

Love Beyond Love (from Prīti Sandarbha, Anuccheda 61)

Translation

Thus, *prīti* for Bhagavān is the highest objective of life. In *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (1.20.19), Prahlāda uses an analogy which describes the intrinsic characteristic of *prīti*:

*yā prītir avivekānām viṣayeṣv anapāyinī
tvām anusmarataḥ sā me hṛdayān māpasarpatu*

“The same irrevocable *prīti* which (*yā*) ignorant people have for sense objects, may that *prīti* for You not disappear from my heart while remembering You.”

The use of the relative pronouns *yā* (which) and *sā* (that), means that *prīti* for Bhagavān has some key characteristics that are the same as the *prīti* ignorant people have for sense objects, but it does not indicate that both types of *prīti* are absolutely the same. Later on, the distinctions between the two types of *prīti* will be clearly defined. One type of *prīti* is a manifestation of *māyā* and the other manifests from the *svarūpa śakti* of Bhagavān.

The word *prīti* means happiness (*sukham*), joy (*mut*), delight (*pramoda*), thrill (*harṣa*), bliss (*ānanda*), and so on. The word *prīti* also implies *priyatā* – which means devotion (*bhāva*), love (*hārda*), affection (*sauhṛda*), and so on. Thus there is a relationship between happiness (*prīti*) and love (*priyatā*).

Happiness is an experience that makes one delighted, thrilled, joyful, and so on. Love (*priyatā*) involves pleasing the beloved, desiring to do so, and experiencing the beloved. This also produces an experience that makes one delighted and so on. Therefore, love is superior to happiness, for love *includes* happiness automatically.

Happiness is an experience of elation. The object causing the happiness (*viṣaya*) does not experience it, only the subject perceiving the object (*āśraya*) experiences it. The same is true for the opposite of happiness, misery. Love, however, is experienced not only by the lover (*āśraya*), but also by the beloved (*viṣaya*). The same is true for the opposite of love, hatred.

Happiness and misery are experienced only by their subjects (*āśraya*), the fortunate and unfortunate living entities. Love and hate are experienced by their subjects (*āśraya*), lovers and haters, as well as by their objects: the beloved and the hated.

The activities of happiness (*prīti*) have the object (*viṣaya*) as their substratum (*adhikaraṇa*), like the meaning of the verb “to light”. The activities of hatred (*dveṣa*) have the object (*viṣaya*) as their target of action (*karma*) like the verb “to kill”.

In this regard, Sanskrit grammar describes the object of a verb (*karma*) as the aspired objective of an agent (*kartā*), the desired result from the verb-action. The means to achieve the result is of four types: generating, transforming, improving, and attaining. Some verbs have no object, grammar describes

them as “intransitive” (*akarmaka*). Most other verbs have an object (indicated by having the *ni*-suffix inherent in their root). Grammar describes them as “transitive” (*sakarmaka*). For example, in the statement, “He makes the pot,” the word “makes” is the transitive verb with the sense of *generating* the object, the pot. In the statement, “He cooks rice,” the word “cooks” is the transitive verb with the sense of transforming the object; he transforms the rice from hard to soft. Examples of intransitive verbs without objects are “to exist,” or “to light.”

Prīti – the happiness of love - is doubtlessly an intransitive concept. Such is the nature of conscious experience, expressed in intransitive phrases like “to be alive.” Like consciousness, *prīti* is ever existent. It is not the effect of any cause. Thus it is not dependent on any injunction, like the knowledge of sacrifice, which generates results in the future.

Thus, the word *prīti* has two meanings: love (*priyatā*) and happiness (*sukha*). However, Prahāda’s definition of it (in *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* 1.20.19, cited above) stresses the sense of love, not happiness, for as “happiness” *prīti* is experienced only in the experiencer, but as “love” *prīti* is experienced by both the lover and beloved. Prahāda’s definition would be very hard to explain if we take *prīti* only in the sense of happiness.

Prīti for one’s son etc. has the same basic characteristic as *prīti* for Bhagavān, but the former is a manifestation of *māyā*, as has been explicitly declared by Kṛṣṇa:

“Desire, aversion, pleasure, pain, the physical body, material consciousness, firmness – this is the *kṣetra* described in brief along with its transformations.” (Gītā 13.6)

The later type of *prīti* is a manifestation of Bhagavān’s *svarūpa śakti*, as will be explained soon [in *anuccheda* 65]. Therefore, it was rightly said that, “The use of the relative pronouns *yā* (which) and *sā* (that), means that the *prīti* for Bhagavān has the same characteristics as the *prīti* of ignorant persons for sense objects; not that both *prītis* are the same” (*Yā yal lakṣaṇā, sā tal lakṣaṇā*).

Prīti for Bhagavān is also called *bhakti* because it is fixed in Bhagavān, just like the *prīti* for seniors like the father. For this reason, in the preceding verse to the verse cited above, Prahāda prayed for *prīti* while calling it *bhakti* (VP 1.20.18):

“O Bhagavān, in thousands of births, whatever form I may take, let me always have irrevocable devotion (*bhakti*) unto You, Acyuta.”

Prahāda begs for the same thing in the next verse, but there refers to it with the words “*ya prīti*,” and so on. It is not a repetition. These two (*prīti* and *bhakti*) are indeed one, because Bhagavān, while blessing Prahāda, also spoke of them as one:

“You indeed have *bhakti* for Me, and let it be so again.” (VP 1.20.20).

If these two were different, Bhāgavan would have also blessed Prahāda with *prīti* for Him.

One may propose to interpret the second line of VP 1.20.20, where Prahāda prays for lack of *prīti* for sense objects as, “O husband of Lakṣmī (*māpa*), let that *prīti* for sense objects (*viṣaya*) disappear, or

run away, (*sarpatu*) from my heart.” Such an explanation, which means praying for renunciation from sense objects, is also not befitting, because Bhagavān did not mention it in His blessings. Moreover it is contrary to the popular reading *nāpasarpatu* instead of *māpa sarpatu*, which has been used in the above interpretation.

Although *bhakti* is a synonym for *prīti*, not all the words made from the root *bhaj* [which is the basis for the word *bhakti*] by applying different suffixes, convey the meaning of the verb *prī* (to love), which is the basis for the word *prīti*. When *bhakti* and *prīti* take the forms of *bhajati* [lit. “serves”] and *prīṇāti* [lit. “loves”], respectively, they are not entirely synonymous. Only the words *bhakti* and *bhakta* convey the meaning of the word *prī* (to love). Therefore, *bhakti* being synonymous with *prīti*, is also intransitive (requiring no object).

Prahlāda indicates that *prīti* for Bhagavān is the experience of favorable action for Bhagavān, and the desire to attain Bhagavān to execute that favorable action. By comparing it to *prīti* for material objects, Prahlāda indicates that, like the experience of the sweetness of a material object, the experience of the sweetness of Bhagavān is distinct from *prīti* itself. Thus, it is appropriate that the Bhāgavatam (11.2.43) describes that experience as somewhat distinct from *bhakti* itself:

“Bhakti, renunciation, and realization of Bhagavān appear simultaneously in a surrendered soul.”

And also in Gītā (11.54):

“Only through one-pointed bhakti, O Arjuna, can I be known in essence, seen in this form, and even be truly entered into.”

Śrī Kapila directly defines *bhagavat prīti* in one and half verses (SB 3.25.32):

“Causeless devotion to Bhagavān is the natural inclination of the senses of a person with mind singularly fixated towards Bhagavān - who is the personification of sattva. These senses are the means of perceiving objects and engage in activities enjoined by the Vedas. This *bhakti* is superior to *mukti*.”

Earlier it was said: “*Śraddhā*, *rati*, and *bhakti* will manifest in that order” (SB 3.25.25). In this statement, although *rati* and *bhakti* have only a difference of gradation, and thus are both a type of *prīti*, yet in *bhakti* that is called *prema* and characterized with excessive *prīti*, love (*prīti*) becomes more explicit. With this intention he defines *prīti* by using the word *bhakti*.

The meaning of the Kapila’s statement (SB 3.25.32) is as follows: *Guṇa-liṅgānām* means those who have the adjuncts (*upādhis*) of the tree *guṇas*. They are also called “*ānuśravikam*, which means that their character is understood from the *śruti* and *purāṇas*.

Among these three *devas* (*devānām*), namely Śrī Viṣṇu, Brahmā and Śiva one who is called *sattva* here is Śrī Viṣṇu. The word *sattva* signifies one who empowers *sattva* by his mere proximity or it means one who is the personification of *śuddha sattva*, a specific manifestation of *svarūpa śakti*. The word *sattva* here as an indicator of Viṣṇu refers to any one of the unlimited forms of Bhagavān.

The meaning is [fixity of mind] in any one of them. The word *eva* categorically denies *prīti* in anyone else; and it also denies *prīti* in Viṣṇu and in someone else simultaneously. *Eka-manasaḥ vṛtti* means the consciousness of a person which is favorable to the worshipable. *Animittā* means devoid of any desire for fruits, *svābhāviki* means naturally manifest on dint of the very quality, such as beauty of Bhagavān, without making an endeavor, not produced by force. This is *bhāgavatī bhakti* or *prīti*. Because of contact of *prīti*, the other *bhakti* is called natural. Therefore, the primary meaning of the word *vṛtti* in this verse (SB 3.25.32) should be only taken as *prīti*; and this is superior to *siddhi* or *mokṣa*, because it is said that:

“My devotee does not accept *mukti* – either in the form of *sālokya*, *sārṣṭi*, *sārūpya*, *sāmīpya* or *sāyujya* – even if I personally offer it; unless it can be utilized in My service.” (SB 3.29.13)

Therefore, if *mokṣa*, which is the goal of *jñāna*, is ridiculed, then it is improper to explain that the meaning of *siddhi* is *jñāna* in the verses under discussion. By stating that *bhakti* is superior to *mokṣa*, it is also shown that the *vṛtti* called *bhakti* is beyond the *guṇas* of nature. It is more dense bliss than *mokṣa*. Like the grace of Bhagavān, it manifests in the mind. Moreover, it is called *vṛtti* of the mind because it is superimposed on the mind.

Commentary

In the first sixty *anucchedas*, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī has established that *prīti* is the ultimate *puruṣārtha* (object of human pursuit). As said earlier, traditionally in India, *mokṣa* or *mukti* is considered the highest *puruṣārtha*. Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī is establishing a new principle, primarily based on *Śrīmad Bhāgavatam*, which he established as the highest authority in understanding the Absolute Reality, Tattva. In the beginning of *Prīti Sandarbha*, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī stated that the real goal of life (*puruṣārtha*) is to attain happiness without any mixture of suffering. All philosophers, theologians, and even common people can easily agree to this. Śrī Jīva equated this to *mukti*, which literally means “freedom,” specifically, “freedom from suffering.” In this sense, *mukti* is a negation, and is automatically included in the goal of attaining happiness devoid of any suffering.

Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī has analyzed that the root cause of suffering is ignorance about the Absolute, Tattva. Therefore, realization (*sākṣātkāra*) of the Absolute is essential to attaining the ultimate goal. This realization is therefore nondifferent from *mukti*. Realization of the Absolute (*tattva-sākṣātkāra*) is of two types, Brahman and Bhagavān. Out of these two, *bhagavat-sākṣātkāra* is far superior. Thus, the real goal of life is realization of the Absolute as Bhagavān (*bhagavat-sākṣātkāra*).

This realization is also of two types, internal and external. Between them, the second one is superior. Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī explains that realization of Bhagavān without love (*prīti*) is as good as having no realization at all. Thus, the ultimate goal of life is love for Bhagavān.

Incidentally Śrī Jīva also explains gradual versus immediate liberation (*krama-* and *sadyo mukti*, respectively); and liberation during life versus liberation after death (*jīvan-* and *utkrānta-mukti*, respectively). He also lists five types of *mukti*:

1. Identity with the Absolute (*sāyujya*)

2. Sharing the realm of Bhagavān (*sālokya*)
3. Sharing the opulences of Bhagavān (*sārṣṭi*)
4. Sharing the beauty of Bhagavān (*sārūpya*)
5. Sharing intimacy with Bhagavān (*sāmīpya*)

Identity with the Absolute has two divisions: identity with Absolute Consciousness (*brahma-sāyujya*) and identity with Bhagavān (*bhagavat-sāyujya*). Neither is recommended by Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī because there is no possibility of *prīti* in them. Among the remaining four, *sāmīpya* is the best. A devotee, however, does not hanker for any of them, but desires only *prīti* – whose essence lies in doing favorable service to Bhagavān. A devotee may accept the four types of *muktis* if they assist in serving Bhagavān.

A devotee never prays for anything but *prīti*. Sometimes, devotees with *prīti* may pray for some opulence with which to serve Bhagavān. Bhagavān readily fulfills their desire, but if He does not, the devotee also considers that the grace of Bhagavān. The logic is as follows: Bhagavān does not wish to entangle His devotee in the potential distractions of opulence. In fact, He prefers to gradually make a devotee devoid of all material opulence, resulting in greater humility and surrender, and increasing the devotee's hunger for pure *prīti*. Ultimately, all devotees reach the shelter of Bhagavān and live with Him in spiritual forms which are given to them at the end of their material lives.

A subject is established by giving its definition and the process to experience it. Thus, after establishing *prīti* as the topmost desirable goal of human life, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī then proceeds to explain the definition of *prīti*. He does so using analogy (*atideśa*).

Thus current *anuccheda* is the most important in the entire book, and a sincere student must study it carefully. If the definition of *prīti* is understood clearly, it will aid greatly in understanding the rest of the book.

Prīti, or “love,” is a very difficult concept to grasp. There are a few reasons for this. The first is that the word “love” is used very commonly in daily conversations. When a word is used excessively, it tends to lose its original meaning. Almost everybody uses the word “love” every day, without paying any attention to its real meaning.

There are various ways of learning the meaning of a word:

1. **From grammar.** We can learn the meaning of the word “went” by comprehending that it is the past perfect form of the verb “to go.”
2. **From analogy.** We can learn the meaning of the word “lime” by hearing that it is like a lemon.
3. **From a dictionary.** We can learn the meaning of the word, “planet” by reading its dictionary definition, “an object that orbits the sun.”
4. **From instruction.** We can learn the meaning of words like “nose,” “eyes,” etc. by being shown what they are.

5. **From experience.** We can learn the meaning of a word by seeing what people refer to when they use it. For example, when visiting a friend, you hear him ask his wife, “Please bring the *rasagullas*.” When she carries out a plate of white, round sweets, you understand the meaning of the word *rasagulla*.

Surprisingly, we use many words in our daily life without clearly understanding their meaning. Love is certainly such a word.

Another problem is that we think we already know what love is. This prevents us from making an effort to understand, or paying attention to an explanation of it. Everyone thinks they have some experience of love. The type of love Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī describes here, however, is completely different from the “love” we may have experienced. We can misunderstand it by assuming it to be the same as our ordinary experience of love.

Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī tries to give an explicit and clear definition of *prīti*.

To begin, he compares it to ordinary “love.” Comparisons, also called analogies, are very useful in understanding something we don’t know, by referencing their similarities and differences with things we do know. Analogies can also be over-extended, however, because the thing we don’t know is not entirely similar to the things it is compared to or analogous with. Non-material things, for example, are *not* identical to the material things that are their analogues. Specifically, in this case, ordinary love is not entirely the same as *prīti* for Bhagavān. Nonetheless analogies are helpful because our material mind cannot begin to grasp non-material things without them.

Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī says that although the definition of material love is the same as the definition of non-material love, the two are not completely identical. Material love is a product of the material *guṇas*, while *prīti* for Bhagavān is a part of His intrinsic potency. In many respects, they have opposite characteristics, although referred to by the same word, “love.” This distinction must always be kept in mind, otherwise we will develop misconceptions about both.

According to the Amarkośa Dictionary (1.4.24), the synonyms for the word *prīti* are *mut*, *pramada*, *pramoda*, *āmoda*, *sammada*, *ānanda*, *ānandathu*, *śarma*, *śāta*, and *sukha*. These all basically mean happiness. Happiness is a type of feeling one gets when something favorable happens to oneself or to one’s object of attachment. When we experience happiness our heart “expands” (*ullāsa*). Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī distinguishes happiness (*sukha*) from love itself. He says that love (*priyatā*) also causes the heart to “expand” as in happiness, but it results not from a favorable event, but from giving pleasure to the beloved, or even by desiring to do so and thus coming into proximity with the beloved. It is significantly different from happiness, because it is not the result of an event, but the result of a mood or temperament that continually exists in the heart of the lover.

Love therefore includes the feeling of happiness, but happiness does not include all the components of love. Love includes the beloved.

To give an example, someone may say, “I love chocolate.” But what he really means is that eating chocolate brings him happiness. He has no desire to please the chocolate in any way, he wants to eat

and enjoy it. The chocolate is meant to give him happiness, and not vice versa. Here, the person acts for his own happiness.

In contrast, someone may say, “I love my daughter.” In this we find a constant flow of affection from the person’s heart towards their beloved daughter, in the form of intense concern to see that she is safe, happy, and so on. This person desires to do something that delights or benefits the child, and when they can make the beloved happy, they automatically experience the expansion of heart, which is a characteristic of happiness. In the quest for happiness, one seeks the desired object to consume it. In the expression of love, however, one seeks the beloved for the sake of their pleasure. In love, one does not seek one’s own independent happiness, whereas in “love” (that is love in name only, but is actually the quest for happiness) one acts *only* for one’s own happiness. Although love permits no desire for one’s happiness, it bestows immense happiness, far greater than the independent pursuit of happiness.

In love, there is no possibility of a lover acting or even thinking unfavorably toward the beloved.

In summary, happiness and love are two different things, but love includes happiness.

Further evidence that happiness and love are distinct entities is the fact that their opposites are also different. The opposite of happiness is misery, while the opposite of love is hate.

To help us still further understand the difference between happiness and love, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī points out that happiness is experienced only by the subject, not by the object. The person eating chocolate experiences happiness. The chocolate doesn’t. The chocolate-eater’s happiness is in no way dependent on the happiness of the chocolate. Love, however, is quite different. Both the lover and the beloved experience it, and it is entirely dependent upon pleasing the beloved. *Bhakti Rasāmṛta Sindhu* also describes love in this way (2.1.16), stating that it exists in the lover (*āśraya*) and flows to the beloved (*viṣaya*), and this dynamic between the two is its sustenance (*alambana*).

Another interesting distinction between happiness and love is that happiness is mechanical and *karmic*, but love is natural and causeless, arising only from its own beneficence. That is, happiness has a simple cause-and-effect dynamic: A particular stimuli generates a particular effect; and the ability or inability to access that stimuli comes as a result of one’s good or bad fortune. Love, however, is without rhyme or reason, and appears simply by its own sweet will. One falls in love simply because the beloved inexplicably captivates one’s entire being.

Like love, hatred also includes the hater and the hated – but there is a difference which Śrī Jīva explains via reference to grammar. All verbs that mean “to love” have the object of love in the seventh grammatical case, *adhikaraṇa*, indicating that the beloved is the fundamental basis of the action (i.e., the beloved is the *adhikarana*, the substratum).

Generally, according to the rules of Sanskrit grammar, a substratum is called *āśraya* and takes the seventh case. However, in case of *prīti*, the lover is also the *āśraya* of *prīti*, but does not take the seventh case. Rather, it is the *viṣaya*, or object of love, with takes the seventh case.

Otherwise, it would be like the consumer of chocolate who is the substrata of the resulting happiness. In love, the lover is the *agent* of love, and therefore takes the first grammatical case. For example, *bhaktaḥ kṛṣṇe prīṇāṭi* or *bhaktaḥ kṛṣṇe prītim karoti*, “The devotee loves Kṛṣṇa.” The devotee is the lover, the *āśraya* of *prīti*, and is therefore expressed in the first grammatical case, as *bhaktaḥ*. Kṛṣṇa is the beloved, the *viṣaya* of *prīti*, and is therefore expressed in the seventh grammatical case, as *kṛṣṇe*.

Saying, “The devotee loves Kṛṣṇa” is similar to saying, “The lamp illuminates the room.” The lamp is the *āśraya* of light and the room is the *viṣaya*. The light flows from the lamp towards the room.

Similarly, verbs that mean “to hate” also have a subject (*āśraya*) of hatred and an object of hatred (*viṣaya*). However, the object of hatred is not expressed in the seventh case but in the second, which is called *karma kāraṇa* – the object of an action’s fruition. For example, *bhaktaḥ kaṁsam dveṣṭi*, “The devotee hates Kāmsa.”

Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī explains the meaning of the second grammatical case. He says that every action has an agent, called *karttā*. The agent performs the action to achieve something. The thing the agent wants to achieve is called the *karma*, the object or fruition of the action. Thus, the verb (*kriyā*) is the means (*sādhanā*) to achieve the desirable, (*sādhya*, *īpsitatama*, or *karma*).

The various cases of a word vary depending on the type of voicing a statement uses, active or passive. *Karttā* takes the first case in active voice and third case in passive voice. *Karma* takes the second case in active voice and the first case in passive voice.

There are four means to gain the objective: by creation, modification, improvement, or attainment. An example of creation is a cook who prepares soup. Soup did not exist to begin with. It was created by using various vegetables, spices, and water. In case of modification, the object already exists and the agent modifies it. For example, the goldsmith makes a ring from gold. In case of improvement, the agent augments the value of an object. For example, we can add flavoring to drinking water. In case of attainment, the agent reaches a destination, for example, “Kṛṣṇa goes to Vṛndāvan.”

Verb roots are of two types, transitive (*sakarmaka*), and intransitive (*akarmaka*). The meaning of a root involves two things: an effort (*vyāpāra*) and the objective (*phala*). For example, when a cook prepares soup, the effort (*vyāpāra*) involves turning on the fire, putting a pot on it, putting vegetables, spices, water and other ingredients into the pot, stirring it, and finally taking the pot off the fire. The objective (*phala*) is that the vegetables become soft and integrated with the water and spices. The shelter of the effort is the agent, the cook in the present example. The shelter of the objective is the *karma*, the ingredients of the soup.

A transitive verb has, as described above, a separate shelter for the effort and the objective. An intransitive verb, however, has the effort and objective co-existing in the agent. For example, *kṛṣṇa hasati* (“Kṛṣṇa laughs”). Here Kṛṣṇa is the agent, and is the shelter of both the effort, laughing, and the objective, laughing.

Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī says that a transitive verb has an inherent causative suffix (*ṇi*), and intransitive verbs do not. With active voice we can say, “A cook prepares soup.” With passive voice, “Soup is prepared

by the cook.” In a causative form, “The cook causes soup to be prepared.” Causative statements are not possible with intransitive verbs. For example, it is not possible to make a causative statement from “Kṛṣṇa laughs.” Laughing is not something that can be produced outside of the agent.

The root *prī*, “to love,” is an intransitive verb, although it appears to be transitive. This is *why* the object takes the seventh case, to act as the substrata of the verb. In Sanskrit, we cannot make a causative statement of the sentence, *bhaktaḥ kṛṣṇe prīṇātī* (“The devotee loves Kṛṣṇa”), as can be done with the sentence, *pācakaḥ yūṣam pācati* (“The cook prepares soup”).

There is a deep implication behind this. *Prīti* is the intrinsic potency of Bhagavān. As will be explained later (*Anuccheda* 65), Bhagavān *gives it* to His devotee. This would not be conveyed properly if the beloved became the object of the verb (thus taking the second case), for this would convey that the agent (the devotee) is in full control of the *prīti*, and would make the *prīti* something that seems to be created or manifested entirely from the *jīva*. Some people do believe that *prīti* is manifest from the *jīva*, where it currently lies dormant. But if such were the case, then it would be fitting to express love with the beloved as the object of the verb, not as the substrata of it.

One may object: *Prīti* was described as a type of awareness, *jñāna-viśeṣa*. Awareness always has an object. So how can the verb “to love” have no object?

Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī replies that the root *prī* is like the root *cit*, which also means “to be conscious or aware”, and which is well known to be intransitive. Roots which mean “to be awake or conscious” are considered to be intransitive.

The following *śloka* lists transitive roots:

*lajjā-sattā-sthiti-jāgaranaṁ vṛddhi-kṣaya-bhaya-jīvita-maranaṁ
narttana-nidrā-rodana-vāsāḥ spardhā-kampana-modana-hāsāḥ
śayana-kṛdā-ruci-diptyarthāḥ dhātava ete karmaṇi noktāḥ*

Thus, the conclusion is that love is not something that can be created or caused. It happens or it does not happen, of its own will. It is self-existent (*svayam-siddha*) in Kṛṣṇa and His pure devotees. From them, it descends into the heart of some fortunate living beings. This is stated in *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu*: *nitya-siddhasya bhāvasya prākatyaṁ hṛdi sādhyatā* (BRS 1.2.2).

It is not a fruit that can be attained by following any injunction. The Veda has injunctions to perform *yajña*. This creates piety, which grants “heaven,” which is another way of saying “happiness.” Happiness, therefore, can be created.

If one performs *yajña* without material motive, the result is subduing of *rajas* and *tamas* and predominance of *sattva*. In turn, this grants clear knowledge of the self, *jñāna*. Kṛṣṇa confirms this in the (Gīta 4.33), *sarva karmākhilam pārtha jñāne parisamāpyate*, “O Arjuna all endeavors culminate in *jñāna*.” Therefore *jñāna*, too, can be created.

Love, although a type of *jñāna* (a type of experience or awareness), is not like this because it *cannot* be manufactured. It neither depends on nor is produced by any *yajña*. It comes only by the grace of Bhagavān or His devotee.

At the beginning of this *anuccheda*, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī quoted Prahāda describing *prīti* for Bhagavān by analogy with material *prīti*. This may lead us to believe that both types of love are the same, which would be a mistake. But this is an unavoidable danger, because *prīti* for Bhagavān is non-material and all our experiences are material. There is no other choice but to give definition of material *prīti* and then try to understand the non-material one. The difficulty in distinguishing the two types of *prīti* arises from their similar manifestations externally. But when one studies the hearts of two different persons who have two different types of *prīti*, then one can understand that these two types of *prīti* are not same. It is like the appearance of brass and gold, which is the same only externally. Therefore, there is a need for scriptural authority to distinguish between these two types of *prīti*.

While analyzing *prīti*, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī said that word *prīti* can mean either *sukha* or *priyatā*. He then explained the difference between them. Now he says that out of the two meanings of the word *prīti*, it is only the second meaning, i.e., *priyatā*, which is applicable to *prīti* for Bhagavān. The definition of *prīti* in conventional relationships is the same as the definition of *prīti* for Bhāgavan, and comprehension of the former facilitates comprehension of the later – on the principle of analogy (*atideśa*). In present day society, traditional family bonds have been shattered beyond repair, and people in general have little or no experience of even conventional *prīti*. Their only experience is of *sukha*, things that make them happy, and they conceive of “love” in this way. The whole modern society is geared towards *sukha*, and against *prīti*. Thus, even to comprehend conventional love is a Gordon’s knot.

There is also a distinction, however, between conventional love and love for Bhagavān. Conventional love is manifest within *māyā*, and love for Bhagavān is manifest within Bhagavān’s *svarūpa-śakti*. To substantiate that conventional love occurs within *māyā*, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī quotes Kṛṣṇa (Gītā 13.6) describing the various modifications of the material body (*kṣetra*). These include *icchā* and *dveṣa*. Literally, *iccha* means desire, but here, contrasted with *dveṣa* (hatred) it refers to love (*prīti*). Earlier it was said that the opposite of *prīti* is *dveṣa*. Also, the word *sukha* in this verse can refer to the inferior *prīti*. Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī already showed that *sukha* is one of the meanings of *prīti*.

After defining the word *prīti*, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī says that sometimes the word *bhakti*, which is derived from the root *bhaj*, is used in its place. But he informs that not all of the words that can be formed from the root *bhaj* equate with the meaning of *prīti*. Only the words *bhakti* and *bhakta* are synonymous with *prīti*. In essence, *bhakti* is a synonym of *prīti*, and *bhakta* is one who has *prīti*. The root *bhaj* is transitive, but when it is used in the sense of *prīti*, it becomes intransitive.

In this way, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī explained *bhagavat-prīti* by comparing and contrasting it with material *prīti*.

Next, he says that the experience of Bhagavān’s sweetness is different from *prīti* for Him. Commonly, also, we know that love for an object is not identical with the experience of that object. There is, however, an intrinsic relationship between love for the object and the experience of the object. Love is

instrumental in granting experience of the object. The stronger the love, the deeper and sweeter the experience.

The distinction between *prīti* and its experience is stated by sage Kavi in SB 11.2.43:

*ity acyutāṅghriṁ bhajato 'nuvṛṭṭyā bhaktir viraktir bhagavat-prabodhaḥ
bhavanti vai bhāgavatasya rājaṁs tataḥ parām śāntim upaiti sākṣāt*

“**Bhakti, renunciation, and realization of Bhagavān appear simultaneously in a surrendered soul.**”

In this verse, the word *bhakti* refers to *prīti*, and *bhagavat-prabodha* refers to the experience of Bhagavān. They are treated as distinct entities.

Similarly, Kṛṣṇa also makes this distinction in verse 11.54 of the *Gītā*.

*bhaktyā tv ananyayā śakya aham evaṁ-vidho 'rjuna
jñātuṁ draṣṭuṁ ca tattvena praveṣṭuṁ ca parantapa*

“**Only through one-pointed *bhakti*, O Arjuna, can I be known in essence, seen in this form, and even be truly entered into.**”

The word *bhakti* here means *prīti*, and it is by this *prīti* that one can know, see, and enter into Kṛṣṇa.

At the end of this *anuccheda*, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī gives the definition of *prīti* made by Kapila in *Śrīmad Bhāgavatam*, the supreme authority on the Absolute Reality. The additional points made in this definition are that *prīti* is only for Kṛṣṇa and His plenary manifestations (*svāmśas*). It is not for any other *deva*, such as Śiva. *Prīti* is natural. There is no effort involved in it. It just happens naturally. It is not an effect of material actions. It is superior to liberation. It is a specific energy of Bhagavān and thus beyond the *guṇas* of *prakṛti*. Its very nature is intense bliss. Thus, *prīti* does not lead to something else. It is its own result. This also proves that it is the ultimate goal. Being eternal and not a product of any material action, it appears by the grace of Bhagavān or His devotee. It is also given the name *vṛtti* (mental state) by Kapila, because it descends into the mind of a devotee – imbuing that mind with itself, like fire contacting an iron rod and making it hot.