acts.” (*Bhāg.* 1.1.20) The Lord’s appearance as a man bewilders the foolish.

[mid page] ...ordinary child. As stated in the *Bhāgavatam* (10.3.46), *babhūva prākṛtaḥ śīśuḥ*: He became just like an ordinary child, an ordinary human being. Now, here again it is indicated that the Lord’s appearance as an ordinary human being is one of the features of His transcendental body. In the Eleventh Chapter of *Bhagavad-gītā* also it is stated that Arjuna prayed to see Kṛṣṇa’s form of four hands (*tenaiva rūpeṇa catur-bhujena*). After revealing this form, Kṛṣṇa, when petitioned by Arjuna, again assumed His original humanlike form (*mānuṣaṁ rūpam*). These different features of the Supreme Lord are certainly not those of an ordinary human being.

9.12 (p. 463 old, 4 lines down, 2nd par): In the *Bṛhad-vaiṣṇava-mantra* it is clearly stated that one who considers the body of Kṛṣṇa to be material should be driven out from all rituals and activities of the *śruti*. And if one by chance sees his face,...

9.12 (pp. 471-72 new, bottom of p. 471): The *Bṛhad-viṣṇu-smṛti* clearly states:

*yo vetti bhautikaṁ dehaṁ
kṛṣṇasya paramātmanaḥ
sa sarvasmād bahiḥ-kāryaḥ
śrauta-smārta-vidhānataḥ
mukhaṁ tasyāvalokyāpi
sa-celaṁ snānam ācaret*

“One who considers the body of Kṛṣṇa to be material should be driven out from all rituals and activities of the *śruti* and the *smṛti*. And if one by chance sees his face,...”

10.15 (p. 513 old, 4 lines from bottom of page) : It should not be received from atheistic persons.

The Supreme Truth is realized in three aspects: ...

10.15 (p. 527 new, end of 1st par): It should not be received from atheistic persons. As stated in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (1.2.11):

*vadanti tat tattva-vidas
tattvaṁ yaj jñānam advayam
brahmeti paramātmēti
bhagavān iti śabdyate*

The Supreme Truth is realized in three aspects:...

11.43 (p. 575 old, end of first par): ...No one can excel Him.

The Supreme Lord, Kṛṣṇa, has senses and a body like the ordinary man,... and everyone is lower than Him.

Whoever knows Kṛṣṇa's transcendental body, activities and perfection, after quitting his body, returns to Him and doesn't come back again to this miserable world.... It is also stated that there is no one who is master of Kṛṣṇa; everyone is His servant. Only Kṛṣṇa is God, and everyone else is His servant.

11.43 (pp. 588-89 new, end 2nd par purport): ...No one can excel Him. This is stated in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (6.8):

*na tasya kāryaṁ karaṇaṁ ca vidyate
na tat-samaś cābhyadhikaś ca drśyate*

The Supreme Lord, Kṛṣṇa, has senses and a body like the ordinary man, ...and everyone is lower than Him.

The knowledge, strength and activities of the Supreme Personality are all transcendental. As stated in *Bhagavad-gītā* (4.9):

*janma karma ca me divyam
evaṁ yo vetti tattvataḥ
tyaktvā dehaṁ punar janma
naiti mām eti so ṅrjuna*

Whoever knows Kṛṣṇa's transcendental body, activities and perfection, after quitting his body, returns to Him and doesn't come back again to this miserable world.... It is also stated that there is no one who is master of Kṛṣṇa; everyone is His servant. The *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* (*Ādi* 5.142) confirms, *ekale īśvara kṛṣṇa, āra saba bhṛtya*: only Kṛṣṇa is God, and everyone else is His servant.

11.54 (pp. 589-90 old, near end of first par): For the beginners in devotional service to the Lord, temple worship is very essential, and this is confirmed in the Vedic literature.

One who has unflinching devotion for the Supreme Lord and is directed by the spiritual master can see the Supreme Personality of Godhead by revelation. For one who does not take personal training under the guidance of a bona fide

spiritual master, it is impossible to even begin to understand Kṛṣṇa. The word *tu* is specifically used here to indicate that no other process can be used, can be recommended, or can be successful in understanding Kṛṣṇa.

The personal forms of Kṛṣṇa, the two-handed form and the four-handed, are completely different from the temporary universal form shown to Arjuna. The four-handed form is Nārāyaṇa, and the two-handed form is Kṛṣṇa; they are eternal and transcendental, whereas the universal form exhibited to Arjuna is temporary. The very word *sudurdaśam*, meaning difficult to see, suggests that no one saw that universal form. It also suggests that amongst the devotees there was no necessity of showing it. That form was exhibited by Kṛṣṇa at the request of Arjuna because in the future, when one represents himself as an incarnation of God, people can ask to see his universal form.

Kṛṣṇa changes from the universal form to the four-handed form of Nārāyaṇa and then to His own natural form of two hands. This indicates that the four-handed forms and other forms mentioned in Vedic literature are all emanations of the original two-handed Kṛṣṇa. He is the origin of all emanations. Kṛṣṇa is distinct even from these forms, what to speak of the impersonal conception. As far as the four-handed forms of Kṛṣṇa are concerned, it is stated clearly that even the most identical four-handed form of Kṛṣṇa (which is known as Mahā-Viṣṇu, who is lying on the cosmic ocean and from whose breathing so many innumerable universes are passing out and entering) is also an expansion of the Supreme Lord. Therefore one should conclusively worship the personal form of Kṛṣṇa as the Supreme Personality of Godhead who is eternity, bliss and knowledge. He is the source of all forms of Viṣṇu, He is the source of all forms of incarnation, and He is the original Supreme Personality, as confirmed in *Bhagavad-gītā*.

In the Vedic literature it is stated that the Supreme Absolute Truth is a person. His name is Kṛṣṇa, and He sometimes descends on this earth. Similarly, in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* there is a description of all kinds of incarnations of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and there it is said that Kṛṣṇa is not an incarnation of God but is the original Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself. *Kṛṣṇas tu bhagavān svayam*. Similarly, in *Bhagavad-gītā* the Lord says, *mattaḥ parataram nānyat*: “There is nothing superior to My form as the Personality of Godhead Kṛṣṇa.” He also says elsewhere in *Bhagavad-gītā*, *aham ādir hi devānām*: “I am the origin of all the demigods.” And after understanding *Bhagavad-gītā* from Kṛṣṇa, Arjuna also confirms this in the following words: *param brahma param dhāma pavitraṁ-paramaṁ bhavān*: “I now fully understand that You are the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the Absolute Truth, and that You are the refuge of everything.” Therefore the universal form which Kṛṣṇa showed to Arjuna is not the original form of God. The original is the Kṛṣṇa form. The universal form, with its thousands and thousands of heads and hands, is manifest just to draw the

attention of those who have no love for God. It is not God's original form.

11.54 (pp. 603-05 new, near end of first par): For the beginners in devotional service to the Lord, temple worship is essential, and this is confirmed in the Vedic literature (*Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* 6.23):

*yasya deve parā bhaktir
yathā deve tathā gurau
tasyaite kathitā hy arthāḥ
prakāśante mahātmanah*

One who has unflinching devotion for the Supreme Lord and is directed by the spiritual master, in whom he has similar unflinching faith, can see the Supreme Personality of Godhead by revelation. One cannot understand Kṛṣṇa by mental speculation. For one who does not take personal training under the guidance of a bona fide spiritual master, it is impossible to even begin to understand Kṛṣṇa. The word *tu* is specifically used here to indicate that no other process can be used, can be recommended, or can be successful in understanding Kṛṣṇa.

The personal forms of Kṛṣṇa, the two-handed form and the four-handed, are completely different from the temporary universal form shown to Arjuna. The four-handed form of Nārāyaṇa and the two-handed form of Kṛṣṇa are eternal and transcendental, whereas the universal form exhibited to Arjuna is temporary. The very word *sudurdarśam*, meaning “difficult to see,” suggests that no one had seen that universal form. It also suggests that amongst the devotees there was no necessity of showing it. That form was exhibited by Kṛṣṇa at the request of Arjuna so that in the future, when one represents himself as an incarnation of God, people can ask to see his universal form.

The word *na*, used repeatedly in the previous verse, indicates that one should not be very much proud of such credentials as an academic education in Vedic literature. One must take to the devotional service of Kṛṣṇa. Only then can one attempt to write commentaries on *Bhagavad-gītā*.

Kṛṣṇa changes from the universal form to the four-handed form of Nārāyaṇa and then to His own natural form of two hands. This indicates that the four-handed forms and other forms mentioned in Vedic literature are all emanations of the original two-handed Kṛṣṇa. He is the origin of all emanations. Kṛṣṇa is distinct even from these forms, what to speak of the impersonal conception. As far as the four-handed forms of Kṛṣṇa are concerned, it is stated clearly that even the most identical four-handed form of Kṛṣṇa (which is known as Mahā-Viṣṇu, who is lying on the cosmic ocean and from whose breathing so many innumerable universes are passing out and entering) is also an expansion of the Supreme Lord. As stated in

the *Brahma-saṁhitā* (5.48),

*yasyaika-niśvasita-kālam athāvalambya
jīvanti loma-vila-jā jagad-aṇḍa-nāthāḥ
viṣṇur mahān sa iha yasya kalā-viśeṣo
govindam ādi-puruṣaṁ tam ahaṁ bhajāmi*

“The Mahā-Viṣṇu, into whom all the innumerable universes enter and from whom they come forth again simply by His breathing process, is a plenary expansion of Kṛṣṇa. Therefore I worship Govinda, Kṛṣṇa, the cause of all causes.” Therefore one should conclusively worship the personal form of Kṛṣṇa as the Supreme Personality of Godhead who has eternal bliss and knowledge. He is the source of all forms of Viṣṇu, He is the source of all forms of incarnation, and He is the original Supreme Personality, as confirmed in *Bhagavad-gītā*.

In the Vedic literature (*Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* 1.1) the following statement appears:

*sac-cid-ānanda-rūpāya
kṛṣṇāyākliṣṭa-kāriṇe
namo vedānta-vedyāya
gurave buddhi-sākṣiṇe*

“I offer my respectful obeisances unto Kṛṣṇa, who has a transcendental form of bliss, eternity and knowledge. I offer my respect to Him, because understanding Him means understanding the *Vedas* and He is therefore the supreme spiritual master.” Then it is said, *kṛṣṇo vai paramaṁ daivatam*: “Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Personality of Godhead.” (*Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* 1.3) *Eko vaśī sarva-gaḥ kṛṣṇa īḍyaḥ*: “That one Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and He is worshipable.” *Eko ‘pi san bahudhā yo ‘vabhāti*: “Kṛṣṇa is one, but He is manifested in unlimited forms and expanded incarnations.” (*Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* 1.21)

The *Brahma-saṁhitā* (5.1) says,

*īśvaraḥ paramaḥ kṛṣṇaḥ
sac-cid-ānanda-vigrahaḥ
anādir ādir govindaḥ
sarva-kāraṇa-kāraṇam*

“The Supreme Personality of Godhead is Kṛṣṇa, who has a body of eternity, knowledge and bliss. He has no beginning, for He is the beginning of everything. He is the cause of all causes.”

Elsewhere it is said, *yatrāvatīrṇam kṛṣṇākhyam param brahma narākṛti*: “The Supreme Absolute Truth is a person, His name is Kṛṣṇa, and He sometimes descends on this earth.” Similarly, in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* we find a description of all kinds of incarnations of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, and in this list the name of Kṛṣṇa also appears. But then it is said that this Kṛṣṇa is not an incarnation of God but is the original Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself (*ete cāṁśa-kalāḥ puṁśaḥ kṛṣṇas tu bhagavān svayam*).

Similarly, in *Bhagavad-gītā* the Lord says, *mattaḥ parataram nānyat*: “There is nothing superior to My form as the Personality of Godhead Kṛṣṇa.” He also says elsewhere in *Bhagavad-gītā*, *aham ādir hi devānām*: “I am the origin of all the demigods.” And after understanding *Bhagavad-gītā* from Kṛṣṇa, Arjuna also confirms this in the following words: *param brahma param dhāma pavitram-paramam bhavān*, “I now fully understand that You are the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the Absolute Truth, and that You are the refuge of everything.” Therefore the universal form which Kṛṣṇa showed to Arjuna is not the original form of God. The original is the Kṛṣṇa form. The universal form, with its thousands and thousands of heads and hands, is manifest just to draw the attention of those who have no love for God. It is not God’s original form.

3. POINTS WITHOUT PINS

9.8 (p. 456 old, 8 lines from end of purp) It is clearly stated here that the living entities have nothing to do with this process.

9.8 (p. 463 new, 4 lines from end of page) It is clearly stated here by the word *avaśam* that the living entities have nothing to do with this process.

9.9 (p. 457 old, 7 lines down): This neutrality is explained here.

9.9 (p. 464 new, 9 lines down in purp): This neutrality is mentioned here with the word *udāsīna-vat*.

13.12 (p. 634 old, bottom of page): Although the living entity is always being kicked by the stringent laws of material nature, he still thinks, “I am God” because of ignorance. One should be humble and know that he is subordinate to the Supreme Lord.

13.12 (p. 654 new, end of purp): Although the living entity is always being kicked by the stringent laws of material nature, he still thinks, “I am God” because of ignorance. The beginning of knowledge, therefore, is *amānitva*, humility. One should be humble and know that he is subordinate to the Supreme Lord.

4. GLOSSES TOTALLY LOST

11.54 (p. 589 old, second par up, 3 lines up): That form was exhibited by Kṛṣṇa at the request of Arjuna because in the future, when one represents himself as an incarnation of God, people can ask to see his universal form.

Kṛṣṇa changes from the universal form to the four-handed form of Nārāyaṇa ... **11.54** (pp. 603-04 new, bottom of page): That form was exhibited by Kṛṣṇa at the request of Arjuna so that in the future, when one represents himself as an incarnation of God, people can ask to see his universal form.

The word *na*, used repeatedly in the previous verse, indicates that one should not be very much proud of such credentials as an academic education in Vedic literature. One must take to the devotional service of Kṛṣṇa. Only then can one attempt to write commentaries on *Bhagavad-gītā*.

Kṛṣṇa changes from the universal form to the four-handed form of Nārāyaṇa ... **17.27** (p. 775 old, 5 lines up): When initiating a person or offering the sacred thread, one vibrates the words *om tat sat*. Similarly, in all kinds of *yajña* performances, the supreme object, *om tat sat* is invoked. These words *om tat sat* are used to perfect all activities. The supreme *om tat sat* makes everything complete.

17.27 (p. 793 new, mid par): When initiating a person or offering the sacred thread, one vibrates the words *om tat sat*. Similarly, in all kinds of performance of *yajña* the object is the Supreme, *om tat sat*. The word *tad-arthyam* further means offering service to anything which represents the Supreme, including such service as cooking and helping in the Lord's temple, or any other kind of work for broadcasting the glories of the Lord. These supreme words *om tat sat* are thus used in many ways to perfect all activities and make everything complete.

5. SANSKRIT SLIPS

7.18 (p. 390 old): In the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (9.4.57), the Lord says:

*aham bhakta-parādhīno hy asvatantra iva dvija
sādhubhir grasta-hṛdayo bhaktair bhakta-jana-priyaḥ*

“The devotees are always in My heart, and I am always in the hearts of the devotees. The devotee does not know anything beyond Me, and I also cannot forget the devotee. There is a very intimate relationship between Me and the pure devotees. Pure devotees in full knowledge are never out of spiritual touch, and therefore they are very much dear to Me.”

7.18 (p. 392 new): In the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (9.4.68), the Lord says:

*sādhavo hṛdayam mahyam
sādhūnām hṛdayam tv aham
mad-anything te na jānanti
nāham tebhyo manāg api*

“The devotees are always in My heart, and I am always in the hearts of the

devotees. The devotee does not know anything beyond Me, and I also cannot forget the devotee. There is a very intimate relationship between Me and the pure devotees. Pure devotees in full knowledge are never out of spiritual touch, and therefore they are very much dear to Me.”

7.25 (p. 400 old, mid page): In the prayers of Kuntī in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (1.8.18) it is said that the Lord is covered by the curtain of *yoga-māyā* and thus ordinary people cannot understand Him. Kuntī prays: “O my Lord, You are the maintainer of the entire universe, and devotional service to You is the highest religious principle...”

7.25 (p. 404 new): In the prayers of Kuntī in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (1.8.19) it is said that the Lord is covered by the curtain of *yoga-māyā* and thus ordinary people cannot understand Him. This *yoga-māyā* curtain is also confirmed in the *Īsopaniṣad* (mantra 15), in which the devotee prays:

*hiraṇmayena pātreṇa
satyasyāpihitam mukham
tat tvam pūṣann apāvṛṇu
satya-dharmāya dṛṣṭaye*

“O my Lord, You are the maintainer of the entire universe, and devotional service to You is the highest religious principle...”

9.29 (p 482 old, bottom of page): This also explains the words: *asti na priyaḥ/ ye bhajanti*: “Whoever surrenders unto Me, proportionately I take care of him.”

9.29 (p 493 new, top of page): This also explains the words *ye yathā mām prapadyante tāms tathaiva bhajāmy aham*: “Whoever surrenders unto Me, proportionately I take care of him.”

10.4-5 (p 498 old, end of 2nd par): *Bhayam*, fearlessness, is only possible for one in Kṛṣṇa consciousness.

10.4-5 (p 511 new, end of 1st par): *Abhayam*, fearlessness, is possible only for one in Kṛṣṇa consciousness.

13.15 (p. 638 old, mid first par): This is very nicely explained in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* in the verse *sarvataḥ pāṇi-pādam*.

13.15 (p. 657 new, mid par): This is very nicely explained in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (3.19) in the verse *apāṇi-pādo javano grahītā*.

6. MANGLED MEANINGS

5.2 (p. 274 old): “Renunciation by persons eager to achieve liberation of things which are related to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, though they are material, is called incomplete renunciation.”

5.2 (p. 276 new): “When persons eager to achieve liberation renounce things related to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, thinking them to be material,

their renunciation is called incomplete.”

7. GENERAL BLUNDERS

2.1 (p. 72 old): This realization is made possible by working with the fruitive being situated in the fixed conception of the self.

2.1 (p. 74 new): This realization is possible when one works without attachment to fruitive results and is situated in the fixed conception of the real self.

2.43 (p. 128 old): In the *karma-kāṇḍa* section of the *Vedas* it is said that those who perform the four monthly penances become eligible to drink the *somarasa* beverages to become immortal and happy forever.

2.43 (p. 130 new, begin 2nd par): In the *karma-kāṇḍa* section of the *Vedas* it is said, *apāma somam amṛtā abhūma* and *akṣayyam ha vai cāturmasya-yājinaḥ sukṛtaṁ bhavati*. In other words, those who perform the four-month penances become eligible to drink the *soma-rasa* beverages to become immortal and happy forever.

3.35 (p. 201 old): Prescribed duties complement one’s psychophysical condition, under the spell of the modes of material nature. Spiritual duties are as ordered by the spiritual master, for the transcendental service of Kṛṣṇa.

3.35 (p. 202 new): Materially, prescribed duties are duties enjoined according to one’s psychophysical condition, under the spell of the modes of material nature. Spiritual duties are as ordered by the spiritual master for the transcendental service of Kṛṣṇa.

7.15 (p. 383 old, bottom): The swine who eat the soil do not care to accept sweetmeats made of sugar and ghee.

7.15 (p. 385 new, bottom): The swine who eat the night soil do not care to accept sweetmeats made of sugar and ghee.

7.15 (p. 384 old, top): Similarly, the foolish worker will untiringly continue to hear of the sense-enjoyable tidings of the flickering mundane world.

7.15 (p. 386 new, top): Similarly, the foolish worker will untiringly continue to hear of the sense-enjoyable tidings of the flickering mundane world, but will have very little time to hear about the eternal living force that moves the material world.

10.27 (p. 525 old, top): The devotee demigods and the demons (*asuras*) once took a sea journey.

10.27 (p. 539 new, top): The devotee demigods and the demons (*asuras*) once took part in churning the sea.

10.29 (pp. 526-27 old): There is also a planet of trees presided over by Aryamā, who represents Kṛṣṇa.

10.29 (p. 540 new, bottom): There is also a planet of Pitās, ancestors, presided over by Aryamā, who represents Kṛṣṇa.

10.35 (p. 531 old, bottom): It has already been explained by the Lord that amongst all the *Vedas*, the *Sāma Veda* is rich with beautiful songs played by the various demigods.

10.35 (p. 545 new, bottom): It has already been explained by the Lord that amongst all the *Vedas*, He is the *Sāma Veda*. The *Sāma Veda* is rich with beautiful songs played by the various demigods.

13.2 (p.621 old, 6 lines up, 1st par): Sometimes we understand that I am happy, I am mad, I am a woman, I am a dog, I am a cat; these are the knowers.

13.2 (pp.638-39 new): Sometimes we think, “I am happy,” “I am a man,” “I am a woman,” “I am a dog,” “I am a cat.” These are the bodily designations of the knower.

15.2 (p. 696 old): The twigs of the tree are considered to be the sense objects. By development of the different modes of nature, we develop different senses, and, by the senses, we enjoy different varieties of sense objects. The source of the senses-the ears, the nose, eyes, etc.-is considered to be the upper twigs, tuned to the enjoyment of different sense objects. The leaves are sound, form, touch-the sense objects. The roots, which are subsidiary, are the by-products of different varieties of suffering and sense enjoyment. Thus we develop attachment and aversion. The tendencies toward piety and impiety are considered to be the secondary roots, spreading in all directions. The real root is from Brahmaloaka, and the other roots are in the human planetary systems. After one enjoys the results of virtuous activities in the upper planetary systems, he comes down to this earth and renews his *karma*, or fruitive activities for promotion. This planet of human beings is considered the field of activities.

15.2 (p. 714 new): The twigs of the tree are considered to be the sense objects. By development of the different modes of nature we develop different senses, and by the senses we enjoy different varieties of sense objects. The tips of the branches are the senses-the ears, nose, eyes, etc.-which are attached to the enjoyment of different sense objects. The twigs are sound, form, touch, and so on-the sense objects. The subsidiary roots are attachments and aversions, which are byproducts of different varieties of suffering and sense enjoyment. The tendencies toward piety and impiety are considered to develop from these secondary roots, which spread in all directions. The real root is from Brahmaloaka, and the other roots are in the human planetary systems. After one enjoys the results of virtuous activities in the upper planetary systems, he comes down to this earth and renews his *karma*, or fruitive activities for promotion. This planet of human beings is considered the field of activities.

18.31-32 (see the section entitled “Some Examples of Restorations of Bhagavad-gītā As It Is.”)

8. TOO HELPFUL

5.28 (p. 303 old, mid page): One has to drive out the sense objects such as sound, touch, form, taste and smell by the *pratyāhāra* (breathing) process in *yoga*, and then keep the vision of the eyes between the two eyebrows and concentrate on the

tip of the nose with half-closed lids.

5.28 (p. 304 new, mid page): One has to drive out the sense objects such as sound, touch, form, taste and smell by the *pratyāhāra* process in *yoga*, and then keep the vision of the eyes between the two eyebrows and concentrate on the tip of the nose with half-closed lids.

15.2 (p. 696 old, 4 down in par): These are situated on the lower parts of the branches, whereas on the upper parts are higher forms of living entities: the demigods, Gandharvas (fairies), and many other higher species of life.

15.2 (p. 714 new, 4 down in par): These are situated on the lower parts of the branches, whereas on the upper parts are higher forms of living entities: the demigods, Gandharvas and many other higher species of life.

9. THE RED-PENNED PURPORT

8.11 (see pp. 3)

8.6 (p. 416 old, end purp): Therefore the chanting of Hare Kṛṣṇa is the best process for successfully changing one's state of being at the end of one's life.

8.6 (p. 421 new, top): Therefore the chanting of Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare/ Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare is the best process for successfully changing one's state of being at the end of one's life.

8.13 (p. 423 old, bottom): It is clearly recommended in this age that if one quits his body at the end of life chanting the *mahā-mantra*, Hare Kṛṣṇa, he will reach the spiritual planets.

8.13 (p. 428 new): The chanting of the Hare Kṛṣṇa mantra is clearly recommended for this age. So if one quits his body at the end of life chanting Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare/ Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare, he certainly reaches one of the spiritual planets, according to the mode of his practice.

8.14 (p. 425 old, end purp): This is the great blessing of the Kṛṣṇa conscious process of chanting the *mahā-mantra*, Hare Kṛṣṇa.

8.14 (p. 430 new): This is the great blessing of the Kṛṣṇa conscious process of chanting the *mahā-mantra*-Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare/ Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare.

8.19 (misplaced on 8.18, p. 429 old): However, those intelligent beings who take to Kṛṣṇa consciousness and chant Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Rāma in devotional service transfer themselves, even in this life, to the spiritual planet of Kṛṣṇa and become eternally blissful there, not being subject to such rebirths.

8.19 (p. 436 new, top): But those intelligent persons who take to Kṛṣṇa consciousness use the human life fully in the devotional service of the Lord, chanting Hare Kṛṣṇa, Hare Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa, Hare Hare/ Hare Rāma, Hare Rāma, Rāma Rāma, Hare Hare. Thus they transfer themselves, even in this life, to the spiritual planet of Kṛṣṇa and become eternally blissful there, not being subject

to such rebirths.

8.28 (p. 439 old, last par): One should try to understand the Seventh and Eighth Chapters of the *Gītā* not by scholarship or mental speculation, but by hearing them in association with pure devotees. Chapters Six through Twelve are the essence of the *Gītā*, if one is fortunate to understand the *Gītā*-especially these middle six chapters-in the association of devotees, then his life at once becomes glorified beyond all penances, sacrifices, charities, speculations, etc. One should hear the *Gītā* from the devotee because at the beginning of the Fourth Chapter it is stated that the *Gītā* can only be perfectly understood by devotees. Hearing the *Gītā* from devotees, not from mental speculators, is called faith. Through association of devotees, one is placed in devotional service, and by this service Kṛṣṇa's activities, form, pastimes, name, etc., become clear, and all misgivings are dispelled. Then once doubts are removed, the study of the *Gītā* becomes extremely pleasurable, and one develops a taste and feeling for Kṛṣṇa consciousness. In the advanced stage, one falls completely in love with Kṛṣṇa, and that is the beginning of the highest perfectional stage of life which prepares the devotee's transferral to Kṛṣṇa's abode in the spiritual sky, Goloka Vṛndāvana, where the devotee enters into eternal happiness.

8.28 (pp. 445 new, middle): The words *idam veditvā* indicate that one should understand the instructions given by Śrī Kṛṣṇa in this chapter and the Seventh Chapter of *Bhagavad-gītā*. One should try to understand these chapters not by scholarship or mental speculation but by hearing them in association with devotees. Chapters Seven through Twelve are the essence of *Bhagavad-gītā*. The first six and the last six chapters are like coverings for the middle six chapters, which are especially protected by the Lord. If one is fortunate enough to understand *Bhagavad-gītā*-especially these middle six chapters-in the association of devotees, then his life at once becomes glorified beyond all penances, sacrifices, charities, speculations, etc., for one can achieve all the results of these activities simply by Kṛṣṇa consciousness.

One who has a little faith in *Bhagavad-gītā* should learn *Bhagavad-gītā* from a devotee, because in the beginning of the Fourth Chapter it is stated clearly that *Bhagavad-gītā* can be understood only by devotees; no one else can perfectly understand the purpose of *Bhagavad-gītā*. One should therefore learn *Bhagavad-gītā* from a devotee of Kṛṣṇa, not from mental speculators. This is a sign of faith. When one searches for a devotee and finally gets a devotee's association one actually begins to study and understand *Bhagavad-gītā*. By advancement in the association of the devotee one is placed in devotional service, and this service dispels all one's misgivings about Kṛṣṇa, or God, and Kṛṣṇa's activities, form, pastimes, name and other features. After these misgivings have been perfectly cleared away, one becomes fixed in one's study. Then one relishes the study of *Bhagavad-gītā* and attains the state of feeling always Kṛṣṇa conscious. In the

advanced stage, one falls completely in love with Kṛṣṇa. This highest perfectional stage of life enables the devotee to be transferred to Kṛṣṇa's abode in the spiritual sky, Goloka Vṛndāvana, where the devotee becomes eternally happy.

9.26 (p. 478 old): Here Lord Kṛṣṇa having established that...

9.26 (p. 487 new): For the intelligent person, it is essential to be in Kṛṣṇa consciousness, engaged in the transcendental loving service of the Lord, in order to achieve a permanent, blissful abode for eternal happiness. The process of achieving such a marvelous result is very easy and can be attempted even by the poorest of the poor, without any kind of qualification. The only qualification required in this connection is to be a pure devotee of the Lord. It does not matter what one is or where one is situated. The process is so easy that even a leaf or a little water or fruit can be offered to the Supreme Lord in genuine love and the Lord will be pleased to accept it. No one, therefore, can be barred from Kṛṣṇa consciousness, because it is so easy and universal. Who is such a fool that he does not want to be Kṛṣṇa conscious by this simple method and thus attain the highest perfectional life of eternity, bliss and knowledge? Kṛṣṇa wants only loving service and nothing more. Kṛṣṇa accepts even a little flower from His pure devotee. He does not want any kind of offering from a nondevotee. He is not in need of anything from anyone, because He is self-sufficient, and yet He accepts the offering of His devotee in an exchange of love and affection. To develop Kṛṣṇa consciousness is the highest perfection of life. Bhakti is mentioned twice in this verse in order to declare more emphatically that bhakti, or devotional service, is the only means to approach Kṛṣṇa. No other condition, such as becoming a brāhmaṇa, a learned scholar, a very rich man or a great philosopher, can induce Kṛṣṇa to accept some offering. Without the basic principle of bhakti, nothing can induce the Lord to agree to accept anything from anyone. Bhakti is never causal. The process is eternal. It is direct action in service to the absolute whole.

Here Lord Kṛṣṇa having established that...

11.52 (p. 586 old, end of 1st par): A foolish person may deride him, but that is an ordinary person. Kṛṣṇa is actually desired to be seen by demigods like Brahmā and Śiva in His two-armed form.

11.52 (p. 599 new, bottom): A foolish person may deride Him, thinking Him an ordinary person, and may offer respect not to Him but to the impersonal "something" within Him, but these are all nonsensical postures. Kṛṣṇa in His two-armed form is actually desired to be seen by demigods like Brahmā and Śiva.

13.5 (p. 626 old, begin first par, 2 lines up): Similarly, in the original *Vedas*, a distinction between the soul, the Supersoul and the body is made, especially in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*.

There is a manifestation of the Supreme Lord's energy known as *annamaya*, by which one depends simply upon food for existence. This is a materialistic

realization of the Supreme. Then there is *prāṇamaya*; this means that after realizing the Supreme Absolute Truth in foodstuff, one can realize the Absolute Truth in the living symptoms, or life forms. In *jñānamaya* the living symptom develops to the point of thinking, feeling and willing. Then there is Brahman realization and realization called *vijñānamaya* by which the living entity's mind and life symptoms are distinguished from the living entity himself. The next and supreme stage is *ānandamaya*, realization of the all-blissful nature. Thus there are five stages of Brahman realization, which are called *brahma puccham*. Out of these the first three-*annamaya*, *prāṇamaya* and *jñānamaya*-involve the fields of activities of the living entities. Transcendental to all these fields of activities is the Supreme Lord, who is called *ānandamaya*. In the *Vedānta-sūtra* also the Supreme is called, *ānandamayo 'bhyāsāt*. The Supreme Personality of Godhead is by nature full of joy, and to enjoy His transcendental bliss, He expands into *vijñānamaya*, *prāṇamaya*, *jñānamaya*, and *annamaya*. In this field of activities the living entity is considered to be the enjoyer, and different from him is the *ānandamaya*. That means that if the living entity decides to enjoy, in dovetailing himself with the *ānandamaya*, then he becomes perfect. This is the real picture of the Supreme Lord, as supreme knower of the field, the living entity, as subordinate knower, and the nature of the field of activities. [end purport]

13.5 (pp. 644-45 new, begin first par, 5 lines up): Similarly, in the original *Vedas*, a distinction between the soul, the Supersoul and the body is made, especially in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*. There are many great sages who have explained this, and Parāśara is considered principal among them.

The word *chandobhiḥ* refers to the various Vedic literatures. The *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, for example, which is a branch of the *Yajur Veda*, describes nature, the living entity and the Supreme Personality of Godhead.

As stated before, *kṣetra* is the field of activities, and there are two kinds of *kṣetra-jña*: the individual living entity and the supreme living entity. As stated in the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (2.9), *brahma puccham pratiṣṭhā*. There is a manifestation of the Supreme Lord's energy known as *anna-maya*, dependence upon food for existence. This is a materialistic realization of the Supreme. Then, in *prāṇa-maya*, after realizing the Supreme Absolute Truth in food, one can realize the Absolute Truth in the living symptoms or life forms. In *jñāna-maya*, realization extends beyond the living symptoms to the point of thinking, feeling and willing. Then there is Brahman realization, called *vijñāna-maya*, in which the living entity's mind and life symptoms are distinguished from the living entity himself. The next and supreme stage is *ānanda-maya*, realization of the all-blissful nature. Thus there are five stages of Brahman realization, which are called *brahma puccham*. Out of these, the first three-*anna-maya*, *prāṇa-maya* and *jñāna-maya*-involve the fields of activities of the living entities. Transcendental to all these fields of activities is the Supreme Lord, who is called *ānanda-maya*. The *Vedānta-sūtra* also describes the

Supreme by saying, *ānanda-mayo 'bhyāsāt*: the Supreme Personality of Godhead is by nature full of joy. To enjoy His transcendental bliss, He expands into *viññāna-maya*, *prāṇa-maya*, *jñāna-maya* and *anna-maya*. In the field of activities the living entity is considered to be the enjoyer, and different from him is the *ānanda-maya*. That means that if the living entity decides to enjoy in dovetailing himself with the *ānanda-maya*, then he becomes perfect. This is the real picture of the Supreme Lord as the supreme knower of the field, the living entity as the subordinate knower, and the nature of the field of activities. One has to search for this truth in the *Vedānta-sūtra*, or *Brahma-sūtra*.

It is mentioned here that the codes of the *Brahma-sūtra* are very nicely arranged according to cause and effect. Some of the *sūtras*, or aphorisms, are *na viyad aśruteḥ* (2.3.2), *nātmā śruteḥ* (2.3.18), and *parāt tu tac-chruteḥ* (2.3.40). The first aphorism indicates the field of activities, the second indicates the living entity, and the third indicates the Supreme Lord, the *summum bonum* among all the manifestations of various entities.

13.19 (p. 643 old, end of purp): In other words, knowledge is nothing but the preliminary stage of understanding devotional service perfectly.

13.19 (p. 662-63 new, bottom of page): In other words, knowledge is nothing but the preliminary stage of understanding devotional service perfectly. In the Fifteenth Chapter this will be very clearly explained.

Now, to summarize, one may understand that verses 6 and 7, beginning from *mahā-bhūtāni* and continuing through *cetanā dhṛtiḥ*, analyze the material elements and certain manifestations of the symptoms of life. These combine to form the body, or the field of activities. And verses 8 through 12, from *amānitvam* through *tattva-jñānārtha-darśanam*, describe the process of knowledge for understanding both types of knower of the field of activities, namely the soul and the Supersoul. Then verses 13 through 18, beginning from *anādi mat-param* and continuing through *hr̥di sarvasya viṣṭhitam*, describe the soul and the Supreme Lord, or the Supersoul.

Thus three items have been described: the field of activity (the body), the process of understanding, and both the soul and the Supersoul. It is especially described here that only the unalloyed devotees of the Lord can understand these three items clearly. So for these devotees *Bhagavad-gītā* is fully useful; it is they who can attain the supreme goal, the nature of the Supreme Lord, Kṛṣṇa. In other words, only devotees, and not others, can understand *Bhagavad-gītā* and derive the desired result.

16.7 (p. 732 old, top): One should always be careful to keep his body clean by bathing, brushing teeth, changing clothes, etc.

16.7 (p. 750 new, first par, 6 lines up): One should always be careful to keep his

body clean by bathing, brushing teeth, shaving, changing clothes, etc.

Appendix G

Texts for the Editorial Quiz

For the editorial quiz, you'll need to refer to the relevant passages from *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*. Here they are, as they appear in both the First (Macmillan) Edition and the Second (BBT) Edition.

1. Bg 2.1 (p. 72 old, end of purport): This realization is made possible by working with the fruitive being situated in the fixed conception of the self.

Bg 2.1 (p. 74 new, end of purport): This realization is possible when one works without attachment to fruitive results and is situated in the fixed conception of the real self.

2. Bg 7.25 (p 400, old): In the prayers of Kuntī in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (1.8.18) it is said that the Lord is covered by the curtain of *yoga-māyā* and thus ordinary people cannot understand Him. Kuntī prays: “O my Lord, You are the maintainer of the entire universe, and devotional service to You is the highest religious principle. Therefore, I pray that You will also maintain me. Your transcendental form is covered by the *yoga-māyā*. The *brahmajyoti* is the covering of the internal potency. May You kindly remove this glowing effulgence that impedes my seeing Your *sac-cid-ānanda-vigraha*, Your eternal form of bliss and knowledge.”

Bg 7.25 (p. 404, new): In the prayers of Kuntī in the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (1.8.19) it is said that the Lord is covered by the curtain of *yoga-māyā* and thus ordinary people cannot understand Him. This *yoga-māyā* curtain is also confirmed in the *Īsopaniṣad* (*mantra* 15), in which the devotee prays:

*hiraṇmayena pātreṇa
satyasyāpihitam mukham
tat tvaṁ pūṣann apāvṛṇu
satya-dharmāya dr̥ṣṭaye*

“O my Lord, You are the maintainer of the entire universe, and devotional service to You is the highest religious principle. Therefore, I pray that You will also maintain me. Your transcendental form is covered by the *yoga-māyā*. The *brahmajyoti* is the covering of the internal potency. May You kindly remove this glowing effulgence that impedes my seeing Your *sac-cid-ānanda-vigraha*, Your eternal form of bliss and knowledge.” The Supreme Personality of Godhead in His transcendental form of bliss and knowledge is covered by the internal potency of

the *brahmajyoti*, and the less intelligent impersonalists cannot see the Supreme on this account.

3. Bg 2.43 (p. 128 old, begin 2nd par): In the *karma-kāṇḍa* section of the *Vedas* it is said that those who perform the four monthly penances...

Bg 2.43 (p. 130 new, begin 2nd par) In the *karma-kāṇḍa* section of the *Vedas* it is said, *apāma somam amṛtā abhūma* and *akṣayyaṁ ha vai cāturmasya-yājinaḥ sukṛtaṁ bhavati*. In other words, those who perform the four-month penances...

4. Bg 10.29 (p. 526 old, bottom of page): There is also a planet of trees presided over by Aryamā, who represents Kṛṣṇa.

Bg 10.29 (p. 540 new, mid par of purport): There is also a planet of Pitās, ancestors, presided over by Aryamā, who represents Kṛṣṇa.

5. Bg 10.35 (pp. 531 old, bottom of page): It has already been explained by the Lord that amongst all the *Vedas*, the *Sāma Veda* is rich with beautiful songs played by the various demigods.

Bg 10.35 (pp. 545 new, bottom of page): It has already been explained by the Lord that amongst all the *Vedas*, He is the *Sāma Veda*. The *Sāma Veda* is rich with beautiful songs played by the various demigods.

6. Bg 10.22 (p. 521 old):

TRANSLATION: Of the *Vedas* I am the *Sāma Veda*; of the demigods I am Indra; of the senses I am the mind, and in living beings I am the living force [knowledge].

PURPORT: The difference between matter and spirit is that matter has no consciousness like the living entity; therefore this consciousness is supreme and eternal. Consciousness cannot be produced by a combination of matter.

Bg 10.22 (p. 535 new):

TRANSLATION: Of the *Vedas* I am the *Sāma Veda*; of the demigods I am Indra, the king of heaven; of the senses I am the mind; and in living beings I am the living force [consciousness].

PURPORT: The difference between matter and spirit is that matter has no consciousness like the living entity; therefore this consciousness is supreme and eternal. Consciousness cannot be produced by a combination of matter.

7. Bg 5.28 (p. 303 old, mid second par) One has to drive out the sense objects such as sound, touch, form, taste and smell by the *pratyāhāra* (breathing) process in *yoga*, and then keep the vision of the eyes between the two eyebrows and concentrate on the tip of the nose with closed lids.

Bg. 5.28 (p. 304 new, mid second par): One has to drive out the sense objects such as sound, touch, form, taste and smell by the *pratyāhāra* process in *yoga*, and then keep the vision of the eyes between the two eyebrows and concentrate on the tip of the nose with half-closed lids.

**For a whole lot more on BBT editorial
policies, please check out
BBTedit.com**