

## CHAPTER ONE

### TRACING LĪLĀ WITH NATURE IN THE ŚRIMAD BHĀGAVATA

#### MĀHĀPURĀṆA

##### *Līlā in the Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*

Fire is said to be Your face, the earth Your feet, the sun Your eye, and the sky Your navel. The directions are Your sense of hearing, the chief demigods Your arms, and the oceans Your abdomen. Heaven is thought to be Your head, and the wind Your vital air and physical strength. The trees and plants are the hairs on Your body, the clouds the hair on Your head, and the mountains the bones and nails of You, the Supreme. The passage of day and night is the blinking of Your eyes, the progenitor of mankind Your genitals, and the rain Your semen<sup>1</sup>. ( *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 40 :13-14)

Akrūra admires Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the aforementioned extract of the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The addresser sees the form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the objects of Nature such as the fire, the sun, the sky, directions, oceans, wind, trees, plants, clouds, mountains, and rain. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the basis in the objects of Nature. Based on this argument, one states that there is no completion of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* without Nature. In this context, it is interesting to note that Nature is inseparable from the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

The idea of Nature has its association with the divine quality and a mother. In this connection, Rakesh Sastri compares the earth with a mother in his article "Vedesu Paryāvaraṇam": "The Earth nourishes us and protects us like a mother. As a mother she offers everything needed for our survival. Therefore, we should also protect her as her offspring" (26). To explicate Sastri's claim, one can ascertain that the earth is our mother and everybody should preserve her for the well-being of species, including mankind and animals. Human beings depend on Nature so that they should maintain

friendly relation with her. If they regard Nature as a divine form, it is sure to be useful to make the form of Nature as it is without making any harm in her beauty.

On the basis of this relation, Rajiv Ranjan Upadhyayin *Vigyān Prakash* unfolds humans' dependence on Nature:

The biological objects like forests and animals and physical elements of nature like land, water, heat, air and space are connected with our existence. When we harm these objects, we actually make our existence worse. Therefore, preservation of these objects is necessary.(32)

The ecological balance helps maintain health for human beings and other creatures on this planet. The balance between human beings and Nature is interlinked in such a way that human beings cannot exist independent from Nature. The ethics of human beings is to show respect to the objects of Nature such as the sun, the earth, the sky, oceans, rivers, forest, and air. The objects of Nature make our life delightful and meaningful. No one should disturb the equilibrium of Nature on this globe for the existence of creatures. Otherwise, we are bound to face unexpected natural calamities. This research work discusses Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in interrelation to Nature in the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. I have used Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa's the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* translated and commented in English with Sanskrit text as a primary source of study by A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swāmi Prabhupāda. I have also used other versions of translation of *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

*Līlā*, in the *Paurāṇic* literature means playful activities, entertainment, celebration, and beauty of a person. Writers, primarily in the tradition of Sanskrit literature, have introduced it with music, song, and dance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Eventually, it is assumed that "It is a gesture from beauty and entertainment" [*layanamiti li: sampādanādīwat kwip, pūna: liyam lātīti*] (Madhukhandewala 224). This notion of

*līlā* emphasizes the *śringāra līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. At this point, Madhukhandewala unravels the hero-heroine relationship: "*Līlā* is the emotion of attraction between the hero and the heroine which does not care about the ethics" [*raticakraprabritte tu naiba śāstraṁ na ca karma*](30). But the *Vaiśṇava* scholars have different line of argument about *līlā* and they establish their view for the reliability and the validity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*.

Swami Vireswarananda introduces *līlā* in confirmation with his logic referring the evidence from *Brahmasutrā*: "This world is the workplace of *līlā*" [*lokabattu li:lākaibalyam*] (2. 1: 256). He sees the worldly activities as *līlā* and this idea deals with the reality. Śrī Madhavāchārya associates his concept with birth and death: "Thus even though the self is eternal, because of its association and disassociation with body (experiences as it were), birth and death as being certain"<sup>2</sup> (qtd. in Sonde 34). In Madhavāchārya's perception, there is *līlā* in the life of a person from birth to death and one who performs different activities are the *līlās*. In line with this argument, he formulates the life of human beings as *līlā*. Unlike Madhavāchārya, Rāmānujāchārya clarifies *līlā* arguing: "Don't Fear" to those who are mortally afraid of the hell as a *līlā* that is the endless cycle the *Varāhā* form as the Lord of knowledge" [*enjāvennaragatthu azhundhi nadunguginrerku anjelennu adiyenai ātkollavallānai*] (6). He goes a step ahead when he associates his idea of *līlā* with death referring an incarnation of *Varāhā*. On the basis of this idea, one argues that *līlā* belongs to birth and death of human beings.

Shankarachārya, however, has a different argument about *līlā* from Madhavāchārya and Rāmānujāchārya. Connecting his definition of *līlā* to the condition of the universe, Shankarachārya in *Manisha Panchakam* reveals that: "The entire universe is always perishable" [*nityam brahmā nirantaram vimṛishatā*

*nirvyājashantātmanā*] (4). This perspective of *līlā* consoles readers with the argument that everything of this universe is perishable. In this light, *līlā* is dynamic either in the life of a person or the universe. In that sense, the idea of *līlā* can be interpreted in the highest level from multiple perspectives.

Caitanya Mahāprabhu further unfolds the concept of *līlā*. At one point, Mahāprabhu asserts that everyone should bear or suffer the fruits of his activity (qtd. in Prabhupada xiii). In his remark, Mahāprabhu connects *līlā* and *karma* to expose *līlā* in the theoretical frame of *karma*. Thus, the validity of *līlā* is as the consequence of human actions. This concept has occupied a considerable space in the *Paurānic* literature. Precisely, *līlā* in its connection with *karma* pervades human life.

*Līlā* is the ground for interpretation about the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In this context, Mahāprabhu in *Caitanya Caritram* validates Kṛṣṇa *līlā*: "The power of Kṛṣṇa lies in the prosperity of Rādhā with three forms: *halādini*, *ṣandhinī* and *cindaśe ṣamvitam*" (Ādīparva: 4. 54). There is the unification of two transcendental identities (Rādhā and Śrī Kṛṣṇa ) for internal potency. This notion of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* presents Rādhā as the base for the playful activities of Kṛṣṇa. Radha is the inner strength of Śrī Kṛṣṇa (Prabhupada 12) so that he proves himself as the rescuer of common people from his *līlā*.

The *Vaiṣṇava* scholars have further explored the concept of *līlā*. The same point is further explored by Rupagosvāmi from a different line of argument: "*Līlā* is the imitation of the activities of the dearest person" [*priyanukaraṇam līlāram yairveśakryadibhi*] (qtd. in Kumar 54). Śrī Kṛṣṇa becomes so influential among *gopīs* that they tend to imitate his activities, such as costumes, speech, glance, and walking style of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in Vṛndāvana. *Līlā* for *gopīs* of Vrajabhumī is real love. Thus, he narrows the area of *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* with reference to the

*gopīs'* playful activities with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In support to this argument, Prabhupāda highlights Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. He goes on arguing that Śrī Kṛṣṇa performs his playful activities to control demonic kings and gives justice to helpless people (4). In fact the idea of *līlā* refers to the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his influence over other characters in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

G. Buhler expounds *līlā* from the *Manusamhita*. Buhler confirms the *līlā* of Brahmā: “Brahma is creating the world in sport. The *manvantaras*, the creation and destructions of the world are numberless, sporting, as it were; *Brāhman* repeats it again and again” (22). He states that Brahmā is the creator of the world. It indicates that the word *līlā* broadens its scope because of its relationship with the creation of the world. Unlike Buhler, Rohit Kumar posits his view in *Ānandavṛndāvana*: “The word *Līlā* relates to the birth and the activities of the Lord” [*Līlā śabda ka byabahār bhagavānke janma evaṁkarmakelie vi kiyā jātāhai*] (57). In his explication, Kumar considers Śrī Kṛṣṇa in his *līlā* as the hero and the superhero.

In her exposure of *līlā*, Manjulata Mehta draws an analogy between *līlā* and Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Moreover, Mehta examines Śrī Kṛṣṇa in his embodiment of love, beauty, celebration, knowledge, and *līlā* (47). Such character traits in Mehta's analogy have taken considerable space. Her analysis of *līlā* resembles *Vaiṣṇava* scholars' speculations on Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* for the exposition *līlā*. Madhukhandewala follows the footsteps of Manjulata while conceptualizing *līlā* in her text *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa me Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā Ki Prabandha Yojanā, ek Adhyan*. Eventually, Mehta parallels *līlā* with devotees in their devotion to God: “*Līlā* is the activity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the eternal pleasure to *bhaktas* –devotees” [*tirohitānandasya layam lāti iti līlā*] (35). She claims that there is happiness in the life of devotees by establishing Śrī Kṛṣṇa as God. If human beings understand the value of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in their practical

lives, they always remain happy. It may be the base for the improvement of the present society which leads the world to the ideal society by following the footsteps of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Modern theorist of *līlā*, Franklin Edgerton presents an evidence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Gītā*. Śrī Kṛṣṇa addresses Arjunā: “O son of Pritha, there is no work prescribed for Me within all three planetary systems. Nor am I in want of anything, nor I obtain anything-and yet I am engaged in prescribed duties<sup>3</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Gītā*: 3. 22). This discussion highlights playful activities and duties of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as his *līlās*.

The activities of God Vīṣṇu are the ground of *līlā* in the cosmos. In this context, David Kingsley in *Divine Player* on the value of Vīṣṇu *līlā* argues:

The image of sleeping Vīṣṇu spinning the world into being from his dreams and image of the solitary boy creating the world amid play suggests a spontaneous, unpremeditated creation. The world does not appear to be purposely fashioned but is brought into being as a result of reflex or over abundance. (3)

In *Vaiṣṇava Dharma*, Vīṣṇu *līlā* remains centre of discussion. God is the creator and rescuer of the universe. God Vīṣṇu appears in different forms to rescue mankind when there is crisis in the universe.

Considering these details on *līlā* from the perspectives of the *Vaiṣṇava* and non-*vaiṣṇava* scholars, one argues that humans and superhumans equally perform *līlā* in the world. It includes both people's common and complex, credible and incredible actions and moves. This idea further highlights the reality that the concept *līlā* is the basis for the analysis of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* with a reference to Nature as a theoretical tool.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses *līlā* from the narrative perspective of Śūkadeva and other characters like Sage Suta, Brahmā, Uddhava, Sage Maitreya, and Prahlāda. They highlight the concept of *līlā* in the *Paurāṇic* period. In this connection, Śūkadeva is apt to state: "Let me offer my respectful obeisances onto the Supreme Personality of Godhead who, for the creation of the material world, accepts the three modes of nature" [*namaḥ parasmai puruṣāya bhūyase/ sad-udbhava-sthāna-nirodha-līlayā*] (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 2. 4: 12). The narrator regards creation of cosmos of the divine being as his *līlā*. With a similar belief, C. L. Goswami notes that the supreme person performs "His sportful activity of creating, preserving and destroying the universe" (100). To strengthen the argument, one can argue that the universe is created and will be destroyed according to the course of time. The *līlā* of the divine being motivates human beings to perform their activities as *līlās* for a short-time. With this conditioning, G. V. Tagare elaborates that the perfect man uses his infinite power for creation, maintenance, and destruction of the universe (172). It shows that the concept of *līlā* began from the analysis of playful activities of divine being.

It is instructive to mention the argument of Sage Suta on *līlā*: "Assuming the roles of incarnations, He performs pastimes to reclaim those in the mode of pure goodness" [*līlavatārānuratodeva-tiryak-narādiṣu*] (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 1. 2: 34). It indicates that God incarnates in the universe for the performance of His *līlā*. But the *līlās* of divine being is for well-being of all creatures. It is interesting to note the view of Prabhupāda to highlight *līlā* of God. He argues: "He appears to be differently manifested according to the particular time (140). The interpreter points out *līlā* as the activities of divine being. Explaining this statement, Bibek Debroy in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses that playful activities of God in

creation, maintenance, and destruction of the world are His *līlās* (29). In these lights, Śūkadēva and Sage Suta underscore the shared values of *līlā* linking the value of *līlā* with the activities of divine beings.

Divine sages of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* highlight the *līlās* of God in the universe. They neglect *līlās* of human beings. Like Śūkadēva and Sage Suta, Brahmā proves the importance of God's *līlā* from his argument: "Through the material qualities, You very easily create the universe, maintain it and again annihilate it" [*viśvasya sarga-sthiti-saṁyamān guṇaiḥ/ sva-līlayāsandadhate 'vyayātmane*] (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 7. 8: 40). Brahmā reaches to the level of thinking *līlā* from the level of creation and destruction of the universe. To support this idea of *līlā*, Pushpendra Kumar remarks that the divine being "himself remains undecayed and unchanged" (606). It shows that the creation of the creator is destroyed according to the course of time but he remains same. To support his claim, John Stratton Hawley in *At Play with Krishna* reiterates that "Godhead into human form" (59) for completion of his *līlā*. The discussion above shows that the creation of the universe is the outcome of the *līlās* of divine beings.

Uddhava opposes an idea of *līlā* from Śūkadēva, Suta, and Brahmā in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. He incorporates Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* as the basis of *līlā*. In his words: "The great wizards who were able to assume any form were engaged by the king of Bhoja, Kāmsa, to kill Kṛṣṇa, but in the course of His pastimes the Lord killed them as easily as a child breaks dolls"<sup>4</sup>. (3.2:30) To support the idea of *līlā*, Uddhava reports Śrī Kṛṣṇa's conquest of the demons including Aghāsura, Bakāsura, Sakatāsura, Dhenukāsura, and Putanā in the forms of humans and animals. It proves that Śrī Kṛṣṇa shows his *līlās* from the time of his childhood. With this idea at the centre of attention, G.V. Tagare in his *The Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* claims



that Śrī Kṛṣṇa "killed those wiley conjuring demons who could assume any form at will and who were deputed by Kāmsa" (230). Thus, Uddhava highlights heroic activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as his *līlās* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

Sage Maitreya examines Viṣṇu *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* in its connotation with the divinity. At one point, Maitreya argues: "In this manner the Personality of Godhead, Lord Viṣṇu, the maintainer of all living entities, raised the earth from within the water, and having placed it afloat on the water, He returned to His own abode" [*sa ittham bhagavān urvīm viṣvaksenaḥ prajāpatiḥ/rasāyālīlayannītām apsu nyasya yayau hatiḥ*] (3. 13: 47). At this point, Maitreya highlights Viṣṇu *līlā* in his conviction of God Viṣṇu's descentance to the universe and ascendance to Vaikuntha after the completion of His *līlā*. In a similar fashion, Ramesh Menon chronicles God Viṣṇu's appearance to the world for *līlā* (130). However, Swami Ranganathananda links the soul of human beings to the super soul, the soul of divine beings. In his words: "the Supreme Soul is thus realized within oneself" (16). In these lights, humans in their actions and expressions become parts of their *līlās* due to the realization of the Supreme Soul in them.

*Līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, is related to the *Paurāṇic* characters in their real actions. Prahlāda discusses on Nṛsimha *līlā*. In his words:

As a snake captures a mouse or Garuḍa captures a very venomous snake, Lord Nṛsimhadeva captures Hiranyakaśipu, who could not be pierced even by the thunderbolt of King Indra. As Hiranyakaśipu moved his limbs here, there and all around, very much afflicted at being captured, Lord Nṛsimhadeva placed the demon on His lap, supporting him with His thighs, and in the doorway of the assembly hall the Lord very easily tore the demon to pieces with the nails of His hand<sup>5</sup>. (7. 8: 29)

Nṛsiṃha *līlā* in which the divine being appears as Nṛsiṃha to rescue Prahlāda from the oppression of his demonic father Hiranyakaśipu. This *līlā* narrates the victory of justice over injustice. At this point, Prabhupāda confirms that Nṛsiṃhadeva "easily killed the great demon Hiranyakaśipu" (443). This incarnation of Nṛsiṃha denotes the importance of god's *līlā* for well-being of creatures and to control oppressors on the earth. Precisely, Śūkadeva, Suta, Brahmā, Uddhava, Sage Maitreya, and Prahlāda highlight the significance of *līlā* of divine beings in the universe for the establishment of righteousness, justice, and peace. In the same way, Śrī Kṛṣṇa takes necessary actions to rescue mankind and maintain justice and peace in Vraja Bhumī.

### **Notion of *Līlā* and Its Historical Development**

*Līlā* is a play which deals with the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and he regards his difficult works as common. Kṛṣṇa is able to solve complicated problems easily. "*Līlā* probably has derived from the root "lelay," "to flare" or "flame." An action of ideas is clear, he adds, as both fire and play suggest spontaneous, erratic movement" (Kinsley 69-70). Spontaneous and erratic movements of a human or divine being are related to *līlā*. In that sense, *līlā* is an indispensable part of the *Hindus*. Superheroes have unconditioned nature and they have universal characteristics. They do not have common frailties in their activities because of their perfectness in works. Śrī Kṛṣṇa has similar characteristics in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are difficult to know from the common understanding of humans (Kinsley 70). Like knowledge and power, *līlā* exposes realities that Śrī Kṛṣṇa does not have limitation in his actions. Śrī Kṛṣṇa of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* performs his *līlās* to save humans from injustice and establish the righteous regime. From *līlās*, he proves himself as an ideal personality to maintain order in society with truth and righteousness.

Parul Choudhary, in *Concept of Purusa*, further elaborates the idea of *līlā*: “*Līlā* is different from or “other” than; the world of here now that is dominated by cause and effect, when man is forced to act out of necessity” (48). Choudhary concludes that “cause” and “effect” are the bases of *līlā* in the life of divine beings. Unlike other children, Śrī Kṛṣṇa plays the cosmic game in his childhood. Nature manifests with spectacular feasts in the worldly *līlās* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. *Hindu* scriptures adapt *līlās* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the different contexts from the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

The *Ṛigveda* does not explicitly include the word *līlā* (Choudhary 49), but it projects this term's resonance in a sense of *māyā*. The oldest *Hindu* scripture illustrates the *līlās* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The divine beings extend themselves from *māyā* with their supernatural abilities. To support the idea of *līlā* in the *Ṛigvedā*, Krishnaswami incorporates his ideas: "Imperial kings, strong, Heros, Lords of earth/ and heaven, Mitra and Varuna, *Ye* ever active ones//*Ye* wait on thunder with the many tinted clouds and/ By the Aura's magic power cause Heaven to (*māyā*) rain”(7). In this light, the heaven is the base for the causes of rain on the earth. The dealing of *māyā* bases on the idea of *līlā* from which Śrī Kṛṣṇa performs his playful activities in the world. Śrī Kṛṣṇa's magical actions epitomize his *līlā* and the worldly *māyā*. But human beings belong to *Mahamāyā* so that they run after the fulfillment of their senses whereas *Yogamāyā* is the *māyā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

The *Svetasvatara Upanisad* discusses *līlā* as a joyful sport of Brahmā for the creation of the universe. Referring the use of *līlā* in the *Upaniṣad*, Choudhary focuses that the *Svetasvatara Upaniṣad* has referred that the creation is the illusory game of joy (49). In this light, one can argue that the creation of the universe is possible while Brahmā is in the mood of happiness. The *Svetasvatara Upaniṣad* incorporates the *līlā*

of Brahmā who is the creator of the universe. Explaining this idea, present readers come to know that the *Svetasvatara Upaniṣad* eclipses Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* from Brahmā *līlā* in the matter of creation of this world. This *Upaniṣad* writes confirmation that Brahmā is the originator of the universe. In relation to this notion, one can postulate the action of Brahmā as *līlā*.

Like the *Svetasvatara Upaniṣad*, the *Taittiriya Upaniṣad* also presents the *līlā* of Brahmā as the creator of the universe. In this regard, Vedavyāsa takes a point in case: “From which all the creatures are born, being born by which they sustain and into which they merge back, know that is Brahmā” [*Yato va imanibhutani jayante/yena jatani jlvanti. Yat prayant-yabhi-sam-vishanti/ tadvijigyasasva tad brahmeti*] (qtd. in Sharvananda 3). In this connection, one can argue that Brahmā is the creator of the universe. With this discussion, we can debunk that the universe is an earthen pot and Brahmā is the potter. The scripture regards soil as *upadāna* and *kartā* is the person who accomplishes the task. The *Upaniṣads* uses *upadāna kāraṇa* (material cause) and *nimitta kāraṇa* (cause of intelligence) to deal with the creation of the universe. One identifies Brahmā as *upadāna kāraṇa* and *nimitta kāraṇa* in the *Taittiriya Upaniṣad*. Brahmā does not only create the universe as an instance of his *līlā* but also manifests himself in his creation. Precisely, *Taittiriya Upaniṣad* discusses on the *līla* of Brahmā concerning to his creation of the universe.

One can observe the *līlās* of Rāma and Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the epic philosophy such as the *Rāmāyāna* and the *Mahābhārata*. In this regard, divine activities are the *līlās* of Rāma in the *Rāmāyāna* and Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. The *Rāmāyāna* reposes Rāma's actions and adventures. His *līlās* make him as an ideal ruler of the world and humans admire his regime time as Rāma *Rājya* (the ideal state of Rāma) in the world. Arun Verma highlights: “Rama *līlā* is simply

an enactment of the epic *Rāmāyāna*. It covers the complete life, values, principles, and journey of Lord Ram” (1). The *līlās* of Rāma are admirable and his actions are imitable for humans. The *Rāmāyāna* refers to the activities of Rāma as *Maryādā Purushottam* who follows disciplines as an ideal ruler (Carole Satyamurti 33). In the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Gītā*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a superhero, counselor, motivator, and a politician. This text discusses that Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the origin of the universe, sole authority of creation and dissolution. The hero performs his *līlā* from the hands of Arjuna.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Gītā* extends the scope of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* regarding him as a planner, philosopher, and politician of the *Mahābhārata*. In this text, Śrī Kṛṣṇa shows his Universal Form to Arjuna for his motivation to participate in the war. In a similar fashion, Franklin Edgerton presents an evidence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Gītā*. Śrī Kṛṣṇa addresses Arjunā: "Should not engage in action scrupulously at any time, great harm will come to the world; for, Arjuna, men follow My way in all matters"<sup>6</sup> (3: 23). In it, Śrī Kṛṣṇa warns humans through Arjuna not to work for the destruction of environment. In this regard, a researcher gets revelation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in his playful actions and the *līlās* help to understand his activities. From the above expression, Śrī Kṛṣṇa claims to have his power in three worlds (heaven, earth, and the netherworld). Unlike the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Gītā*, G. Buhler associates the idea of *līlā* in *Manusamhita* (The Laws of Manu). He writes a confirmation of the *līlā* of Brahmā: “Brahma is creating the world in sport. For *manvantaras*, the creation, and destructions of the world are numberless, sporting, as it were; *Brāhman* repeats it again and again” (22). Like the *Taittiriya Upaniṣads*, this scripture indicates that Brahmā is the creator of the world. The word *līlā* broadens its scope because of its relationship with the creation of the world. Both the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*

and the *Manusamhita* oppose to each other about the creation of this universe. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* claims that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the creator of the universe whereas the *Manusamhita* asserts that Brahmā has the same role as Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Vedavyāsa clarifies the supremacy of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to Brahmā in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* concerning their power. Śrī Kṛṣṇa extends himself into calves and *gopās* using his *yogic* power after the disappearance of the real calves and the *gopās* by Brahmā.

We find same crux of logic when we locate critics' evaluative comments on the *līlā* of Brahmā. The *Brahma Sutra* is apt to describe the *līlā* of Brahmā as a creator of the universe as the description in the *Svetasvatara* and the *Taittiriya Upaniṣads*. Unlike the claim of *Brahma Sutra*, Radhakrishnan states that: “Creation is not possible for Brahmā on account of having a motive. But, as in ordinary life, creation is mere sport” (361-62). In this regard, sportive impulse causes the creation of the world. From his unlimited power, Brahmā creates the universe without cooperation from others. Parul Choudhary goes a step ahead when the critical thinker traces: “People say that you perform *līlā* for many times” (53). Thus Brahmā *līlā* is inevitable for the creation of the universe. The sportive actions of Brahmā become the base of creation of the world.

The *Matsya Purāṇa* and *Vīṣṇu Purāṇa* refer *līlās* of superheroes whose activities are as the activities of the divine beings. These *Purāṇas* focus on the activities of the certain Lords according to its subject matter. The *avatārs* (incarnations) of animals like Matsya (fish), *Kūrma* (tortoise), *Vārah* (hog), and *Narśimha* (man with the head of lion) are necessary for God to rescue the earth during the time of crisis. There is the description of different *avatārs* of God in the form of animals. *Matsya Purāṇa* deals with the *līlā* of God in the form of fish. The divine

being rescues the earth during the time of *pralaya* (devastation) from the *avatār* of *Matsya*. This *Purāṇa* expresses that Vīṣṇu creates the world while he is sleeping on the serpent *Ananta* (*Śesa*) in the Primordial Ocean. *Matsya Purāṇa* mentions the *līlā* of God as follows: “During the sleep, a lotus grows from his navel and the demi-urge *Brahma* is created, who in turn creates the world. Creation here is seen as a pointless reflex of God” (Choudhary 53). The god creates the cosmos as his one of the *līlās* while he is asleep.

Vedavyāsa postulates the significance of Nature as a platform for performance of *līlā* through the character of Śūkra in the *Matsya Purāṇa*. Śūkra further proves the validity of *līlā* to Virôchana: "O, Son of Earth, O blessed one, you have been born of the sweat drop of Lord Śiva, I pray you for beauty and have taken shelter under you. Be pleased to accept this *arghya*, I salute you. Please accept this liberation of water"<sup>7</sup>(32: 217). In this connection, Lord Śiva performs his *līlā* for creation of plants and animals and Virôchana is an example of it. One stresses on the point that God Śiva performs his *līlā* for the creation of both plants and creatures. The *panchamahābhuta* (earth, water, light, air, and sky) are the bases for the stand of Śiva's *līlā*. Likewise, everybody has elements of *panchamahābhuta* in his body so that humans should respect Śiva. Śūkra formulates his notions to Virôchana that both the earth and God Śiva are same so that humans should respect both of them. The *Matsya Purāṇa* praises Vīṣṇu as the creator of the Universe even though it respects God Śiva as one of the trinities of the *Hinduism*.

The *Vīṣṇu Purāṇa* discusses Vīṣṇu as a sporting God. It presents sufficient evidences in the *līlā* of Vīṣṇu. To support the idea of *līlā* in the works of Nature, the *Vīṣṇu Purāṇa* elucidates:

Then, ether, air, light, water, and earth, severally united with the properties of sound and the rest, existed as distinguishable according to their qualities, as soothing, terrific, or stupefying; but possessing various energies, and being unconnected, they could not, without combination, create living beings, not having blended with each other.<sup>8</sup> (1. 2: 48-50)

This manifestation of *līlā* is based on the idea of Nature in the *Vīṣṇu Purāṇa*. In this line of argument, one opines that the activities of *pancamahābhūt* incorporate the works of Nature's *līlā*. The activities which happen in this world are the illustrations of *līlās*. As the *līlās* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Brahmā, Vīṣṇu, and Śiva have similar roles in connection to Nature.

To support this idea, David Kinsley argues the *līlā* of God Vīṣṇu in this way: The image of sleeping Vīṣṇu spinning the world into being from his dreams and image of the solitary boy creating the world amid suggests a spontaneous, unpremeditated creation. The world does not appear to be purposely fashioned but is brought into being as a result of reflex or over abundance (3). The tradition of *Vaiṣṇava Dharma* regards Vīṣṇu *līlās* as the focal point. The god is the creator and the rescuer of the universe. When there is crisis in the universe, God Vīṣṇu appears in different *avatārs* as need of time. From the evidences that are presented about the concept of *līlā* from the time of the *Ṛīgveda* to the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, one can argue that *līlā* is concerned to creation of the universe.

### **Statement of Problems**

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses problems related to Nature and makes humans conscious about it. But they fail to understand the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* as a source to uphold the value of Nature. This burning crisis becomes the prime problem for the study of this research work. One continues to choose resources from its various passages and considers how people mobilize to raise the environmental awareness. This text forecasts the environmental crisis in the future



world. It shows how Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* creates awareness about Nature to readers. The theory of "Nature" helps humans to discuss on the environmental awareness of the earth. It shows responsibility of humans to control crisis in Nature. The major problem of this study is to examine Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* from the perspective of Nature. Thus, the dissertation has sought answers to the following research questions to address the problem.

1. What type of interrelation do Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature get the reflected in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*?
2. How does Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* manifest Nature in creation?
3. How are the linkages between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlās* and Nature represented in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*?

### **Objectives**

Based on the research questions, the objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To explore the interrelationship between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature reflected in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.
2. To examine manifestation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.
3. To explicate the representation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature represented in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

### **Delimitation**

There are several texts which represent the embeddedness between divine spirit and Nature such as the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Bhāgavata Gitā*, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* etc. Among them, my primary text under scrutiny is the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. There are several issues to be explored and analyzed. This study also focuses on exploring, examining, and analyzing the interrelationship between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Among various echotheologists, the ecocritical insights envisioned by Aristotle, Baruch Spinoza and John Locke have been used as theoretical parameters to analyze the primary texts.

### **Significance of Study**

This dissertation interrelates the Eastern philosophy of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* with mainly the Western concept of Nature based on thoughts keeping Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* at the centre. This study is innovative because it

encourages humans to dedicate their lives for the conservation of Nature as Śrī Kṛṣṇa of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. This study motivates scholars, writers, and the critical thinkers how literature connects East and West and how there are the commonalities of the problems in relation to Nature. It is very much useful and helpful for interpretation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the academic field. At the same time, this research provides guidance for the future researchers on Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* to see how the text is explored, identified, analyzed, and evaluated from the perspective of Nature.

### **Methodology**

The analysis of this dissertation is based on Nature and interpretive approach has been used for analysis. Nature is the main theoretical modality that has been applied for the analysis of this research. The researcher has applied Baruch Spinoza's principle on Nature for the analysis on Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The philosopher argues that the things of Nature and God are same (120). He further explicates that the law of Nature is the basis for morality. Aristotle and John Locke are supporting theorists to overview Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in Nature. On this ground John Locke argues that God puts humans on the earth and he does not put us to starve. For this, the theory of Nature is based on for the analysis of the primary texts, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The original text in Sanskrit has been used in the appendix section using superscripts in the dissertation. Nature, description, its significance, and awareness from the text have been cited and highlighted for analysis. The research also relates and refers to philosophical, social, political, environmental, and religious issues in the concerned texts. Basically, it is based on the library research so that the selected texts form the primary source of study.

Critical materials on the text obtained from libraries, internet search, scholars' and experts' suggestions have been taken sincerely, seriously, and responsibly for the research. Other ideas that suit for the research have been used. Apart from the selected texts, other commentaries on the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* written in *Sanskrit*, English, *Hindi*, and *Nepali* languages have been taken into account. Transliteration method has been used while citing examples from those texts except A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swāmī Prabhupada's the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* in English with Sanskrit stanzas. While citing examples, non- English words have been written in *italics* along with the translation of Prabhupāda in English from Sanskrit within inverted commas.

The secondary sources have been taken from *Sanskrit*, English, *Nepali*, and *Hindi* languages. But those sources have been used in terms of free translation. Both electronic and print forms of the sources have been used to collect secondary data. Other classical Sanskrit literatures like *Vedas*, *Upanishada*, *Manusmritī*, and *Purāṇas* have been referred where necessary in the dissertation. In the course of critical reading, the study helps from various theories on environment to strengthen the theory of Nature. The collected data have been selected, evaluated, interpreted, and presented appropriately as the need of this dissertation. In addition to these, the researcher has visited accessible national and international libraries and book-stalls to accomplish the project.

### **Outline of Chapter Division**

The dissertation has been divided into five major chapters: Tracing *Lilā* with Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, Basic Concepts of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Lilā*, Ecotheories, and the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*; Connecting Human Activities with Nature; Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Lilā* and Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, and

Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā* Thrives in Nature. The first chapter introduces *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, notions of *līlā* and its historical development, statement of problems, objectives, significance, delimitation, methodology, and outline of chapter division. Apart from these chapters, this dissertation contains preliminaries, work cited list and appendix sections.

Chapter two incorporates reviews on the basic concepts of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*, reviews of Nature in ecotheories, and reviews on the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. At first, it deals with the basic concepts on Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā*. After this discussion, the study moves ahead to the reviews on ecotheories referring the relation of Nature with ecofeminism, ecopoetics, and ecocriticism with the sufficient evidences. Then, the discussion concentrates on reviews on the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

The third chapter comprises of methodology with the title "Connecting Human Activities with Nature". Then, the study is related to Nature discourse in the *Vedas*. After this, the discussion concentrates on Nature discourse in the *Upaniṣads* and *Purāṇas* with conclusion. Later, the study relates to the traditional and modern discourses on Nature. Then, the researcher analyzes Nature in relation to ecology and environment. After this, the discussion belongs to comparative study of the *Hindu* religion and western traditional philosophical approaches to Nature. Later, the discussion on this process is related to the theoretical modality for the analysis of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

The fourth chapter presents the analysis of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* from the perspective of Nature theory. The focus of the study is interrelation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. At first, this section analyzes interrelation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature. Then it is followed by manifestation Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in Nature. Each *līlā* of the hero and the contribution of Nature in his

performance has been analyzed. Later, this chapter deals with Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in its mild and destructive forms of Nature. The destructive forms of Nature such as whirlwind form of Tṛṇāvarta, destruction of yamalārjuna trees and effects from the poison of Kāliya, conflagration in forest, and the torrential rain on the Govardhan hillock are analyzed from the perspective of Nature in interrelation to Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*.

The interrelation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* with the physical and the transcendental worlds of Nature has been explored. At first, it deals with Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in interrelation to Yamunā River and the Indian Ocean. Then the analysis concentrates on Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in interrelation to animals and trees. There is special focus on discussion of *Kadamba* and *Pārijāta* trees due to their major role to promote Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* on the basis of Nature. After this, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and its interrelation to Transcendental Nature is the focal point of discussion. In the third part of the chapter, the transcendental Nature extends to the role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to conserve Nature for benefits of all creatures. Then, the discussion moves to the *Virāta* form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Other chapters such as Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā* in interrelation to Nature in *Māhātmya*, *Rāsa Līlā* and Nature in the union and separation of characters, and Nature for the creation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* shows and evaluate the importance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in interrelation to Nature. It proves that Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is the essence of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. It motivates readers to care and conserve Nature for the existence of creatures on this globe. The fifth chapter of this dissertation concludes with summary and the conclusion of the entire research.

## CHAPTER TWO

### BASIC CONCEPTS OF ŚRĪ KRṢṆA LĪLĀ, ECOTHEORIES, AND THE ŚRĪMAD BHĀGAVATA MĀHĀPURĀṆA

This section aims at discussing the views of writers, critics, and the literary thinkers on the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. It consists of the reviews of the relevant literature in the field of the basic concepts on Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*, ecotheories, and the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is possibly the most widely-read hero in the *Hindu* Scripture. Though the hero had his *līlās* more than five thousand years ago, however he is the most discussed character in Sanskrit texts (Prabhupada 19). Some of his *līlās* are controversial so he becomes one of the debatable characters in the vast body of literature.

The study begins with Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* referring the views of critical thinkers, writers, and philosophers. Then, it presents review on theory mentioning ecotheories as the base of analysis. Then, the discussion goes ahead to the interpretation of critics' and philosophers' reflection to prove Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a social activist who sacrifices his life for the well-being of plants and creatures. After that, the discussion moves to the views of different critics on ecotheories. Then, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* becomes the centre of reviews for critical thinkers and writers. Their arguments on Śrī Kṛṣṇa highlight him as a model character to follow his activities for the betterment of every society. The text shows the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa during the time of his childhood. *Bāla* Kṛṣṇa is a very helpful hero in the community of cowherds in time of difficulties. This study demonstrates that the use of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature is relevant and useful for the scholarly outlook.

#### **Reviews on the Basic Concepts of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Līlā**

Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the most discussed hero of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, is the centre of discussion among critics and writers from different perspectives such as

mythical interpretation, pastoral hero, children literature, Śrī Kṛṣṇa in romance, and *Yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Myth, a traditional and imaginary story, deals with certain characters for the evocation of his activities in the historical context. In this connection, Carl G. Jung claims that "collective unconscious of the human race are expressed in myths, religion, dreams, and private fantasies, as well as in works of literature" (qtd. in Abrams and Harpham 18). It shows that the manifestation of myth is found not only in religion but also in dreams, fantasies, and literature. It is related to condition, events, and the activities of people who had become different from others. On this ground, Northrop Frye clarifies that "some of the figures of myth have had a pleasanter after life" (401). In this regard, a myth passes from generation to generation drawing attention of human beings from the admirable activities of the mythical hero. When it remains in contact to religion, myth becomes popular everywhere.

Claude Levi-Strauss opposes Carl Jung and Frye on the idea of myth: "Myth within each culture as signifying systems whose true meanings are unknown to their proponents" (qtd. in Abrams and Harpham 231). The followers may follow the certain myth as the trend of society without basic knowledge about it. "Superhuman" personalities are the characters of myth and they perform extraordinary and incredible actions. Myths are narratives in different forms with shared underlying universal patterns. Myths narrate multiple human actions, such as love, quest, and journey taken by heroes and legends. Mythological characters, such as hero, child, mother, and father embody certain characters shared by individual all times and cultures.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa myth is a subject matter of discussion among scholars, analysts, and critical thinkers. Major reviewers on the myth on Śrī Kṛṣṇa are Wilfred L. Guerin, Anna George, Sri Aurobindo, Paru Kosambi, and Alice Bailey who have reviewed the myth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from the perspective of king maker, master in *rāsa līlā*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa's

comparison with Hercules, a Roman mythical hero. Likewise, A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda, Kamala Subramaniam, G.V. Tagare, and C.L. Goswami have interpreted the myth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa stressing on his strength for lifting the Govardhan Hillock with his hand. R. K. Srinivasa Lyengar and Alexander Pope have expressed their worries on Śrī Kṛṣṇa myth due to academic negligence for the appropriate justice in the myth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The mythical interpretation of different events is quite interesting. Wilfred L. Guerin and et al extend the scope of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's myth from their statements that "Kṛṣṇa myth is by nature collective and communal; it binds a tribe together in common psychological and spiritual activities" (160). But the critics on Śrī Kṛṣṇa myth highlight his spiritual activities.

Anna George extends the scope of Śrī Kṛṣṇa myth by depicting the sufficient evidences about him as a king maker who gives justice to the suppressed people and selects a suitable king for them in that place (1). The interpreter analyzes Śrī Kṛṣṇa from the religious perspective. The critic further highlights his miraculous activities that surpass to other mythical characters of the world (3). Śrī Kṛṣṇa myth is one of the much discussed subject matters at present. Even the scholars of the post-Vyasa era treat him as a human being and there is misconception in the heroic myths of Śrī Kṛṣṇa (Sivananda 3). The *Rāsa Līlā* and his taking the clothes of *gopīs* are two episodes misunderstood by readers and interpreters. At the connotative level, the same manifestation signifies him as a different mythical character from others in the world. The reality is that people, who have the system of monogamy comment on the system of polygamy and the freedom of women during the time of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Modern social system invites criticism about the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa due to differences in culture caused by the span of long time.



Sri Aurobindo has his argument a bit different from Sivananda regarding the mythical action of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He puts forward his ideas in an authentic version saying that as Śrī Kṛṣṇa shows his art of playing the flute in the forest of Vrindavan bringing together birds and animals in a shared community with humans. Aurobindo expresses about the mythical deeds of Śrī Kṛṣṇa by referring it as *Gopī Līlā*:

The *līlā* of the *Gopīs* seems to be conceived a something which is always going on in a divine Gokula and which projects itself in an earthly Vṛndāvana and can always be realized and its meaning made actual in the soul.... The writers of the *Purāṇa* took it as having been actually projected on earth in the life of the incarnate Kṛṣṇa. (426)

The mythical activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa related to the *gopīs* of Vraja are the most debatable subject matters in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Vṛndāvana, the most favorite place of Kṛṣṇa, is the prime setting of his mythical actions. Vṛndāvana and Gokula are good places because of the selection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the performance of his playful activities.

Paru Kosambhi has different line of argument on Śrī Kṛṣṇa myth. She compares Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the Roman mythical hero named Hercules. In her words: “Kṛṣṇa can be seen as a parallel to Hercules. Both were black in colour. Kṛṣṇa lifted Mount Govardhana while Hercules lifted Mount Atlas” (5). This discussion traces that the myth of Hercules is popular only in the West but the myth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is well-known everywhere. Both the mythical heroes establish themselves as the superheroes from their miraculous activities. Impossible tasks are regarded as the Herculean task in the western interpretation. The fight of Hercules with hydra, Nemean lion, and men eating mares (Bailey 9) reminds the miraculous activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his battle with the serpent Kāliya and the bear named Jambhavān. But Śrī Kṛṣṇa has obligation

to kill many demons to maintain peace and establishes the social order and justice in the world. Human beings regard Hercules as a brave mythical hero, whereas the devotees regard Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the eighth *avatār* [incarnation] of Mahāviṣṇu. Thus, Śrī Kṛṣṇa's activities are made clear from the manifestation of Hercules. There may be the birth of the most powerful personalities in the world such as Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Hercules.

Prabhupāda highlights the mythical activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and deals with incredible actions of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as his mythical works. For example, Nanda Mahārāja is ready to follow the ritual for worshipping Indra, the king of Lords who causes rain on the earth. "My dear father," Lord Kṛṣṇa said, "There is no need to worship the demigod Indra. Everyone has to achieve the result of his own work" (Prabhupada 229). It is the objection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa against Indra and the same objection becomes the root of conflict between them. Furious Indra decides to punish them from the heavy rain. This objection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa establishes himself as a mythical revolutionary hero who changes the trend of worshipping from Indra to the Govardhan Hillock in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Elaborating this argument, Kamala Subramaniam bases her idea on the background of Indra's anger: "The entire group of clouds which had been released by Indra travelled fast towards Vṛndāvana. All on a sudden in Vṛndāvana, it began to rain" (462). In this context, it is important to argue that the anger of Indra changes into revenge against Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Vṛndāvana dwellers, and their cows. As the rain starts with *sāmbartak* cloud, the inhabitants of Vṛndāvana request Śrī Kṛṣṇa to save them: "Save us from the wrath of Indra and his rain clouds (qtd. in Subramaniam 462). This mythical event invites crisis for cows, calves, oxen, and the cowherd community. During the time of this crisis, Śrī Kṛṣṇa lifts up the Govardhan Hillock and uses the hillock as a huge umbrella for the safe of the cowherd

community and their animal property. Revenge is the prime outcome of anger not only for humans but also for the divine beings. Śrī Kṛṣṇa wants to change the trend of worshipping from Indra to Govardhan Hillock. In this sense, he is a rebel and changes the trend of worshipping in Vraja *Bhumi*. Vanity and the realization of superiority make Indra ready for revenge against Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his cowherd mates.

G.V Tagare, a translator and critic, supports the view of Subramaniam about the wrath of Indra and he is correct as he mentions: "When the clouds let loose incessant downpour of showers as big as column (in volumes), the earth was inundated with torrential floods of water, and the elevations and the depressions of the ground became invisible" (1417). Explaining this statement, one can contemplate that it is the climax of Indra's wrath and his wrath turns into destruction by the origin of the heavy rain. As there is crisis for the cowherd community, they expect solution from Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In this situation, Śrī Kṛṣṇa has obligation for the performance of his incredible power to rescue the cowherd community and their property of cattle. To support this notion, Tagare rests on the argument: "Kṛṣṇa, though a child uprooted with ease the mount Govardhana with one of his hands and held it up sportively as if it were a mushroom" (1418). Providing the ground for interpretation, the critic highlights the way of lifting up the Govardhana Hillock by Śrī Kṛṣṇa. This mythical action of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is one of the the most discussed mythical events in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

C. L. Goswāmi discusses the solution from Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He requests to the inhabitants of Vraja to head beneath the Govardhana Hill for shelter. In his words: "O mother, father, the people of Vraja, comfortably take shelter cavity beneath the mountain along with your cattle wealth" (213). It reveals the reliability in the view of Goswāmi about Śrī Kṛṣṇa's help during the time of difficulties for the inhabitants of

Vraja. This mythical action of Śrī Kṛṣṇa establishes him as a rescuer. He argues that Śrī Kṛṣṇa takes the guarantee of shelter for those people when they are in need of his help. Ramesh Menon has similar interpretation about the action of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for lifting Govardhana Hillock: "Seven days, without let, Indra's storm raged all around them. But the *gopās* remained beneath the mountain, and Kṛṣṇa held it above them, never moving, and no sip of water or morsel of food passed his lips"(845). What is important is that for holding the Govardhana Hillock for seven days is beyond capacity of a mortal being on the earth. Without superheroic power, nobody imagines lifting a hillock. This noticeable work of Śrī Kṛṣṇa draws attention of readers and they regard him as a supreme mythical hero.

To look into the broader framework for the analysis of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's character, the views of the critics and scholars in his mythical activities stress the heroic deeds. Supporting this idea, R. K. Srinivasa Lyengar argues that "Kṛṣṇa, who holds the key to the solution of world's problems, has been grossly devalued in post-Vyasa times" (109). There is reliability in the review of Lyengar in the mythical actions of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. No one bothers to evaluate Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Present people regard him as their equal and are curious to trace his weaknesses without the knowledge of his *līlās*. The above mythical activities were unavoidable for Śrī Kṛṣṇa and he completed the job for the benefits of others. Due to his heroic power and talent, Śrī Kṛṣṇa performs his playful activities as a real person of this world so that the miraculous mythical deeds of Śrī Kṛṣṇa create debates among critics, scholars, and interpreters.

People evaluate him according to their level of understanding, knowledge, and culture. The detailed knowledge of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, *Śrimad Bhāgavata Gīta*, *Śrī Caitanya Caritāmṛta*, and the *Mahābhārata* are necessary for the evaluation about the Myth of Kṛṣṇa. Otherwise,

the saying “A little learning is a dangerous thing” (Pope 72) is applicable in the mythical interpretation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Without any knowledge of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *tattva*, the evaluation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is not reliable and justifiable. Thus, the above review on the mythical interpretation on Śrī Kṛṣṇa refers that his activities should be considered as useful lessons for practical life of human beings.

Pasture of Vraja *Bhumi* [land] is the venue for nourishment of Śrī Kṛṣṇa during the time of his childhood and boyhood. His pastoral life is the matter of discussion among scholars, writers, and critical thinkers. Ananda Coomaraswamy, Anna S. King, Roshen, Whitney Sanford, Sārātha Darśini, Jiva Gosvāmi, Vanamali, D.K. Hari, D.K. Hema Hari, and Kamala Subramaniam deal with the pastoral life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and its significance. Among them, researcher Ananda Coomaraswamy finds that there is the connection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the idealized pastoral life of Gokula, Vṛndāvana in the Vraja Mandala, where he was brought up as the foster child of Nanda and Yaśoda (64). This discussion traces that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is reared in the pastoral area and from the time of his childhood, he gets an opportunity to look after calves with other cowherd mates. Anna S. King argues about the role of animals in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa: “Animals have the status of sentient being rather than agricultural commodities” (180). For Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the animals have their own role to please him during the time of his pastoral life in Vṛndāvana. To play with calves and cows is the hobby of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

In the pastoral setting, Śrī Kṛṣṇa develops friendship with animals. In this regard, Roshen reports that Kṛṣṇa is reared in the community of cowherd and is given the name “Govinda,” which means “One who gives pleasure to the cows” (16). One can get many stories of Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s connection to cows during his lifetime. The commentator further explores that there are similarities between a mother and a cow.

In his words: “Mother Cow is, in many ways, better than the mother who gave us our birth due to the ability of cows to provide milk and the usefulness of cows after death” (24). Therefore, humans should treat the earth, mother, and cows from the same perspective.

The pastoral life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa motivates devotees for the protection of cows and other animals. It boosts up its wide range of value of the pastoral life style of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. To broaden this concept, Whitney Sanford is apt to state: “The cow is fundamental both economically and spiritually, and by protecting the cows and the *brāhmanas* [priests], people are guaranteed both material and spiritual success” (298-99). From the connection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with cows and pastoral life, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* manifests Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a cowherd boy and he dedicates himself for grazing and protecting cows. Roshen claims that the pastoral lifestyle of Śrī Kṛṣṇa traces material and spiritual fulfillment (300). While Kṛṣṇa is in the pastoral life, he plays the flute to attract plants and animals. The melodious music from Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s flute is one of the discussed subjects of the text.

Sārātha Darśinī interprets the pastoral life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a rescuer for the cowherd community, animals, birds, insects, and plants in the forest. As Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his cowherd mates are in the pastoral area, the herdsboys come to know that the forest catches fire. The boys approach to Śrī Kṛṣṇa with expectation for the solution of the problem. The hero realizes that there is a problem for them and is able to control the crisis. In Darśinī’s words: “Seeing His devotees disturbed, Kṛṣṇa, the infinite Lord of the universe and possessor of infinite power, then swallowed the terrible forest fire” (495). Providing the ground for interpretation, the critic makes Śrī Kṛṣṇa a divine being but the present humans contradict this notion. Above mentioned example confirms that Śrī Kṛṣṇa uses *Samharika-Śakti* [power of destruction] to control bon-

fire. From this evidence, Śrī Kṛṣṇa turns from pastoral hero to superhero because a normal person is unable to swallow conflagration of forest. The commentator stresses on the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa while he remains in his pastoral life in Vṛndāvana.

Jiva Gosvāmi extends the scope of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a pastoral hero due to his happiness for grazing cows in Vṛndāvana. Explaining this statement, he clarifies that Śrī Kṛṣṇa grazes cows in his childhood (750). Being a pastoral hero, he performs his heroic activities for the solution of complicated problems in the cowherd community. The analyst writes ahead referring that there is no sign of fear for other members of the pastoral community due to the presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with them. Both plants and animals concentrate in the heroic activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa (752). This analysis by Jiva Gosvāmi further supports that pastoral lifestyle pleases too much in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Gosvāmi further tries to clarify the value of the pastoral life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa on the bank of the Yamunā River: “Who resides on the bank of the Yamunā, who lives among the cowherds, who resides in all the *Vedas*, who is praised in all the *Vedas*, and who entering all beings, makes them special, is none other than the husband of the *gopīs*” (153). This discourse has deep influence on the main setting of the pastoral life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Gosvāmi differentiates Śrī Kṛṣṇa from other heroes arguing that he is not only a common herdsman in Vṛndāvana but also knower of the *Vedas*. There is the mobilization of the pastoral study in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Theorists have been working in this line of interpretation referring to multi tasks of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Thus, he has diverse faces as the demand of time and circumstances.

Devi Vanamali supports the view of Jiva Gosvāmi and posits Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a pastoral hero because of his miracles to rescue cows and farmers from the poisonous

water of Kālindi River. The multi-headed snake Kāliya lives there releasing poison causing death of cows and the herdsboys. Trees and grass get withered from the effect of Kāliya's venom. Vanamali focuses on:

Without much ado, Kṛṣṇa climbed this tree and plunged into the swirling, poisoned waters below! His friends watched breathlessly as he splashed about in water creating a huge whirlpool to attract the attention of the snake.

Enraged at this strange disturbance of his peace, Kāliya raised his cluster of heads to see who had been so fool hardy as to jump in. (61)

Kāliya *Nāga* bites to baby Śrī Kṛṣṇa even though he controls the serpent and dances on his hood. Later, the serpent leaves the pond of the Kalindi River and goes to Raivatak forest. It is a miracle of the pastoral hero in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. This review of Vanamali promotes the heroic activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. One can argue that he is unparalleled as a pastoral hero.

Another aspect of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's pastoral life is his sharing the happiness with cows. Other pastoral heroes regard cows and other animals as their assets but Śrī Kṛṣṇa has different perspectives about cows. He treats the cows as his playmates and remains happy with them. The cows please themselves in the company of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. With this conditioning, D.K. Hari and D.K. Hema Hari argue that Śrī Kṛṣṇa plays with the cows in the pasture of Vṛndāvana (37). There is the description of cows, pasture, and other animals and Śrī Kṛṣṇa is always surrounded by cows, *gopās* and *gopīs*. The reality is that Śrī Kṛṣṇa has the influence on both plants and animals. Nature is humanized during his pastoral *līlās* (Hari 43) and it traces the interrelation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with Nature.

Kamala Subramaniam has different line of analysis on the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a pastoral hero. The reviewer depicts the scenario of a night time in the pasture of



Vṛndāvana: "Kṛṣṇa went to the bank of the Yamunā. The sands were silvery and golden with light of the newly risen moon and the moon itself looked like a huge orange globe. It was as beautiful as the face of Lakshmi. The forest nearby was bathed in the light of the moon"(470). This analysis examines that there is the manifestation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the harmony of the pastoral life. The analyst presents richness in the beauty of Nature and the night with full moon promotes the natural beauty. Of course, there is exaggeration of the scenario of pasture at night. Śrī Kṛṣṇa remains happy in pasture as a herdboys. The motive of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is to please both plants and animals. Thus, Subramaniam extends the discourse of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's pastoral life referring how happily the hero spends his life there with natural beauty and purity.

The above reviews of the reviewers on Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a pastoral hero, can be concluded that pastoral leadership of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is unique in the rural life. The role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the pastoral hero is for emphasis in the livestock in the *Paurānic* period. Śrī Kṛṣṇa has the ideas in the pastoral management. The *gopās*, *gopīs*, cattle, other animals, and plants regard Śrī Kṛṣṇa as their hero for the solution of their crisis. The hero becomes an instructor, helpful guide, and rescuer among the cowherd community.

Children literature flourishes from *bāla līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Scholars have expressed their views on *bāla līlās* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa based on as the root of children literature. In it, Śrī Kṛṣṇa performs his activities in Vṛndāvana as a little child. Some prominent critics, researchers, scholars, and writers are actively involved in making of the discourse as children literature. Such major commentators are N. Ranghunathan, E. M. Forster, Mary Ann Miller, J. Kennedy, Prabhupāda, Jiban Narah, John Stratton Howley, Dennis Hudson, David Kingsley, and Edwin F. Bryant. They have analysed on *bāla līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa referring his pranks and other mischievous activities.

Likewise, other commentators are Kamala Subramaniam, Marlene B. Pitkow, Prabhupāda, and G.V. Tagare who have evaluated children literature from the manifestation of the character of Pūtanā. His playful activities of childhood become argumentative among scholars and commentators.

N. Raghunathan stresses on the role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's *bāla līlās* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*:

The *Bāla Lilas* are so artfully contrived that every new and engaging childish prank or pastime is followed by another miraculous exploit. And being thus trained to accept and accommodate side by side the charm of the human and the truth of the superhuman, the mind of the reader surrenders itself completely and unquestioningly to the denouement, the magic of the *Raasa* dance. (xxxiii)

The analyst provides the ground for interpretation in the childish pranks of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It reflects the childish activities for entertaining others and Śrī Kṛṣṇa performs his funny activities in Vṛndāvana. There are other *līlās* of *Bāla Śrī Kṛṣṇa* but the commentator does not highlight them apart from his funny pranks.

Practical jokes are common in children literature and *Bāla Śrī Kṛṣṇa* has special interest in it. In the same vein, E. M. Forster posits that “there is fun in the heaven. God can play practical jokes upon Himself” (280). Practical jokes are the bases of merrymaking for children. But Foster does not specify the practical jokes of *Bāla Śrī Kṛṣṇa*. He performs his playful activities in his childhood in Vṛndāvana not to please only himself but also to please plants and animals. Love is the base for every child and the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa draws attention to other characters. This dealing is based on the idea of children literature. The argument turns out to be valid when Mary Ann Miller mentions: “He is deliberately turning for his organizing from war to love,

from warrior to lover” (69). The commentator has identified the characteristics of children literature from the revelation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s actions. But the critic limits her views only in love and war excluding Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s other activities such as fun, games, sports, ragging and the stealing *mākhan*.

J. Kennedy distinguishes between *Bāla Śrī Kṛṣṇa* and Vāshudeva Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In his finding: “We have a child Kṛishna who is not a nature-god at all, and has nothing in common with the elder Kṛishna except the name” (521). Śrī Kṛṣṇa is fond of living in Vṛndāvana during the time of his childhood. This idea of Kennedy opposes the view of devotees who respect Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a Nature God. By using *Daibi Sakti* (divine power), Śrī Kṛṣṇa kills demons who are sent by Kāmsa in the form of animals (Prabhupada 5). The text reveals Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the god of Nature and establishes him as a character of children literature.

Prabhupada writes in confirmation about the birthday celebration of Śrī Kṛṣṇa: “The people of Mathura celebrate the birthday of Kṛṣṇa ” (515) for pleasing him. Birthday celebration is for children and the guardians have their intentions to please the particular child. In the same way, birthday celebration in Mathura occurs to please child Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The childhood activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa draw the attention of beholders. Jiban Narah claims that Śrī Kṛṣṇa scares to other herdsboys from his playful activities (53). Scaring and teasing are the characteristics of children. The above expressed playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are the roots of children literature.

John Stratton Howley shows the mischievous activities of *Bāla Śrī Kṛṣṇa*. The analyst points out the butter prank of Śrī Kṛṣṇa which makes him popular from the name of *mākhan chor* [butter thief]. He provides the basic criteria of children literature referring the activities of *Bāla Śrī Kṛṣṇa*: “Kṛṣṇa stealing butter: he lifts it to his mouth and smears it all over his face in one of his most characteristics acts” (427).

The *līlā* of butter prank of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is admirable in which there is exposition of his mischievous character. He explores that Śrī Kṛṣṇa steals not only the butter but also breaks the butter pots that are hanging (427). There is the manifestation of the creativity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa even in the piracy of *mākhana*. He steals *mākhana* everyday from new style which surprises the cowherd community. To explain this process further, Hawley proves that “Kṛṣṇa has stolen their hearts” (428) from the means of butter. He is known as *mākhana chor* and *chitta chor* [heart thief]. It is human nature to be attracted from the mischievous activities of children.

Dennis Hudson presents similar view referring bath of cowherd boys: “If you are going to bathe, let us go” (558). For this reason, general assumptions related to children focus that children are fond of bathing together. Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s bathing activities with his playmates become a component part in children literature. David Kingsley has different argument about the childhood activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa: “Playful activities of Kṛṣṇa and his companions are motivational factors” (157). Thus different activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa become the base for children literature.

Edwin F. Bryant interpretes the childhood of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the example of what *Bāla Śrī Kṛṣṇa* and his cowherd mates do with monkeys: “Tugging at the young monkeys, they climbed the trees with them. Then, imitating them, they joined them in swinging through the trees” (126). In the childhood days of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, his playmates assist him for the creation of fun. Śrī Kṛṣṇa plays with the monkeys to please them. Children literature includes their relationship with animals. The friendship of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the monkey friends interrelates his *bāla līlā*. Bryant explores that Śrī Kṛṣṇa also provides *mākhana* to the monkeys (126). It shows the friendship of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with monkeys and his love with animals. One can get the relationship between animals and children in children literature.

The aforementioned discussion shows that children literature concentrates on the activities of children. Those activities are appropriate subject matters for discussion among critics and research scholars. In the same way, demon Pūtanā plays the role of a witch. The witch is an antagonistic force which brings problems in the life of *Bāla Śrī Kṛṣṇa*. Kamala Subramaniam, Marlene B. Pitkow, Prabhupāda and G.V. Tagare have arguments about the role of Pūtanā. Kamala Subramaniam stresses on how Pūtanā appears in Gokula to feed her breast to *Bāla Śrī Kṛṣṇa*. In her words: “With her powers of *māyā*, she changed herself into a beautiful woman and she went to the sacred spot by name Gokula” (386-87). The commentator points out how the demoness disguises herself as a beautiful woman to draw the attention of people in Gokula.

Children literature includes villainous women such as Pūtanā to arouse interest for children. The story of Pūtanā is “a popular enactment in many *Hindu* performance genres” (Pitkow 238). Pitkow writes ahead about the *karmic* [working] destiny of Pūtanā is “to go through the murder of Krisna” (241). Her solo performance traces her devotion to Śrī Kṛṣṇa as an apotheosis. She flies to Gokula from Mathura, she draws the attention of children. Flight of characters in the sky is common in children literature and this role of Pūtanā promotes the popularity of children literature. By touching Śrī Kṛṣṇa, she realizes her union with him (241). It exhibits how Pūtanā is curious to feed her breast to *Bāla Śrī Kṛṣṇa*. She pretends to show her maternal love to the divine child. One can argue that the story of Pūtanā makes the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* as the root text of children literature.

Prabhupāda explains about the role of child killer: “Pūtanā *Rākṣasi*’s heart was fierce and cruel, but she looked like a very affectionate mother. Thus she resembles a sharp sword in a soft sheath”(357). This discussion reveals that there is a gap in the

appearance and reality in the character of Pūtanā. Her appearance steals the heart of children and the grown up humans. This sort of pretty character is appropriate in children literature. G.V. Tagare supports the view of Prabhupāda and writes ahead: “The terrible demoness placed her child Kṛṣṇa on her lap and sucked him at her breast full of indigestible virulent poison” (1288). Prabhupāda tries to highlight Pūtanā as an infanticide in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Her presence arouses interest for readers. Especially children have curiosity to know about her role as an antagonist and her death brings *catharsis* for them.

Based on the above features, Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s playful activities are found pertinent for children literature. Thus, the above commentators on Śrī Kṛṣṇa are the bases of children literature. Their arguments show that the role of *Bāla Śrī Kṛṣṇa* postulates an illustration of this type of literature. This standpoint justifies the discussion of the notions of *Bāla Śrī Kṛṣṇa* as a model of children literature. Thus, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* forms a sound ground for children literature.

Philosophers, critical thinkers, and analysts have mentioned romance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa such as taking away the clothes of *gopīs* during the time of bathing, *Rāsa Līlā* and eloping with Rukmiṇī. Stealing clothes of the *gopīs* portrays romance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. M. B. Emeneau, Sārātha Darśinī, G.V. Tagare, and Tracey Coleman have interpreted these incidents. Their analysis contradicts to each other and helps understand multiple aspects of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. M. B. Emeneau elucidates: “*Cīraharāṇa* [stealing the clothes] is a well-known episode in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa*” (521). When the *gopīs* are clothesless in the river, Śrī Kṛṣṇa “breaks a tree to provide the *gopīs* with leaf dresses, and thinks that this is somehow amalgamated with the stealing of their clothes” (Emeneau 523). The incident shows Śrī Kṛṣṇa has attraction with the opposite sex. *Cīraharāṇa* is the prelude of *Rāsa Līlā* from which “Kṛṣṇa

wanted to share his bliss with the *gopīs* on the spiritual platform, completely free from mundane lust” (Darśinī 571). Emeneau believes that the *gopīs* have transcendental relationship with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. This discussion needs spiritual perspective to understand the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It is impossible to make a union with Śrī Kṛṣṇa wearing clothes. Devotees can make a union with the Supreme Personality of Godhead without clothes after their demise. Evidently, G.V. Tagare supports the view of Darśinī and he agrees: “Kṛṣṇa wanted to see their hearts” (1397). He proves that “Kṛṣṇa’s physical age was only six years and four months at this time” (1397). A boy of six years old teases girls without any signs of the physical attraction. It exposes that Śrī Kṛṣṇa has spiritual relation with the *gopīs*. Having stolen the clothes, he steals their hearts (Darśinī 572). There is an allegorical meaning of this episode. Unlike Darśinī, Tracey Coleman opposes: “Kṛṣṇa enjoys himself” (395). Śrī Kṛṣṇa has certain time and place for romance and seeks different measures for the root of pleasure. Among them, this episode is one which promotes Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a romantic hero of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

*Rāsa*, in literature, is an aesthetic experience of emotions of an individual and it is stirred by the experiences in the artistic work. *Rāsa Līlā* is the base for romance in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The major scholars on this event are Swami Girishanand Saraswatiji, Śrīla Viśanātha Cakravartī, Tracy Coleman, Sārtha Darśinī, and Osho. Their reviews highlight the importance of *Rāsa Līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Swami Girishanand Saraswatiji bases his discussion on the *Rāsa Līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with *gopīs* at night in the forest of Vṛndāvana. He finds that the *gopīs* give up everything for this *Rāsa* (10). The *gopīs* are the components to promote *Rāsa Līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Emphasizing on the role of *Rāsa Līlā*, Śrīla Viśanātha Cakravartī has similar view. In his evaluation: “The *gopīs* heard the sound of Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s flute, their bodies had been twofold, material and spiritual, and upon hearing the flute, they gave up the material bodies, which their husbands had enjoyed” (qtd. in Prabhupāda 525). Cakravartī applies the spiritual lens for the analysis of *Rāsa Līlā* between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and the *gopīs*. From the magical sound of the divine player’s flute, the *gopīs* have self-realization and they neglect their physical bodies without paying attention to their duties at home and rush to the nearby forest for the union with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He further explores that spiritual bodies of the *gopīs* surpass the material bodies (526). Thus, this analysis highlights the romance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the *gopīs*.

Coleman has different idea on *Rāsa Līlā*: “Exactly what sorts of mutual pleasures Kṛṣṇa and the *gopīs* enjoy together is debatable” (390). This analysis provokes *māyābādī* (mundane) for misinterpretation of the *Rāsa Līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Coleman sees Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the material lust. Unlike Coleman, Sārtha Darśini reviews on the *Rāsa Līlā* from the lens of spiritualism. In this line of argument, she claims: “The divine *rāsa-līla* is like the loving smile of the intimate devotee of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, who is victorious and glorified for this ability to conquer Śrī Kṛṣṇa by his pure love” (890). It is the grace of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for his devotees. Thus, from the material point of view, the *rāsa* manifests Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a lustful hero; but from the spiritual perspective, it is the *līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. From power of his *Yogamāyā*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa multiplies himself in different forms at the same time (887). Of course, this concept of the *yogic* power is difficult to accept for modern readers.

Osho points out the necessity of the *Rāsa Līlā* for the revelation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's romance: “The *raas* symbolizes the overflowing, outpouring of the primeval energy as it is divided between man and women” (200). He exposes that *Rāsa Līlā*



promotes for the continuation of fertility of creatures on this earth due to the attraction from the two opposite sexes. This playful activity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa motivates readers and audience to attract with the opposite sex (201) for their existence. Śrī Mātā Amritannadamayi Devi praises the *Rāsa Līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and regards his work as one of the romances of Śrī Kṛṣṇa: “Kṛṣṇa’s lifting of the Govardhana Mountain as a child was not the real miracle; the real miracle was the *gopīs*’ love for Kṛṣṇa” (3). This discussion traces that the *gopīs* violate the social norms and leave their houses at night. In the general understanding, the *gopīs* give up everything for the sake of Śrī Kṛṣṇa which is not possible for others. Thus, to judge the *Rāsa Līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa only from the superficial perspective may be a faulty analysis. The most reliable reason is that the *gopīs* do not have bodily consciousness for Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Rukmiṇī *haraṇa* establishes Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the romantic hero. Some commentators have presented this episode as romantic experiences of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in his life. These commentators are Veneemadhava Shastri Joshi, Heidi Pauwels, and Nitai Guar Premanande. Veneemadhava Shastri Joshi exposes the decision of Rukmiṇī: "The circumstance forced her to take up this hard and bold decision. Had she not taken this bold step she would have been certainly married to Śiśupāla for whom she had reserved her heart full of hate. Her sublime love is attested by her letter" (215). It shows that the billet d'aux of Rukmiṇī to Śrī Kṛṣṇa traces her one-sided love to him. She regards Śrī Kṛṣṇa as her rescuer from her oppression in Kundinyapur, the place of King Bismaka, her father. If she is not immediately rescued, she will be forced to get married with Śiśupāla, a person whom she hates. This letter indicates Rukmiṇī’s sign of love to Śrī Kṛṣṇa. If not, she may commit suicide (Joshi 216). It is the nature of Śrī Kṛṣṇa not to deny anything in his life and this love letter arouses the romantic mood of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the elopement with Rukmiṇī.

Heidi Pauwels argues on the romantic scenario of Rukmiṇī's elopement as the base of romance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's life: "A closer look reveals that Kṛṣṇa is actually grabbing her by the wrist; yet the lady seems more than willing, she is coquettishly lifting her skirt as she mounts the vehicle, and her eyes look adoringly, somewhat naively, at her hero as she smiles coyly" (407). This scene seems to be the scene of abduction, but it is actually a romantic scene of elopement in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Rukmiṇī. The plan of Rukmiṇī for elopement is successful and it shows the freedom of girls about marriage. But this argument about elopement contradicts to the perspectives of the traditional society of the *Hindus* that believes in arranged marriage alone.

Nitai Guar Premanande opines in this context: "Rukmiṇī used to hear about *rupa*-form, beauty, virya, *guna*- qualities of Mukunda and result was *mene sadrsam patim*" (1). The commentator mentions the activity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa referring that Śrī Kṛṣṇa takes away Rukmiṇī and starts heading towards Dwārakā (11). Thus, Śrī Kṛṣṇa rescues Rukmiṇī before her wedding. From the spiritual lens, one can conclude that the hero rescues his devotee when crisis occurs in her life. The circumstances make Śrī Kṛṣṇa to become the husband of Rukmiṇī and gives his grace to her. Every critical problem is playful for Śrī Kṛṣṇa and this Rukmiṇī *haraṇa* is romantic and memorable event in his life.

The aforementioned discussion shows that Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his romantic activities promote his pleasures with objects and *gopīs*. The scenario of *Cīraharāṇa* evokes pleasure to him and to the *gopīs* who are taking bath in the Yamunā River. *Rāsa Līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the *gopīs* at night postulates the climax of his romance in the text. He teaches human beings to remain happy in their lives and help other people

during the time of need. Singing, dancing, stealing, and abduction are the bases of romance.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa's *yogic* power is the next aspect of his life that highlights his activities. *Yoga* is an "attention in the control of the physical body that can be gained by long practice of its physical disciplines" (Gopikrishna 1). It signifies the union of an individual soul with the universal consciousness. John Stratton Hawley associates the ideas from the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* about the *Yogā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa: "Yogā devotes specific attention to integrating (or, use the cognate term, yoking) what is complex; it defines a graded process; it emphasizes knowledge and practice; it is thought of mature and difficult" (6). Hawley claims that *yogā* is a practical knowledge for the solution of difficult problems and Śrī Kṛṣṇa applies his *Yogic* power for the solution of diverse problems. With the help of this power, he overcomes the crisis in his life. Prabhupāda explains the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa: "Being, therefore, the ultimate object of *yoga*, Kṛṣṇa's name is *Yogesvara*, the master of *Yoga*" (1) in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the base of the *yogic* power from which he performs the miraculous activities such as creating calves and cowherd boys, devouring the bonfire, multiplication of his own form during the time of his divine dance with the *gopīs*. It is in need of the spiritual practice for a person to remain perfect in the *yogā*.

Miraculous *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa draws the attention of writers, philosophers, scholars, and commentators. Major commentators are John Stratton Hawley, Prabhupāda, Sārthā Darśinī, Loknath Swami, and Śrī Aurobindo have commented for replication of cows and cowherd boys. Similarly, other reviewers such as Ramesh Menon, Jayashree Venugopala, Jīva Gosvāmi, Ranganathananda,

Pavan K. Varma, and Vanamali have commented on the *Yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for controlling the blaze of Vṛndāvana forest.

One can realize the *Yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa when Brahmā has stolen all the calves and the cowherd boys to test the power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He knows the trick of Brahmā and “expanded Himself as calves and boys” (Prabhupāda 675). The superhero expands himself into missing calves and the cowherd boys with their exact bodily features (676) which surprises Brahmā. It is the miraculous activity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from his *Yogic* power. Darśini supports Prabhupāda and she links this *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with *mahat-tattva* [element]. In this connection, she claims: "To give bliss to Lord Brahma and the mothers, Kṛṣṇa expanded Himself into both the calves and the boys. Kṛṣṇa could do this because He is the master of *mahat-tattva* and the creator of the entire cosmic manifestation" (327). *Mahat-tattva* is *budhi* (knowledge) from which there is the perfection of *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Brahmā tries to bewilder Śrī Kṛṣṇa by hiding calves and boys but he himself is bewildered from the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa because of the replacement of Śrī Kṛṣṇa into the cowherd boys and their calves in their respective places.

Loknath Swami extends the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa: “He expanded and in matter no time there were as many cowherd boys as many he had that day coming with him herding the cows” (4). This type of miraculous implementation of the *yogic* power cannot be found in the characters of the other heroes and superheroes in the history of the world-myth (Prabhupāda 675). On the base of this logic, one can opine that the power of the *yogā* can be utilized for fulfillment of multiple tasks. But the practicality of Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s *yogic* power is beyond description in words. The hero saves the family members of the cowherd boys’ and cows from the fear of losing their

members from their families. Other human and devine beings do not know the use of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's *yogic* power for this replacement except Brahmā.

Śrī Aurobindo has different argument in interrelation to the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa: "If you meet a Godhead there, it is not as a separate person; you feel only the Divine having a particular face, as it were, and interrelation with you for a certain purpose" (458). The word "Godhead" traces Kṛṣṇa and his playful activities (Prabhupāda xv). Śrī Aurobindo regards Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a divine being having the face of a human with the *yogic* power to deal with crisis in his life. The use of the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa identifies him as the creator of this universe and to create the cowherd boys and calves in the forest of Vṛndāvana from his *yogic* power is an illustration of creation.

Other major critics such as Jīva Gosvāmi, Ramesh Menon, Jayashree Venugopala, Prabhupāda, Ranganathananda, Pavan K. Varma, and Vanamali have commented on Śrī Kṛṣṇa's devouring the fire of forest of Vṛndāvana from his *yogic* power. They point out how Śrī Kṛṣṇa has swallowed the blaze of forest from his *yogic* power. Jīva Gosvāmi's argument on Kṛṣṇa's *yogic* power for devouring fire shows him "the supreme controller of all controllers" (37) and to control the blaze of forest is a common work for Śrī Kṛṣṇa. But he evaluates Śrī Kṛṣṇa not as a human being but the personality of Godhead. He can control not only the bonfire from his *yogic* power but also can control everything in the universe. Thus, Jīva Gosvāmi introduces and spreads the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* mentioning the reference of stopping the blaze. Gosvāmi further extends the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in practical life to save the forest (7). The interpreter further proves that impossible works are possible for Śrī Kṛṣṇa due to his miracle for the

solution of the world's problems. By swallowing the blaze, Śrī Kṛṣṇa differentiates himself from other mythical heroes of the world.

Ramesh Menon states on the significance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's *yogic* power: "Kṛṣṇa , greatest *yogin*, emptied his lungs and with a great intake of breath sucked in the conflagration from every side, quenched the last flame" (817). As Śrī Kṛṣṇa goes near the blaze and takes a deep breath, the bonfire is swallowed. This episode promotes the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from which the bonfire is controlled. The ordinary playmates of Śrī Kṛṣṇa have no idea about his supremacy for saving plants and animals when crisis occurs for them. The *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa works appropriately for controlling the blaze. This activity supports the superheroic deed of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Jayashree Venugopala shows the same line of logic referring the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for controlling the blaze of forest. He argues: "Śrī Kṛṣṇa went near the fire and took a deep breath. The force of his inhaling was such that he swallowed the fire too: (79). He stresses that the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is used to save the beauty of forest from destruction of fire. From this implementation of this power of the superhero, one can guess that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a unique ecologist who solves the environmental crisis by controlling the blaze. Prabhupāda comments fire as the energy of Śrī Kṛṣṇa (33). This *yogic* power of the hero becomes useful and fruitful for the rescue of plants and animals from the blazing fire. This *yogic* power turns him from hero to superhero.

Pavan K. Varma supports Ramesh Menon and Jayashree Venugopala and he further interprets that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the savior of the world with the help of his *yogic* power and he controls the blaze of the forest by swallowing it (185). Elaborating the statement, Devi Vanamali argues that the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is "not only to

bless his contemporaries and establish righteousness on Earth, but to provide a spiritually potent account of his earthly deeds for the uplifting of the future generations” (3). He stresses on the power and utility of Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s *yogā* for future generations. Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s devoring the blaze of forest is an illustration of his *yogic* power for the solution of the world’s problems.

Scholars and the reviewers have commented on the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa during the time of *Rāsa Līlā* because of his multiplication into incalculable numbers as the numbers of the *gopīs*. The interpreters on this power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are Prabhupāda, Kunjan Nambiar, Meetu Dhawan, Benjamin Preciado- Solis and Devi Dayal Aggrawal. Prabhupāda is apt to state that the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is for his own creation into different forms. In his words: “Expanding Himself as many times as there were the cowherd women to associate with the supreme Lord, though self-satisfied, playfully enjoyed their company” (664). The analyst supports Śrī Kṛṣṇa not only as a superhero but also the supreme personality of Godhead. He agrees: “Lord Kṛṣṇa is eternally free from all material desires, perfect on platform of spiritual self-satisfaction” (665). He interrelates the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to his divine power from which he obtains eternal peace and bliss.

Kunjan Nambiar further highlights the ideas of Prabhupāda: "Though too many *Gopīs* like Radha/ Śrī Kṛṣṇa was the prime attraction. //But, assuming multiple forms, /he paires with many damsels there (97). He hints why Śrī Kṛṣṇa extends him into different forms and how he dances with the innumerable *gopīs* at the same time by pairing with them. In the circle dance of *Rāsa Līlā*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa dances with each *gopī* making her belief that the divine dancer is dancing only with her. Meetu Dhawan expresses his view mentioning the closeness of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the *gopīs* multiplying him into many forms (175). It is the ultimate use of the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. An

ordinary *yogi* cannot perform this kind of task but Śrī Kṛṣṇa proves himself as the master of the *yoga*.

Benjamin Preciado- Solis explores: “The Lord of the lords of *yoga*, having heard their lamenting, smiling compassionately, though delighting [only] in [his own divine] self, gave intense delight to the *gopīs*” (85). He regards Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s intention to multiply himself into many numbers is to please to the *gopīs* during the time of *Rāsa Līlā*. One can argue that Śrī Kṛṣṇa does not only use his *yogic* power to save plants and animals from crisis but also for the pleasure of the *gopīs*. Devi Dayal Aggrawal has different line of argument and focuses on different forms of Śrī Kṛṣṇa by regarding him as the Supreme Personality of Godhead (196). Thus, the hero multiplies as many numbers as he can as the need of time and situation.

The aforementioned review shows that there is perfection in the *yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Firstly, Śrī Kṛṣṇa uses the *yogic* power to instruct Brahmā by replacing all the calves and the cowherd boys in their respective forms. Śrī Kṛṣṇa changes himself into the calves and the cowherd boys. Secondly, he swallows the bonfire to keep calm to the fearful cowherd boys, animals, and other creatures. Thirdly, Kṛṣṇa multiplies himself into different numbers to please the *gopīs*. Thus, Śrī Kṛṣṇa uses his *yogic* power for three times for different purposes to give a lesson to Brahmā, to save the cowherd community, and to please the *gopīs*.

### **Reviews of Nature in Ecotheories**

One can explore the connection of Nature in terms of relations with ecotheory. Both in the traditional and modern discourses of literary theory, the relation of Nature with other ecotheories such as ecocriticism, eco-feminism, and ecopoetics has occupied a considerable space in the evaluation of literature. In the aforementioned



literary theories, Nature is kept at the centre for the judgment of literary works of art. Nature is at the centre of ecology from which other related theories got evolved (qtd. in Richard 2). Nature, the root for other theories, is discussed through the lens of ecocriticism, eco-feminism, ecopoetics, ecology and environment. Other related theories, in this regard, concentrate on the significance of the Nature theory. So, it is necessary to review the connection of Nature with ecotheory for its proper understanding.

Ecofeminism is the theory that often pairs with Nature in mutual relation with some differences. Both the theories share the basic features: the ecofeminists emphasize on the link of women to Nature (qtd. in Gandouz 89). Ynestra King puts the connection between Nature and ecofeminism: "Ecofeminist theory seeks to show the connection between all forms of domination, including the domination of nonhuman nature, and ecofeminist practice is necessarily anti-hierarchical" (qtd. in Lori Gruen 80). This discussion concentrates on the ecofeminist theory for the study of non-human Nature because of interconnectedness of this theory with Nature. In this sense, one can argue that without Nature, ecofeminism will be dead and without ecofeminism, Nature will have no shape.

The idea on Nature is ascertained by Karen Warren, a modern feminist in his review on Nature. He equates between Nature and women in the matter of oppression: "There are important connections between the oppression of women and the oppression of nature" (qtd. in Sessions 93). To support the connection of Nature to ecofeminism, he pinpoints similar condition between them. On this background, modern human beings should have their realization about the oppression on Nature as well as on women. In the same line of thought, Barry Commoner evidently proves that "everything is interconnected with everything else" (qtd. in Sessions 94). The

ecofeminism and its connection to Nature suggest that Nature is the part and parcel for the development of this theory. Many modern literary theories discuss on Nature directly and indirectly so that the Nature theory is not only connected to ecofeminism but also to ecopoetics, ecology, and environmentalism.

This discussion heads to the development of Nature theory from its connection to ecofeminism. Similarly, Greg Garrard, a modern ecofeminist, further proves the validity of this connection and claims the importance of Nature for the interpretation of literary theory. He points out the relevance:

If women have been associated with nature, and each denigrated with reference to the other, it may seem worthwhile to attack the hierarchy by reversing the terms, exalting nature, irrationality, emotion and the human or non-human body as against culture, reason and the mind. (23)

The aforementioned example confirms intimacy of Nature theory with the ecofeminists in relation to exploitation. One can find women's suffering in the patriarchal system whereas Nature is destroyed by modern Adams. The sameness in condition from exploitation is the relevance for connection between them.

The connection between Nature and ecofeminism occupies a considerable space and it stresses the reliability of Nature theory for the interpretation of the ecofeminism. We find same crux of argument when we understand the evaluative comments in connection of Nature for promotion of ecofeminism. Keeping the same idea in mind, Susan Griffin argues that modern human beings should connect women with Nature (198). The ecofeminist points out the history of western civilization referring oppression of Nature and women. According to this discussion, one can argue that the ecofeminism flourishes on the base of Nature and there is the whole and part relation between them. In this connection, Baruna Bianchi follows the footsteps of

Griffin and she incorporates her view about Nature. She argues that both women and Nature are exploited by the patriarchal society (3). From this standpoint what she argues is plausible and credible. Due to the lack of strictness in rules of the male-chauvinist society, both Nature and women have been facing similar problems.

The extension of the connection of Nature with ecofeminism can also be found in the argument of Kate Soper. She finds it appropriate to apply Nature in the ecofeminism for the solution of women and the problems of Nature. In this connection, she argues that "a woman is naturalized because of her biological role of giving birth, becoming a mother and a source of life" (qtd. in Gandouz 89). The ecofeminist gives credit to Nature and a woman in terms of fertility and creativity. This analysis further supports the base of Nature for the connection of ecofeminism. There is a trend in the eastern philosophy to connect a woman to the earth due to the similarities in their conditions. Thus, the ecofeminists are quite close in many ways of their concerns and interpretation to pinpoint what seems to have connections to Nature. Nature is in the base to flourish the theory of ecofeminism and this theory highlights Nature as a prime theory for the analysis of literary works of art. From the aforementioned discussion, the ecofeminists reach to the conclusion that the connection between them stresses the need of Nature.

Literary genres from the *Vedic* period to present do have close relation with Nature during the process of creativity. There are number of noticeable points in connection between Nature and ecocriticism. Scott Slovic regards the highest value to the relationship between Nature and ecocriticism: "Ecocritics not only interpret the meaning of nature writing texts. They also use those texts as a context for analyzing the ideology and practices of our society in relationship to nature. Often, the result is a critique of how our culture devalues and degrades the natural world" (2). Modern

readers should judge a literary work of art from the perspective of ecocriticism. If the cultural activities are against Nature and this connection between Nature and ecocriticism motivates readers to remain conscious about the significance of Nature.

Glen A. Love expresses his view on ecocriticism as a tool for the origin of consciousness about Nature: "Ecocriticism is developing as an explicit critical response to this unheard dialogue, an attempt to raise it to a highest level of human consciousness" (16). He views that human beings should be ecologically conscious to love and save Nature. On this ground, one can state that teaching and studying literature without reference of Nature is the sign of short-sightedness. A. Love has gone a step ahead when he associates analysis of literature with Nature: "A nature-conscious, nature-validating literature and criticism offers (26). The interplay between Nature and literature supports the value of Nature for creatures. The connection between Nature and ecocriticism demands writers to emphasize the consciousness of people about Nature in their writing.

We find ecocriticism as a bridge for connection between Nature and culture. According to Greg Garrard, Nature plays the role of demarcation in relation between Nature and culture (179). This discussion concentrates on the role of ecocriticism to maintain the relation between Nature and culture. If the modern culture is in favor of Nature, one cannot see the impediments in flourishing Nature. This connection is further highlighted with argument that the concept of Nature makes conscious to human beings. Garrard argues that "the planet has a future, after all, are we likely to take responsibility for it" (107). Garrard contradicts Glen A. Love as he defends Nature by saying that ecocriticism creates consciousness in humans and it may lead to good future.

There is relation between the *Vedic* concept of Nature and ecocriticism. Unlike Greg Garrard, T.J. Abraham clarifies himself with the argument that the *Vedic* concept of Nature is a ground stone of ecocriticism. In this line of thought, he argues that "the question is not what is good for man but what is good for everyone" (185). This connection discusses in the light of the suggestive meanings for the betterment of all creatures. The critic thinks that everything is related to ecocriticism and Nature. This idea gives further insight for us to give continuation of ecocritics' relation to Nature and it is necessary for the existence of creatures as their rights to survive on this globe.

Ecopoetics, a modern trend for judgment of literature, treats Nature as the most important property. M. Jimmie Killingsworth claims that ecopoetics is the "theory and practice of a creative relationship with the process and products of one's world expressed in writing, whether poetics or prose, or in some other medium entirely"(498). It is a base for the composition and analysis of many modern poems and other literary genres because it has connection with Nature. The connection puts Nature in an ethical relation. In this relation, Josh A. Weinstein agrees: "The ethical relationship between human and nonhuman is significant and encouraging" (386). Here, the word "non-human" shows Nature as a motivational factor for the composition of ecopoetics. The critic goes a step ahead arguing that Nature is not only the tool for analysis of ecopoetics but also the subject matter for the origin of poetics. He tries to console himself with the argument connecting Nature theory to ecopoetics in order to stress how Nature is the soul of ecopoetics.

The idea developed by Matthew Cooperman becomes the backbone for the analysis of ecopoetics. He goes on arguing that human beings find reflection of Nature in ecopoetics in the form of landscape: "All poems are landscape poems in as

much as they refer primarily or secondarily to a visible world" (182). To explain this idea, one can argue that the exposition of landscape in poetics is an illustration of Nature. With this idea at the centre, the eco-poetic theorist writes focusing on Romantic poets to show the connection with Nature (185). He exemplifies the reality stating that Nature is in the centre of discussion for romantic poets and Nature is the centre for eco-poetics in modern time.

The connection between Nature and eco-poetics is further highlighted by Hsinya Huang. Unlike Matthew Cooperman, she deals with the ecosystem in relation to Nature in eco-poetics: "We seek protection not only for humans but for ecosystems and the related species on which humanity depends for survival" (144). This interpretation heads to the development of eco-poetics on the basis of Nature theory. Based on this statement, we can associate our idea about the importance of ecosystem for the survival of eco-poetics. The basis of ecosystem is in the natural world and the human and non-human activities occur there relating to each other. Ecosystem, the ground for interpretation shows connection between plants and animals for their existence. This connection reveals the dependency of eco-poetics on Nature and its popularity at present.

Eco-poetic argument forwarded by Matthew Cooperman is considerable to discuss on Nature. His dealing is based on the idea of Hsinya Huang and the critic points out Nature as a house for the origin of poems: "The poem is a house that centers our lives and our words. But as the poem contains the world so must our house. The locations of our always moving existence are thus centered on an experience of dwelling; it is the intimate lens through which we see the larger world" (186). According to the critic, there is considerable impact of Nature in the field of poetics and argues that the world of eco-poetics resembles to the natural world. This

discussion shows the connection of ecopoetics with Nature and it is an appropriate subject matter to highlight the significance of Nature.

M. Jimmie Killingsworth has similar opinions as Cooperman in connection between Nature and ecopoetics. He claims that Nature appears as the mirror image of the mind of writers ((499). This discussion explores that every writer is the product of Nature (five gross elements: earth, water, fire, air, and sky) and s/he cannot help including Nature in the creation of literary works of art. With this idea at the centre of attention, Killingsworth concludes his argument: "First you see yourself in relation to Nature, in a startling likeness or disturbing difference; then you perform the mental actions that bring the impression into relation with accepted wisdom or prior knowledge" (501). Before the composition of a literary work of art, a writer sees his reflection on Nature. The concerned reflection belongs to usefulness of Nature for the birth of ecopoetics and its evaluation in the world of literary criticism. Western philosophy regards Nature for the fulfillment of human needs, whereas the *Hindu* religion sees the presence of the divine being in Nature.

### **Reviews on the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa***

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is the nectarine ocean in which one gets every philosophy of life. Researchers can find different reviews on this text from multiple perspectives. The three dimensions of the reviews such as *bhakti* literature, *Sāṃkhya* and *advaita* philosophies are the matter of discussion in this study. *Bhakti*, in literature, is surrender of devotees from body, mind, speech, and actions towards the Lord. It is a system of hero worship based on the performance of his miraculous activities. The devotees keep on thinking their personal Lord hoping special grace from him. The Sanskrit word *Bhakti* is derived from the verb *bhaj* means to serve, love, revere, adore, and to share. Krishna Sharma defines *Bhakti* with his argument:

"The term *Bhakti* means nothing more than a loving devotion to God" (12).

Supporting Sharma's argument, one can corroborate that his idea is identified with *Vaiṣṇavism*. The standpoint of *Vaiṣṇavism* promotes the evolution of *Bhakti* literature. At the same time, however, it is significant to have *bhāva* from works and words for the service of God. The *bhaktas* (devotees) use the word *seva* (service) for the clarification of *Bhakti*. *Bhakti* embraces the notions of liking and *Bhakti* literature emphasizes on the social ethics and the morality of devotees. Muktaben Dasharathbhai Thakkar highlights the importance of *Bhakti* and its process. In his evaluation of *Bhakti*, he elucidates that: "*Bhakti* begins with self-surrender, culminates in self-knowledge and ends in union with God" (5). In this sense, *Bhakti* increases the frequency of love to the divine being so that it is "love for love's sake" (6). A sense of *Bhakti* connects human to the divine. On the basis of *Bhakti* literature, one can argue that it helps to have intimate relation with the divine being.

Govindācārya Svāmin expresses his opinion: "In the *Dvāpara Yuga*, *Bhakti* descended on earth in the person of Śrī Kṛṣṇa on the shores of the Yamunā in North India" (83). He claims that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the base of *Bhakti* literature. But no one can deny the fact that Rāma *Bhakti* was popular in the *Dvāparayuga* before the existence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. There is also Śiva *Bhakti* literature for the promotion of *Bhakti* literature. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is an illustration of *Bhakti* literature in which there is a manifestation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti*. In a sense, Rāma *Bhakti*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti*, and Śiva *Bhakti* have enriched *Bhakti* literature. So, the analysis of *Bhakti* in this dissertation is related to the analysis of *Bhakti* literature in the highest level.

Tulsidās remarks the Rāma *Bhakti*: "Rāma is born in countless ways, and there are ten millions of *Rāmāyanas*" [*nānā bhanti rāma avatār: rāmāyana satakoti apārā*] (qtd. in Wadley 7). This discussion asserts the development of Rāma *Bhakti* in *Bhakti*



literature. Analysis of Rāma *Bhakti* from Tulsidās is in the highest level because he transforms Rāma from a mythical hero to religious and spiritual Lord from the manifestation of his countless forms. The same notion has been extended by Sheldon Pollock on this subject. He captures the attention of readers that Rāma is sacred object of worship (261). Responding to such claim, it is interesting to incorporate that Rāma *Bhakti* has been prevailing in the *Hinduism* since the period of the sage Vālmikī.

Contrary to the previous notion, Dheeraj Kaushik and B. K. Goswāmī argue about Rāma *Bhakti* and the interpreters have their standpoints for its enhancement referring *Rāma Charitmānas*. Under such condition, they argue that *Rāma Charitmānas* is useful and helpful for us to make our social and ethical life great (65). The unyielding interpretation of *Rāma Charitmānas* [description of the character of Rāma] is to flourish the cult of Rāma *Bhakti*. When there is the development of modern society, the theological principles and the similar beliefs are guidelines for the maintenance of social order.

Confirming the Rāma *sampradāyasa* [cult], Vasudha Paramasivan discusses on some noticeable points. The interpreter argues that *Rāmacaritmānas* is for Rāma *Bhakti*. Elaborating the argument, she states that "the *Rāmacaritmānas* is generally considered to be the quaint essential work of Sagun Ram *Bhakti*" (32). Her position is different in respect, commonly suggests the importance of Rāma *Bhakti* in the *Hinduism*. Paramasivan's famous formulation stresses that the path of devotion is easy as well as pleasant and it is the independent source of happiness (34). This, however, is accepted by the ritual practices by the *Hinduism*. In conclusion, the cult which is related to Rāma *Bhakti*, highlights the position and status of Rāma as a founder of

democracy in modern context. This is why, modern human beings discuss on the *Rāmarājya* [State of Rāma] regarding the rule of Rāma as the best ruler of the world.

The issues of *Bhakti* literature are in focus in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The text popularizes the notion of *Bhakti* literature in extended form. The text motivates devotees to follow the path of *Bhakti* for salvation. The major concern of *Bhakti* literature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is to motivate towards the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Rāmānujācārya discusses on the importance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* flourished in Vṛndāvana where Śrī Kṛṣṇa had performed his *Bāla Līlā*. The philosopher further points to his *Bhakti* to Kṛṣṇa: “Since I came to Vṛndāvana , I have recovered and now young and beautiful” (qtd. in Svāmin 482). The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses to the scenario of Vṛndāvana as the sportive activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in detail. The landscape draws attention due to *Bhakti* in Śrī Kṛṣṇa. From this stand point, one can argue that the devotees show their *Bhakti* when they reach to the birthplace and workplace of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Rāmānujācārya shows a link between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* and the landscape of Vṛndāvana. In his review, Rāmānujācārya refers Vṛndāvana for evoking *Bhakti* to Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He extends the scope of *Bhakti* literature in relation to Vṛndāvana. Thus, Vraja Bhūmī is the fertile place for the origin of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swāmī Prabhupāda follows the same line of argument on Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti*. According to him: *Kṛṣṇa s tu bhagavān svayam* [Śrī Kṛṣṇa is God Himself] (174). The commentator regards Śrī Kṛṣṇa not as a common person but God himself. This quotation connotes to the devotees that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is not only a hero but as real divine being. This concept promotes *Bhakti Yoga* of devotees and they dedicate themselves to Śrī Kṛṣṇa from their minds, works, and words. But to regard Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a *bhagavān* (God) is not easy to justify. The concept of the analyst is to

promote *Bhakti* literature showing Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a divine being. This concept promotes *Bhakti* to Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It may contradict with the logic of the present scholars. Scholars and readers regard Śrī Kṛṣṇa not as a Supreme Personality of Godhead but as a mythical hero.

*Bhakti* literature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* stresses on the qualities of devotees for the performance of *Bhakti Yoga* properly. These qualities are love, devotion, tenderness, mercy, obedience, and readiness to serve. Every devotee has intention to surrender himself/herself on the feet of *Bhagavān*. True devotees “give everything, claim nothing” (Thakkar 55). His subject matter of conversation is Śrī Kṛṣṇa and keeps on thinking only about him. The devotee believes that his words and works should be related to the glory of Lord. This analysis is based on the idea from the instructions of Śrī Kṛṣṇa about *Bhakti Yoga* for *moksha* to his devotee Uddab. In this connection, Prabhupāda discusses *Bhakti Yoga* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* in this way: "If somehow or other by good fortune one develops faith in hearing and chanting My Glories, such as a person, being neither very distinguished with nor attached to material life, should achieve perfection through the path of loving devotion to Me"<sup>9</sup> (11. 8: 24). In this discussion, Śrī Kṛṣṇa instructs Uddab how to dedicate to himself without being attached to material life. Chanting promotes the devotional service to the Supreme Personality of Godhead. Detachment from the material life qualifies oneself for the sake of *Bhakti Yoga*. Pure devotee must follow strict disciplines to flourish *Bhakti* literature.

Tamal Śrī Kṛṣṇa Goswami and Graham M. Schweig have similar opinions on Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The researchers mention the role of ISKCON (International Society of Kṛṣṇa Consciousness) in flourishing Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* in the West. Prabhupāda is the founder of Hare Kṛṣṇa Movement (351).

He introduces Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* in America. Tamal Kṛṣṇa Goswami's *A Living Theology of Kṛṣṇa Bhakti* is an analytic text on Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti*. He exposes: “ Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* makes an outstanding contribution in this regard, representing a sophisticated example of how rigorous historical and contextual work can be conducted by practitioner scholars” (354). The writer claims that Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* flourishes from the contribution of scholars on the foundation of *Bhakti* literature of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

T.S. Rukmani presents different line of argument in the *Bhakti* of *Gopī* to Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. He argues that the *gopīs* are true devotees of Śrī Kṛṣṇa due to their complete sacrifice of their lives for his sake.

While describing the plight of the *gopīs* the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa* mentions that they had to steal away from their homes unobserved by their husbands, parents and other relatives. The *gopīs* are still working within the family and its norms, within the norms of the *grhasthāśrama* and are seen observing all the taboos associated with it. (276-77)

The *gopīs* are the special devotees of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and leave their homes for the sake of him. They are superior to other Śrī Kṛṣṇa devotees because unlike *gopīs*, today's devotees are unable to leave their houses. But the *gopīs* leave their houses for union with Śrī Kṛṣṇa neglecting their activities. To make a union with Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the ultimate aim of the devotees and the *gopīs* achieve their aim categorically. Thus, the activities of the *gopīs* promote *Bhakti* literature with the light of the suggestive meanings.

Manager Pandey and Alka Tyagi present their points about Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* and relate it to Rāma *Bhakti* referring to the poetry of Surdās and Tulsidās. The classical poets use Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* and Rāma *Bhakti* as the subject matter of their poetry. In

their words: “The stories of Kṛṣṇa and Rāma which Surdās and Tulsidās have used as a basis of their poetic creation are born out of the idealised tradition of Sanskrit poetics and are popular tales in public life” (131). It traces that the *Bhakti* tradition flourished from the poetry of Tulsidās and Surdās. The poets inspire readers to recite their *Bhakti* poetry for mental peace and the purification of soul. Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Rāma establish a benevolent socio-political order by defeating the contemporary tyrannical rulers. There is no restriction of *Bhakti* literature in any society of the world. During their time, *Bhakti* literature flourishes in the then contemporary society.

Vijay Kumar Thakur extends the scope of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* literature with the view of Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* for devotees for journey towards Lord. The reviewer reveals that *Bhakti* is a good path to please Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He is correct when he posits the freedom of *māyā* of devotees to Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He declares that he is under the control of his devotees who have “enthralled him by their devotion even as good wives do by their devotion to virtuous husbands” (99). This standpoint helps *Bhakti* literature to move ahead. He exposes analogy in relation to the devotion of devotees to Śrī Kṛṣṇa as same as devotion of wives to their faithful and virtuous husbands. In this connection, the feminists allege about the miserable condition of women in the *Paurāṇic* period. There are no special female devotees apart from the *gopīs* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (qtd. in Rukmani 276). The *gopīs* go away from their houses for devotion.

Nicholas Shutan presents different line of argument in connection to Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*: “*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa* refers the sign of emotional *Bhakti* horripilation, weeping, flowers dropping from loosening hair, the knot of the *sari* becoming loose, sweating and swooning” (155). This discussion concentrates that devotees should share their feelings with the feelings of

Śrī Kṛṣṇa by crying, sweating, and getting their hair cut. The discussion is related to the activities of the devotees during the time of *Bhakti*. They deal with the problems of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as their own problems having sympathy and empathy to the condition of their Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It is difficult for them to be separated from their Lord. It is the characteristics of the real devotees of Kṛṣṇa. It makes Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* a typical example of *Bhakti* literature.

Christian Lee Novetzke goes a step ahead when he associates his ideas of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* to *pūjā*, *darśan*, and *kirtan*. He writes in confirmation with his logic stating that *Bhakti* practices *pūjā* [worshipping], *darśan* [bowing head], *kirtan* [chanting], and pilgrimage or keeping vows are associated with the idea that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is watching them (256). He bases his discussion on Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* from the ritual activities of devotees. But the devotees perform different activities such as *pūjā*, *darśan*, *kirtan*, *dān*, *bhajan*, and other *sewās* for the sake of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. There is the realization of *Bhakti rasa* from *pūjā*, *darśan*, *kirtan*, *dān*, and *bhajan* for pleasing Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The critic emphasizes on the role of *Bhakti* with the evocation of *bhāva* for worshipping Śrī Kṛṣṇa. On the basis of this relation, one can argue that Novetzke publishes *Bhakti* literature referring to the ritual of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti*. For devotees, *bhāva* is also the expression of their *Bhakti* to their personal Lord. The *bhāva* is related to the personal feelings and thoughts to the particular Lord.

It remains a fact that the expression of B.G. Tiwari that the original flavor of *Bhakti* literature gets from the scenario of Vraja *Bhūmi*. In Tiwari's words: "The traditional association of Braja *Bhūmi* with Kṛṣṇa's childhood, the concept of the Lord and his energy or *Śakti*, in the form of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā, became more popular, in this region, than other forms of *Vaiṣṇavaism*" (414) Explaining this statement, we can

corroborate that Vraja *Bhūmī* is a fertile place for the origin of *Bhakti* literature. The manifestation of the playful activities of Kṛṣṇa become the subject matter of discussion of *Bhakti* literature. Tiwari refers to the tradition of *Vaiṣṇavaism* for the promotion of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti*. He rightly presents Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his *lilās* of Vraja *Bhūmī* as the roots of *Bhakti* literature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

Mutaben Dasharathbhai Thakkar has different line of argument about *Bhakti* literature :“The *Bhakti* cult of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is catholic and universal. It is the religion for all. It is a perfectly democratic religion; for the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. God is the God of love who has no caste or sex or nationality” (47). Because of limitlessness of God, humans express their love with the sign of *Bhakti*. To widen the scope of *Bhakti*, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses it with diverse attitudes such as Vrīṣṇis have *Bhakti* to Śrī Kṛṣṇa from family relation; fear is the means of *Bhakti* for Kāmsa to Śrī Kṛṣṇa . Likewise, Śiśupāla is guided by hatred as *Bhakti* but friendliness is the way of *Bhakti* for the *Pāṇdavas* whereas intimacy is the path of *Bhakti* for *gopīs* to Śrī Kṛṣṇa (Thakkar 53). This example confirms that the nature of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is mysterious due to different form of *Bhakti*. With all these logical descriptions in *Bhakti Yoga*, one can express that negative relation such as fear and hatred with Śrī Kṛṣṇa are also the forms of *Bhakti*. Thus, one can pursue the Supreme Reality either as an object of love or hatred.

The logic of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* is found in detail in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The academicians such as Nicholas Shutan, Prabhupāda, Christian Lee Novetzke, B. G Tiwari, and Muktaben Dasharathbhai Thakkar have pointed out their views on Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* from different perspectives. They relate to the utility of *Bhakti* literature from the light of Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti*. The reviews of the interpreters present how importance the Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Bhakti* is in the evolution of *Bhakti* literature. It

discusses domain of *Bhakti* literature in detail citing the views of the commentators. Not only the devotees and sages but also Śrī Kṛṣṇa himself presents his view about the path of *Bhakti Yoga*. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is the only text which evaluates the importance and utility of *Bhakti Yoga* and it is reflected in the analysis of different commentators, researchers, and philosophers. Thus, the place of *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* in *Bhakti* literature is incomparable.

Likewise, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy to show connection between *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*. When *Puruṣa* disturbs the equilibrium of *Prakṛti*, the process of evolution happens in the universe. The *Sāṃkhya* philosophy, one of the reviews of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, discusses on *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa* from the perspective of numbering system. Major critics of the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy are James Fieser, Bradley Dowden, R. Puligandla, Mikel Burley, Gerald James Larson, C. T. Kenghe, Jumli Nath, Vikram H. Zaveri, and Pratima Chattopadhyay. The critics express their views on *Sāṃkhya* philosophy from different perspectives. In this context, it is necessary to mention the view of James Fieser and Bradley Dowden for the clarification of *Sāṃkhya* philosophy of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. In their words:

Word *Sāṃkhya* is derived from the *Sanskrit* noun *Sankhya* (number) based on the verbal root *khyā* (make known, name) with the proverb *sam* (together). *Sāṃkhya* thus denotes the system of enumeration. It belongs to number and calculation. (1)

The argument of Fieser and Dowden on *Sāṃkhya* philosophy helps to understand the universe with the help of numbering system.

*Sāṃkhya* represents *pancha tattva* (five elements) of Nature such as the earth, water, heat, air, and sky; five *tanmātrā* (special qualities) such as smell (*gandha*), fluid (*rasa*), form (*rupa*), feeling (*sparsa*), and word (*sabda*); four *antaskaraṇa* (inner



senses) *mana* (mind), *budhi* (wisdom), *chitta* (psyche), and *ahangkār* (arrogance); five *gyānendriyas* (senses) such as eyes, nose, ears, skin, and tongue; five *karmendriyas* (actions with god Indra) *wāka* (voice), *wāṇī* (hands), *pāḍa* (legs), *upstha* (anus), and *pāyū* (reproductive organ); four *brittis* (intentions) *sangkalpa* (aim), *niscaya* (certainty), *chintā* (worry), *abhiyān* (mission).

In the same line of argument, R. Puligandla expresses his view on the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy from his logic: "Every object of our experience is dependent upon and caused by other objects" (116). Explaining this statement, one clarifies that the elements of Nature have dependency each other. Unlike Puligandha, Mikel Burley connects *Sāṃkhya* system with *yoga* mentioning that " *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga* are among the oldest and most influential systems of classical Indian thought and religious practice" (1). It further proves that *Sāṃkhya* philosophy is highlighted from the lens of *yoga*. Moving ahead in this line of thought, we examine that *Sāṃkhya* system is in practice from the ancient time in the *Hinduism*.

Gerald James further proves the validity of *Sāṃkhya* philosophy in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* from his logic. The critic argues that *Sāṃkhya* philosophy is a lens for the analysis of history (21). From this perspective, it can be argued that humans study the creation of this universe from the perspective of *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. Basing his argument on such idea, Jumli Nath pinpoints his view: "*Sāṃkhya* system doesn't believe in the unreality of the phenomenal world. It solely deals with the evolution of the universe which is not based on just a mere hypothetical speculation" (44). This discussion concentrates on the evolution of the universe on the basis of *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. With the support of this idea, one can clarify that *Sāṃkhya* philosophy is one of the ancient philosophies of the *Hindus*.

Unlike James Fieser, Bradley Dowden, R. Puligandla, Mikel Burley, and Gerald James, C. T. Kenghe appraises the oldness of the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. In his argument: "Though Kapila mentioned in the *R̥gveda* and the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* cannot be identified with the founder of *Sāṃkhya* system, it is quite obvious that *Sāṃkhya* was already recognized as an ancient system in the age of the *Mahābharata*" (6). This standpoint justifies the discussion of the notion that one can find the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy in the *R̥gveda* and it thrives in the *Śvetāśvatara* and other *Upanishads*. The *Mahābharata* and *Purāṇas* discuss this philosophy showing the relation between *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*. Jumli Nath stresses on this point and the critic goes on arguing that: "*Sāṃkhya* flourishes on the strong foundation laid by the *Upanishads* regarding this concern" (45). Explaining this statement, the readers postulate that *Sāṃkhya* philosophy flourishes on the groundstone of the *Vedic*, *Upanishadic* and *Paurāṇic* texts.

Vikram H. Zaveri is the next critic of *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. In this connection, he acknowledges that the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy refers the creation of this universe (2). The critic intensifies his view on the basis of this philosophy about the creation of the universe. In this connection, it is necessary to discuss the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy as the ground of knowledge. With this conditioning, Richard Garbe surveys the area of the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. He corroborates that "In Kapila's doctrine, for the first time in the history of the world, the complete independence and freedom of the human mind, its full confidence in its own powers, were exhibited" (Chattopadhyay 8). This idea is related to the views of other critics and philosophers in connection to the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. In conclusion, one exposes that sage Kapila generates the *sāṃkhya* philosophy at first in this universe for the knowledge of his mother Debahuti. The aforementioned views of the critics and their critical writings on *Sāṃkhya* philosophy

relate how the ideas of *Sāṃkhya* become basis for the creation of the universe. Sanskrit literature creates and flourishes this philosophy for the analysis of the creation of the universe.

*Advaita* philosophy is next dimension of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* to draw the attention of writers and critical thinkers for discussion. This philosophy shows spiritual realization for the attainment of humans. The aim of the *Advaita* philosophy is to establish the nature of truth (*tattva-nirṇaya*), and triumph over the opponent, *vādi-vijaya*. It serves as the base of inner strength and ethics in the life of humans. This philosophy becomes the centre of discussion among writers, critics, and philosophers. Among them, the major writers, critics, and philosophers on the *Advaita* philosophy are Śankarāchārya, Deepshikha Shahi, William M. Indich, G.M. Mallica, Sthan Timalisina, Stephen Greg K. S. Murthy, and John Grimes.

The credit of clarifying the *Advaita* philosophy at first goes to Śankarāchārya. In Śankarāchārya's words: "*Advaita* marks the highest point of spiritual realization a human being can attain" (2). It remains the fact that spiritual realization is the foundation stone of *Advaita* philosophy. In her counter argument, Deepshikha Shahi highlights the *Advaita* philosophy on the base of human consciousness. The critic hints the consciousness of humans (21). This argument supports the point that the consciousness of humans is necessary to understand the *Advaita* philosophy.

Unlike Śankarāchārya and Deepshikha Shahi, William M. Indich is apt to state the *advaita* in this way: "*Brahman* is non-dual and unchanging reality; the world is illusion; man's eternal Self (*Ātman*) is not different from reality (*Brahman*)" (3). This dealing is based on the idea of *advaita* on the base of *Ātman* (soul). Moving ahead in this line of logic, we can remark that the *advaita* philosophy is highlighted from the concept of *Ātman* and *Brahman*. With this conditioning, humans can analyse that

*advaita* is a kind of monism. With this discussion, one reaches to the conclusion that the knowledge of self-consciousness, *Ātman* and *Brahman* is necessary to understand the *advaita* philosophy.

G.M. Mallica further proves the validity of *advaita* philosophy in the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The reviewer of the *advaita* philosophy corroborates that the world is perishable using the term *itaratasca* (1). The word *itaratasca* refers that the world does not remain same all time. This discussion heads to the analysis of the development of *advaita* philosophy. William M. Indich follows the footsteps of Deepshikha Shahi in the review of the *advaita* philosophy. The critic claims that "The world appears to emerge from *Brahman* only from within the context of the world" (6). Responding to such claims, one analyzes that *Brahman* is the ground stone for the creation of this world. From the aforementioned logic, readers can conclude that the domain of the *advaita* philosophy is broad to examine.

Judy Kupferman has different notions about *advaita* philosophy. The critical thinker argues about the creation of the world. The critic discusses that the world was created from "a big explosion"(10). To strengthen the argument, readers link this idea to the modern concept about the creation of the universe. Unlike the above views of other critical thinkers about the *advaita* philosophy, Kupferman links *advaita* philosophy with the creation of the universe. Likewise, Sthaneshwar Timalsina, a critical thinker supports Deepshikha Shahi about *advaita* philosophy and points out his notion: "Consciousness can arise due to the rise of various impressions" (127). The discussion concentrates on human consciousness as the basis of the *advaita* philosophy.

The extension of this logic can also be found in the perspective of Stephen E. Gregg. According to the critic: "*Advaita* represented ultimate religiosity in its truest

form" (228). It proves that *Advaita* and religion have reciprocal relation each other. K.S. Murty remains in the opposite direction from other critics and writers about *advaita* philosophy but the critic joins his hands with William M. Indich. The analyst uses the term *Brahman* (world) and expresses that *Brahman* is in the world as curd within milk (177). Curd is inseparable from milk and so is the condition of *Brahman* in the world. With this discussion, he reaches to the conclusion that the *Advaita* philosophy and *Brahman* are the two lens for the analysis of the world.

John Grimes contradicts Timalisina, Gregg, and Murty, and the critic hints the weaknesses of the *Advaita* philosophy. His finding reveals that "Some *Advaitins* have compared this to seeing the surface of the ocean and completely forgetting the immensity beneath" (9). His analysis clearly shows that the *Advaita* philosophy is difficult to understand for experts. It remains the fact that the *Advaita* philosophy is not understandable by common readers. The above critics and their critical writings on the *advaita* philosophy basically show the use of this philosophy in the creation of the universe.

The aforementioned reviews on the basic concepts of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*, ecotheories, and the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* show discussions on thematic aspects. The philosophers, critics, writers, and scholars have their literature reviews on the popularity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Paurāṇic* period as well as at present. The researcher claims that no one has reviewed the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* from the perspective of the interrelation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature. Thus, Nature theory has been unexplored in interrelation with Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. It is the point of departure of this dissertation for analysis. For this reason, it is important to examine Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in interrelation to Nature to instruct humans how the hero had played his role in favor of Nature. This research attempts to

link Nature theory with the text of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. It analyses how the *līlās* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa have interrelation with different facets of Nature.

## CHAPTER THREE

### CONNECTING HUMAN ACTIVITIES WITH NATURE

This section concentrates on the origin and the use of Nature, its flourish, and its relevance in the life of human beings. To chronicle relationship between Nature and creatures, the researcher introduces the evolution of Nature theory from the *Vedic* period to present. The study of Nature begins at first in the *Vedas* and some *Purāṇas* such as *Agnipurāṇa*, *Śivapurāṇa*, *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, *Skandhapurāṇa*, *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, *Varāha Purāṇa*, *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* and the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* highlight Nature due to its connection with creatures and plants. Then, it introduces traditional discourse on Nature and it is followed by modern discourses on the same theory. The discussion on Nature flourishes on the ground of ecology and environment. For the clarification of Nature, the discussion moves to the exploration of Nature in ecotheory. In this theoretical background, the discussion concentrates on modes of Nature in literary criticism. Thus, this chapter postulates the theoretical background for Nature theory which forms the basis for Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the following chapter of this dissertation.

#### **Evolution of Nature in the *Hindu* Philosophy**

Nature, in Sanskrit literature, is a core concept for discussion for researchers and critics. Scholars, primarily in Sanskrit literary tradition, have defined it in relation to the earth. In this regard, G. Naganathan argues: "The *Hindus* had always looked upon Earth as a mother Goddess; the sun is not just a gigantic fusion generator but a form of Viṣṇu to be worshipped" (12). They regard the earth as their mother and worship her. This concept of Nature has undergone modification along with the evolution of the concepts of human relation with literature.

### Nature Discourse in the *Vedas*

The credit for the definition of Nature, of giving the process of its utility, establishment of its value in literature, goes to Vedavyāsa, the compiler of the *Hindu* religious texts. In around 1500 BC, according to Kenneth Chandler, Vyāsa formulated the value of Nature for creatures and referred in the *Vedas* (1). In the *Vedas*, he accumulated attentively the useful concepts related to Nature and inscribed them in his writings. To support this thought, Raimundo presents sufficient evidences of the significance of Nature from its comparison with human body. He goes a step ahead when he posits the value of the earth: “A man can no more live without the earth than he can live without the body” (120). The scholar emphasizes the importance of the earth as the base of Nature. Without body, we cannot think about our lives; in the same way, no one thinks about the existence of creatures in the absence of the earth. This analogy, for the support of Nature is justifiable.

The theory of Nature has considerable place in the *Atharva Veda* and the writer presents a space for discussion of the use, importance, and necessity of Nature for creatures. Vedavyāsa regards *bhūmī* as the divine force: “*Bhūmī* is upheld by divine forces and penance: *Bhūmī* is the witness of our past, present and future”]<sup>10</sup> (*Atharva Veda* 12. 1: 23). The writer goes a step ahead from modern critics and sees divine force in Nature. He argues that *bhūmī* is formulated by cosmic divine laws and everybody should try to save Nature. Here, the author personifies land as human being saying that she is a silent witness of all the activities which are performed on the earth.

We find the evaluative comments of Aurobindo on *Bhūmī Sukta* (Ode to the Earth) of the *Atharva Veda*. He finds in this long poem about the praise of motherland in the *Vedas* (45). It depicts the thoughts of the *Vedic* seers about the significance for



Nature in the very ancient time. This poem portrays land, its utility, beauty, and ultimately it is an attack on general human absurdities for not using *Nature* properly and respectfully. The writer shows misuse of *bhūmī* for the sake of selfishness of humans. Human beings think themselves as the master of the earth so that they use *bhūmī* for the sake of their utility by neglecting the condition of animals and plants. The interpreter regards *bhūmī* as the Goddess of fertility using the word "motherland" due to her capacity of food production for the sake of living beings.

With this idea at the centre of attention, Vedavyāsa further focuses on the use and respect of Nature referring appropriate words such as earth, hill, mountain, forest, river, and flower in the *Atharva Veda*. Highlighting the use and value of Nature, he exposes:

O Mother Earth, May Your Hills and Snow- Clad Mountains (spread its coolness within us); May your forests (provide us food, medicine and shelter); May your forests spread its delight within us, you present a *Vishwarupa* with your many colors- *babhru* (brown) of mountains, Śrī Kṛṣṇa (blue) of rivers, Rohini (red) of flowers; (but behind all these enchanting appearances) O Mother Earth, you are like Dhruva- firm and immovable; and you are protected by Indra, (on your firm foundation) which is unconquered, unslain, unbroken whole, I stand firm (and whole, O Mother.<sup>11</sup>

(*Atharva Veda*: 12. 11 :21)

The given hymn has sufficient evidence for interpretation to save the earth and other natural things. It identifies how the *bhūmī* makes a balance from excessive heat and cold to make good environment for the existence of creatures. The mountains make cool and they save the earth from excessive heat. It further proves the validity of forest and rivers for humans and other creatures for their existence on this planet.

At this point, Ian Marshall and Megan Simpson highlight: "Nature writing typically functions to bring about the social change" (3). They forward the concept of Nature to bring social changes in the civilized life-style of human beings. This discussion concentrates on the relation of Nature with society regarding the necessity of Nature for the present civilized society. This finding is related to the psychology of humans and its prime concern to make clear about the value of Nature through literary writings. From this point what they argue is plausible. Moving ahead, they argue that "Nature writing can be a force for social change" (3). On this ground, they formulate that there should be the presentation of Nature in literature.

Vedavyāsa gives further insight about the earth admiring her as the base for food in the *Atharva Veda* with evidence: "O purifying Earth, I invoke you! / O patient Earth, by sacred word enhanced, // Bearer of nourishment and strength, of food and ghee/ O Earth, we would approach you with due praise!"<sup>12</sup>(*Atharva Veda*: 12. 29: 22). This finding is about the utility of the earth which the theory of Nature deals with. The earth provides everything and she nourishes all creatures by supplying nutritious food. As the earth tolerates both the rain and the sun, human beings should have patience to tolerate ups and downs in their lives. They are only a part of the earth but not the whole. If people use Nature negatively, their destruction is inevitable. The hymn, *Bhūmī Sukta*, motivates humans to use the earth for positive purpose. People should have the qualities of land for the betterment of others and they should not dedicate themselves only to fulfil their needs.

Aurobindo connects the sky with the earth to extend the scope of Nature. He comments that daily activities of creatures are possible on the earth from power of the sky (34). He feels the value of Nature stressing that modern human beings should respect the earth and the sky. The ideas from the *Atharva Veda* in connection to

Nature, are the basis for evolution of Nature theory. The activities of the earth, which are the bases for Nature, are pointed out: “She carries in her lap the foolish and also the wise. She bears the death of the wicked as well the good” [*maiwam bibhrati gurubhrida/bhadrapapa nidhanam titichu*] (*Atharva Veda*: 12. 48: 31). Moving ahead in this line of logic, Aurobindo confirms that Nature has impartiality for different sorts of humans. Both foolish and wise persons get equal opportunities and benefits from the utility of land. With all these logical descriptions, one can opine that humans should accept Nature as the foundation of education for practicality to improve modern society.

The revelation of Nature in the form of the earth evokes readers to respect Nature. Vedavyāsa concludes: “The earth bears many plants and medicinal herbs of various potencies and she extends her riches to the creatures to make them healthy” (*Atharva Veda* 12. 2: 24). The efforts of the writer have been continued for the judgment on Nature referring the earth as the donator of varieties of herbs and medicine. The writer does not differentiate between Nature and a mother and the images of Nature are the evidences in the text. A mother provides everything for her children and the children depend on her without raising questions against her. In the same way, no one thinks his existence without the earth and one should focus on multi purposes of Nature for creatures.

With all these discussions related to Nature from the *Atharva Veda*, the researcher feels that Nature is observed primarily in the form of the earth. *Atharva Veda* too argues in favor of Nature and provides awareness to modern human beings not to create problems in Nature. During the *Vedic* period, there was not problems with Nature even though Vedavyāsa predicted the future condition of Nature and

makes aware of it. Thus, the use of Nature in the *Vedas* exposes that this theory is one of the oldest theories.

### **Nature Discourse in the *Purāṇas***

Nature theory, though theoretically introduced in the *Vedas*, became matured in the *Upaniṣhads*. Then, this theory has occupied a considerable space in the *Agnipurāṇa*, *Śivapurāṇa*, *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, *Skandhapurāṇa*, *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, *Varāha Purāṇa*, *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* and the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The concept of Nature turned into maturity in the *Purāṇic* literature. Vedavyāsa contributes for exploring the notion of Nature single-handedly in the very ancient time. Linking this point, Tapas Pal argues: "Veda-Vyasa was a great fluvial geographer" (5). Providing the ground for interpretation on the contribution of Vyāsa on Nature, he judges him as an ancient theorist of Nature.

In this line of judgment, one can argue, it is Vedavyāsa who examines Nature in different *Purāṇas*. The *Purāṇas* extend the scope of Nature giving its images and the impact of Nature in the life of characters. The researcher finds clues related to Nature theory in the *Agnipurāṇa*. The *Agnipurāṇa* deals with the planning of town, construction of houses and temples using materials from Nature. The text has revealed inscribing *Āhārasudhi* (purity in food) for humans which are possible only from purity in Nature. In the words of Vedavyasa: "Pure food gives energy and good thoughts" [*āhārasudhiramnyarthamagnimu:lam balam nrnām*] (18. 24: 184). The *Agnipurāṇa* makes discussion in favor of purity in food and it is necessary for good health. Nature has prominent role for good health of human beings and other creatures.

Nature provides food and medicine for creatures. Manik S. Thakar makes discussion about Nature for medical purposes based on the *Agnipurāṇa*. He stresses

that our ancestors were careful about Nature for the medical utility (102). The interpreter has medical judgment in the evaluation of Nature. Human beings use Nature for multipurposes. From this interpretation, he limits the use of Nature in the life of human beings. But the *Agnipurāṇa* discusses the use of Nature in the form of trees: "The trees are looked upon from different angles. Their uses are for ritual, medical and social purposes"[*āsanam śayanam yānam jayāpatyam kamandaluh / ātmanah śuciretāni pareṣam na śucirbhavet*] (60. 13:14). This verse stresses on Nature and its importance in the *paurāṇic* period. Thus, the *Agnipurāṇa* explains the idea of Nature in the ancient time.

The *Śivapurāṇa* has similar ideas on Nature and this *purāṇa* refers the value of trees for humans for the spiritual life. The humans, who have their faith in the spiritual life, have keen interest for planting trees. In Vedavyāsa's words: "One who plants trees is well protected from the Sun even in the world of Yama"<sup>15</sup> (5. 11: 392). The *Śivapurāṇa* clarifies that humans who plant trees and build reservoirs of water are supposed to go to the heaven after their death. It stresses the benefits for mankind from plantation of trees even after death. Suggestions of *Śivapurāṇa* is that to love Nature is necessary and useful in the physical and the spiritual worlds. One can opine that a tree pleases God by flowers, travelers by shadow, and people with the help of fruits. Nature and its conservation is the major theme of the *Śivapurāṇa*. Thus, the reference of Nature in this *Purāṇa* inspires human beings to plant trees for the benefit of all.

With similar belief in the moderated form, T.N. Khoshoo makes his remark on Nature in connection to the *Śivapurāṇa*. He argues that "Nature and human beings are two major elements recognized in the scriptures, which bring doom and gloom to the Mother Earth" (1147). This is so definitely said that there is contradictory

relationship between Nature and humans which creates problems in the natural world. The expression attempts to capture the condition of Nature from intervention of human beings. If human beings believe in the philosophy of the *Śivapurāṇa* in favor of Nature, they can control the intervention to Nature and there may be no gloomy scenario in it.

Like the *Śivapurāṇa*, the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* discusses the evolution of Nature. Unlike the *Śivapurāṇa*, the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* examines the future condition of Nature. Here, Vedavyāsa changes his role from the author to the predictor and depicts the future scenario of Nature. In his words: "All living beings have their right in this earth. So, humans should not make disturbance in their inhabitants" <sup>16</sup> (5. 6: 19). In this statement, the writer warns human beings not to disturb the inhabitants of other creatures.

Vedavyāsa goes on arguing that the destroyer of forest is *mahāpātaka* (189). This type of person is cruel to animals and plants. The *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* discusses severe punishment to the destroyer of forest in the light of the suggestive meanings. The Ninth Chapter *Pūtradharmavyavastha* ["the *dharma* of son"] (190) projects various plans with reasons for conservation of forest and purification of wells. In line with this idea, this *purāṇa* throws light upon the duty of a son to remain aware of Nature from the problems of modern human beings.

T.N. Khoshoo explores consequences from the explosion of population and the predictions from the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. He incorporates his idea: "We must not do so with arrogance of conquering nature, but working in close harmony with it" (1151). He argues that there should be the horizontal relation of humans with Nature. Human beings have no right to destroy the ecological balance. If modern human beings regard themselves as the master of Nature, there is no use of saying *vasudaiba*

*kutumbakam* [the world is an extended family]. This idea deals with the sustainability of plants and animals on the earth. From this standpoint, there is reliability in the expression of Khoshoo related to human activities and their consequences in the natural world. Thus, the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* highlights Nature in relation to life of different creatures.

The trend of Nature changes from the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* to *Skandhapurāṇa*. The *Skandhapurāṇa* clearly states the significance of Nature with the word *kalpavṛkṣa*. The word *kalpavṛkṣa* indicates the *pīpal* tree which represents all trees of the world. It refers sufficient evidences for the conservation of Nature regarding trees as our sons. Vedavyāsa writes with full confidence: “One tree is equal to ten sons” [*daśakratusamāh putro daśaputrasamo drumah*] (2. 27: 21). This idea suggests to conserve the forest and the other objects of Nature. If trees get love and affection like sons, they may not be cut down. Trees are personified as human beings in the *Skandhapurāṇa* and this idea instructs us to love trees for conservation. If we follow the instructions of *Skandhapurāṇa*, we can control the trend of deforestation. The text attempts to convince readers with the argument to plant trees for the benefits of creatures.

In this line of logic in favor of trees and plants from the *Skandhapurāṇa*, William Carlos Williams has similar types of findings about the importance of trees and flowers. But he has a bit different idea from Vedavyāsa in connection to Nature. He argues that flowers and men are relatively equal (qtd. in Wallaert 93). To see human and a flower from the same lens is a kind request from the poet that we should care the world of Nature. He states that humans should try to be as pure as a beautiful flower. If everybody follows precepts of the *Skandhapurāṇa* and William Carlos Williams, there may not be a question mark about the existence of Nature in its pure

form. Thus, the writer and the critic of the *Skandhapurāṇa* have highlighted the value of Nature in interrelation to the activities of human beings.

Here the focus is on the importance of Nature. The *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* argues in favor of Nature and warns human beings not to pollute water. If there is pollution in rivers, it causes many problems for humans and other creatures. The *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* exposes: "Pollution in water causes problems in the health of humans and other creatures"<sup>17</sup> (3. 12: 45). Water pollution is caused by mixing unwanted materials in water. It affects in health of humans and other creatures. One uses water for diverse purposes from drinking to making different constructions for development. This *purāṇa* mentions the global problem in which modern human beings must think seriously for the solution of the problem related to Nature. It is necessary to organize programs to control water pollution for our good health and save animals from diseases.

Vasudha Narayan, an analyst on Nature and a professor of religion from the University of Florida explores the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* in relation to rivers: "Rivers are perceived to be nurturing mothers, feeding, nourishing, quenching and when angered, flooding the earth" (307). This logic concentrates the pros and cons of rivers. The rivers respond humans according to their activities. If they love and care the rivers, they get benefits as a loving mother. If not, they must face natural calamities such as flooding and siltation. Vasudha Narayan confirms that flooding is the consequence of anger of the rivers. The above verse from the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* and the perspective of Vasudha Narayan shows the importance of Nature and its relation to the present condition of the world.

*Varāha Purāṇa* addresses Nature for its improvement by planting trees. The trees are useful gifts of Nature and they primarily provide us oxygen, shelter, and



food. Forest, a component of Nature, has a crucial role for survival of all creatures. This *purāṇa* evidently emphasizes on planting trees: "Plantation of trees is useful for the improvement of quality of air and water of this globe"<sup>18</sup> (2. 26: 21). The reality is that trees improve the quality of air and water. They save us from the siltation of rivers, landslides, and desertification. The *Varāha Purāṇa* contains illustration regarding the significance of Nature. It refers to the consciousness of the *paurāṇic* people about Nature.

The *Hindu* philosophy discusses the destruction of forest as a sinful act. In this context, Mary Mcgee brings us the view of *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* as an evidence for the proof of her idea. In connection with the idea of the *Varāha Purāṇa*, she posits her advice that a man should recite one hundred *Vedic* verses after cutting down a tree (276). This standpoint indicates that human beings should be careful in their relation with trees. Human beings express their view in the opposite direction from the thoughts of the *Varāha Purāṇa* and *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*. Thus, Mary Mcgee concludes: "*Dharma* focuses first on oneself, emphasizing one's own behavior" (172). This notion of Nature can be further explained in detail in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

Beginning the idea of Nature from the *Atharva Veda*, *Upaniṣads* and *Purāṇas*, one can see the extension of the concept of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Nature, a prominent idea of study, develops through Śrī Kṛṣṇa and other *Paurāṇic* characters. Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the hero of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, performs his playful activities in favor of Nature. Lance E. Nelson argues: "One who cares for Kṛṣṇa , cares for His land" (254). The projected idea is that modern humans who love Śrī Kṛṣṇa must love the land they belonged to and care Nature of nearby

area. This expression confirms that human beings who are in support in playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, never create problems in Nature.

The interrelation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature can be made clear from the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Śrī Kṛṣṇa highlights contribution of trees in Vṛndāvana to support the life of others:

See these greatly fortunate trees, whose lives are completely dedicated to the benefits of others. Even while tolerating the wind, rain, and heat and snow, they protect us from these elements. Just see how these trees are maintaining every living entity! Their birth is successful. Their behavior is just like that of great personalities, for anyone who asks anything from a tree never goes away disappointed. These trees fulfill one's desires with their leaves, flowers and fruits, their shade, roots bark and wood, and also with their fragrance, sap, ashes, pulp and shoots. It is the duty of every living being to perform welfare activities for the benefit of others with his life, wealth, intelligence and words.<sup>19</sup> (10. 22: 32-34)

This extract shows Śrī Kṛṣṇa's love for Nature referring trees as serving others and he explains the use of trees to the cowherd boys in the forest of Vṛndāvana. In this context, his role is a nature lover for the welfare of others. In reality, we do not have humanity because of our selfishness.

The trend of explaining Nature in light of the precepts of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is forwarded by Basudha Narayanan. He compares trees with our children. He asserts that people feel success in their lives from the progress of their children and grandchildren. In the same way, we should regard trees as our children (11). On this background, everybody should care trees as his kith and kin. The evolution of Nature

related activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* will be discussed in detail in the application chapter of this dissertation.

The *Vedas* and the *Purāṇas* include sensitive philosophy on Nature and these scriptures suggest us to preserve Nature for the sake of ecological balance. The prime achievement in the concept of Nature in the *Vedic* and the *Paurāṇic* periods was the contribution of Vedavyāsa. He has made broad discussion on Nature in the *Atharva Veda*. But the concept of Nature turns to maturity in the *Purāṇas*. He views that Nature is the base for human beings and other creatures. The scriptures confirm that modern humans should analyze Nature in relation to the activities of divine beings. Thus, the description of Nature in the *Atharva Veda* is the platform for discussion.

The precepts of the *purāṇas* are not to conquer over Nature but to preserve it for the benefits of all creatures. The *Paurāṇic* texts warn modern human beings not to exploit Nature. The *paurāṇic* characters have special respect for Nature; their ideas on Nature are full of spiritualism. On the basis of these *purāṇas*, one can argue that our ancestors had far-sighted vision about Nature and its effect in our lives. They have clear vision to promote relationship between Nature and man. The *Paurāṇic* texts expect to have friendly relation between human beings and Nature. Human beings should develop close relationship with Nature and they should love and respect it. Without facing problems in Nature, the seers of the ancient time give instructive precepts to the future generations.

The noble aim of the *Purāṇas* is to unite humans from all sections of society in a common platform. If men have simple lifestyle, they will not face any problems. These texts embrace both ancient and modern subject matters. In this sense, every *Purāṇa* gives someone new idea about Nature. Multifarious ideas for the preservation of Nature are given directly and indirectly. Nature had been a reliable life force for the

people of the *Paurānic* period. Due to their harmony with Nature, those people did not face any problems in Nature. One can find the utility of plants and other natural things in almost all the *Purāṇas*. There is discussion about importance of plantation and controlling the pollution in Nature. The *Purāṇas* throw the considerable light on the significance of Nature for the maintenance of Nature. Thus, the *Vedas* and the *Purāṇas* are the bases to discuss on the value and importance of Nature.

### **Traditional Discourse on Nature**

Nature, in the definition of Aristotle is " as the essence of things, what they are made of and entail their destiny: the nature of a bed or of a tree is wood" (3). The destiny of human beings is related to their activities on Nature. Nature theory, from the traditional discussion, deals with experiences acquired by local people over hundreds of years through direct contact with Nature (Inglis 6). In this connection, Dhruva Laudari argues that traditional Nature is considered tradition-based, because it is created in a manner that reflects the traditions of the communities (79). This argument supports the idea how the traditional concept of Nature uses land and the other natural things. On the basis of the traditional discourse on Nature, those humans equate Nature with God.

Aristotle had made human beings conscious about the devastation of Nature at first in the ancient Greece: "Here the sea encroaches upon the land, there the land reaches out timidly into the sea; new continents and new oceans rise, old oceans and old continents disappear, and all the face of the world is changed and rechanged in a great systole and diastole of growth and dissolution "(1). The philosopher appraises human beings to love Nature due to the ground of existence of all creatures and plants. This idea shows that intervention in Nature invites the destruction of the world. It is a warning of Aristotle to remain aware of Nature. In this light, Gregor

Scheiman argue that human beings should realize the reflection of Nature in different shapes (67). In support of this idea, one can corroborate that the five elements of Nature such as the earth, water, light, air, and space are the shapes of Nature.

The theory on Nature is the base for the solution of Nature's problems and its use is the focal point at present. To highlight this theory, it is necessary to be conscious about the sensation of animals. Arthur H. Hirshorn supports Aristotle in his article "Earth Saving Strategies": " I do not deny the sensation of animals" (224). If everybody realizes the sensation of animals as the sense of human beings, the threat in Nature is controlled. The notion of animal consciousness helps us respect animals and other objects of Nature. The warning of Aristotle is a lesson for us to respect Nature. Thus, the theory of Nature propounded by Aristotle has become a pioneer for other theorists.

Ethical Nature, an aspect on the Nature theory, establishes Baruch Spinoza as a renowned philosopher. To support Aristotle's theory of Nature, Spinoza discusses the value of Nature relating to God: "By the help of God I mean the fixed and unchangeable order of nature, or the chain of natural events"; the universal laws of nature and the eternal decrees of God are one and the same thing" (163). Explaining this statement, one can evaluate both Nature and God from the same perspective. In this connection, John Grey exposes: "God is identical with Nature" (3). Because of the presence of God in Nature, it plays an active role in the world. Human beings cannot deny the changes in Nature and it is their obligation to change their activities as the condition of weather. The changes in weather in Nature and its impression in the life of humans and other creatures shows the supremacy of Nature.

Spinoza highlights Nature and God with reciprocal relation each other:

The universal laws of Nature, according to which all things exist and are determined, are only another name for the eternal decrees of God, and these eternal decrees always involve truth and necessity. God is the laws of Nature. Since the laws of Nature prevail throughout the universe, then God is everywhere (187).

From the given logical presentation, the philosopher views Nature and God from the same perspective. He instructs humans to respect Nature thinking that it is the dwelling place of God. His pantheistic perspective on Nature shows its significance for creatures and plants.

Spinoza's theory on Nature in connection to God is the ground stone for other analysts. Basing his argument on such idea, Juliana Mercon clarifies: "Spinoza was concerned with the ontological bases of ethical positions and with the consideration of humans as part of Nature" (2). As a pantheist, Mercon exposes that natural orders cannot be changed by men-made laws. Nature has its domain in the life of human beings and other creatures. For the same reason, John Grey explores that Nature is the state of all individuals together (13). Formation of Nature includes diverse beings and things of the globe and they should remain in the balanced form. If humans explain Nature from the standpoint of God, there is no crisis in Nature.

To support the idea of Nature, Spinoza incorporates that "God acts from the laws of Nature alone" (97). Moving ahead in this line of logic, one explicates that Spinoza postulates the presence of God in Nature. This discussion heads to the examination of God from the perspective of Nature. The philosopher further proves the validity of divine being in Nature: "The identity of God with Nature is a strong and determinative principle" (32). The analysis of Nature discussed in this subject shows that God and Nature are same. The objects of Nature which are necessary for

the survival of creatures are divine beings. For Spinoza, "the laws of Nature themselves are the laws of God" (11). From such perspective of Spinoza, the researcher argues that his perspective on Nature and God is a lens to explicate the interrelationship between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature in the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz gives continuation to Nature theory of Spinoza. He discusses on this theory in the light of suggestive meaning regarding the perfection of Nature due to its creation from God:

But universal nature is, so to speak, the artifice of God, and such a work, indeed, that any natural machine whatever consists further of infinite organs (this is the true, but little noted, distinction between nature and art) and so entails an infinite wisdom and power on the part of its author and governor (499).

Leibniz's argument turns out to be valid for the interpretation of Nature from the perspective of God. Spinoza compares the works of Nature with a machine which works smoothly. But unlike a machine, Nature works without making mistakes.

There is reliability in the perspective of Leibniz to see God and Nature in the same form. Basing his argument on such idea, Rutherford outlines the vindications of God's works in reflection on Nature (8). Nature is the outcome from the works of the divine being. This view encourages human beings to use the lens of *dharma* (duty) to conserve Nature. Humans should regard Nature and God in the same way. The realization of God in Nature supports Leibniz's idea in favor of existence. There is the progressive move of Nature theory from the idea of similarities between Nature and God. It is important to equalize between human and non-human beings to see the presence of God in Nature. In this regard, Mercon exposes that human beings are

equal and different with non-human beings (3). The biocentric perspective sees similarities between human and non-human beings.

Elaborating his argument, Leibniz confirms that "everything is moved by divine power alone rather than admit something called a 'nature" (4). With the support of this idea, one can contemplate the supremacy of divine power on Nature. This idea of Leibniz draws the attention of human beings to be responsive for the conservation of Nature. In this light, Simonis deals with God from his respect of Nature. He puts forward his idea from the notion of "international commitment"(16). This idea confirms to examine God and Nature from the same perspective. If there is international commitment to study God and Nature from the same perspective, the risk in Nature will be controlled. The Nature theory of Leibniz makes us conscious about our responsibility in favor of Nature.

John Locke, a philosopher of the seventeenth century, follows the footsteps of Aristotle, Spinoza, and Leibniz for the necessity of Nature. Natural law is the base of his theory in which he highlights the use of Nature. Locke appraises:

It has been granted that some divine power presides over the world— something it would be impious to doubt, for he has commanded the heavens to turn in their perpetual revolution, the earth to abide in its place, the stars to shine, has fixed limits to the unruly sea itself, has prescribed for every kind of plant the manner and season of its germination and growth (95).

The statement makes the natural law more clear as the will of the divine being. This argument rests on the creation of the world from divine power. The works of Nature such as shining of stars, patience of the earth, and changes happen as the course of time.



To highlight the theory of Nature, Steven L. Heyman has a bit different opinion: "The law of nature imposes duties not only toward other individuals but also toward oneself and God" (729). It proves that the interrelation between God and Nature has occupied a considerable space in the activities of human beings. Locke believes that one should think on the use and importance of Nature. His exploration is not to differentiate between God and Nature. With this discussion, one reaches to the conclusion that Nature theory of Locke is the base for the existence of creatures on this globe. To see Nature and God from the same perspective, it is necessary to evaluate interconnectedness between creatures and plants. Forde supports Locke in the importance of Nature and points out his logic elaborating that the law of nature is the path of happiness (4). With this conditioning, one can get the extension of Nature theory from the contribution of Locke.

Explaining the statement in the connectivity of Nature with God, Locke further highlights: "Human beings are God's property because God created them. Due to this assumption they do not have the right to destroy themselves but have to fulfill their highest duty: the survival of the species and the individual" (3). In this context, one can expose that human beings have connection with God. They have soul but God is the super soul. It is the *dharma* (duty) of human beings to preserve Nature regarding the base of their existence. Human beings should love themselves, to other species, and Nature. This argument of Locke resembles with the logic of Leibniz. In Leibniz's view: "The perceptions of non-human animals are interconnected in a way that has some resemblance to reason" (3). On the basis of this expression, we find his love for animals. With the similar belief, the humans who are in favor of animals appreciate this thought. From the use of the word "interconnection," the philosopher

emphasizes the value of Nature in which the role of all creatures is significant in the same ratio.

Locke links Nature to the property right of human beings from his arguments. He hinted that the features of Nature theory is related to God and formulates the necessity of Nature from his logic as follows:

1. God puts us on the earth.
2. he did not put us here to starve.
3. but we will starve unless we can rightfully consume apples and acorns in peace.
4. individuals can peacefully consume if they can securely possess plots of land and rightfully exclude others.
5. humans are born a "a blank slate."
6. they have a state of perfect equality.
7. they are bound by law of Nature.
8. everyone is bound to preserve himself, so by the like reason when his own preservation comes not in competition, ought he, as much as he can, to preserve the rest of mankind.
9. the state of Nature is a state of perfect freedom. (qtd. in Berkeley 2)

The list shows the contribution of Locke on Nature theory. Like other creatures, humans cannot starve so that they should not destroy Nature thinking that other creatures have their rights to survive as humans.

Michael Lacewing, a supporter of Locke in this theory, is apt to state that the law of Nature comes from God and we have the duty to preserve and not to harm life (3). It further proves that modern human beings should obey the law of Nature sincerely. Like Locke, Lacewing is in the support of Nature theory for the protection

of environment. Francis Oakley associates the position of understanding Nature theory from his argument: "Locke's admittedly numerous references to natural law as a declaration of the will of God"(93). This argument turns out to be valid from acceptance of the laws of Nature.

Immanuel Kant gives continuation for the development of Nature theory of Locke. In his words: "God is seen as a being that is absolutely necessary, unconditioned, thinkable, a being that faces the sensible world, the only world that can be investigated" (200). Kant has realization of God in Nature and ponders that human beings should explore this knowledge. Aaron James Goldman gives a credit to Kant's Nature for creation of the literary works referring God. The critical thinker asserts that one should recognize the moral obligation as the commands of God to do (3). This idea further points to the reality that moral realm is inevitable for humans to respect Nature. Kant clarifies himself with the argument that the existence of God is necessary in the world of Nature for happiness. If one does not see the demarcation line between Nature and God, he destroys the natural things randomly. For Kant, the existence of God in Nature is not optional so that the denial of God is the violation of natural laws. He points out the moral argument for the postulation of God's existence.

On the basis of this idea, Kant further corroborates analogy between Nature and Supreme Power: "In beautiful nature we find a 'purposiveness without purpose'-nature looks as if it had been designed for the purpose of bringing our cognitive powers in free play" (154-155). The kernel of Kant's theory of Nature exposes the power of Nature to work properly. The philosopher signals the knowledge of humans to understand the necessity of the natural law for their benefits. On this ground, Massimi and Breitenbach incorporate their view: "We have to pursue the conditions of the inner as well as the outer appearances of Nature through an investigation that

will nowhere be completed, as if Nature were infinite in itself" (63). The analysts present sufficient base for the interpretation of Nature. This argument supports the point of inner and outer condition of Nature. Inner condition of nature shows human nature is the root for the conservation of outer Nature i.e. the environment. If the inner nature of men is good and co-operative, there is no obstacle in the outside Nature.. This notion indicates that human nature is the base for the condition and existence of Nature.

Paul Guyer formulates his view that Nature theory is made popular from moral law (284). In this connection, the interpreter extends the view of Kant's theory on Nature by paying adequate attention. Morality is useful to distinguish between goodness and badness. This dealing is based on the idea of the law of Nature which draws the attention of readers to follow. But the senses of human beings do not pay attention about the connection with Nature. According Kant, Nature, takes the "demands of morality" (qtd. in Guyer 284). As per this argument, the Nature theory motivates readers not to create any harm in environment.

With the aforementioned logical descriptions on Nature theory, we can conclude that from Aristotle to Immanuel Kant, the theorists extend the scope of Nature from their common views. In the context of the traditional perspective on Nature, almost all the philosophers regard the connection of Nature either to God or to morality. The discussion concentrates on the interrelation between Nature and creatures. Thus, the traditional discourse on Nature motivates human beings to love the natural things.

### **Modern Discourse on Nature**

Traditional Nature theorists discussed it in relation to God and morality. Later on, Nature theory was used for the analysis of literary texts. In this connection, Ernest

Haeckel, a modern Nature theorist, elucidates: "The evolutionary story indicates that humans are woven into the ecological interconnectedness of the Earth community, and Earth is itself woven into the complexity and self-organization of the whole universe" (153). This discussion shows that human beings have interconnection with Nature. His discussion is based on the evolutionary theory of Charles Darwin.

Haeckel associates the idea on Nature with the value of Nature. The theorist further explores the broad area of ecology: "Ecology is not restricted to environment, environmentalism, natural history, or environmental sciences but also includes evolutionary biology, genetics ethnology" (qtd. in Michael 3). He deals with the broad area of Nature as it is base for creatures. He shows similarities between structures and creatures. Haeckel exposes: "Nature was not just a jumble of possibility, but it was a place where similarities between structures and creatures could be easily seen, if one were able to look at as many creatures as possible" (2). He draws the similarities among creatures in relation to Nature.

The role of plants and animals is prominent to form a community. From this standpoint, Antonio Bodini and Stefan Klotz focus on Haeckel's principle and they state that plants and animals form a community (4). The Nature theory continually thrived in the literary practice from the contribution of Haeckel. In literary writing, Haeckel becomes a pioneer in the modern period from his new perspective on Nature (qtd. in Burgin 1). He uses terms like plant ecology and animal ecology to highlight the connection between Nature and creatures.

The trend of Nature theory has been continued with slight differences in modern time by Henry Chandler Cowles from his "dynamic ecology" (qtd. in Chandler 6). He goes a step ahead from the ideas of Ernest Haeckel and T. S. Eliot and proposes the term "dynamic ecology" to show the real condition of Nature theory.

The burden of the explosion of population and the activities of modern humans affect Nature directly. If modern men have awareness of Nature, there will be no excessive intervention. Explaining the statement of Cowles, one can discuss that the mode of Nature theory is changing because the form of Nature is changing in due course of time.

On the Nature theory, Cowles sees the "mutual relationship between plants and their environment" (1). He discusses the role of plants in making a connection with creatures for the evocation of Nature theory. This argument supports the point that plants are the base for the development and the importance of this theory. With the similar beliefs, he postulates that changes in environment also bring changes in plants (5). Cowles has a different opinion regarding the condition of plants in the natural world. Looking his ideas on Nature, one can argue that he speaks only about plants.

The major achievement in Nature theory in modern period goes to Rachel Carson. In her groundbreaking book entitled *Silent Spring*, she concentrates on the value of Nature and points out the mishandled condition of Nature by modern humans. Connecting upon this argument, she exposes: "Mankind is degrading the quality of life on our planet" (iii). On the basis of this notion, modern human beings should alter the way of their thoughts and lifestyle about Nature. Carson further shows the connection between human beings and Nature.

Linda Lear supports Carson on theory of Nature: "Human beings, she insisted, were not in control of nature but simply one of its parts: the survival of one part depended upon the health of all" (qtd. in Rachel xvi). She extends the idea on Nature theory highlighting human beings as a component of Nature. This logic shows that modern humans should not try to overcome Nature for the completion of their

demands. This argument points out Nature is the ground for interpretation of literature.

Rachel Carson has her argument on the validity on Nature as a prime subject for discussion. Her noticeable point is to see a balance in the natural world. The balance between plants and animals is the basis for the continuation of Nature. In Rachel's words: "The balance of nature is not a *status quo*; it is fluid, ever shifting, in a constant state of adjustment. Man, too, is part of this balance. Sometimes the balance is in his favor; sometimes-and all too often through his own activities- it is shifted to his disadvantage" (245). She posits the significance of balance in the natural world. This analysis is based on the idea of Cowles on Nature. He hints that human beings create problems on Nature for the fulfillment of their needs.

Human beings should not remain silent in the intrusion of Nature. John Paull, in Rachel's line, states that there will be no peace for a person after remaining silent (37). He gives credit to the writer providing the ground for analysis on Nature. It is the right of every man to raise his voice in favor of the conservation of Nature. This argument turns out to be valid if every modern human remains aware of Nature. This dealing is based on the idea of "poisoning the planet" (37). It is the responsibility of conscious humans to argue in favor of Nature.

The opinion of Rachel Carson in *Silent Spring* has occupied a considerable space in the development of Nature theory. This groundbreaking literary text indicates the environmental awakening ( qtd. in Hagood 58) for modern humans. Hagood accepts the ideas of Carson and asserts that the writer is able to awaken modern human beings on Nature. Hagood's discussion heads to the development of Nature theory in the twentieth century. Thus, his contribution to the Nature theory is plausible for modern readers. Carson's arguments and findings are related to making

a close relationship between plants and animals. Her view is forwarded by James Lovelock from different perspective referring his belief in *Gaia* as a part of Nature.

The credit of defining *Gaia* formally in literature establishing its value to promote Nature theory goes to James Lovelock in 1979 A.D. On ground of *Gaia* Theory, he exposes Nature: " The most important property of *Gaia* is the tendency to keep constant conditions for all terrestrial life" (119). This discussion concentrates on the value of Nature for plants and creatures to keep their condition constant. In the similar fashion, S bastian Dutreuil highlights Nature from *Gaia* theory: "*Gaia* became Lovelock's major and central scientific concern" (4) in his text *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth*. In this book, Peacock establishes *Gaia* as the soul of the Nature theory regarding the earth as a mother. In this connection, John Postgate formulates his idea: "*Gaia* - the great mother Earth! The planetary organism! Am I the only biologist to suffer a nasty twitch, a feeling of unreality, when the media invite me yet again to take her seriously?" (qtd. in Dutreuil 2). This observation shows the utility of Nature and draws the attention of modern humans to be sensitive about it.

Lovelock proves that " *G ia* is a new way of organizing the facts about life on Earth, not just a hypothesis to be tasted" (qtd. in Ogle 276). This explanation opens up the space for the validity and practicality of this new looks on Nature. With this idea at the centre of attention, one can appraise that this new lens on Nature is useful for living beings. At this point, Claude Kuwanijuma clarifies that "The Earth remembers, the stones remember. Similarly, it supports contentions that tribal people sustain a connection or mystic in participation" (qtd. in Monaghan 1). He rests on the argument that human beings should regard living things as a part of Nature.

Lovelace writes ahead for the extension of this theory: "The *Gaia* theory posits that the Earth is a self-regulating complex system involving the biosphere, the



atmosphere, the hydrosphere, and the pedosphere, tightly coupled as an evolving system" (255). This idea focuses that the earth and the other aura are related to the *Gaia* theory. From this perspective, one can expose that Lovelace flourishes Nature theory as the basis for the interpretation of the literary works of art. He gives a new mode to Nature theory from his concept of *Gaia* and this idea is helpful to show the sign of respect to the earth and the other natural things.

O.P. Dwivedi stresses the view of Lovelace about the earth and expresses this idea: "Our relationship with the earth from birth to death is like children with their mother. The mother- in this case Earth, not only bears her children but also has been the main source of fulfillment of their mending desires" (34). Based on this point, one can opine that he extends the scope of Nature based on the use and necessity of the mother earth for humans and other creatures. In support of this argument, one can argue that the critic highlights Nature theory for the interpretation of the literary texts.

Good relation with Nature becomes friendly relation among human beings. On the basis of Nature, Gary Snyder argues about the behaviors of humans. In his words: "A society that treats its natural surroundings in a harsh and exploitative way will do the same to 'other' people" (qtd. in Dwivedi 26). It points sameness between humans and the natural things of the world. Along with this view, a naturalist argues that our natural surrounding is like our kith and kin and it is our duty and responsibility to care them. Human attitude to other people will be evaluated from how they treat their surroundings. If they have no sympathy to Nature, those human beings do not know love and care for others. In this context, Snyder indicates the weaknesses in the activities of modern humans who are poor in the relationship with other people and their surroundings.

The Theme of Nature has become so popular for discussion due to our relation to it. Firas A. Nasif Jumaili deals with the same theme postulating that the earth provides food, water, and air to the inhabitants (25). He finds interdependence of the life of plants and animals on the earth and believes that diversity provides life for all living and non-living beings and things. This relation of interdependence presents a considerable significance of Nature for all creatures and plants. In Snyder's words: "Nature is a term that is not of itself threatening" (5). It shows that Nature does not create problems itself. Human beings are the sources to create problems in Nature. To broaden the scope of Nature, Lothar Honnighausen concentrates in individual consciousness for the conservation of Nature (356). The Nature theorist has his goal to teach modern readers about the awareness on Nature. We can see comprehensive understanding of the relevance of Nature. Thus, Nature has the considerable impact for the improvement in the consciousness of modern humans.

Honnighausen explains his points highlighting Snyder's poems for value of Nature and its conservation (367). The noticeable aspect of Gary Snyder is to support Nature from literature. He plays double role for evaluation of Nature as a poet and a critic. This connection between Nature and creatures of Snyder is further stressed by Jumaili: "Modern civilization, Snyder remarks, deprives people of the natural world and impedes people from being conscious of its significance to their survival"(2). The intention of the critic is to give the original flavor of Nature to the modern civilized people. Julia Fiedorczuk is worried due to the negligence of modern human beings about the use of Nature. He writes in confirmation with this idea: "Many people avoid even using the word "nature" (8). It is the climax of negligence of modern humans towards Nature. Of course, modern human beings are indifferent to Nature.

Arne Naess views on Nature's role in the same line of Snyder but with slight difference. To explain the idea on Nature, he "invented the term "deep ecology" in his English article, "The Shallow and the Deep Long-Range Ecology Movement: a Summary"" (qtd. in Michael 206). Arne Naess has considerably similar opinion about Nature:

1. The well-being and flourishing of human and non-human Life on Earth have value in themselves. These values are independent of the usefulness of the non-human world for human purposes.
2. Richness and diversity of life forms contribute to the realization of these values and are also values in themselves.
3. Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital needs.
4. The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantial decrease of the human population. (qtd. in Sessions 91)

The aforementioned ideas of Arne Naess shows the equality between human and non-human beings. This idea overthrows the western notion of anthropocentrism (humans are in centre of the earth) and stresses in favor of Nature. This central concern of Arne Naess resembles to the *Gaia* theory regarding Nature as the base for morality.

Deep ecology is a lens for the evaluation of Nature. In this connection, Orlando José Ferrer Montaña forwards the argument of Arne Naess to highlight Nature theory for the evaluation of literature. He writes in confirmation with the saying that deep ecology is a new perspective for the thoughtful reflection about Nature (188). This discussion heads for the development of Nature theory. It throws light upon the use and value of Nature in modern context. One can believe that *Gaia* and "deep ecology" are the prime bases in the modern period in favor of Nature.

Keeping the same concept in mind, Montañó explores the connection from his argument that "animals are more important as we are" (191). Modern humans should be conscious about the value of animals in the natural world for the continuation of Nature in the same form.

In the similar vein, Thomas Berry joins his hands with Arne Naess for the restoration of Nature. In support of this line of logic, he summarizes the discussion on Nature: "In this universal disturbance of the biosphere by human agents, the human being now finds that the harm done to the natural world is returning to threaten the human species itself" (9). This discussion focuses on the threat in the natural world. Everybody should realize that harm to Nature is warning for the forthcoming destruction of human beings.

It can be concluded that modern discourse on Nature from Ernest Haeckel to Arne Naess contributes in Nature theory from their different perspectives. Other commentators on the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Māhāpurāṇa* from the perspective of Nature are Bhakti Vedanta Svāmī Prabhupāda, Pushpendra Kumar, G.V. Tagare, C. L. Gosvāmī, Charles A. Fillion, David Kingley, Swami Krishnanda, Manjulata Mehta, Purna Chandra Ojha, Devdutt Pattanaik, Sridhar Swami, Purnendu Kumar Sinha, and Devi Vanamali. Despite certain disagreements, most theorists and academicians of modern period, take this theory for the academic field. All the above critics reach to the conclusion that modern human beings must show their humanity to the natural things. The discussions and findings on the Nature theory from modern writers evoke Nature as a focal point for the analysis of the literary genres. This theory is the backbone for the analysis and evaluation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. So, it is necessary to explore the connection of Nature to other related theories for better understanding of Nature theory.

## Nature and Ecology

Nature is the ground for the creation of literature. The element of ecological study expresses Nature during the creative process. In this connection, Dana Phillips discusses that ecology sparks debates about the issues of Nature (45). This state of Nature traces that the focal point of ecology is to show its connection to Nature. In this regard, the analyst incorporates the idea of Gustave Flaubert: "There is a pleasure in the pathless wood" (qtd. in Phillips 152). The pathless wood is the venue where human beings feel difficulties to enter but this place is the base of Natural beauty. Nature flourishes perfectly in the absence of humans.

Basing his argument on Nature, Timothy Morton deals with the connection between Nature and ecology. He defines ecology is the study of interaction of organism to Nature (139). Ecology continues to expose the activities of living organism and their relation to Nature. Nature writing is the central interest for ecologists and Morton defines Nature writing as "literary non-fiction that offers scientific scrutiny of the world..." (144). This discussion points out the appraisal of Nature for the foundation of ecology. This argument shows a connection between Nature and it also indicates internal relation between them.

The connection of ecology with Nature is maintenance of unity and ecological balance. With this idea as the focal point, Kay Milton inscribes: "We need to see "sense and pattern", "unity and coherence" in our lives" (96). Milton thinks everything from the perspective of unity between ecology and Nature. One can see the value of Nature under the influence of ecology. George Perkins Marsh points out how humans destroy Nature: "Man is everywhere a disturbing agent. Wherever he plants his foot, the harmonies of nature are turned to discords" (qtd. in David W. Orr 14). Marsh blames humans for the destruction of Nature.

Human beings intervene in Nature for the completion of their needs and greed. In this connection, Paul W. Taylor presents his idea based on George Perkins Marsh about Nature-ecology relation. He exposes that men are not superior to other living things on this globe (100). The discussion points out the irresponsible activities of human beings for creating problems in Nature. This finding indicates that humans are short-sighted, irresponsible, and careless to make a balance as it is in the connection between Nature and ecology. In reality, humans are not quite irresponsible for the conservation of Nature.

Having evaluated Nature in relation to ecology, one can realize the importance of Nature for creatures. With the similar beliefs, David W. Orr elucidates:

Ecological design describes the ensemble of technologies and strategies by which societies use the natural world to construct culture and meet their needs.

Because the natural world is continually modified by human actions, culture, and ecology are shifting parts of an equation that can never be solved. (14).

This discussion proves that the growth of modern technologies, construction of large buildings, and the needs of humans cause constraints in the connection of ecology to Nature. For the proper justice of Nature, it is imperative that we treat them like our kith and kin. Thus, the connection of ecology with Nature is one of the highly discussed issues for the flourish of Nature theory.

### **Nature and Environment**

Nature is the phenomena of the physical world which includes landscape, plants, animals, and different products of the earth. Nature has certain qualities whereas environment is the natural world affected by humans. Hildegard confirms the importance of Nature: "The whole nature serves humanity, and in this service offers all her bounty (qtd. in Gottlieb19). Nature is the prime source from which the survival

of all creatures is possible. Gottlieb profusely uses the term "environment" to reveal Nature. The naturalist further remarks that environmental crisis has challenged Nature and spiritual practice (7). In this line of thought, we argue that *Hindu* theology helps to preserve Nature. In *Hinduism*, objects like rivers, soil, trees, rock, the sun, and the moon are regarded as manifestation of cosmic soul.

Environmentalist Carmen Meinert extends the Nature theory from the base of environment. She confirms that the environmental ethics helps for the promotion of Nature (69). Based on her ideas, one can clarify that human beings should be careful about the significance of Nature. Paul W. Taylor argues differently in connection of environment with Nature. He argues that one should have gratitude, love, and reverence about Nature (189). When humans have love and gratitude to Nature, there is no question of improvement in it. He goes on arguing that good environment helps promote the natural beauty.

Bemhard Glaeser projects his view: "At present there seems to be a lack of interest in environmental issues, specifically among social scientists" (5). He charges the social scientists for their negligence about Nature and environment. Human beings should be serious about such social problems as effects of Nature in society. In fact, all the social scientists are not indifferent to Nature and environment. They perform their activities for maintaining a conducive relationship between Nature and environment. Thus, Glaeser's blame is shaky as human beings contribute for maintaining a balance between plants and animals. The usefulness of Nature is the focal point the way the environmentalists try to conserve it.

Adil Najam and David Runnalls do not support the idea of Bemhard Glaeser about Nature and environment. In their words: "Global environmental concerns were born out of the recognition that ecological processes do not always respect national

boundaries and that environmental problems often have impacts beyond borders; sometimes globally" (1). With this idea at the centre of attention, one expresses that eco critics circulate their views about the global environment. In this line of argument, human beings should realize how important is Nature to flourish our life from the care of environment.

Arthur H. Hirshorn in his concluding remark inconection between Nature and environment exposes: "To promote the respect of Natural processes and interrelationships which affect daily living, rather than viewing them as obstruction to human development" (8). The connection of environment with Nature promotes the value of Nature. Thus, one can find the history and evolution of Nature theory from its connection to the ecotheory. This theory highlight the importance and necessity of Nature theory. I use this theory as my perspective analysis of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Nature theory is used to analyse literary works. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is closely connected with Nature. This theory is quite appropriate for analyzing Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. So, it is contextual to examine Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* with the application of the Nature theory.

## **Comparative Study of the *Hindu* Religion and Western Philosophical**

### **Approaches to Nature**

*Hinduism* believes that problems in Nature are spiritual and in the words of Michael Cremo "it demands a spiritual solution" (59). On the basis of this notion, one can argue that Nature and God are same and humans should love and care Nature. On this ground, G. Naganathan incorporates: "The *Hindu* had always looked upon the Earth as a Mother Goddess" (12). This idea extends the scope of Nature for its conservation. Western philosophers on Nature such as Aristotle, Baruch Spinoza, and



John Locke have similar notions on Nature like the *Hinduism*. Those philosophers see the presence of divine being in Nature. In this relation, Locke argues that God has put us on the earth so that it is our duty to conserve Nature (qtd. in Berkeley 2). It is apt to state that the belief of the *Hindus* in favor of Nature has impressed to the western philosophers.

The argument on Nature and God turns out to be valid for interpretation. Basing his argument on such idea, Spinoza regards "God is the law of Nature" (187). This view highlights the concept of the *Hinduism* for the importance of Nature for animals and plants. In this context, Vasudha Narayan claims referring the *Varāha Purāṇa*, "One who plants five mango trees does not go to hell" (300). This notion further proves the validity of God for the conservation of trees and other objects of Nature. Both the *Hinduism* and the traditional western philosophers link God and Nature for our betterment and express their view to conserve Nature and to respect God.

Modern western philosophical approach in relation to Nature contradicts to the *Hinduism* and western traditional approach. This approach studies Nature in relation to culture. To strengthen the argument, Lisbeth Witthofft Nielsen postulates "The concept of nature cannot be seen apart from its cultural context" (32). This standpoint highlights the western philosophical approach to Nature. It shows that the *Hindus* and the westerners have different outlooks on Nature. They want to use Nature as far as possible for their benefits. In this line of thought, Claude Kuwanijuma clarifies that human beings should regard everything as a part of Nature (qtd. in Monaghan 1). The philosopher separates Nature from God in his argument. This philosophical approach disputes with the approach of the *Hinduism* relating to Nature.

Arne Naess strengthens the value of Nature for humans. In the same line of logic, he incorporates the equality between human and non-human beings (188). Unlike the *Hindu* philosophy, he compares human beings with other creatures. The evaluator does not mention God for conservation of Nature. T. N. Khoshoo, an interpreter of Nature from the *Hindu* lens, explores: "There is a deep interconnectedness among *dharma*, ecology, and environment that surround all forms of life all the time" (1269). Responding to this claim, one argues that all creatures and plants are the focal point for preservation and not to create crisis in Nature.

With the above discussion about the comparative study of *Hindu* religion and western philosophical approaches to Nature, we conclude that the traditional western philosophical approaches to Nature is linked to God for its conservation as the *Hinduism*. But modern western philosophical approach highlights the importance of Nature for all creatures without referring God. Thus, both traditional and modern western philosophical approaches contradict each other. Due to the link of the traditional western philosophical approach to the *Hinduism* relating to Nature, one can conclude that we can conserve Nature comparing it with God.

### **Western Theoretical Frame and Śrī Kṛṣṇa Līlā of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa on Nature**

Traditional western theoretical frame of Nature is related to God. In this context, Baruch Spinoza argues that there is sameness between Nature and God (163). This discussion heads to examine Nature relating to God. It incorporates that the manifestation of God is realized in the objects of Nature. It discusses equality between creatures and plants. From the explanation of Nature from the standpoint of God controls crisis in Nature. In the same line of logic, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz corroborates that Nature is "the artifice of God" (499). Explaining this statement, one

can claim that Nature is the reflection of God. This notion does not differentiate between Nature and God. This philosophy on Nature contributes to flourish *Hindus'* view on Nature.

One can find the extension of the western theoretical frame on Nature in John Locke. He rests on the argument: "some divine power presides over the world" (95). Commenting upon this argument, we are apt to state that Nature is not free from the divine power. It proves that Nature and divine power have interconnectedness each other. In a similar vein, the philosopher puts forward his logic regarding Nature as the property of God (96). In this connection, the argument of Leibniz turns out to be valid. He evaluates Nature and God from the same lens and claims to love and respect God is to care Nature (5). This discussion concentrates the similarities between Nature and God.

Nature theory has continuation in its development from Immanuel Kant in Germany. He has realization of God in the objects of Nature (3). The philosopher goes on arguing that existence of God in Nature is the basis of happiness for humans and other creatures. From this standpoint what he argues seems to be plausible to strengthen the theory of Nature. With the aforementioned traditional western theoretical frame on Nature, one can conclude that Nature is inseparable from God. This theoretical frame on Nature supports Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and its interrelation to Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, the most discussed discourse in the *Hindu* texts, deals with the Nature theory in this dissertation. The way of understanding Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is shaped by the domain of knowledge (mundane, religious people, and researchers understand Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* from different perspectives) level, political, social, cultural and personal circumstances. Thus, the

theoretical modality for the examination of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* has been developed paying attention to the theoretical discussion on the Nature theory. This modality provides the base for the analysis of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* from the Nature theory. So, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* has been analysed from the lens of Nature referring the concerned verse from the text and then, the researcher presents the views of other writers, critics, and researchers as the evidences. The argument of the researcher shows necessity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* for the solution of modern problems in Nature. Then, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is analyzed proving its validity and practicality in the life of human beings.

In the explication of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* from the standpoint of Nature, themes, and circumstances are amplified with discussion. Then, based on Nature theory of Baruch Spinoza, the researcher discusses Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* and he uses other theorists such as Aristotle, and John Locke for supporting the main theory. Despite few disagreements, most theorists, critics, and academicians take Nature theory as an academic field grounded in literary criticism. The analysis of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* based on the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is followed by the analysis on its theme. The thematic discussion of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is related to time, situation, location, actions, obligation, rescue from oppression, and lesson for humans on the background in detailed explication. This type of discussion prepares the background for the analysis of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* under consideration.

For the discussion of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the text, the notion of Nature developed by Baruch Spinoza has been used. In the process of expanding the Nature theory, Dean A. Steele expresses: "God's is presented in two forms: divine inspiration and the Law of Nature" (12). Explaining this statement, the interpreter evaluates the contribution of Spinoza in relating Nature to the divine being. With this idea at the

centre of attention, human beings postulate that Nature can be the foundation stone for Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Supporting this line of logic, Ashcraft concentrates on the Nature theory of Locke for its use for analysis of literature: "A State also of Equality, wherein all the Power and Jurisdiction is reciprocal, no one having more than another" (qtd. in Hindess 5). This notion of equality provides the ground for analysis. In this reference, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a Nature lover who dedicates himself for the welfare of others by preserving different aspects of Nature.

In Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*, the analysis focuses on Nature. The analysis on Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is related to Nature. After the detailed analysis on the use of Nature in Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*, the study heads to the second phase in which the relevance of this *līlā* is discussed. The analysis starts Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* from Vṛndāvana and its importance from the perspective of Nature. Then, the discussion moves to Mathura and Dvaraka respectively in the light of suggestive meanings. It has continuation with the analytical discussion on the use of Nature, the lifestyle of characters, and connection of episodes with Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the texts.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### ŚRĪ KRṢṢṢA LĪLĀ AND NATURE IN THE ŚRĪMAD BHĀGAVATA

#### MAHĀPURĀṆA

This chapter discusses on Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in interrelation to Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Different *līlās* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa establish him as a great hero whose activities are closely related to different aspects of Nature. In the analysis of the text, the theory of Nature has been used. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is quite famous for the tradition of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. The linkage between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature is like water and milk. One cannot examine Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the absence of Nature. Different aspects of Nature become base for the revelation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. It manifests the interrelation of Nature with Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. The analysis of the following section clearly shows interrelation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

#### **Interrelation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā* and Nature**

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* focusses on *dhārmic* literature and Nature through the character of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. To support the idea of Nature, Swami Ranganathananda quotes from the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*: "On the tree of the *Vedas*, there was a ripe fruit, full of nectarian juice. A bird came and tasted the fruit, and it fell"<sup>20</sup> [*Nigamkalpatarogalitam phalam // śukamukhādāmṛtadravasamyutam*] (1. 1: 3). In this regard, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is a ripe fruit from the *Vedic* tree and human beings can get peace by its nectarian knowledge. There is an analogy between Nature and the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* to establish its importance for humans. From this standpoint what the analyst argues seems to be plausible and credible. It indicates that the text presents sufficient evidences for the base of Nature through Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. The text establishes

Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a Nature lover who dedicates his life not only for the welfare of creatures but also for the preservation of Nature.

Nature is a noticeable point in the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa both in the physical and the spiritual worlds. For this reason, it is imperative to understand land of Vraja as "geographically identified, venerated, and visited regularly, since the times of Krishna" (qtd. in Hari 53). This expression focuses on the use of Vraja *Bhumi* as the background for the performance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. During his *līlā*, each natural phenomena of that place is dear to him. Natural beauty of Vraja is significant for him. The description of Yumanā River, Kādambā tree, Govardhan Hillock, creepers on the plain area, trees, and bushes show the importance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

To look into the broader framework of Nature in the text, it may be instructive to stress Śrī Kṛṣṇa as an embodiment of Nature. The argument of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* through the character of King Parīkṣit is reliable to highlight Nature images from the appearance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. According to Śukadeva: "The sky was then covered by dense blue clouds accompanied by lightning and thunder. Thus the sky and its natural illumination were covered in the same way that the spirit soul is covered by the three modes of material nature"<sup>21</sup> (10.20: 4). Elaborating this statement, one can express that there is the comparison of lightning with the mode of goodness and it shows good activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He has dark complexion like the color of clouds and does the welfare for others. Here, lightning represents *sattva-guna* (super ego), thunder has the quality of *raja-guna* (ego) whereas clouds has *tama-guna* (id) [qtd. in Prabhupāda 237]. The cloudy sky during the time of rainy season has analogy to soul. Nature which denotes materialism disturbs the soul. In the same line of argument, we can examine that original Nature of creatures is disturbed

by the material qualities. The presence of dark clouds portrays fertility on the earth. When there is the birth time of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the sky is cloudy. During this time, Vasudeva, Devaki, and other well-wishers believe that there is going to be the birth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the welfare of human beings on the earth. The aforementioned expression confirms that Nature creates the background for the birth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

The discussion about the birth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa heads to the analysis of the commencement of his *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. One of the notions put forth by Devdutt Pattanaik is "Devaki experienced no birthing pains, the baby did not cry, instead he smiled" (34). Based on this argument, one can claim that the birth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is different from the birth of other infants as Devaki has no labour pain. Every mother faces the childbirth pain and the infant cries immediately after the birth if it is healthy. From this standpoint, one can agree that Śrī Kṛṣṇa does not give pain to his mother during the time of his birth. In same way, from the time of his childhood, he does not cause any problem in Nature. This event has occupied a considerable space in the text and Śrī Kṛṣṇa is as calm as the mild form of Nature. There is connection between the nature (behavior) of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with Nature (environment) due to their sameness in calm form and their welfare works for others.

The birth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is in the critical circumstances inside a prison house of Kāṁsa. The analysis of the birth discussed in the text shows that his birth brings the sign of hope to the *Yadu* dynasty. To retain the value of Nature, sage Ugrasravāsūta says to the sages Saunakādī in Naimīsāranya forest and he compares Śrī Kṛṣṇa with sandalwood: "The unborn is unborn for the glorification of pious kings, and others say that He is born to please King *Yadu*, one of Your dearest devotees. You appear in the family as sandalwood appears in the Malaya hills"<sup>22</sup>: (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 1. 8: 32). Explaining this statement, one can postulate that a tree of



sandalwood becomes the centre of attention in the Malaya Hills forest and the beholders neglect other trees due to the fragrance of the sandalwood. The comparison of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to a sandalwood of Malaya Hill makes Nature valuable. It presents the view that Nature is the embodiment of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

Birth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the subject matter of discussion among readers, writers, and critics. In this connection, Shantilata Tripathi expresses her ideas on the birth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. She opines that "Śrī Kṛṣṇa was sent to the cowherd settlement" (143). In this context, one can state that almost all the heroes are abandoned after their birth in the world such as Bhishma was left on the bank of the Ganges and Karna was left to the charioteer (qtd. in Tripathi 143). The isolation of the hero gives him chance to develop in the natural world and proves him as different from others in the performance of his heroic deeds. Nature played role in rearing Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the grain field of Nandabābā. Based on this argument, one can analyse that Nature is the background in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Thus, Nature has made considerable impact in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from the time of his birth.

Nature manifests spirits in forms of trees and humans should be careful about it. In this connection, Kavi Karnapura gives spiritual element to the trees of Vṛndāvana: "The trees have not grown from any seed. From Kṛṣṇa's desire, the trees in Vṛndāvana grow in natural cluster" (3). In the counterargument, human beings believe in the scientific reasons for germination of trees. They believe that there might have some causes for the germination of trees in the forest of Vṛndāvana. Human beings ponder why there is the special connection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to the forest of Vṛndāvana. The expression "natural cluster" of trees shows that there is harmony in Nature. But Prabhupāda has different line of argument in interrelation to Nature: "A

leader who disobeys the laws of Nature, cannot have good qualifications" (4). On this ground, one can claim that every leader should have idea for the conservation of Nature. Thus, the analyst blames to the irresponsible activities of politicians for the creation of doom and gloom in Nature. The reality is that not only the politicians but also all human beings should remain conscious following the footsteps of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the conservation of natural things.

When there is the birth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Nature is in jubilant mode and there is the ecological harmony in the world. Rivers, lakes, trees, flowers, and birds are in their happy mood. In the text, Śukadeva tells to King Parikshīt about the harmony in Nature:

The Rivers flowed with clear water, and the lakes and vast reservoirs, full of lilies and lotuses, were extraordinarily beautiful. In the trees and green plants, full of flowers and leaves, pleasing to the eyes, birds like cuckoos and swarms of bees began chanting with sweet voices for the sake of the demigods.<sup>23</sup>

(*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 3:3)

One can find joy in Nature (earth and sky) during the forthcoming *līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The discussion concentrates that the objects of Nature assume that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is in favor of their protection. It is the nature of lotus flower to blossom on the day time but during the birth time of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, it blooms even at night. The night time has had the characteristics of the day. It suggests Śrī Kṛṣṇa a different character from others because the position of Nature changes in his presence in the forest of Vṛndāvana . Nature has shown keen interest for participation in Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

Relating Nature with playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Devdutt Pattanaik sees Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the same form. Responding such claims, he writes: "Kṛṣṇa is

the world, he is in the world and the world is in him" (229). Elucidating this logic, one can argue that mother Yasodā sees the world within the mouth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa when she is trying to see whether there is clay in his mouth or not. Therefore, it is important to point out that *bāla* Kṛṣṇa is in the natural world even though he shows the whole world within his mouth to his mother. It is exhilarating to see Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature from the same lens. We can find the same crux of argument when modern readers make evaluative comments on the importance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* for the solution of the current issues on Nature.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* takes place in rivers, wind, rainbow, birds, and lotus flower in Vṛndāvana. The attraction of rivers with fresh water and the lakes draw the attention of beholders. The scenario of lotus flowers promotes the natural beauty. Nature has harmony with creatures. The natural world seems to be green, matured, and healthy. The rivers swell in the rainy season and their appearance attracts creatures. The wind blows and makes the rivers powerful with strength. It shows that there is harmony in the ecological imaginings in to *līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Prabhupāda compares Śrī Kṛṣṇa with Nature referring the condition of the rainbow. In his words: "The Supreme Lord can appear and disappear like a rainbow, which appears and disappears without being affected by the roaring thunder and cloudy sky" (10). This discussion indicates that the presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa occurs after the duration of years or the centuries. When there is the appearance of the rainbow, it becomes the centre of attention for humans. Similarly, the advent of Śrī Kṛṣṇa becomes the focusing matters for others in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* and his activities are related to postulate the issues of Nature.

Clouds and fog have their own role to enrich the world of Nature. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is related to those elements of Nature to make her young, fresh, and beautiful. The

similarities are drawn between frogs and *brāhmaṇa* students in the morning: "The frogs, who had all along been lying silent, suddenly began croaking when they heard the rumbling of the rain clouds, in the same way that *brāhmaṇa* students, who perform their morning duties in silence, begin reciting their lessons when called by their teacher"<sup>24</sup> (10. 20: 9). At this point, one can examine that croaking of frogs is the sign of the forthcoming rain. In the same way, the chanting of the *Vedic* hymns from the *brāhmaṇa* students is the sign of peace and goodness. The rain changes the condition of Nature and the *Vedic mantras* (hymns) affect the minds of humans after their regular chanting. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is like the position of clouds in the sky and humans are no more than frogs. Because of the presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in Vṛndāvana, good persons have their expectation to get relief from the demonic rulers such as Kāmsa and Sisūpāla. There are changes in the scenario of Nature from rain and the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa make difference in the life of Vraja dwellers. Newness in Nature makes also newness in the life style of creatures and vegetation.

Devdutt Pattanaik expresses his ideas: "Every event is the fruit of the past and every action is seed of the future" (141). The discussion concentrates on the analogy of fruits to action and we believe that not all fruits are tasty and all works may not bring good achievements in the life of humans. Relating Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* to his childhood indicates that he is the ray of hope for the establishment of peace and justice in Mathura from the dictatorship of Kāmsa. Swami Sivananda supports Pattanaik in the analysis of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and states that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the history maker and is in favor of right (19). It suggests that Śrī Kṛṣṇa does not work for himself but always works for others. He is not guided by the time but he guides the time so that he is a maker of history from his *līlās*. His playful activities of Vrindāvana and political life of

Dwāarakā are regarded as historical events in the Indian history. His playful activities are the instances to maintain balance in Nature.

The involvement of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in Nature is to make a balance between Nature and society. He was born in Mathura city but was reared in Vṛndāvana village. It shows that Śrī Kṛṣṇa becomes a bridge between villagers and town dwellers. Jīva Gośvāmī associates playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with rivers having their origin from lakes: "The *avatārs* are like thousands of rivers emanating from a lake which does not dry up" (24). To explain this idea further, one can analyse that Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* resembles a river which is useful for all plants and animals. Prabhupāda echoes similar view in interrelation to *līlā avatār* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and he further explores that "Lord can appear and disappear like a rainbow" (10). Śrī Kṛṣṇa symbolizes the rain and his *līlā* is closely linked to Nature. To explain this idea further, we can argue that human beings are bound by natural laws and they should adhere this matter carefully for the utility of natural things.

Śukadeva argues on Nature in the forms of oceans and lakes in the autumn season: "With the arrival of autumn, the oceans and the lakes became silent, their water becomes still"<sup>26</sup> (10. 20: 40). In this discussion, there is connection between the autumn season and the water of the ocean and lake. One can claim that Śrī Kṛṣṇa remains silent after observing the condition of others because he knows everything about others. To have prior knowledge behind each action is the main characteristics of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. So, he always smiles seeing others and their activities. As the oceans stop roaring and become motionless to make the environment of that place calm. In the same way, Śrī Kṛṣṇa remains calm accepting those hurdles in his life happily. There is no effect of water from rivers to the oceans during the rainy season. Similarly, common human activities do not affect in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He is

omniscient personality and his temperament is compared with the lakes and the oceans (Nature) in the rainy season.

With this idea at the centre of attention, Osho has similar view on the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He claims that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is not attached to other characters and he has an idealized life-style (71). Positivism is the prime principle of his life and "does not negate anything there in his life" (73). This discussion highlights that Śrī Kṛṣṇa never gives up his duty, never escapes from problems in his life and he dedicates his activities for betterment of helpless human beings. The same point is further explored that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a neutral character (Babineau 62) in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Human beings have their attachment to their senses, politics, power, property, family, religion, culture, and society so that it is impossible to be impartial in their lives as Śrī Kṛṣṇa did and his *līlās* reflect.

The elements of Nature get interconnected with Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. Specific relevance refers to his flute for both creatures and vegetation. Śrī Kṛṣṇa plays the flute while he is with Rādhā and *gopīs* in Vṛndāvana to please them, other creatures, and plants. Everybody praises his melodious music of flute and it is said Nature dances with his music. The music captures the attention of rivers and *gopīs*: "When the rivers hear the flute-song of Kṛṣṇa, their minds begin to desire Him, and thus the flow of their currents is broken and their waters are agitated, moving around in whirlpools"]<sup>27</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 21: 15). It is exhilarating to realize the attraction of rivers from the sonorous sound of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's flute. In this context, it is instructive to examine Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a Nature lover. He lures other objects of Nature from the music of his flute. Nature is the prime setting for the performance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and he does not regard Nature as passive form. He personifies Nature as a human being and always treats her positively and saves her from the destruction

of the demonic rulers. In this sense, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the first nature lover of this world and he keeps on maintaining balance between Nature and creatures.

On the basis of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's love to rivers, Prabhupāda gives credit to Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the purification of the water of Kālindī (Yamunā). He rests on the argument exploring that Śrī Kṛṣṇa banishes to the serpent Kāliya from the river to save Nature from his venom (175). Śrī Kṛṣṇa is different from modern environmentalists because he solves the problem of water pollution in the Yamunā single-handedly without accompany from others. In this context, one can analyse that the contribution of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to control pollution in the Yamunā River is admirable for modern environmentalists. It is based on the idea that Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is a typical example for interrelationship between Nature and human beings.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* supports Nature and its protection from the destruction of humans. His *līlā* rests on the argument that there is comparison between human body and tree in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* Śukadeva exposes:

The body may figuratively called 'the original tree.' From this tree, which fully depends on the ground of material nature, come two kinds of fruit- the enjoyment of happiness and the suffering of distress. The causes of the tree, forming its tree roots, are associated with the three modes of material nature- goodness, passion and ignorance. The tree of the body has nine hollows- the eyes, ears, the nostrils, the mouth, the rectum and the genitals.<sup>28</sup> (10. 2: 27)

The above discussion concentrates on the interrelation of human body with trees and other objects of Nature. The material body consists of five elements (*prthvi, jal, tej, wayu* and *ākāś*) and those elements have their interrelation with Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Nature. The writer puts forward the analogy between trees and human body. The reality is that a tree is the production of Nature but human beings do not have idea to love trees like

human body. Everybody should be aware of this analogy for the conservation of Nature. Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Nature should be regarded in the same form that help keeping Nature lively and fresh.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* evokes natural awareness in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. On the basis of this notion, John Locke claims: "When the natural law ends, tyranny begins" (66). According to this discussion, this saying of the philosopher is reliable in the context of the text. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses about the earth in the form of a cow when there is crisis in Nature from the tyranny of cruel rulers: "Mother earth assumed the form of a cow. Very much distressed, with tears in her eyes, she appeared before Lord Brahmā and told about her misfortune"]<sup>29</sup> (10. 1: 18). In the *Hinduism*, cow is a component of Nature so that she needs special care by human beings. The *Hindus* regard her as *gaumāta* [cow as a mother] and care her with special love and respect by worshipping and providing her grass, grains, fodder, and porridge. But the domination of human beings on Nature had been beyond limitation and the earth had obligation to take the form of a cow and requested Brahmā to protect her (Solis 84). The interpreter associates the sorrow of the cow with Nature and it shows that the state of sorrow in Nature (earth) is miserable from the lack of awareness of human beings.

The tyrannical rulers such as Vena, Kaṁśa, Śiśhupāla, and Jarāsandha run after to satisfy their senses and forget their responsibility to Nature. Sukadeva is correct when he shows the reality of the earth: "Kings greedy for sense gratification on this earth almost always kill their enemies indiscriminately. To satisfy their own whims, they may kill anyone, even their mothers, fathers, brothers or friends"<sup>30</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 1: 67). This condition shows that the rulers lack awareness the importance of Nature. If one does not respect Nature, he respects no



one and destroys everything around him. For those foolish rulers, the knowledge of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is essential for the practical education to save Nature for the benefits of creatures. With this preconditioning, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* postulates to work for others and save Nature for all.

In the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa "accepts *Prakṛiti* for play" (Jīva Gośvāmī 58). Basing his argument on such idea, the analyst believes that Śrī Kṛṣṇa and *Prakṛiti* are same. Vedavyāsa writes in confirmation about Nature as the production of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The writer argues: "The Lord of the universe maintains all planets inhabited by demigods, men and lower animals"<sup>31</sup>(1. 2: 34). This argument addresses the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a superhuman who has capacity to retain Nature from devastation. He stresses to maintain Nature and applies all methods to save it from destruction. The role of lower animals is as important as demigods in the matter of existence of the earth. In this connection, Śrī Kṛṣṇa realizes that no one should harm to each other in Nature. Other creatures have their rights to live there without disturbance from human beings. In this sense, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is important for practical life of creatures. He does not discriminate among creatures in the world and encourages human beings for the preservation of Nature.

From this standpoint what Maura Corcoran examines seems to be plausible. He explores that "Vāsudeva is a sportive manifestation of Viṣṇu" (62). This analysis opens up the space for discussion in the creation of the world as a sportive activity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa or Viṣṇu. In this context, it is instructive to recall Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a nature lover who does not only preserve Nature but also creates it. One can find reciprocal interrelationship between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Nature. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is fond of the things of Nature such as flute and lotus flower and is interested to have those things with him. His feet are as the shape of lotus and everybody likes him. His *baijayanti mālā*

(garland) is furnished by lotus flower. In Suta's words: "Kṛṣṇa whose abdomen is marked with a depression like a lotus flower, who is always decorated with garlands of lotus flowers, whose glance is as cool as the lotus and whose feet are engraved with lotuses"<sup>32</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 1. 8: 22). From the above discussion, the narrator gives deep insight of lotus flower in interrelation to Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He defines Nature from the use of the lotus flower in the text. Śrī Kṛṣṇa takes the products of Nature (lotus and flute) and realizes satisfaction in his life. It shows that Śrī Kṛṣṇa likes remain in the world of Nature.

The manifestation of Nature in Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is found in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* and one should care the natural objects as the base for human civilization. No one can imagine living on the earth without support of natural objects. If human beings could understand the link between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature, they understand his love to Nature. Due to self-realization, Śrī Kṛṣṇa does not do selfish works in his life but rather he dedicates for the welfare of others. In his company, humans, animals, plants, rivers, and insects get relief. If there is an effort to preserve Nature from local and cosmic levels, it is possible to control the intervention of human beings upon Nature.

### **Nature for the Creation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā***

Human beings have reciprocal interrelationship with Nature and Nature's positive impression creates background for the future incidents. Vedavyāsa focuses on the forthcoming episode using the scenario of certain background in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Śrī Kṛṣṇa has intention to motivate human beings and he shows that life, youth, beauty, and property are for a short time. He formulates that one should not give priority to those things in his life. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* portrays the background which indicates its effects in the life of Śrī

Kṛṣṇa, his cowherd mates, and the sober inhabitants of Vraja. Nature in the background of an incident boosts Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and its importance for the well-being of society. Certain background of Nature motivates Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the formation of his *līlās*. The personal depiction of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in interrelation to Nature is the "primary subject matter of the tenth book of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*" (Bryant 11). His playful activities in the natural world from his childhood to adulthood are presented in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

The scenario of Naimiṣāraṇya forest is the background information of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. There is the gathering of eighty-eight thousand sages for the performance of *yajna*. (Prabhupāda 58). This gathering becomes the base to highlight Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and his interrelation to Nature. In the words of Vedavyāsa: "Once, in a holy place in the forest of Naimiṣāraṇya, great sages headed by the sage Śaunaka assembled to perform a great thousand-year sacrifice for the satisfaction of the Lord and His devotees"<sup>33</sup> (1. 1: 4). The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* begins with the background information of Naimiṣāraṇya forest to emphasize the glory of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and the significance of Nature. The sages select the forest as an appropriate venue for the sake of *yajna* thinking that beautiful scenario of Nature is an apt for the performance of *yajna*. These background informations show that Ugraśṛvāsūta is going to explain the glory of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and the interrelationship of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with Nature in the *Śrīmad Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

The scenario of the *aśrama* of Vedavyāsa is rich in natural beauty. It elucidates the background information for the creation of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The bank of the Sarasvatī River with trees motivates him to inscribe the glory of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. This idea, further, points to the reality from the inspection of sage

Śūta: "In that place, Śrīla Vyāsadeva, in his own *āśrama*, which was surrounded by berry trees, sat down to meditate after touching water for purification"<sup>34</sup> (1. 7: 3). The atmosphere of the bank of the Sarasvatī River motivates the author to write an epic and as a consequence, there is the preparation of the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The background of Nature is the base for the creation of knowledge. In relation to this argument, Vanamāli Dāsa is worried about the present condition of Nature and she explores: "The biggest problem in society today is that almost all of us claim God's property as our own" (qtd. in Cremona & Goswami 35). It is our duty to handle the property of Nature to our future generation without creating problems. The above discussion warns human beings not to forget the images of Nature to highlight the glory of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Nature gives information to the volition death of Bhīṣmapitāmaha as the background. The heroic death of great warrior of the *Mahābhārata* is admirable. He sleeps on the bed of arrows for two months due to his wish to die in *uṭṭārāyaṇa*. The sun in the northern hemisphere is suitable time for him to die. In Śūta's words: "While Bhīṣmadeva was describing occupational duties, the sun's course ran into the northern hemisphere. This period is desired by mystics who die at their will"<sup>35</sup> (*Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 1. 9: 29). The death of Bhīṣmadeva is not on a comfortable bed but the scenario of Nature of Kurūkshetra makes him comfortable psychologically. It shows that a perfect *yogī* can leave the world as his wills in an appropriate time. From this standpoint, Prabhupāda postulates: "He thus prepared himself to quit his body before the exalted Lord Kṛṣṇa " (508). This idea debunks that Bhīṣmadeva has keen interest to die in front of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for his mental peace. On this ground, human beings claim that both Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Nature are the bases for peace. They should understand how the rules of Nature motivate a *yogī* to die in the

certain time. Thus, the rules of Nature make conscious in the psychology of a person during the time of death. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature play the role of background in the death of Bhīṣmadeva and there is the fulfillment of his volition to die in the expected time.

The background of Nature affects in the life of King Parikshīt in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Unlike humans, Nature does not distinguish between plants and animals but King Parikshīt knows that Nature is in problem seeing the condition of one-legged bull-the personified *dharma*. According to sage Sūta:"The bull was white as a white lotus flower. He was terrified of the *śūdra* who was beating him, and he was so afraid that he was standing on one leg, trembling and urinating"<sup>36</sup> (1. 17: 2). The single leg of the bull symbolizes three of four portions of *dharma*. It hints that the condition of *dharma* is miserable in *kaliyuga*. Kali, the embalm of *adharmā*, personifies the destruction of *dharma*. In the same line of logic, Kamala Subramaniam is apt to state: "With a stick he was trying to break the one remaining leg of the bull" (35). Explaining this statement, one can claim that human beings are not sensitive in the value of *dharma*-duty.

Like animals, the sky plays the role of background in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. To strengthen the argument, Brahmā remarks: "From the darkness of false ego, the first of the five elements, namely the sky, is generated. Its subtle form is the quality of sound, exactly as the seer is in interrelationship with the seen"<sup>37</sup> (2. 5: 25). This dealing is based on the idea of Nature in the form of the sky. There is the continuation of Natural works to flourish from the contribution of sky in this universe. But false ego of living entities is the basis of pollution and destruction of Nature. Generally, the ego of human beings causes problems in Nature. In the same way, *Tanmātra* is a component of *mahattava* in which there are five elements (earth, water,

light, ether, and space) and those elements have their characteristics of Nature. The sound is the characteristics of the sky. Likewise, modern scientists believe that there is the origin of the *Aum* sound from the sky (Prabhupāda 269). The critic reaches to the level of thinking everything from the level of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The colour of Śrī Kṛṣṇa resembles to the colour of the sky (Hari 52). The meaning of "Kṛṣṇa " is black but he has sky blue color in reality in his complexion. Thus, faith in Śrī Kṛṣṇa assists for the conservation of the sky and other natural objects.

Brahmāji gets the background of his future condition listening two alphabets from an unknown speaker. After the creation of Brahmāji on a lotus flower, he is unable to find the source of lotus. As he is in the perplexed mood, he listens the sixteenth (*ṭa* ) and twenty first letter (*Pa*) of Nepali alphabets and he decides to do penance. It is the background of creation of the natural world. In this connection, Śūkadeva informs to king Parikṣit in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*:

When thus engaged in thinking, in the water, Brahmāji heard twice from nearby two syllables joined together. One of the syllables was taken from the sixteenth and the other from the twenty-first of the *apaśa* alphabets, and both joined to become the wealth of the renounced order of life.<sup>38</sup> (2. 9: 6)

Penance is the background in the creation of the universe by Brahmā and there is the solution of his problem from austerities. Basing his argument on such idea, C. L.

Goswāmī clarifies himself with the argument that it "is known to be the wealth of men of renunciation" (122). As a consequence from severe austerities sitting on a petal of lotus flower, Brahmā is able to find out the path of his life from penance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa who is in the form of Viṣṇu.

Brahmā has intimacy to Nature and he ponders to create the universe for inhabitants of all creatures. The creator believes in connection between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature. Brahmā is apt to state about it as a proof: "On the disappearance of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Hari, who is the object of transcendental enjoyment for the senses of devotees, Brahmā, with folded hands, began to re-create the universe, full with living entities, as it was previously"<sup>39</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 2. 9: 39). Nature is favourite for Brahmā so that his creation is full of living entities. It involves that he has keen interest in Nature and its diversity. Both Brahmā and Śrī Kṛṣṇa give priority to the objects of Nature for survival of creatures. To explain this idea further, Tagare remarks that Brahmā "practiced the prescribed *yamas* and *niyamas* for attaining the good of the creation which was as his own objective as well" (210). The discussion supports the way of creation of the universe from Brahmā. It shows that there is connection between Nature and human beings from the time of creation.

The concept of creation of the universe in the *paurāṇic* period opposes to the opinions of scientists. The scientists believe that the creation of the universe is possible from the explosion of the sun (Börner 173). Unlike the view of scientists, Brahmā's creation of the universe is different in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. He does not find the stem of the lotus which is originated from the navel of Viṣṇu. In this regard, sage Maitreya informs Vidura: "Lord Brahmā, thus contemplating, entered the water through the channel of the stem of the lotus. But in spite of entering the stem and going nearer to the navel of Viṣṇu, he could not trace out the root"<sup>40</sup> (3. 8: 19). Brahmā does not find the stem of the lotus and spends a long time to search it. As the stem of the lotus, humans of this present world feel difficulties to understand the use and value of Nature in their lives (Solis 3). As a result, no one realizes his base

of life in relation to Nature. In this sense, both Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature are difficult to understand for humans and they have been facing natural calamities frequently.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* points out the creation of the planets and other objects of Nature as the *līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It claims that the creation of the universe is the outcome as the interest of the creator. In the words of Vidura: "The supreme king of all kings has created different planets and places of habitation where living entities are situated in terms of the modes of nature and work, and He has created their different kings and rulers"<sup>41</sup> (3. 5: 8). Vidura forwards his logic that the creator manages Nature and the rulers to rule there without creating any harm. To add more bricks on this line of argument, one can contemplate that Śrī Kṛṣṇa motivates himself for the use of Nature appropriately. In relation to this subject, Prabhupāda further explores the necessity of Nature for humans "for the sake of further enlightenment" (191). The relation of human beings to Nature should be positive. If not, it causes harm to both plants and animals.

Immovable entities are parts and parcels of Nature and the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* formulates Nature as the background for the performance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. Under such conditions, Vidura is apt to state: "The seventh creation is that of the immovable entities, which are of six kinds: the fruit trees without flowers, trees and plants which exist until the fruit is ripe, creepers, pipe plants, creepers which have no supporters, and trees with flowers and fruits"<sup>42</sup> (3. 10: 19). It rests on the argument that the creation of trees and plants is possible on the globe from Brahmā by the grace of Viṣṇu. As Viṣṇu, the prime concern of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is Nature so that he focuses his works for the flourish of trees, vegetation, and land. The same idea is ascertained by Pushpendra Kumar from his argument. The critic extends the sportive activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in Nature (158) and there is the flourish of his *līlā* from the help of natural



beauty. In this context, it is important to incorporate the duty of movable creatures to preserve the immovable things for the conservation of Nature.

To highlight the background of Nature, Vidura refers its utility on the earth, sky, and heaven in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* and motivates readers to observe Nature for the maintenance of the ecological balance. The speaker stresses on the point that there is link of *omkāra* in Nature during the time of creation: "The science of logical argument, the *Vedic* goals of life, and also law and order, moral codes, and the celebrated hymns *bhū*, *bhuvah* and *svah* all became manifested from the mouths of Brahmā, and the *praṇava omkāra* was manifested from his heart"<sup>43</sup> (3. 12: 44). This discussion shows that the concept of *omkāra* has become its importance to stress the value of Nature. Brahmā is the creator of Nature and human beings have their duties and responsibilities for the continuation of natural works. Unlike Vidura, Purnendu Narayana Sinha incorporates on the duty of Brahmā: "His task was simply to bring back the former state of things through a graduated series of intermediaries" (60). Elaborating this statement, audience believe that superpower might have been the creator of this earth. There is reciprocal relationship between Brahmā and Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the matter of creation.

In connection to background, one can believe that human beings with demonic qualities are basis for the destruction of Nature. Those humans who neglect the value of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*, seem to destroy the natural things. Evil intention is the birth of demons in the mind of humans and this intention becomes the main root for the destruction of Nature. Brahmā gives birth to demons and it questions to the existence of Nature. In line with this idea, sage Śaunaka associates his view: "Lord Brahmā then gave birth to the demons from his buttocks, and they were fond of sex. Because they were too lustful, they approached him for copulation"<sup>44</sup> (3. 20: 23). This standpoint

clarifies that human beings who are born from buttocks, are lustful, selfish, and remain careless to Nature. The birth of humans happens from the buttocks of their mothers (except the caesarean case) and they have evil intention to plants and animals. There is a demon within a person so that he does not care about the value of Nature. Basing his argument on such idea, Tagare further claims that the two demons are lustful for copulation (331). This analysis shows that lustful life is the background for destruction of Nature.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* makes balance in Nature and it motivates human beings to use it without harming. Some natural works are constant so that the existence of creatures is possible. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* refers it as the background for the projection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. In this regard, sage Kapila captures the mind of Debahuti from his argument: "Out of fear of the Supreme Personality of Godhead the rivers flow, and the ocean never overflows. Out of fear of Him only does fire burn and does the earth, with its mountains, not sink in the water of the universe"<sup>45</sup> (3. 29: 42). Fear of someone is necessary for the completion of any works appropriately and the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* presents fear of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the rules of the oceans, fire, and mountains. It is important to remember that "The material scientists can discover laws of Nature, but they are unable to recognize the lawmaker" (Prabhupāda 666). This discussion hints that Śrī Kṛṣṇa might have been the lawmaker of Nature. The oceans flow, fire burns, and there are no sinks of the mountains due to their ethics. If rivers do not flow and fire does not burn, it creates problems in the works of Nature.

The sun keeps harmony with the help of the light among the objects of Nature in the matured form. It is the base of Nature so that plants and animals exist on the

earth. Due to the existence of the sun, human beings get knowledge about the survival of the natural objects. Supporting this idea, Śūkadeva analyzes:

All living entities, including demigods, human beings, animals, birds, insects, reptiles, creepers and trees, depend upon the heat and light given by the sun-god from the sun planet. Furthermore, it is because of the sun's presence that all living entities can see, and therefore he is called *dr̥g-īśvara*, the Personality of Godhead presiding over sight.<sup>46</sup> (5. 20: 46)

The given discussion is related to the supremacy of the sun over other objects of Nature such as animals, birds, and plants. The sun is the centre motif of Nature and other components depend on it. Moving ahead in this line of argument, Prabhupāda corroborates: "The actual life and soul of all living entities within this universe is the sun (778). This analysis is based on Nature referring the value of the sun. The *Paurānic* literature highlights the interrelation between the sun and the other components of Nature.

We can observe the manifestation of Nārāyana in the form of the sun in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. For the extension of his *līlā*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa performs different activities in the name of Nārāyana. In the statement of Śūkadeva Gośvāmī:

The original cause of the cosmic manifestation is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Nārāyana. When great saintly persons, fully aware of the *Vedic* knowledge, offered prayers to the Supreme person, He descended to this material world in the form of the sun to benefit all the planets and purify fruitive activities. He divided Himself into twelve parts and created seasonal forms, beginning with spring. In this way, He created the seasonal qualities, such as heat, cold and so on.<sup>47</sup> (5. 22: 3)

The sun is the embodiment of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the form of Nārāyaṇa and the natural works are going on in the universe. There is analogy between the sun and Śrī Kṛṣṇa to work for others. The sun burns to generate light and dedicates himself for the well-being of others. In the same way, the works which Śrī Kṛṣṇa does are for betterment of others. To support the idea in favor of Nature, the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and the sun are admirable and imitable for humans. To broaden Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*, Dimmitt and Buitenen investigate: "As a man he fulfils his task as *avatāra* of Viṣṇu" (104). This view is apt to state that the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* elucidates Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in diverse forms and Viṣṇu is one of the forms. It shows that Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is not limited only in one name of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

For the extension of Nature in the background of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*, humans should follow his path. If yes, it provides the ground for the conservation of Nature. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* advises people to follow the path of their forefathers. To strengthen the argument, sage Suta is apt to state:

The path of goodness traversed by your father, grandfather and great-grandfathers is that of maintaining the subjects including the men, animals and trees. That is the path you should follow. Unnecessary anger is contrary to your duty. Therefore I request you to control your anger.<sup>48</sup> (6 .4: 11)

It proves that our forefathers followed the rules of Nature and they did not face problems from it. It shows that present human beings should follow the path of their forefathers relating to Nature.

When there is crisis in Nature, Śrī Kṛṣṇa rescues creatures and the natural objects in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. With this conditioning, he rescues Brahmā during the time of creation:

In the beginning of creation, a tremendous wind caused fierce waves of inundating wafter. The great waves made such a horrible sound that Lord Brahmā almost fell from his seat on the lotus into the water of devastation, but he was saved with the help of the Lord. Thus, we also expect the Lord to protect us from this dangerous condition.<sup>49</sup> (6. 9: 24)

The above mentioned example confirms that Śrī Kṛṣṇa plays a role as a ruler to rescue Brahmā. In this context, he proves himself as a mythical hero by helping others. In the same line of logic, Jīva Gośvāmī remarks that Śrī Kṛṣṇa relieves the burden of the earth (22) stressing on the utility of Nature for both plants and animals.

For the creation of background, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* gives credit to the five elements of Nature for humans during the time of death. A *yogi* dies emerging fire in his body and he turns into the five elements of Nature. On the basis of this relation, Śūkadēva associates the idea: "He should properly place the fire element in his own self and in this way give up bodily affinity, by which one thinks the bodily to be one's self or one's own. One should gradually merge the material body into the five elements-earth, water, fire, air and sky"<sup>50</sup> (7. 12: 24). The human body is the consequences of five elements of Nature and one turns to the same element after death. Merging into Brahmā is the self-realization and sages treat Nature as the components of their body. C. L. Goswāmī has similar idea in this matter: "A wise man should merge that apertures of his body" (713). It proves that a human turns into Nature after his death in the form of five elements.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* extends the scope of Nature referring the creation of water. Water is one of the basic needs for creatures and there is no flourish of human civilization in the absence of water. Brahmā exposes the origin of water as follows:

The entire cosmic manifestation has emerged from water, and it is because of water that all living entities endure, live and develop. This water is nothing but the semen of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, who has such great potency, be pleased with us.<sup>51</sup> (8. 5: 33)

Despite the theory of scientists for the formation of water, the *Paurānic* perspective opposes to this outlook in relation to the origin of water. In the perspective of the modern science, there is the combination of hydrogen and oxygen for the formation of water (Dickinson 409). Unlike Dickinson, Tagare expresses his view in favor of the *Paurānic* logic regarding the origin of water. He stresses on the point that "Brahman whose seminal fluid is water, of so much enormous power that it became the source of existence" (1022). This discussion claims that the origin of water is from the semen of Brahmā.

Vindhyāvali, King Bali's queen in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, associates the ideas of Nature as the creation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for his entertainment. The queen rests on the argument: "O my Lord, You have created the entire universe for the enjoyment of Your personal pastimes, but foolish, unintelligent men have claimed proprietorship for material enjoyment"<sup>52</sup> (8. 22: 20). Śrīmatī Vindhyāvali is a *bhakta* who surrenders on the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. She should analyse the contribution of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the creation of natural objects. To create the universe is the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and he equates to the creator in the matter of unlimited power.

Sensual pleasure is the background for the destruction of Nature. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* presents as an evidence for the manifestation in the activities of rulers. In Sūkadeva's words: "Kings greed for sense satisfaction on this earth almost always kill their enemies indiscriminately. To satisfy their own whims, they may kill anyone, even their mothers, fathers, brothers or friends"<sup>53</sup> (10. 1: 67). Evil-

minded kings such as Kaṁsa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* kill their kith and kins. Kaṁsa determines to kill his nephew Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In the similar vein, Viśvanātha Cakravartī explores that "this type of behavior is not uncommon for wicked people like Kaṁsa" (qtd. in Filion 268). He symbolizes an evil ruler who does not hesitate to destroy creatures and plants. If a human does not hesitate to kill others, he is sure to destroy natural objects. The belief in Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* encourages human beings to be sensitive for the conservation of Nature.

In the general understanding of readers, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is in favor of Nature and the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* manifests his love to Nature. The extension of this logic can be found in the complaints of Vraja's *gopīs* to the mother Yaśodha about the mischievous activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa:

Our dear friend Yaśodā, your son sometimes comes to our houses before the milking of the cows and releases the calves, and when the master of the house becomes angry, your son merely smiles. Sometimes He devises some processes by which He steals palatable curd, butter and milk, which He then eats and drinks. When the monkeys assemble, He divides it with them, and when the monkeys have their bellies so full that they won't take more, He breaks the pots. Sometimes, if he gets no opportunity to steal butter or milk from a house, He will agitate the small children by pinching them. Then, when the children begin crying, Kṛṣṇa will go away.<sup>54</sup> (10. 8: 29).

The mischiefs of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's activities are reflected in the form of complaints. Śrī Kṛṣṇa loves creatures such as calves and monkeys as his siblings and provides milk to calves and butter to monkeys. For him, the animals are his intimate mates and he pleases them. In this connection, Vallabhācārya ponders that he "has a habit of giving

liberation to all" (qtd. in Filion 454). Everybody should follow the footsteps of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to please animals regarding them like humans.

Everyone has his right to alive successfully without harming others. If an animal kills so many other animals and decreases the population of animals in forest, one should kill to that animal. Śrī Kṛṣṇa makes a balance in Nature by killing the serpent Aghāsure:

Then, because Kṛṣṇa had increased the size of His body, the demon extended his own body to a very large size. Nonetheless, his breathing stopped, he suffocated, and his eyes rolled here and there and popped out. The demon's life air, however, couldnot pass through any outlet, and therefore it finally burst out through a hole in the top of the demon's head.<sup>55</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 12: 31)

The python has swallowed animals and cowherd boys so that Śrī Kṛṣṇa decides to kill him for the rescue of others. The python symbolizes greediness of humans who are not satisfied despite their material prosperity. The same point is explored by Pika Gosh that Śrī Kṛṣṇa saves the cowherd boys from the serpent (48). This discussion instructs human beings to save both plants and animals from crisis.

Nature supplies food, clothes, and shelter for human beings and other creatures so that everybody should care it. The argument of Śrī Kṛṣṇa turns out to be valid for the realization of Nature in daliy lives of creatures referring the utility of the Govardhan Hillock. Providing the ground for discussion, Sukadeva supports the point:

Of all the devotees, this Govardhana Hill is the best! O my friends, this hill supplies Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma, along with Their calves, cows and cowherd friends, with all kinds of necessities-water for drinking, very soft grass, caves, fruits, flowers and vegetables. In this way the hill offers respects to the Lord.



Being touched by the lotus feet of Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma, Govardhan Hill appears very jubilant.<sup>56</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 21: 18)

The Govardhan Hillock is an example of Nature which provides the necessities of life for Śrī Kṛṣṇa, and the inhabitants of that place. As the Govardhan Hillock, every hill, forest, and mountain fulfil the needs of creatures so that one should be aware of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in interrelation to Nature. In the same line of logic, Paul W. Taylor asserts that "we share with wild animals and plants" (101). The Govardhan Hillock provides food to animals and plants so that Śrī Kṛṣṇa convinces to the cowherd community to worship the hillock.

The music from the flute of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the background for the influence of Nature and it makes a considerable impact in the interrelationship between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. In Sukadeva's words:

He plays His flute, the rivers stop flowing, and their water stunned by the ecstasy they feel as they eagerly wait for the wind to bring them the dust of His lotus feet. But like us, the rivers are not very pious, and thus they merely wait with their arms trembling out of love.<sup>57</sup> (10. 35: 7)

This discussion shows that the music of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's flute causes conscious even to the inanimate objects such as rivers. Moving ahead in this line of logic, one can claim that Śrī Kṛṣṇa has the power from the flute to attract both plants and animals. On the ground of this idea, Cornelia Dimmitt and J. A. B. Van Buitenen explain the effect of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's flute for cows: "Lord Kṛṣṇa, with gracious mind, concentrated on Vṛndāvana, seeing to the welfare of the cows" (113). The cows and calves have attraction to Śrī Kṛṣṇa and follow him listening the music of the flute. The music is the cause of attention for rivers, plants, and vegetation.

To highlight the background of Nature, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* makes a considerable impact for its destruction. In relation to this background, Mucukunda (Śrī Kṛṣṇa) goes to the North for austerities thinking that Nature is in problems: "Seeing the size of all human beings, animals, trees, and plants was reduced, and thus realizing that the age of *Kali* was at hand, Mucukunda left for the north" <sup>58</sup> (10. 52: 2). The word *kṣullakā* has diverse meanings such as little, small, and poor. These are the symptoms of the *Kaliyūga*. The destruction of Nature is one of the consequences of this *yūga*. In the *Vedic* culture, going to the north indicates comforts for human beings for the spiritual practices. Sārātha Darśinī expresses similar ideas on this topic. She explores that the size of plants and animals were reduced (1323). The discussion shows that there is not only the reduction of size of plants and animals but also in the thoughts of humans.

Nature affects the activities of human beings, so they cannot go against its course. But Duryodhana, an envious man, is deceived by the artificial scene of Nature in the Assembly Hall of the *Rājasuya Yajna* of King Yudhishtira. This episode creates the background for the war of the *Mahābhārata*: "Bewildered by the illusion created through Maya Dānava's magic, Duryodhana mistook the solid floor for water and lifted the end of his garment. And elsewhere he fell into the water, mistaking it for the solid floor"<sup>59</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 75: 37). There is an illusion of Duryodhana in vision and he mistakes the solid floor as water or vice-versa. It makes him shameful in the hall of the *Rājasuya Yajna* of King Yudhishtira. Viśvanātha Cakravartī rests on the argument stressing on the effect of the mistakes made by Duryodhana: "King Yudhishtira tried to check the laughter by glancing at the women and Bhima" (qtd. in Prabhupāda 204). This discussion shows the effect of the maze in the reaction of women and others. Prabhupāda explores that this incident

has happened as the purpose of Kṛṣṇa (204). Water is a component of Nature and it makes Duryodhana in illusion.

There are number of noticeable points for the manifestation of Nature, creatures, and Kṛṣṇa *lilā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Everybody has *tattva* (element) of Nature in his body. The *Hindus* believe that there is Śrī Kṛṣṇa *tattva* within the body of creatures. In this connection, Sanandana confirms:

Neither material nature nor the soul who tries to enjoy her are ever born, yet living bodies come into being when these two combine, just as bubbles from where water meets the air. And just as rivers merge into the ocean or the nectar from many different flowers bends into honey, so all these conditioned beings eventually merge back into You, the Supreme, along with their various names and qualities.<sup>60</sup> (10. 87: 31)

The transformation is possible from one form to another form as the passage of time. The *jīva* arises from Nature and it turns to dust in another time. In the same crux of logic, Matthew Cooperman is apt to state that in Nature "foreground and background are located" (188). This analysis associates the idea that the condition of Nature resembles to the life of creatures due to sameness of five elements in their creation and destruction.

The theme of Nature is observed as the background for description of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Moving ahead in this line of logic, the queens of Śrī Kṛṣṇa regard Nature as the background: "Dear ocean, you are always roaring, not sleeping at night. Are you suffering insomania? Or is it that, as with us, Mukunda has taken your insignias and you are hopeless of retrieving them?"<sup>61</sup> (10. 90: 17). The queens of Śrī Kṛṣṇa personify the ocean as human being addressing her as a patient of insomania. C. L. Gośwāmī postulates that the queens of Śrī Kṛṣṇa

share their feelings of separation with him (511). The ocean is the background information for showing the suppressed feelings of the queens who are unable to sleep at night.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa claims himself as the object of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*: "I am the sweet taste of water and among brilliant things I am the sun. I am the effulgence of the sun, moon and stars, and I am the transcendental sound that vibrates in the sky"<sup>62</sup> (11 .16: 34). It is a reliable idea to interpret between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature from same perspective. From this standpoint what Śrī Kṛṣṇa argues seems to be plausible. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is in the form of natural things such as the sun, moon, stars, and the sky. In this context, Pushpendra Kumar emphasizes on the role of Nature in the evocation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. He further explains that Śrī Kṛṣṇa has the "essential characteristics" (1319) of Nature. If human beings have trend to see the magnificence and the glory of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in Nature, her conservation is possible.

For the extension of background, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* refers the condition of the *Vānaprasthāśram*. In this *āśram*, a sage should leave the house and go to the world of Nature for making good interrelation. In the view of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, a *Vānprasthi* should follow certain rules and regulations in Nature after leaving his house. In this regard, Śrī Kṛṣṇa corroborates Uddhab: "The sage should travel; in sanctified places, by flowing rivers and within the solitude of mountains and forests. He should enter the cities, towns, and pasturing grounds and approach ordinary working men only to beg his bare sustenance"<sup>63</sup> (11. 18: 24). In the *vanāśrama dharma*, a *Vānprasthi* should leave the house and should turn to Nature for Śrī Kṛṣṇa consciousness. The *vanāśrama dharma* of the *Hindus* emphasizes in the utility of Nature in human life. In this connection, Prabhupāda confirms that "one should not deal unnecessarily with the materialistic world" (247). If there is the trend to go to

Nature in *Vānaprastha āsram*, human beings understand the value of Nature and they preserve the environment for themselves and for the future generation.

With all these logical descriptions, one argues that Nature has a prominent role for the creation of background information about Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. There are a number of noticeable evidences in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* which motivate the minds of human beings to be careful about Nature. There may be improvement in Nature in the future following the footsteps of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. One can intellectually reach the conclusion that Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is the base to evoke awareness about Nature. Present generation tries to restore Nature realizing their past misdeeds. This expression supports to control intervention of human beings in Nature. If humans do not separate between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Nature, it becomes a roadmap to conserve Nature. They respect the objects of Nature and become aware of her destruction.

### **Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā* in Mild Form of Nature**

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* portrays mild form of Nature in relation to beauty, purity, and ecological harmony on the earth. The beauty, happiness, and the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are related to mild form of Nature. In it, Nature becomes dynamic according to context and psychology of characters. The writer asserts in the beauty of Nature as the base of entertainment and the fulfillment of the needs of creatures. Mild form of Nature originates positive sense in the life of human beings and the other creatures. Śrī Kṛṣṇa has good interrelation to Nature and wants to remain happy in the natural world. *Vṛndāvana* is the main setting during the time of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's childhood and the scenario manifests mild form of Nature. In this venue, the creatures feel happy in company of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the richness of natural beauty.

Mild form of Nature affects human beings and other creatures in Vṛndāvana. Keeping the mild form of Nature at the centre of theme, Śukadeva presents it as the following:

Between Nandeśvara and Mahāvana is a place named Vṛndāvana. This place is very suitable because it is lush with grass, plants, and creepers for the cows and other animals. It has nice gardens and tall mountains and is full of facilities for the happiness of all the *gopas* and *gopīs* and our animals.<sup>64</sup>

(*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 11: 27)

This argument supports the point that Vṛndāvana is rich and matured in mild form of Nature. The cowherd community is fond of the beauty of Vṛndāvana forest. Because of troubles from demon Ariṣṭāsura, they shift from Nandagrām to Vṛndāvana. It shows that mild form of Nature is suitable for human beings to live without any problems. Human beings of the *Paurāṇic* period had their selection to live in the place where Nature supported them. On the basis of this relation, Śrī Kṛṣṇa has mild activities and helps others without any sign of selfishness.

Mild form of Nature inspires human beings to be cooperative and helpful for others. Gopīparāṇadhana Dāsa intellectually reaches to this connection and forwards his idea: "Kṛṣṇa created happiness for every creature in Vṛndāvana, including the humans, animals, and plants" (106). It hints that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is dear to Vṛndāvana and the venue is memorable for him. It further proves that mild form of Nature is the foundation-stone of Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Both Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma make Vrajabhūmi as their playground and perform their *līlās*. The geographical identity of Vraja Bhumi is closely associated with the *līlās* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. As a profound narrator, Śukadeva explicates: "Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma passed their childhood age in Vrajabhūmi by engaging in activities of childish play, such as

playing hide-and seek; constructing a make-believe bridge on the ocean, and jumping here and there like monkeys"<sup>65</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 11: 59). Based on this argument, one can state that Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma have their merrymaking life-style in Vraja Bhūmī playing games and sports. The mild form of Nature makes them easy for the creation of fun in their childhood. Both the children and Nature seem to be in good harmony of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in that place. The mild form of Nature images please to the inhabitants of Vraja Bhūmī. In this form of Nature, one can get the scenario of progress, success, and happiness. The activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa which take place there, teach human beings how to make harmony with Nature.

One can argue that the natural objects such as lotus flowers are the embodiment of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Kavi Karnapura extends the scope of Nature in Vṛndāvana contemplating that lotus flowers on lakes are as the feet of Kṛṣṇa (5). The text formulates that Śrī Kṛṣṇa and the cowherd boys go to different places of forest to observe the scenario of Nature. Kṛṣṇa has intimate friendship with Nature and pleases to the cowherd boys, cows, and the other creatures of forest. For him, the beauty of Nature makes him and his mates happy. According to the survey of Śukadeva Gośvāmī:

Sometimes Kṛṣṇa would go to a somewhere distant place to see the beauty of the forest. Then all the other boys would run to accompany Him, each one saying, "I shall be the first to run and touch Kṛṣṇa! I shall touch Kṛṣṇa first!"

In this way they enjoyed the life by repeatedly touching Kṛṣṇa.<sup>66</sup> (10. 12: 6) Śrī Kṛṣṇa wanders hither and thither to satisfy himself from the beauty of Nature and other cowherd boys follow him. The mates of Śrī Kṛṣṇa accompany him to share happiness of natural beauty. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*, which is related to Nature, inspires human

beings to go to forest like Śrī Kṛṣṇa. If human beings go to forest now and again, they may be careful about its pollution and destruction.

Rain symbolizes fertility, so it is the mild form of Nature. Cornelia Dimmitt and Van Buitenen write about mild form of Nature with evidence: "Rainclouds rumbled softly, pouring down showers of blossoms" (109). Based on this argument, one can argue that rainclouds cause rain and it brings changes from dreary landscape to fertility. With this conditioning, there is the depiction of mild form of Nature in the autumn season tracing fertility. It is the season of mating and pregnancy for cows, women, and the female birds. It shows the mild form of Nature that brings fertility in the life of creatures. Śukadeva extends the scope of mild form of Nature:

By the influence of the autumn season, all the cows, does, women, and female birds became fertile and were followed by their respective mates in search of sexual enjoyment, just as activities performed for the service of the Supreme Lord are automatically followed by all beneficial results.<sup>67</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 20: 46)

From this logical description, the autumn season is presented as the fertile time for creatures. The female creatures are engaged with their mates and their pregnancy is the news of happiness. If there is happiness, one gets the possibility of creation. We can agree if Nature remains in the mild form, it brings fertility in the life of creatures. It indicates that happiness becomes the sign of creativity but Nature should be in favor of creatures. Human beings and other creatures do important works when Nature is in the mild form with supporting actions.

The images relating to the Yamūnā River are remarkable and they have connection to Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Śrī Kṛṣṇa, *gopās*, and *the gopīs* go to the river frequently either for water sports or for other works. The river symbolizes fertility and the land



which is situated near the Yamūnā River is arable for farming. Due to that river, the area is green, fresh, and healthy. Śrī Kṛṣṇa describes the scene of the Yamūnā River as follows:

My dear friends just see how this riverbank is extremely beautiful because of its pleasing atmosphere. And just see how the blooming lotuses are attracting bees and birds by their aroma. The humming and chirping of the bees and birds is echoing throughout the beautiful trees in the forest. Also here, the sands are clean and soft. Therefore, this must be considered the best place for our sporting and pastimes.<sup>68</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 13: 5)

The aforementioned scenic description highlights the area of the Yamūnā River which is filled with the chirping and cooing sound of different birds. Here, we have picture that shows the connection between Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature. Śrī Kṛṣṇa describes his favorite place which is full of natural beauty. The bank of the Yamūnā River is full of blooming lotus flowers with sweet fragrance and the fragrance becomes the centre of attraction for bees and birds. This mild form of Nature brings perfection of freedom for Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his playmates.

There is climax of richness of natural beauty on the bank of the Yamūnā River. Richard L. Thompson associates his ideas about the value of the Yamūnā River. He ponders that the river is the base to entertain for Śrī Kṛṣṇa and other cowherd boys (190). From this perspective, human beings realize the intimacy of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with rivers. In this connection, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* refers how Śrī Kṛṣṇa looks after the cows on the bank of the Yamūnā River: "Thus expressing His satisfaction with the beautiful forest of Vṛndāvana and its inhabitants, Lord Kṛṣṇa enjoyed tending the cows and other animals with His friends on the banks of the river Yamūnā below Govardhan Hill"<sup>69</sup> (10. 15: 9). This discussion shows that cows and

other animals are part of Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa treats cows not as his property but as intimate friends. The animals remain near him to endow pleasure. In mild form of the world of Nature, the persons become aware of its ecological balance. This activity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa evokes awareness in Nature and this *līlā* of Kṛṣṇa gives a lesson to human beings to go to rivers and forests for eternal pleasure.

Keeping the mild form of Nature at the centre of theme, the activities of Balarāma highlight Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*: "Sometimes the honey bees in Vṛndāvana became so mad with ecstasy that they closed their eyes and began to sing. Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva imitate their sounds"<sup>70</sup> (10. 15: 10). To imitate the sound of birds and animals is the sign of enjoyment in Nature. Two brothers remain happy with those natural things and creatures of that place. Being nature lovers, both Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva treat birds and animals as their friends and try to remain happy with them. Like them, human beings should have their awareness with the natural things and they should love them. Thus, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* has his profound interrelationship with Nature.

Charles R. Brooks explores Kṛṣṇa *līlā*: "Krishna and his *līlās* are not bound by human conceptions and understandings" (29). With this argument, one can opine that Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* incorporates layers of meanings so that modern readers should attempt to understand it. The text refers the scenario of forest as follows: "Sent by the demigod Varuna, the divine Vāruṇī liquor flowed from a tree hollow and made the entire forest even more fragrant with its sweet aroma"<sup>71</sup> (10. 65: 19). Varuni is liquor made from honey and the fragrance of the liquor makes the aura of forest charming. The creatures of that forest remain happy there. The objects which are the production of Nature have their prominent role to attract others. There are sufficient evidences to show the interrelation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature. The world of Nature has its

own fragrance for the pleasure of creatures. Thus, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* evokes awareness to project Nature in their respective forms.

One can get the maturity and richness of the mild form of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* at night before the *Rāsa Līla*. The mild form of Nature is in climax at this moment. The scenario of the night time in the forest of Vṛndāvana is a typical example of mild form of Nature:

Kṛṣṇa saw the unbroken disk of the full moon glowing with the red effulgence of newly applied vermilion, as if it were the face of the goddess of fortune. He also saw the *kumuda* lotuses opening in response to the moon's presence and the forest gently illuminated by its rays. Thus the Lord began to play sweetly on His flute, attracting the minds of the beautiful-eyed *gopīs*.<sup>72</sup> (10. 29: 3)

Śrī Kṛṣṇa belongs to the lunar dynasty and the moon plays a prominent role for the background of the *Rāsa Līla*. The presence of the moon promotes natural beauty of the earth and raises the mood of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for *rāsa* dance. Thus, this natural beauty has reciprocal relationship with *rāsa līla*. Nature is the sources for the creation of emotions and love.

About the mild form of Nature, Edwin F. Bryant further explores that "A fresh breeze blew in that region, pleasing the senses and carrying pleasant fragrance " (119). This is a positive sign that the beauty of Nature is a joy for beholders. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* refers the mild form of Nature of Indraprastha: "Requested by the king to stay with them, the almighty Lord remained happily in Indraprastha during the months of the rainy season, giving joy to the eyes of the city's residents"]<sup>73</sup> (10. 58: 12). The discussion shows that Yudhishtira requests Śrī Kṛṣṇa to stay in Indraprastha for pleasure in natural beauty. Rainy season symbolizes fertility and Nature is seen at the apex of her beauty. Green scenario of Nature draws

the attention of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and it evokes him awareness about the utility of Nature. The pleasure with Nature surpasses to the other entertaining things for humans. It instructs human beings to see the beauty of Nature for the sake of peace and pleasure.

One can get the reflection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's passion in the creation of Dvārakā. The scenario of water in front of the palace of Śrī Kṛṣṇa promotes the value of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The noticeable beauty is presented as follows:

The Lord then entered His capital. The city was lavishly decorated with flags and victory arches, and its avenues and crossways were all sprinkled with water. As conch shells, *ānakas* and *dundubhi* drums resounded, the Lord's relatives, the *brāhmaṇas* and the general populace all came forward to greet Him respectfully.<sup>74</sup> (10. 63: 52)

It shows that Śrī Kṛṣṇa uses Nature to promote the beauty of his palace in Dvārakā. There is the amalgamation of the beauty of Nature with artificial beauty of the palace. Kṛṣṇa regarded the objects of Nature as the source for merrymaking. He is fond of natural beauty and the scene of the spring reminds him the scenario of waterfalls in forest.

The activities and the characteristics of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are related to the activities of a folk hero. On the basis of this notion, Benjamin Preciado Solis describes Nature referring Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a folk hero. Responding to such claims, he argues that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is in favor of Nature (87). Explaining this statement, one can establish Kṛṣṇa as a folk hero due to his love for Nature. Ugrasravā Suta discusses on the Nature of Dvārakā: "The city of Dvārakāpurī was filled with the opulences of all seasons. There were hermitages, orchards, flower gardens, parks, and reservoirs of water breeding lotus flowers all over"<sup>75</sup> (1. 11: 12). Based on the quote, one can agree that Nature is the backbone in the perfection of human civilization. The gardens contribute to the

natural beauty of Dvārakāpurī. There are no references of industries, garbage, and pollution. The reality is that Śrī Kṛṣṇa has ideal lifestyle and his Dvārakāpurī is the ideal place to live where one can get harmony between Nature and creatures. This remarkable image of Nature is useful for the revelation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

Human beings can observe the mild form of Nature in the panorama of Dvārakā. The city of Dvārakā which is built by Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the area of 90 sq miles on the Indian Ocean is naturally an enchanting place. Śukadeva explains the natural beauty of Dvārakā: "The city was filled with the sounds of birds and bees flying about the parks and pleasure gardens, while its lakes, crowded with blooming *indīvara*, *ambhoja*, *kahlāra*, *kumuda* and *utpala* lotuses, resounded with the calls of swans and cranes"<sup>76</sup> (10. 69: 2-4). This idea confirms that the premises of Dvārakā is full of natural beauty. When Nārada arrives at Dvārakā, he is fascinated by the beauty of Nature. There are 900,000 palaces (Prabhupāda: 869) and the palaces are surrounded by beautiful gardens and parks. It is a clear manifestation of the beauty of Nature in the magical form. One can realize that Nature is the foundation stone of Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. When Śrī Kṛṣṇa lives in the forest of Vṛndāvana, he is pleased with the world of Nature but he develops the same environment in Dvārakā by planting trees and flowers. He plants various types of trees in the premises of his palaces. If one intends, he can make the world of Nature in the city as the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in Dvārakā city.

Ranchor Prime connects Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* with Nature: "The best way to teach environmental concern is through Krishna's life. Krishna is the only savior of the environment" (57). It is exhilarating to see that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the base to conserve environment. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* focuses on the mild form of Nature

by showing contrast between town and the forest dwellers. This contrast creates interest for readers and researchers. Śrī Kṛṣṇa prefers Nature in his argument: "Residence of forest is in the model of goodness, residence in a town is in the mode of passion, residence in a gambling house displays the quality of ignorance, and residence in a place where reside is transcendental"<sup>77</sup> (11. 25: 25). In this context, it is important to remember that the inhabitants near forest are better than town dwellers. Śrī Kṛṣṇa lives in village that is close to forest so that he is simpler in his activities and behaviors than the inhabitants of cities. The scenario of Nature affects in the psychology of human beings. One can claim that the people of country sides are helpful and co-operative for others. The mild form of Nature shows mildness in the works and words of villagers. It motivates human beings to live happily in the world of Nature without destroying it. There is encouragement for inhabitants to live close to Nature for betterment.

In order to show the connection of Kṛṣṇa *līlā* with the mild form of Nature Śrī Kṛṣṇa travels to different places and enjoys the beauty of Nature. It is the job of a nature lover to visit different places to make mutual relationship with Nature. In this regard, Sage Śaunakādī highlights the beauty of Nature during the journey to the place of Śrī Kṛṣṇa: "The Lord then proceeded towards Kurujāngala, Pāñcālā, Śūrasenā, and the land on the bank of the river Yamunā, Brahmāvarta, Kurukṣetra, Matsya, and Saravastā"<sup>78</sup> (1. 10: 34). As Śrī Kṛṣṇa visits the places Yamunā, Brahmāvarta, Kurukṣetra, Matsya, and Sarasvatā, he gets opportunity to observe Nature in its diverse forms. Here, Śrī Kṛṣṇa plays the role of a pilgrim and a traveler. His observation of beauty of different places supports ideas about the importance of Nature. In this sense, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is more Nature lover in comparison to the present

pilgrims and the environmentalists. If there is awareness about Nature as Śrī Kṛṣṇa, there is possibility in maintaining the natural beauty and purity in the same condition.

The argument turns out to be valid when John Milton exposes *karma* of human beings for the evaluation of the mild form of Nature. He tries to console himself with the argument: "The mind is its own place, and in itself can make a heav'n of hell, a hell of heav'n" (qtd. in Prophet and Spadaro 190). From this standpoint, one can inscribe that humans have their responsibility either to create or spoil the natural beauty. This discussion further supports that a conscious person should believe in the *Brahmājyoti* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the foundation stone of Nature. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* emphasizes the use of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's *Brahmājyoti* to highlight Nature. With the help of that *Brahmājyoti*, there is the creation of the stars and the planets.

The sage Nārada argues about the significance of *Brahmājyoti*: "I create after the Lord's creation by His personal effulgence known as *Brahmājyoti*, just as when the sun manifests its fire, the moon, the firmament; the influential planets and the twinkling stars also manifest their brightness"<sup>79</sup> (2. 5: 11). The divine sage claims that the *Brahmājyoti* is the base for the creation of the universe. Here, the role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa changes from a simple Nature lover to the creator of the universe. There are the natural things in the planets and stars which are useful for the existence of creatures on this planet (earth). This expression extends the scope of Nature. These Nature images have connection to Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* so that human beings should survey Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature relating to each other.

Generally, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* focuses on the mild form of Nature in Vṛndāvana, Mathura, and Dvārakā. In Vṛndāvana, he lives in the world of Nature and performs his sportive activities with his cowherd mates but in Dvārakā, he creates Nature by making gardens, orchards, and fountains to entertain himself and others. The

remarkable Nature images in the mild form show Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* as the development from childhood to manhood. He teaches human beings how to deal with the mild form of Nature so that one becomes happy and satisfied without harming Nature. The mild form of Nature becomes supportive to understand his *līlā* in the text. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* instructs human beings how to be pleased in the world of Nature.

### **Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā* in Destructive Form of Nature**

Creation and destruction are the two components of Nature which occur repeatedly in the universe. Natural disaster and other calamities are related to it. The destructive form of Nature affects creatures and plants negatively. Like happiness and sorrow, mild and destructive forms of Nature occur in the narration of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. There is the continuation in the works of Nature either positively or negatively. When the changes in the actions of Nature occur, they bring newness in this physical world. But the destructive form creates wonder, panic, and pain for them. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* includes the destructive works in the physical world. Demons destroy the life of humans, demigods, and the other creatures. The text mentions the elemental, occasional, continuous, and final *pralayas* (destruction) and the mythical characters of the text feel difficulties during this critical time.

Changes in Nature bring both pain and pleasure to creatures. Sometimes Nature seems to be merciless to human beings. One can see the destructive forms of Nature in different episodes of the text. Destructive form is a part of creation because without destruction, creation is not possible in this world. Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is the base of ethics and the role of his *līlā* is to conserve Nature from its destruction. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is the rock foundation to face the destructive form of Nature either from natural



calamities or from demonic activities. Śrī Kṛṣṇa faces the destructive form of Nature to save religion and *sādhus* (good persons) from the demonic rulers and other factors.

Tṛṇāvarta, a demon servant of Kamsa, comes to Gokūla in the form of whirlwind to carry baby Śrī Kṛṣṇa away as per the instruction of his master. Nature turns suddenly into destructive form from the presence of the demon Tṛṇāvarta near Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Śukadeva formulates the scenario of the destructive form of Nature: "For a moment, the whole pasturing ground was overcast with dense darkness from the dust storm, and mother Yaśodā was unable to find her son where she had placed Him"<sup>80</sup> (10. 7: 22). Demon Tṛṇāvarta changes Nature into the destructive form and the whirlwind affects the environment of that place. The whole Gokūla is covered by darkness and mother Yaśodā does not see anything there. The presence of this demon creates the destructive form of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

Men with their irresponsible activities, are sure to destroy Nature in this world. C. Mackenzie Brown purports that disaster in Nature occurs at any time (553). This discussion suggests readers to be always careful because the natural calamities may occur at any time without preinformation. During this critical moment, human beings and animals feel difficulties to control themselves. The destructive form of Nature is in climax when the demon Tṛṇāvarta takes Śrī Kṛṣṇa high into the sky. The intention of the demon is to assassinate Kṛṣṇa but Śrī Kṛṣṇa increases his weight and becomes difficult for Tṛṇāvarta to carry him. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discloses that situation: "Having assumed the form of a forceful whirlwind, the demon Tṛṇāvarta took Śrī Kṛṣṇa very high in the sky, but when Śrī Kṛṣṇa became heavier than the demon, the demon had to stop his force and could go no further"<sup>81</sup> (10. 7: 26). Here is the competition of the *Yogic* Power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the power of demon Tṛṇāvarta. Śrī Kṛṣṇa uses his power for protection of himself against the demon

Tṛṇāvarta. But there is the victory of the *Yogic* Power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa against the demonic power of Tṛṇāvarta. It suggests that the life of a child always remains in danger because any problem may occur at any time during this period. The humans, who have the demonic nature, can use their power to destroy Natural things and good persons as this episode of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

As the demon uses Nature in the destructive form of whirlwind, Śrī Kṛṣṇa makes solution immediately and controls the demon: "With Kṛṣṇa grasping him by the throat, Tṛṇāvarta choked, unable to make even a sound even to move his hands and legs. His eyes popping out, the demon lost his life and fell, along with the little boy, down to the ground of Vraja"<sup>82</sup> (10. 7: 28). As a nature lover, Śrī Kṛṣṇa kills Tṛṇāvarta by choking his throat to preserve Nature. This Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in controlling the whirlwind is a typical example for the preservation of Nature from destruction. All creatures have their equal role in the world of Nature for survival without harming others. It is the *dharma* (duty) of everybody to preserve Nature and creatures. The above mentioned discussion confirms that the humans, who have intention to destroy others, may destroy themselves as Tṛṇāvartadid in the text.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* inscribes the value of Nature through the character of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In this connection, McComas Taylor explicates his view about the value of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* for humans to deal with the natural disaster. He argues: "*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇakathā* performances deserve scholarly attention" (262). In this context, it will be instructive to claim that the text draws the attention of modern scholars and academicians. The text incorporates problems in Nature and those problems affect humans. From this standpoint, Gangādhara Pandā and Brījeśkumār present a saying: " "The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is the tasting ground for scholars"[*Vidyāvatām bhāgavate parīkṣha*] (9).

As other problems, the text educates how to deal with the destructive form of Nature on the earth.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* includes Yamalārjuna trees in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. This episode supports the point how Kṛṣṇa deals with the problems in connection to the Yamalārjuna trees. *Bāla* Kṛṣṇa steals *mākhan*, breaks pots and mother Yaśoda is fed up from the mischievous activities of her baby. She has her obligation to tie him to punish in a wooden mortar but the baby crawls with the mortar because of his intention to remain free from the bondage of his mother. Śukadeva Gośvāmī gives background about the destruction of the twin Arjuna trees: "Śrī Kṛṣṇa, to fulfil the truthfulness of the words of the greatest devotee, Nārada, slowly went to that spot where the twin Arjuna trees were standing"<sup>83</sup> (10. 10: 24). The trees are personified as human beings and Vedavyāsa circulates his thoughts to love trees as human beings. We should not cut down trees due to our relation with trees and the other objects of nature. The destruction of the Yamalārjuna trees indicates the activities of humans for the destruction of forest.

Sārārtha Darśinī explains the event from her perspective that the Yamalārjuna trees had been the two young men Nalakūvara and Maṇigrīva. They had not felt shame in being naked in front of sage Nārada and the divine sage cursed them to be trees (254). Through this incident, humans come to know that Śrī Kṛṣṇa postulates to preserve Nature during the time of his childhood. He caused uprooting two trees when he is tied in a mortar. : "By dragging, behind Him with great force the wooden mortar tied to His belly, the boy, Śrī Kṛṣṇa uprooted the two trees, with their trunks, leaves and branches, trembled severely and fell to the ground with a great crash"<sup>84</sup> (10. 10: 27). In other *līlās*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa preserves Nature but in his Dāmodar *līlā*, he destroys the twin Arjuna trees to make him free from the bondage of his mother. The

destruction of those trees is not intentionally done by Śrī Kṛṣṇa but it happens accidentally. This Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* includes sometimes the destruction of Nature happens in the world without intention.

Kāliya *Nāga* is an antagonistic character in the text whose role is to destroy Nature from his venom. The serpent is able to affect the world of Nature negatively from the destruction of plants and creatures. Śukadeva purports: "As soon as they touched the poisoned water, all the cows and boys lost their consciousness by the divine power of the Lord and fell lifeless at the water's edge."<sup>85</sup> (10. 15: 49). It is a notable example of the spoiling pure water by poison. The intention of the serpent is to destroy creatures. It points out that a component of Nature (serpent) spoils another component of Nature (river). Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* covers the minds of the cowherd community and they remember him to be rescued. From this standpoint, one can say that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is in centre point of expectation during the time of his child *līlā* to save Nature and creatures.

The role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a savior and defender. In this line of logic, A.D. Bhattacharya exposes: "The atmosphere above the pool had also become poisonous and the birds overflying the pond used to get scorched and burnt out. The plants, herbs, and creepers had also got dried up due to the excessive heat prevailing in the area" (106). The aforementioned discussion shows the destructive form of Nature for animals, birds and plants. The serpent Kāliya symbolizes destructive element of Nature. Evidently, humans need not expose their quality of Kāliya to create problems for plants and animals.

In harmful situations, Śrī Kṛṣṇa becomes rescuer to human beings and other creatures. He makes up his mind to rescue them from destruction. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses how Śrī Kṛṣṇa controls Kāliya Nāga:

Having severely depleted the serpent's strength with His relentless circling, Śrī Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the origin of everything, pushed down Kāliya's raised shoulders and mounted his broad serpentine heads. Thus Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the original master of all fine arts, began to dance, His Lotus feet deeply reddened by the touch of the numerous jewels upon the serpent's heads.<sup>86</sup> (10. 16: 26)

Śrī Kṛṣṇa subdues the hundred-headed *nāga* miraculously and controls the pollution of the river. The dead animals and plants are restored miraculously. Supporting the physical strength of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Pavan K. Varma is apt to state that he has "superhuman physical strength" (14) to protect creatures and plants from the destructive form of Nature.

Conflagration is a fearful and destructive form of fire in forest and it destroys plants and animals. The blaze destroys the world of Nature and creates complicated situations for humans, plants, and animals. In the area of foliage, the conflagration swallows everything. Śukadeva refers conflagration and its problems to King Parikshīt in the forest of Vṛndāvana: "Passing from one part of the great forest to another, the goats, cows, and buffaloes eventually entered an area overgrown with sharp canes. The heat of a nearby forest fire made them thirsty, and they cried out in distress"<sup>87</sup> (10. 19: 2). The domestic animals which are in the forest during the time of conflagration are thirsty and rush hurriedly to and fro to save their lives. This scenic description is an example of the destruction of Nature caused by fire in forest. It shows that Nature had faced problems in the *Paurānic* period. During that time, everybody expected the presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the solution of the environmental problem.

The blaze starts swallowing the foliage and vegetation which creates problem to the cowherd boys and other creatures. The effect of the conflagration is panic to the

creatures in the forest. Benjamin Preciado Solis expresses his idea in the effect of conflagration surveying that the animals, birds and insects escape to different directions (71). This state of crisis shows that the creatures are in problems from blaze in the forest. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* highlights the incident of forest fire:

Suddenly a great forest fire appeared on all sides, threatening to destroy all the forest creatures. Like a chariot driver, the wind swept the fire onward and terrible sparks shot in all directions. Indeed, the great fire extended its tongues of flame toward all moving and nonmoving creatures.<sup>88</sup> (10. 19: 7)

The rage of the blaze is out of control and the sign of the conflagration is to destroy the area of Vṛndāvana. This verse shows the crisis from the blaze indicating that the destruction of Nature is also the sign of destruction of creatures. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* had predicted about the future condition of the world quite a long ago. This prediction has come to be true as forest blaze is one of the common incidents for the destruction of Nature at present.

The cowherd boys claim that the blazing fire affects everyone because of the gust of wind. It devours creatures and the objects and the cowherd mates of Śrī Kṛṣṇa do not have any alternation to extinguish the fire. During the time of crisis, the cowherd boys invoke Kṛṣṇa: "O Kṛṣṇa ! You are most powerful! O Rāma! Your power never fails. Please save us from the forest fire. We are under your shelter"<sup>89</sup> (10. 19: 9). The *gopās* expect solution of the crisis from their rescuer friend Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Fear seizes all creatures of the forest and the terrific fire encircles them. Then, Śrī Kṛṣṇa realizes their panic condition and instructs the cowherd boys to shut their eyes (Menon 817). He does not show his action for controlling the conflagration.

Kṛṣṇa believes that his cowherd mates may have fear from his action. This discussion identifies the value of a hero for ordinary human beings in time of crisis.

The cowherd boys are shocked by the forest blaze and they seem to be psychologically paralysed. Pushpendra Kumar shows the psychology of *gopās*: "They resorted to Kṛṣṇa along with Balarāma, for shelter" (922). The expectation of help is justifiable for the cowherd community in such a crisis. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the master of *Yogā* and there is the control of the bonfire with the help of His *Yogic* power. In this connection, Śukadeva Gośvāmī formulates his idea: "The boys immediately closed their eyes. Then the Supreme Lord, the master of all mystic power, opened His mouth and swallowed the terrible fire, saving His friends from danger"<sup>90</sup> (10. 19: 12). The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* presents the destructive form of Nature through the scenario of conflagration. He dedicates his life to save others during the time of blaze in the forest and this activity to save others is praiseworthy. We should have humanity in their thoughts and activities. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a model personality who faces problems and solves them immediately using his *Yogic* power.

The conflagration in forest is a burning issue at present on the face of the earth. The effort of a single person to control conflagration was possible during the *Paurāṇic* period but not at present. However, one can purport that an individual has a significant role to preserve Nature. In reality, it is difficult to get human beings who have humanity to preserve Nature and creatures. One should follow the path of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to preserve Nature for living beings. We should not destroy Nature for the fulfillment of our needs and greed. If crisis occurs in Nature, everybody should deal with the problems according to his capacity. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* takes place in the yard of Nature. He evokes awareness about Nature and his role is memorable in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* due to his closeness to Nature.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa defies the trend of worshipping Indra, the king of gods because he thinks that Govardhan Hillock is better for them than Indra for their survival. This new concept to respect Nature is guidance for the human beings to keep the world of Nature in fresh and healthy condition. This mythical hillock has its significance in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Śrī Kṛṣṇa and the cowherd community have their special relationship with the *Govardhan* Hillock. "Krishna thought that it was better to worship the hills, forest and cows than to perform a ritual for the demigods" (qtd. in Ranchor Prime 55). Śrī Kṛṣṇa tries to convince the cowherd community of the need of looking after their natural inhabitant. He promotes for worshipping *Govardhan* Hillock: "This Govardhan Hill, assuming any form he wishes, will kill any residents of the forest who neglect him. Therefore let us pay our obeisances to him for the safety of ourselves and our cows"<sup>91</sup> (10. 24: 37). It shows the idea of Śrī Kṛṣṇa about Nature and its utility in the life of humans. The hillock is the source of food and shelter for cows and the herdsmen so that Śrī Kṛṣṇa makes a plan to worship the hill not Indra. "Mountain Govardhan is worshipped as a natural form of Kṛṣṇa" (Haberman 340). It makes Indra furious, the rain god. This decision of Śrī Kṛṣṇa becomes the root of conflict between the inhabitants of Govardhan and Indra. Indra decides to destroy the pride of Śrī Kṛṣṇa by the heavy rain. The rain causes problems for human beings and the other creatures in the area of the Govardhan Hillock. Similarly, the most agreeable factor concerning the matter is that shifting of power is the root of conflict between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Indra.

The establishment of the new trend of worshipping Govardhan Hillock is the base of fury for Indra against Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In this context, Cornelia Dimmitt and J.A.B. Van Buitenen expose the fury of Indra and his order to *Samvartaka* cloud for the heavy rain (116). Concerning this argument, one can agree that the shifting of trend



from Indra, the king of gods to Govardhan Hillock makes Indra pour the heavy rain at the area of Govardhan Hillock. The heavy rain is a typical example for the destructive form of Nature for the inhabitants of that place. Relating this incident, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* portrays: "As the clouds released torrents of rain as thick as massive columns, the earth was submerged in the flood, and high ground could no longer be distinguished from low"<sup>92</sup> (10. 25: 10). Rain symbolizes fertility and creation on the earth. But the heavy rain for a long time is destructive form of Nature. The wrath of Indra in the form of the heavy rain causes panic for Govardhana Hillock dwellers. In the *paurāṇic* period, it was the system to attack others using the *Yogic* power. Indra used his *Yogic* power for the origin of the heavy rain to create problems for the cowherd community.

The effect of the destructive form of Nature causes fear to human beings, birds, and animals. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* refers the panic as the fearful visionary description as an occasional destructive form of Nature: "The cows and other animals, shivering from the excessive rain and wind, and the cowherd men and ladies, pained by the cold, all approached Lord Govinda for shelter"<sup>93</sup> (10. 25: 11). Humans cannot remain free from the destructive form of Nature so that they need to be sensitive about it. During the time of destruction of Nature, it is our duty to protect as far as possible. If human beings destroy Nature, it may be their self-destruction so that this scenario of the text makes humans aware of Nature. The creatures and plants are victimized from the creation of flood by the wrath of Indra.

This condition shows that the wrath of Indra affects the life of the dwellers of Govardhan Hill. From this standpoint, Kamala Subramaniam expresses her view: "The cowherds, their wives, and children were helpless" (462). The condition of the cowherd community was miserable at the beginning of the heavy rain. In this

situation, the inhabitants of Govardhana Hill expected solution of the problem by Śrī Kṛṣṇa and they address him: "Kṛṣṇa, O most fortunate one, please deliver the cows from the wrath of Indra! O Lord, You are so affectionate to Your devotees"<sup>94</sup> (10. 25: 13). The cowherd community remembers Śrī Kṛṣṇa for help. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is in need for the inhabitants of that place for solution of the destructive form of Nature and they appeal him to help them. They know the miraculous power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and request him to help.

Indra does not show mercy to the helpless condition of the cowherd community. Supporting this opinion, Kavi Karnapura claims that "Indra felt no fatigue as he continued to attack Giriraja" (161). In this line of logic, one can argue that Indra shows his fury in the form of the torrential rain. During this crisis, Śrī Kṛṣṇa uses his *Yogic* Power lifting up the Govardhan Hillock to make conscious to Indra. At this point, Śukadeva argues with evidence: "Śrī Kṛṣṇa picked up Govardhan Hill with one hand and held it aloft just as easily as a child holds up a mushroom"<sup>95</sup> (10. 25: 19). From this logic, one can express that the things of Nature are useful in the time of need either for benefits or to save us from crisis. This *līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa portrays the utility of natural things to save creatures. In this connection, Benjamin Preciado-Solis expresses his notion: ""The themes of a strong-man are found all through the life of Kṛṣṇa " (78). There is the link between *dharma* and *karma* from this *līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. From this standpoint, the argument in favor of Nature is plausible. From this *līlā*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa gives lesson to human beings to help others during the time of crisis.

Jayashree Venugopala elaborates that Kṛṣṇa lifts up the Govardha Hillock for one week and safeguards people and animals (95). It shows that the act of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is miracle. In this regard, humans assume him as a mythical character with incredible

strength. As a nature lover, it is his duty to protect cows and the cowherd community from the destructive form of Nature. The cowherd community shelters under the hillock and the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* states this scenario in this way: "Their minds thus pacified by Lord Kṛṣṇa, they all entered beneath the hill, where they found ample room for themselves and all their cows, wagons, servants and priests, and for all other members of the community as well"<sup>96</sup> (10. 25: 22). The cowherd communities bring their domestic animals beneath the Govardhana Hill for safety. The use of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* to deal with the destructive form of Nature for protection of humans and the domestic animals is admirable. The role of animals is as important as the role of humans in ecology.

Govardhana Hillock is a remarkable Nature image in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* in which Śrī Kṛṣṇa plays his role as a philanthropist by rescuing humans and animal property. In the understanding of Pattanaik: "The story of Indra's defeat most clearly reveals a shift away from the *Vedic* worship of celestial beings to the more popular worship of Nature. Krishna was clearly a pastoral god who gradually became part of later *Puranic Hinduism*, overthrowing old *Vedic* gods" (92). Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is part and parcel to save human beings and other creatures from crisis. As a philanthropist, he solves the complicated problems easily. The help of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to the inhabitants of the Govardhana Hillock is a model to humans how to help others while they are suffering from natural disaster. Thus, in this context, Śrī Kṛṣṇa teaches human beings how to deal with the natural disaster in the world as the circumstances.

### **Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā* in Physical Nature**

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* elucidates the scenario of beautiful world which pleases everyone. The beauty of Nature is a joy for creatures and the text inscribes its utility in the life of human beings and animals. The description of cows,

pasture, river, and forest has the prominent role to stress the significance of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The cows, other animals and plants remain happy listening the sound of the flute of Kṛṣṇa. He becomes the centre figure for both human beings and Nature. Each Nature object is eager to see him when he enters into the forest of Vṛndāvana (Prabhupāda 16). The major Nature images in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* are rivers, oceans, animals, and trees. These images of Nature flourish Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and it becomes the matter of discussion to understand Nature through Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*.

The Yamunā River plays a crucial role to understand Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* begins in the Yamunā River when Nanda Bābā takes him to Gokula from Mathura:

Because of constant rain sent by the demigod Indra, the River Yamunā was filled with deep water, foaming about with fiercely whirling waves. But as the great Indian Ocean had formerly given way to Rāmachandra by allowing Him to construct a bridge, the Yamunā River gave way to Vasudeva and allowed him to cross.<sup>97</sup> (10. 3: 50)

The Yamunā River was in her fearful form because of the flood due to torrential rain at night. Despite the wrath of the river, she gives way to *bāla* Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Fearful form of the Yamunā River becomes calm during the presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It hints the intimacy of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with Nature. Law of Nature is the basis of morality (Locke 3). If one loves Nature, he gets help from her and the person need not face difficulties. Thus, one gets the same reply from Nature as his activities either positively or negatively.

Nature does not create problems to human beings if they love and care her. On the basis of this idea, David L. Haberman further highlights Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in

interrelation to the Yamunā River as a part of Nature. In his words, Yamunā is "depicted as a vibrant world of Nature" (340). The Indians and other pilgrims worship Yamunā River as a component of Nature. There is a famous saying in Vraja Bhūmī: "where there is Yamunā is, there is no death" [*jahā Yamunā, tahā Yamana na*] (Haberman 346). Elaborating this saying, one can highlight the importance of the Yamunā River in the life of human beings.

The Yamunā River is the main setting where Śrī Kṛṣṇa rescues the cowherd community and cows by subduing the kāliya Nāga. Śrī Kṛṣṇa jumps into the water to save life of creatures from the venom of the Nāga. He takes the risk of his life for the rescue of others by jumping into the river:

Kṛṣṇa saw how the Kāliya serpent had polluted the Yamunā River with his terribly powerful poison. Since Kṛṣṇa had descended from the spiritual world specifically to subdue envious demons, the Lord immediately climbed to the top of a very high *kadamba* tree and prepared Himself for battle. He tightened His belt, slapped His arms and then jumped into the poisonous water.<sup>98</sup>

(*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 16: 6)

It shows the preparation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the battle against the serpent to make an ecological balance. The Kālindī pond is one of important sites for Śrī Kṛṣṇa to restore Nature from the poison of Kāliya. In this connection, the role of Kṛṣṇa is admirable in the preservation of Nature.

The Yamunā River is the prime venue for entertaining activities in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In the same river, the *gopīs* come for their water sports: "One day the *gopīs* came to the river bank and putting aside their clothing as they had done before, happily played in the water while singing the glories of Kṛṣṇa "<sup>99</sup> (10. 22: 7). It is against the rituals of the *Hinduism* because to bathe naked is prohibited in the

religion. Neither boys nor girls are permitted to bathe naked. But the *gopīs* violate the social and cultural rules. The river attracts the *gopīs* for water sports and they create fun swimming and bathing there. It shows that the *gopīs* become nearer to Nature than culture.

The *gopīs* have their faith in the wish fulfillment by worshipping the Goddess Kātyāyanī after bathing in the Yamunā River. At this standpoint, Noel Sheth comments: "The herdsmaidens undertake the observance of Kātyāyanī vow for the duration of a month in order to obtain Śrī Kṛṣṇa as their husband" (161). It is clear that the *gopīs* select the river to get fulfilled their wishes. In this context, the role of Nature is the foundation for the completion of human needs. Śukadeva highlights the importance of Yamunā river: "The river's sweet water was more effulgent than brilliant jewels. After Lord Kṛṣṇa had touched it for purification, He drank some from His hand. Then He had the chariot moved near a grove of trees and climbed back on, along with Balarāma"<sup>100</sup> (10. 39: 39). This is the evidence of love of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to river. It is the main source of refreshment and entertainment for him. The purity in the fresh water refers the pure mind of Śrī Kṛṣṇa who does not have antagonism with others. There is identification of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the Yamunā River in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* and it portrays the connection between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Yamunā river.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa regards rivers and oceans as manifested form of god Varuna. The god of water shows respect to him. Śrī Kṛṣṇa goes to the ocean to search the dead son (Punardutt) of his *gurū* Sandipani and addresses the ocean: "Let the son of my *guru* be presented at once- the one you seized here with your mighty waves"<sup>101</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 45: 39). The ocean is personified as a human being so that Śrī Kṛṣṇa addresses the god of the ocean to return the son of his *guru*. But Kṛṣṇa

has his *Yogic* power so he could bring the dead son of his *gurū* back to his house.

Hence, one can see Nature as the base for the solution of humans' problems.

Supporting this idea, C.L. Gośvāmī further states that Śrī Kṛṣṇa has positive attitude for the restoration of his guru's dead son (295). Later, Śrī Kṛṣṇa restores and brings back the son of his *gurū*. In this context, the role of the ocean changes from destruction to creation. It shows Śrī Kṛṣṇa a great hero who could perform impossible works easily.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* presents sufficient evidences to show the connection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* with the Yamunā River. Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna go to the Yamunā River for bathing to make them fresh. The survival of creatures is possible depending on river. In this connection, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* exposes: "After two, Kṛṣṇa bathed there, they drank the river's clear water"<sup>102</sup> (10. 58: 17). Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and the Yamunā River have reciprocal relationship to each other. Nature is in the form of rivers fulfils the demands of the creatures.

The Yamunā River is compared with pure love. B. K. Chaturvedi exposes the importance of the Yamunā River for the inhabitants of Vraja Bhūmī: "The river Yamunā epitomizes for them the purest form of love" (1). The statement suggests that human beings come to know the value of the river as a symbol of love for their life. In the general understanding of most humans, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* deals with the same river in three planetary system. On this ground, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* incorporates:

My dear Lord, You are the symbol of everything auspicious. Your transcendental name and fame is spread like a canopy all over the universe, including the higher, middle and lower planetary systems. The transcendental water that washes Your lotus feet is known in the higher planetary systems as

the Mandakini River, in the lower planetary systems as the Bhogavatī and in this earthly planetary system as the Ganges. This sacred, transcendental water flows throughout the entire universe, purifying wherever it goes.<sup>103</sup> (10. 70: 44)

The aforementioned discussion shows that the same river has different names in the higher, middle and the lower planetary systems. Śrī Kṛṣṇa has blue color as the color of the river and it symbolizes his eternity. Likewise, Śrī Kṛṣṇa has different names such Keshab, Govinda, Bālagopal, Mukunda, Bankebihari and so on.

Like the Yamunā River, the Indian Ocean plays a crucial role in Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. Another thing to remember about the use of the ocean is that after the elopement of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with Rukmiṇī, his plan was to take her to the ocean in the future: "Terrified by the kings, O lovely-borrowed one, We took shelter in the ocean. We have become enemies of powerful men, and We practically abandoned Our royal throne"<sup>104</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 60: 12). Śrī Kṛṣṇa states the utility of Nature during the time of crisis. When the demon kings Jarāsandha and Kālayavana made a plan to attack in Mathurā, Śrī Kṛṣṇa shifted to the inhabitants of Mathurā to Dvārakā to save humans and their property. On this ground, one can highlight when there are difficulties in societies, some human beings go to the world of Nature for relief. It indicates that sometimes we think of taking a shelter in Nature as we realize difficulties to live in our society.

Moral lessons are given to human beings from Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in connection to Nature. In this context, the expression of Christopher Key Chapple and Mary Evelyn Tucker is quotable: "*Śrīmad Bhāgavata kathās* (stories) are the narrative tales of the actions of divine beings from which practical moral lessons are often derived" (513). Every narrative of the text gives at least one moral lesson for human beings. When



society is not suitable for humans, they can take shelter in Nature. For protection from the demon rulers (Kālayamana and Jarāsandha) Śrī Kṛṣṇa builds his palaces in the Indian Ocean and takes the Yadus for settlement in that place. Here, the ocean, a form of Nature guarantees the safety when there was crisis for Yadavas.

When Śrī Kṛṣṇa starts to settle down in Dvārakā, Jarāsandha, king of Maghad blames him: "But I will not fight with You, Kṛṣṇa, for You are a coward, Your strength abandoned You in the midst of battle, and You fled from Your own capital of Mathurā to take shelter in the sea"<sup>105</sup> (10. 72: 31). The citation shows the love of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to the sea and river. The ocean keeps the Yadavas safe from the invaders and Śrī Kṛṣṇa takes his dynasty to the safe place. This incident suggests us to take the shelter in Nature if danger occurs in our lives.

Prabhupāda writes ahead about the plan of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to shift from Mathurā to Dvārakā. Kṛṣṇa explains that Kālayamana and Jarāsandha may kill his relatives so that he takes the dwellers of Mathurā to Dvārakā (229). This discussion establishes the importance of the oceans for human beings from the very ancient time to modern. For Śrī Kṛṣṇa, nothing is impossible because of his *Yogic* power. Śukadeva tells to King Parikṣhīt how Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna take the son of *Gurū* Sandipani back to life from the ocean:

From that region they entered a body of water resplendent with huge waves being churned by a mighty wind. Within that ocean Arjuna saw an amazing palace more radiant than anything he had ever seen before. Its beauty was enhanced by thousands of ornamental pillars bedecked with brilliant gems.<sup>106</sup>  
(*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 89: 52)

The quote states the sea is full of gems. Here is the description of the precious things of Nature in the palace of the ocean. In the process of bringing back, the son of

Sandipani, Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna observe the richness of the ocean. Thus, there is richness inside the seas and oceans. This incident of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* informs us about hidden treasure in the womb of the earth.

Animals are one of the components of Nature, and their preservation is significant in the natural world and such act becomes beneficial for human beings. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses the role of animals as characters. The animals are useful to understand Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and the importance of Nature. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is reared in pasture and is surrounded by calves, cows, bullocks, heifers, and oxen during the time of his childhood. The text begins referring the condition of the personality of *Dharma* in the form of a bull with one leg and the earth in the form of a cow: "The personality of religious principles, *Dharma*, was wandering about in the form of a bull. And he met the personality of earth in the form of a cow who appeared to grieve like a mother who had lost her child. She had tears in her eyes, and the beauty of her body was lost"<sup>107</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 1: 18). The cow is the representative of the earth and the bull symbolizes the moral principle. Nature is defined in the form of a cow and one legged bull at the beginning of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Thus, the condition of these two animals becomes the base of Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. From this evidence, the text encourages human beings to respect animals and preserve them for the continuation of the ecosystem.

Concerning such argument, Prabhupāda comments that "The bull and the cow can be protected for the good of all human society" (917). If these two animals are in danger, there is a question mark in the existence of human civilization. The cow delivers milk whereas the bull has pivotal role in farming so that the *Hindus* worship cows and oxen during the time of *Tihar*. If human beings mistreat to these two animals, there will be no maintenance of moral principles. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata*

*dharma* pleads to preserve animals. Human beings are warned not to create disturbance in Nature. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and cows are related to each other because of the love of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to cows. The cows and calves are always close to Śrī Kṛṣṇa and become happy with him.

After the birth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, it is said Nanda Bābā gives many cows as *dāna* (donation) to the *Brāhmaṇas* to celebrate the occasion. Śukadeva Gośvāmī confirms: "Nanda King gave cows decorated with cloth and jewels, in charity to the *Brāhmaṇas*. He also gave them seven hills of grain, covered with jewels and with cloth decorated with golden embroidery"<sup>108</sup> (10. 5: 3). The animals are pure gift which may bring fortune in the life of a person and there is the trend in the *Hinduism* to provide calves and cows as the gift to *Brāhmaṇas*. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* presents evidences of animals as gift and the description of cows in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a notable event. The carrier of God Śīva is an ox (Nandi) whereas Śrī Kṛṣṇa cannot be separated from cows (Bercik 2). There is important role of animals in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and it inspires us to preserve both Nature and animals.

When Śrī Kṛṣṇa is in the forest of Vṛndāvana, he attracts cows by playing his flute. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* portrays the scenario: "When the cows wander onto the mountain sides and Kṛṣṇa calls out to them with the sound of His flute, the trees and the creepers in the forest respond by becoming so luxuriant with fruits and flowers"<sup>109</sup> (10. 35: 8). The flute of Śrī Kṛṣṇa attracts to the cows and creepers so that the cows follow him. Śrī Kṛṣṇa promotes harmony between plants and animals playing his flute. Music is magic to please *gopīs* and animals due to their attraction to the music of Kṛṣṇa's flute. Human beings should follow *līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to please animals.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa loves animals and makes them as a part of his life. In the context, Michael A. Cremona and Mukunda Goṣvāmī argue for the protection of animals: "Killing animals for food, fur, leather, and cosmetics is one of the most environmentally destructive practices taking place on the earth today" (37). It is the *dharma* (responsibility) of human beings to respect cows and other animals as Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Similarly, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is fond of monkeys and he has a keen interest about them. He distributes *mākhan* and *dahī* (yogurt) to monkeys after stealing from his own houses and the houses from others. The monkeys like to be near him to have *mākhan* and yogurt all the time:

Mother Yaśodā was able to trace Kṛṣṇa by following His butter smeared footprints. She saw that Kṛṣṇa was stealing butter, and thus she smiled. Meanwhile, the crows also entered the room and came out in fear. Thus mother Yaśodā found Kṛṣṇa stealing butter and very anxiously looking here and there.<sup>110</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 9: 8)

It shows that *mākhan* is a favorite edible thing for Kṛṣṇa and to eat the *mākhan* and to give it to birds, animals, and other children is his hobby. It traces that Śrī Kṛṣṇa gives priority to animal products during the time of his childhood.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata dharma* is supporting animals for the conservation of Nature. But Sage Nārada is worried about the interest of humans who kill animals: "Unable to control their senses, rascals who are falsely proud of their riches or their birth in aristocratic families are so cruel to maintain their perishable bodies, which they think will never grow old or die, they kill poor animals without mercy. Sometimes they kill animals merely to enjoy an excursion"<sup>111</sup> (10. 10: 9). The above discussion argues that human beings are slaves of their senses and they feel difficulties to control the pleasure seeking tendency of their senses. To satisfy the

sense of taste, they kill animals without paying attention to their rights. The divine sage argues that people, who belong to the higher class of society, are merciless and kill animals.

It suggests that human beings should understand the feelings of animals to love and care them. In this connection, Brigid Brophy states that animals and humans have same feelings (194). This expression impresses us to defend the helpless creatures of Nature. If everybody loves animals as Śrī Kṛṣṇa, there will be no problems in environment. Description of animals in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* shows interrelation between Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature. Śrī Kṛṣṇa makes a plan to go to the abode of Indra, and makes up his mind to dispatch sixty four elephants as gift. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* describes: "Kṛṣṇa dispatched sixty-four swift white elephants, descendants of Airāvata, who each sported four tusks"<sup>112</sup> (10. 59: 37). Favorite things and animals are given as gift and the gift of the elephants in the *Paurāṇic* period indicates the value of animals in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Dense forest is the inhabitant of elephants. It is clear from the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* that the condition of the natural world was in good in time of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Human beings need to preserve elephants and other wild animals in the natural world.

The animals such as cows, oxen, calves, and monkeys are favorite for Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He pleases them by playing the flute and providing food. Both wild and the domestic animals participate in his *līlā*. Those animals please themselves by listening, watching and eating from him. Due to his love to the animals in forest, the friendship is possible between human beings and animals. Nature is the background for the performance of his *līlā* in the world of animals. Both Nature and animals are defined through the character of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Vṛndāvana is the playground during his childhood and he performs different *līlās* there. For him, the trees are his mates and he remains happy with them. Once, mother Yaśodā ties him in a mortar to control his mischievous activities. During that time, *Bāla* Kṛṣṇa walks with the mortar to remain free from the bondage of his mother. The baby sees the two Yamalārjuna trees and goes to that place. To go to that place is to share his problems with trees because the trees are the sons of Kubera: "While mother Yaśodā was very busy with household affairs, the Supreme Lord, Kṛṣṇa, observed twin trees known as Yamalārjunas, which is a former millennium had been the demigod sons of Kuvera"<sup>113</sup> (10. 9: 22). He shows miracles to identify the Yamalārjuna trees as humans. It points out that Kṛṣṇa sees the trees in the form of humans. Arjuna tree is used "in skin disease, chronic fever. It cures *Prameha*, Gonorrhoea, and free urination" ( Ojha 161). Arjuna trees are useful for medicine.

The psychology of Śrī Kṛṣṇa towards trees is always positive and treats as his mates. The trees are remarkable images of Nature and are very important to expose Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. Śukadeva refers the scenario of trees: "The primeval Lord saw that the stately trees, with their beautiful reddish buds and their heavy burden of fruits and flowers, were bending down to touch His feet with the tips of their branches. Thus He smiled gently and addressed His elder brother"<sup>114</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 15: 4). Śrī Kṛṣṇa is in joking mood with his brother Balarāma and claims that the trees have their queries to bow down with their fruits and flowers. The fruits and flowers are gifts from trees for human beings. No one punishes the contributor of the gift. In the similar vein, one should think that human beings should have the sign of respect to trees for preservation.

The *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses in detail about Vṛndāvana forest where Kṛṣṇa *līlā* took place. There is great role of trees in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Bruce M. Ullivan investigates that "The forest of Vrindavan is the sacred playground of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa " (255). This argument shows keen interest of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the trees of Vṛndāvana. Vṛndāvana represents typically beautiful Nature which pleases animals and birds, and they entertain each other sharing happiness. Perfection of Nature in the dense forest is a source of joy for animals and human beings. Humans, animals, birds, and insects take benefits from natural beauty. In this connection, Śukadeva highlights: "Flowers beautifully decorated the forest of Vṛndāvana, and many varieties of animals and birds filled it with sound. The peacocks and bees song, and the cuckoos and cranes cooed"<sup>115</sup> (10. 18: 7). Among the components of Nature, the role of trees is very significant. If there is the system of conservation of trees, other natural things remain in safe from the environmental threat.

There is direct association of humans with trees for the use of wood, flowers, and fruits in the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Humans go to trees to get flowers, fruits, leaves, and wood. Balarāma highlights the connection of Kṛṣṇa *līlā* with trees. In this regard, Śukadeva highlights: "Balarāma entered the *Tāla* forest first. Then with His two arms He began forcefully shaking the trees with the power of a maddened elephant, causing the *tāla* fruits to fall to the ground"<sup>116</sup> (10. 15: 28). It shows that human beings have their attraction towards trees for the fulfillment of their needs. It is human nature to be attracted by fruits and the psychology of Balarāma is not an exception. He shakes the tree and makes the fruits fall down. One can use trees, fruits, and flowers for one's benefits without harming tree as Balarāma did. In the same way, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is as careful as his brother Balarāma to use trees without

harming them. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* inspires us to use trees with special care. This *Paurāṇic* text is related to love of forest.

The trees of Vṛndāvana have special connection with the Yamunā River.

David L. Haberman remarks that trees are close to the Yamunā River. In this context, he confirms that "beautiful river lined with bountiful forests and fragrant flowers" (344). The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* educates human beings not to be selfish but should work for others for their welfare as Śrī Kṛṣṇa did with trees. Trees become role model for human beings: "Are there no torn clothes lying on the common road? Do trees, which exist for maintaining others, no longer give alms in charity?"<sup>117</sup> (2. 2: 5). Clothes and trees are the outcomes from Nature and human beings use them. The clothes are torn from the excessive use of a person. In the similar vein, trees tolerate heats, cold, and rain not for themselves but for the sake of others. Nature is identified with trees. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* belongs to Nature in the matter of dedication and sacrifice for others. No works of Kṛṣṇa are individual because he is dedicated for the welfare of others.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* also suggests that the trees need rain for their survival. The components of Nature such as rain, trees, and creatures have their mutual relationship to each other. Śukadeva stresses on the point: "The trees had grown thin and dry, but after they drank the newly fallen rainwater through their feet, their various bodily features blossomed"<sup>118</sup> (10. 20: 21). The trees look thin and dry due to the lack of water in dry season and the same trees become green and healthy in rainy season. Swami Ranganathananda suggests other aspect of trees: "bearing all the rigours of wind, rain, heat, dew, etc." (41-42). Nature solves its problems of dry trees and other vegetation according to time and situation. Thus, Nature in the form of trees specifies that human beings should not run hither and thither for food and the solution of other



problems. If we have patience, our problems get resolved in suitable time. Human beings should love Nature and save her from pollution and destruction. Trees can survive without water for some months but humans and other creatures need water every moment so that it is our responsibility to be more sensitive to trees for the sources of rain.

In hot season, trees are used as shelter by Śrī Kṛṣṇa and the utility of a trees is significant for him and the cowherd family. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* amplifies: "When the sun's heat became intense, Kṛṣṇa saw that the trees were acting as umbrellas by shading Him"<sup>119</sup> (10. 22: 30). The utility of trees increases in the summer season so that human beings and other creatures come there for the sake of freshness and relief from the heat. In this connection, the trees such as *Kadamba*, banyan, and *peepal* are useful not only for fruits but also for shelter during hot season. Ranchor Prime connected forest with education system in ancient time as *Gurūkula* where sages taught to their disciples (12). Then, the system of teaching-learning activities established in the world. In this context, it is important to note that Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his cowherd mates use trees as much benefits as possible for them.

A twig Kṛṣṇa used to signal Bhīma how to defeat Jarāsandha. The ruler is undefeatable for others so that Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Bhīma, and Arjuna go to his palace disguising themselves as *Brahmaṇas* for alms but their intention is to defeat him in a duel. Jarāsandha selects Bhīma for the duel as his equal in strength and the fight goes on for twenty eight days. During the time of the duel, Bhīma looks tired and Śrī Kṛṣṇa knows his condition. Śrī Kṛṣṇa indicates Bhīma how to defeat: "Having determined how to kill the enemy, that Lord of infallible vision made a sign to Bhīma by tearing in half a small branch of a tree"<sup>120</sup> (10. 72: 41). Śrī Kṛṣṇa takes twig in his hands and shows gesture to Bhīma by making it into two parts. Ganesh Vasudeo Tagare sums of

the idea "Śrī Kṛṣṇa knew the secret of the birth and death of the enemy" (1711). From the secret sign of Kṛṣṇa, Bhīma kills Jarāsandha by tearing his body into two parts. A tree or a leaf is used as a symbol at present for the performance of *yajna*.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses in detail about *Kadamba* Tree in connection with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It is a large tree with horizontal branches and it grows quickly. S. Percy Lancaster uses the expression "Old Man's Head"(9) to a *Kadamba* tree because the fruits of the tree seem to be like gray head of an old man. The text incorporates *Kadamba* tree and its connection with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He uses a *Kadamba* tree to subdue Kāliya Nāga in the Yamunā River. According to the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*: "Kṛṣṇa climbed up to the top of a very high *Kadamba* tree and prepared Himself for battle" [*Kṛṣṇaḥ kadambam adhiruhya tato 'ti-tuṅgam*] (10. 16: 6). It indicates that the tree symbolizes victory for Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the battle against the fearful serpent. In the tree, he tightens his clothes, belt and flaps his arms as a wrestler. In this connection, Purna Chandra Ojha opines that climbing up the *Kadamba* tree gives courage in the life of Kṛṣṇa (171). The tree helps to be strong psychologically to Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the battle.

In the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa uses *Kadamba* tree to play hide and seek with *gopīs* in Vṛndāvana. As the *gopīs* are taking bath in the river for worshipping the goddess Kātyāyāni, Kṛṣṇa takes their clothes and climbs a *Kadamba* tree. In this context, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* incorporates: "Taking the girls' garments, He quickly climbed to the tree of a *Kadamba*. Then, as He laughed loudly and His companions also laughed loudly and He addressed the girls jokingly"<sup>121</sup> (10. 22: 9). Śrī Kṛṣṇa involves Nature with the *gopīs* using the *Kadamba* tree. Purna Chandra Ojha stresses the value of trees in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. There is an inseparable relation between Kṛṣṇa and *Kadamba* tree and this is the most favourite

tree for him. In his words: "Krishna plays flute under *kadamba* tree to assemble *gopīs* for amorous ring-dance" (170). It is clear that *Kadamba* tree forms the background of *rāsa līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the *gopīs* at night in the forest of Vṛndāvana .

Two things of Nature the Yamunā River and *Kadamba* tree are associated with the *gopīs*. The *Kadamba* causes shame for them but the river hides their nude condition. No one imagines the divine love of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and the *gopīs* without mentioning the *Kadamba* tree. There is association of the same tree for Kṛṣṇa and the *gopīs* for different perspectives. The *Kadamba* tree is the base of joy for Śrī Kṛṣṇa and problem for the *gopīs*. It is one of the remarkable and memorable *līlās* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

*Kadamba* trees become important for *gopīs* during the time of sudden disappearance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from them. They regard the trees as eye-witness about the location of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and move to and fro in the forest at night. In the view of Śukadeva: "O *jambu* O *arka*, O *bilva*, *bakula* and *āmra*, *Okadamba* and *nipa* and all you other plants and trees living by the banks of the Yamunā who have dedicated your very existence to the welfare for others, we *gopīs* have lost our minds, so please tell us where Kṛṣṇa has gone"<sup>122</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 30: 9).

*Kadamba* and other trees such as *jambu*, *arka*, *bilva*, *bakula*, *āmra*, and *nipa* are the reliable witnesses for the *gopīs*. In this connection, *Kadamba* and other trees are personified as humans by the *gopīs* and they have queries to know about Kṛṣṇa regarding the trees as human beings. One can argue that the *gopīs* have special respect to trees. Moving ahead in this line of logic, Purna Chandra Ojha claims: "The tree-*Kadamba* is associated in Sanskrit literature with the monsoons" (172). The repeated use of *Kadamba* trees in the text showss that it is useful for Śrī Kṛṣṇa, *gopīs*, and

other characters. Humans must love and respect to *Kadamba* tree due to its use for furniture, fruits, and other multi-purposes.

To highlight the connection between *Kṛṣṇa līlā* and *Kadamba* trees in the text, it is reliable to refer the value of the tree for sage Kardama. His hermitage is surrounded by *Kadamba* trees. In the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, sage Maitreya narrates the value *Kadamba* and other trees in the decoration of Kailāsa Hill: "Kailāsa Hill is decorated with various kinds of trees such as mango, *kadamba*, *dhūli-kadamba*, *nāga*, *punnāga*, *campaka*, *pātala*, *aśoka*, *bakula*, *kunda* and *kurabaka*. The entire hill is decorated with such trees, which produce flowers with fragrant aroma"<sup>123</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 4. 6: 15). Among other trees, *kadamba* is a major tree in the decoration of Kailāsa Hill. In his analysis, Pushpendra Kumar investigates that *kadamba* trees promote the beauty of the hill (276). There is close connection between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and sage Kardama due to their love and care to *kadamba* trees. Both of them live in the places where there are majorities of *kadamba* trees.

In the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, a *kadamba* tree has a prominent role in Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. Using *kadamba* trees; Śrī Kṛṣṇa performs his *līlās* to save the life of others and to have entertainment with the *gopīs*. The *gopīs* regard the *kadamba* trees as the symbol of their relation with Kṛṣṇa. The tree has its association in Sanskrit literature with the monsoons. "It is said to bloom only when it hears the roar of thunderclouds" (Ojha 172). If human beings have their craze to save *kadamba* and other evergreen trees as Śrī Kṛṣṇa, it will be easy to control the environmental hazards. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a model for humans to love *kadamba* and other trees.

Like *kadamba* tree, *Pārijāta* is also connected with Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. *Mandāra* and *Kalpavṛkṣa* are its other names and those names are simultaneously referred in the text. Śukadeva confirms the origin of

the *Pārijāta* as follows: "Generated next was the *Pārijāta* flower, which decorates the celestial planets"<sup>124</sup> (8. 8: 6). The above mentioned example confirms that the beginning of the *Pārijāta* flower is from the churning of the ocean between *devas* and *dānavas*. Ganesh Vasudeo Tagare discusses: "*Pārijāta* is the ornament of the heavenly region, - a tree capable of confirming eternally all the objects desired by the supplicants" (1038). It is the flower from *devaloka* on the earth. *Pārijāta* is a special flower which had been expected to remain only in the heaven but not on the earth.

It is interesting to refer the history of this tree from the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Śukadeva informs King Parīkṣhit that Nārada has brought some *Pārijāta* flowers from the heaven to Dvārakā. But the sage forgets to give Satyabhāmā, the most stubborn wife of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. She insists Śrī Kṛṣṇa to have a *Pārijāta* plant in front of her palace. To please his wife, he goes to the heaven to get the plant but Indra, the king of gods, denies. Śukadeva further clarifies the matter: "At Satyabhāmā behest the Lord uprooted the heavenly *Pārijāta* tree and put it on the back of Garuḍa. After defeating Indra and all the other demigods, Kṛṣṇa brought the *Pārijāta* to His capital"<sup>125</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 59: 39). There was an effort of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to bring the *Pārijāta* tree from the heaven to the earth and planted the tree near the palace of Satyabhāmā. He does not only convince Indra and other demigods but also fights with them for the sake of this rare flower. Purna Chandra Joshi explains: "*Rat-ki-Rani*, the Queen of the night because its flowers usually open in the evening emitting a most pleasant and strong scent during the whole night and corolla fall off at the break of day" (176). We must do hard works for the collection of different trees and flowers for decoration of the premises of our houses. Thus, no one can separate Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* from *Pārijāta* trees in *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

Śukadeva refers the use of *Pārijāta* trees in Trikūta Mountain which spread perfume at night. In his words: "In the Ṛtumat garden of Trikūta Mountain, there were *mandāras, pārijāta, pātalas, aśokac, ampakas*" [*mandāraiḥ Pārijātaiśca/ pātalāśka-campakaiḥ*] (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 8. 2: 10). The *pārijāta* flower is famous for fragrance in Ṛtumat Garden of Trikūta Mountain. It shows how an important flower influences the whole garden from its fragrance at night. In this relation, the role of *pārijāta* tree is deeply connected with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The analogy between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and *pārijāta* is effective. The reality is that *pārijāta* impresses others only at night because of fragrance but Śrī Kṛṣṇa remains the centre of attention all time. In this connection, Swāmī Ranganathanda refers the view of Śrī Kṛṣṇa that "the branches of *pārijāta* and other trees are like an umbrella" (41). The branches of the *pārijāta* are useful in sunny and rainy time for creatures.

When Śrī Kṛṣṇa is with *gopīs* on the bank of the Yamunā River, they are impressed from the fragrance of *mandāra (pārijāta)* flowers. The flowers become meaningful due to the presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* highlights importance of *mandāra* flower for them: "Kṛṣṇa repaired with *gopīs* to the sandy bed of the Yamunā where swarms of black bees were attracted by the gentle breeze charged with the fragrance of fully blossomed jasmine and *mandāras*"<sup>126</sup> (10. 32: 11). The union of *gopīs* with their favourite Śrī Kṛṣṇa becomes meaningful due to the venue of *pārijāta* flowers. The beauty of flower promotes their love. In this context, *pārijāta* becomes the base for the perfection of *gopīs'* love to Kṛṣṇa. Sārātha Darśinī argues that "The breeze along the Yamunā's bank was fragrant with blossoming *kunda* and *mandāra* flowers" (847). Thus, *pārijāta* is a useful tree to be positive for human beings to environment.

It is clear that the *pārijāta* was obtained by Indra during the time of churning of the ocean (Tshirasāgara) and plants the tree in the heaven. But Śrī Kṛṣṇa brings the fragrant flower from the heaven to Dvarākā to please to his beloved wife Satyabhāma. Satyabhāma is instrumental for *pārijāta* on the earth. Due to her stubborn behavior, we have obtained the *pārijāta* flower on the earth from the heaven. The *pārijāta* flowers introduced the *gopīs* towards Kṛṣṇa during the time of *Rāsa Līlā*. The fragrance of the trees castigate the *gopīs* towards Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The presence of *pārijāta* trees makes the environment different. Like *kadamba* trees, the *pārijāta* trees highlight the connection between Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* inscribes the confluence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with other trees and this connection highlights the interrelation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with Nature. Śukadeva points welfare act of trees for creatures:

Kṛṣṇa said: O Stoka Kṛṣṇa and Amśu, O Śrīdāmā, Subala and Arjuna. O Vṛṣabha, Ojasvī, Devaprastha and Varūthapa, just see these greatly fortunate trees, whose lives are completely dedicated to the benefit of others. Even while tolerating the wind, rain, heat and snow, they protect us from these elements.<sup>127</sup> (10. 22: 31-32)

The aforementioned expression confirms that Śrī Kṛṣṇa stresses the importance of trees for others. In this context, his awareness of Nature is quite evident.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* identifies the role of *aśoka* trees in the promotion of natural beauty. The trees draw attention of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his cowherd mates. Everybody likes garden because of the beauty of *aśoka* trees: "Along the river Yamunā, within a garden decorated with buds of *aśoka* trees, they caught sight of Him strolling along in the company of the cowherd boys and His elder brother,

Balarāma<sup>128</sup> (10. 23: 21). The noticeable aspect of this text is the description of forest, full of *aśoka* trees. The trees beautify the scene of Nature. In this regard, Basanta Bidari argues that an *aśoka* tree symbolizes *Kāmdeva* (1). Śrī Kṛṣṇa has better qualities than *Kāmdeva* for attracting others so there is connection of *aśoka* tree with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Thus, this tree has its value to highlight the importance of Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and its connection to Nature.

Human beings use trees for shelter and other purposes. In this sense, the trees are used as the supporter to comfort the life of humans and other creatures. Vṛṣṇis had the same trend in *Dvāpara Yuga* during the time of Śrī Kṛṣṇa: "With the permission of Lord Kṛṣṇa, their sole object of worship, the *Vṛṣṇis* ate breakfast and sat their leisure beneath trees that gave cooling shade"<sup>129</sup> (*Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 82:11). It is true that *Vṛṣṇis*, the dynasty of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are fond of trees like Kṛṣṇa and they have their confirmation about the use of trees in their lives. They use trees for taking rest after their breakfast (C.L. Goswāmī 461). Without cutting down the trees, they had trend to use them as shelter.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa pleases the Vṛndāvana dwellers during the time of his childhood. When Śrī Kṛṣṇa plays the flute, trees behave like humans from the effect of music. In this context, the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses: "The *gopīs* sang His praises, that leader of hundreds of women sang loudly in reply. He moved among them, wearing His *Vaijyantī* garland, beautifying the Vṛndāvana forest"<sup>130</sup> (10. 29: 44). The *Vaijyantī* garland of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the representation of Nature and the garland which is round the neck of Kṛṣṇa symbolizes the beauty of forest. In this relation, Ganesh Vasudeo Tagare exposes: " Kṛṣṇa wandered over the forest" (1442). Śrī Kṛṣṇa has special interest to the trees of Vṛndāvana.



There is description of trees in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He never thinks of the destruction of trees but rather regards them as his playmates. He sits down the shades of trees, climbs up them, and plays his flute to please both plants and animals. Nowhere in *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, we get the scenario of deforestation and Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* teaches human beings to show the sign of love to trees. Thus, the objects of Nature such as rivers, animals, trees, and the Indian Oceans promote Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in interrelation to Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

### **Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā* in Transcendental Nature**

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* presents the scenario of the transcendental world through Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. His *līlā* educates human beings for the conservation of Nature. In the transcendental world, there is the manifestation of Nature of god which is beyond the laws of Nature (Bernet 1). A modern reader comes to know that transcendental world differentiates from the physical world in relation to Nature. The description of the transcendental world is free from pollution and it instructs humans to make this physical world as fresh and healthy as the transcendental world. The text outlines the scenario of transcendental world as follows: "The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* gives an elaborate description of the earth's continents, regions, oceans, mountains and rivers. Also described are the arrangement of the celestial sphere and the conditions found in the subterranean regions and in hell"<sup>131</sup> (12. 12: 16). Prabhupāda elucidates that the natural things of transcendental world resembles to the Nature of this globe (358). The inclusion of the scenario of the transcendental world instructs us to love Nature of both physical and transcendental worlds. The faith of transcendental world motivates human beings to be sensitive about the present condition of Nature.

Nature of the transcendental world inculcates human beings to epitomize the environment as the picture of transcendental world. Sage Sūta informs sage Saunakādī in the *yajna* of Naimisāranya forest about the scenario of Nature for the identification of the transcendental world: "The rivers, oceans, mountains, forests, creepers and active beings, in every season, paid their tax quota to the King in profusion"<sup>132</sup> (1. 10: 5). On this ground, a reader realizes that a king collects taxes from his subjects and spends the same money in the development of the country. Later, the citizens get benefits from their taxes in the name of development. Rivers and seas regard trees and creepers as their monarch and they spread rain in the same forest (Kumar 35). The sun consumes the water of the earth and the same water is transformed into rain after some months and the creatures and plants get benefits from it. Similarly, rulers need to spend taxes having collected from the citizens for development.

Nature is the background for the performance of diverse activities of human beings and other creatures. Sage Dattātreya provides the ground about useful works of Nature for all creatures:

Just as the sun evaporates large quantities of water by its potent rays and later returns the water to the earth in the form of rain. Similarly, a saintly person accepts all types of material objects with his material senses, and at the appropriate time, when the proper person has approached him to request them, he returns such material objects. Thus, both in accepting and giving the objects of the senses, he is not entangled.<sup>133</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 11. 7: 50)

This discussion concentrates on the social activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa who appears as a saintly person for human beings. In the matter of goodness for others, he is compared

to the sun because both the sun and Śrī Kṛṣṇa do not discriminate between plants and animals. The sun is the main component of Nature so that the works of Nature are going on. Tagare further explores that a *yogi* is as the sun because he either "enjoys the objects of senses or rejects according to the time" (1944). In the similar vein, Śrī Kṛṣṇa helps others without taking advantages of the situation and proves himself different from other characters. When they are in need of his help, he helps and saves them from crisis. This imaginings of Nature identify Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the first Nature lover of the world.

Transcendentalists believe in the spiritual world and realize that this world is better than the physical world. They neglect this material world arguing that the transcendental world is the world of *paramātmā* (divine being): "Generally the transcendentalists, even though engaged by others in dualities of the material world, are not distressed. Nor do they take pleasure in worldly things, for they are transcendently engaged"<sup>134</sup> (1. 13: 50). The transcendentalists are beyond the three modes (id, ego and super ego) of nature and they like to be detached from the material world. On the basis of this interrelation, C.L. Gośvāmī ventures to state that the transcendental world is the model for this physical world (54). Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* makes a balance between these two worlds and he performs his activities in the area of Sumeru and Citrakūta Mountains. But readers have contradictory beliefs in this idea so that they neglect the existence of the transcendental Nature. The fact is that transcendental world teaches human beings how to make harmony with Nature.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* deals with the transcendental world and it shows that the physical world is the cause of suffering. The lack of knowledge of the transcendental world has caused deterioration of Nature on the earth. In Śukadeva's words: "Who else but the gross materialists will neglect such transcendental thought and take to the

nonpermanent names only, seeing the mass of people fallen in the river of suffering as the consequence of accruing the result of their own work?"<sup>135</sup> (2. 2: 7). This concept about Nature opposes the present perspective regarding the regression of the material world. In this connection, Pushpendra Kumar investigates that a human is "in repentance in consequence of his vicious deeds" (81). When there is the excessive destruction of Nature, regression is its consequences. Thus, everybody should think that there is the identity of the divine being in Nature. Belief in the transcendental world is useful for the enhancement of the physical Nature. The certainty is that the transcendentalists never think to destroy the environment of this world. They have keen interest on making the Nature of the earth as fresh as the Nature of the transcendental world.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses on the value of the Ganges as a transcendental river because of her origin from the lotus feet of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The celestial river is identified with the transcendental value of the spiritual world. Basing his argument on such idea, sage Maitreya portrays to Vidura:

The sages came from the highest planets down to the lower region through the water of the Ganges, and therefore the hair on their heads was wet. They touched the lotus feet of the Lord, which are worshipped with various paraphernalia by the daughters of the serpent-king when they desired good husbands.<sup>136</sup> (3. 8: 5)

It shows that the Ganges flows from the transcendental world to the material world. Its name in the heaven is Mandākinī; it is Gangā on the earth and Bhogvati in the underworld (Prabhupāda 346). The sages visit to different places by taking advantages of this river and purify them by dipping into its water. Thus, the transcendental belief in Nature becomes the base for preservation of the environment.

The argument about the Ganges turns out to be valid as a transcendental river. Vedavyāsa further argues to clarify his points: "After purifying the seven planets near Dhruvaloka, the Gange's water is carried through the space ways of the demigods in billions of celestial airplanes. Then it inundates the moon and finally reaches Lord Brahmā's abode atop Mount Meru"<sup>137</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 5. 17: 4). This idea claims that the water of the Ganges originates from the Casual Ocean and then it turns to the moon and the Sumeru- *Parvata* (mountain). In this context, the author does not discuss the Ganges of India but the Ganges of the transcendental world. It shows how Nature works in the transcendental world in the form of river. In this connection, Ralph Waldo Emerson is apt to state: "Transcendentalists were experimentalists in the commodity of life itself" (qtd. in Singh 166). This standpoint identifies that the scenario of the transcendental Nature reveals the condition of environment and warns human beings to be careful from environmental crisis.

Miraculous origin of the Ganges River draws the attention of pilgrims in India. Bhagīratha is apt to state: "Because of mother Ganges emanates from the lotus toe of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Anantadeva, she is able to liberate one from material bondage. Therefore whatever is described herewith about her is not at all wonderful"<sup>138</sup> (9. 9: 14). Bhagīratha is supposed to have brought the Ganges from the transcendental world to the earth. In the similar vein, Lance E. Nelson confirms: "The origin of those rivers are said to have their sources in the heaven. They have been brought to the earth to bless human beings" (231). This unaddressed concern about the origin of the Ganges becomes the matter of debate among the modern academicians. Even though it is believed that anyone who bathes in the Ganges becomes healthy due to the mixing of herbs in water. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* and other *Vedic sāstras* (scriptures) recommend human beings to bathe

in the Ganges due to her transcendental value. The description of this river in the text evokes human beings to treat rivers as a basis of transcendentalism. Thus, the Ganges is related to Śrī Kṛṣṇa in interrelation to its transcendental Nature.

Akrūra, a messenger of Kāṁsa, praises Śrī Kṛṣṇa as he refers the Ganges as a transcendental river in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*: "The water of the river Ganges has purified the three worlds, having become transcendental by bathing Your feet. Lord Śiva accepted that water on his head and by that water's grace the sons of king Sāgara attained to heaven"<sup>139</sup> (10. 41: 15). The mythical proof of the Ganges as a transcendental river motivates human beings to respect her for transcendentalism. In this regard, David Kinsley further proves the validity of the Ganges as a transcendental river and its connection to Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*: "The river then spread the divine potency of these gods into the world when she flowed onto the earthly plane. A dip in her sacred waters purifies devotees of sin and physically connects them with a transcendent, heavenly sphere" (232). Śrī Kṛṣṇa has association with the Ganges so that this river is useful to use Nature in the name of transcendentalism.

There is the description of Nature of Vaikuṅṭha in the text and this transcendental picture of the natural world is an ideal scenario for humans. The description of the scenario of the transcendental world motivates them how to make this world naturally beautiful as Vaikuṅṭha. In the view of the writer: "In those Vaikuṅṭha planets there are many forests which are very auspicious. In those forests the trees are desire trees, and in all seasons they are filled with flowers and fruits because everything in the Vaikuṅṭha planet is spiritual and personal"<sup>140</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 3. 15: 16). In the material world, the trees usually produce flowers and fruits in the particular season as the order of the material energy. But the

trees in Vaikuṅṭha have fruits and flowers as desires of the celestial people. In this line of thought Prabhupāda argues that the transcendental Nature is superior to the Nature of this world (2). Human beings do not have their faith about the existence of Vaikuṅṭha and Goloka *dhāma* even though they have remarkable images of Nature of the transcendental world in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The ecological balance of the transcendental world is useful to motivate people to preserve Nature from deterioration.

The birth of bad humans causes problems in Nature and the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses the birth of the two demons Hiranyāksha and Hiranyakasipu. Maitreya remarks the effects of these two demons: "On the birth of the two demons there were many natural disturbances, all very fearful and wonderful, in the heavenly planets, the earthly planets and in between them"<sup>141</sup> (3. 17: 3). Their birth brings earthquake and after the birth, they uproot gigantic trees. There is a drastic change in the physical and the spiritual worlds. In this regard, Pushpendra Kumar Confirms: "When they were born innumerable portents occurred in heaven and on earth" (189). It points out that human beings who have demonic activities, causes impediments in Nature. The humans who have their intention to destroy Nature symbolise Hiranyāksha and Hiranyakasipu. When there is the birth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, there is harmony in Nature. The naturalists must play the role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to save Nature from demonlike humans. Of course, the demons are within humans so that they do not become sensitive about the importance of Nature for all creatures.

We find the description of rivers of the transcendental world and the demigods please themselves from beauty and freshness of water. The writer formulates the scene as follows: "They also saw the two rivers named Nandā and Alakanandā. These two rivers are sanctified by the dust of the lotus feet of the Supreme Personality of

Godhead, Govinda"<sup>142</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 4. 6: 24). The lotus feet of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are the origin of the two rivers: Nandā and Alakanandā. Both the rivers are the identification of the transcendental world and Śrī Kṛṣṇa has his direct association with them. Here, the role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa changes from a hero to the divine being and these two rivers are purified from the association of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. With the similar beliefs, David Kinsley explores that "There are well-known myths concerning the origin of these rivers, which are said to have their sources in heaven and to have been brought to earth to bless humankind in some way" (231). The transcendental rivers Nandā and Alakanandā are Yamunā River in the physical form. At present, human beings can control the pollution in rivers regarding them with their transcendental meanings.

Humans are unable to control their senses so that there is destruction of Nature. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is aware of destruction of Nature in transcendental world. Due to the negligence about the existence of the transcendental world, humans destroy Nature. Śūkadeva compares human senses with plunderers:

In the forest of material existence, the uncontrolled senses are like plunderers. The conditioned soul may earn some money for the advancement of Kṛṣṇa consciousness, but unfortunately the uncontrolled senses plunder his money through sense gratification. The senses are plunderers because they make one spend his money unnecessarily for seeing, smelling, tasting, touching, hearing, desiring and willing. In this way the conditioned soul is obliged to gratify his senses, and thus all his money is spent. This money is actually acquired for the execution of religious principles, but it is taken away by the plundering senses.<sup>143</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 5. 14: 2)

Śūkadeva indicates that money is the root of many evils and it leads to the satisfaction of senses and the destruction of Nature. But the sages of the very ancient



time realized the divine form in Nature. Devadutt Pattanaik posits: "The *rishis* went about exploring nature, appreciating humanity and discovering divinity" (xiv). From the above discussion, it is ascertained that human beings have intention to fulfil the demands of their senses and they forget the transcendental principles.

Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is against the massacre of animals and destruction of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. He does not kill animals and is against the untimely death of animals. Śukadeva gives further insight to discourage animal killers by referring fearful consequences of killing animals in the transcendental world:

For the maintenance of their bodies and the satisfaction of their tongues, cruel persons cook poor animals and birds alive. Such persons are condemned even by man-eaters. In their next lives they are carried by the *Yamadūtas* to the hell known as Kumbhīpāka, where they are cooked in boiling oil.<sup>144</sup> (5. 26: 13)

If humans are encouraged to have faith about the transcendental world, it may be one of the means to preserve animals. To forward this idea, Ramesh Menon argues:

"Those that look beyond the appearance of this *sthula rupa* find *bhakti* and the Lord's grace and are liberated from the material universe" (318). We should be aware that by animal killing and destroying of forest this world will be transformed into the hell in future because of irresponsibility of human beings.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* further focuses against the death of animals for the continuation of ecosystem in Nature. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is against the sacrifice of animals to offer in the name of God and Goddesses:

A person fully aware of religious principles should never offer anything like meat, eggs or fish in the *śrāddha* ceremony, and even if one is a Kṣtriya, he himself should not eat such things. When suitable food prepared with ghee, it is offered to saintly persons, the function is pleasing to the forefathers and the

Supreme Lord, who are never pleased when animals are killed in the name of sacrifice.<sup>145</sup> (7. 15: 7)

The text discourages humans to sacrifice animals in the name of demigods and goddesses. If it is used practically, it controls the death of animals and the problems in Nature are unlikely to occur. From the perspective of transcendentalism, Prabhupāda exposes: "If one does not begin cultivating transcendental knowledge, then one's life is very risky" (5). It is ascertained that transcendental knowledge is necessary to save Nature from its risks. This argument points out that there are risks in Nature after killing animals. Disputing this notion, human beings kill animals in the name of sacrifice for goddesses in temples. From the death of animals, it affects the ecosystem of Nature. The transcendental world denies the death of animals and encourages men to offer other things such as flowers and fruits to their demigods and goddesses except animals.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a form of Viṣṇu who disguises himself as a dwarf Brahmin i.e. Bāman and the King Balī realizes Nature under his control. The king is apt to state: "As far as the sun and the moon shine with the stars and as far as the clouds pour rain, all the land throughout the universe is in your possession"<sup>146</sup> (8. 21: 30). On the basis of this idea, one can believe that the planets and stars belong to Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In this connection, Joseph Campbell incorporates his idea that "after long period of obscurity, his true character is revealed" (304). This expression defends the heroic activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in connection to Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The transcendental concept is practically useful for creating awareness about Nature. If one sees the interrelation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature, there are the possibilities for the solution of the environmental problems.

Vṛndāvana Forest, Govardhana Hill, and the Yamunā River have transcendental meanings so that the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* refers to those places as the model of natural beauty. On the base of this idea, Sukadeva points out to King Parīkṣhit: "O King Parīkṣhit, when Rāma and Śrī Kṛṣṇa saw Vṛndāvana , Govardhana and the banks of the River Yamunā, They both enjoyed great pleasure"<sup>147</sup> (10. 11: 36). From this standpoint; one can argue that Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his brother Balarāma realize the importance of Nature in the area of Vraja *Bhumi*. Michael Cremo and Mukunda Goswāmi have different interpretation of the same subject. They claim that "man is on the verge of self-destruction"(46). With this conditioning, human beings are warned not to create problems in Nature. They need to make friendship with the natural things for happiness as the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in interrelation to Nature. It motivates human beings to remain happy in Nature without discrimination between plants and animals. Present civilized world provides facilities but not mental peace so that it is necessary to make friendship with Nature for the establishment of peace and bliss. Freshness in Nature gives freshness in the mind of humans. Thus, Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is a notable example to be happy and to have peaceful life from the preservation of Nature.

The description of Kālīndī lake has transcendental meaning in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The text inspires human beings to have bath in the lake: "If one bathes in this place of My pastimes and offers the water of this lake to the demigods and other worshipable personalities, or if one observes a fast and duly worships and remembers Me, he is sure to become free from all sinful reactions"<sup>148</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 16: 62). The lake Kālīndī has its transcendental meaning for the motivation of the *Hindu* pilgrims to visit there. The role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is divine after his subduing the Kālīya serpent in the lake. In this venue, Kālīndī is

popular for *Hindu* pilgrims and they go there to observe the scenario. In this regard, David L. Haberman formulates the role of Nature in interrelation to Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā*. He further explores and explains that "contemporary Kṛṣṇa theologians engaged in environmental reflection"] (344). At this point, modern readers opine that theologians of Śrī Kṛṣṇa have their contribution for the preservation of ecology. For the purification of soul, the *Hindu* pilgrims go to the Kāliṅdī Lake. Thus, there is interrelationship between Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature in connection to Kāliṅdī Lake.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* deals with the transcendental condition of Nature and one feels difficulties to separate between Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature. The text manifests the components of Nature such as air, water, land, and plants as the forms of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Evidently, Śrī Kṛṣṇa postulates to his father Vasudeva: "The elements of ether, air, fire, water, and earth become visible, invisible, minute or extensive as they manifest in various objects. Similarly, the *Paramātmā*, though one, appears to become many"<sup>149</sup> (10. 85: 25). This verse presents sufficient evidences of transcendental Nature from the expression of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa has miraculous qualities and activities so that he is different mythical hero from others. In this relation, Noel sheth analyses " Kṛṣṇa from rowdy hero to sublime godhead by isolating a variety of events in Kṛṣṇa's life" (qtd. in Mahoty 56). It shows that the role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa changes according to the demand of time. Nature is one but it appears in the various forms like land, plants, and rivers. The emanation of transcendental Nature is possible in his appearance. It suggests human beings to respect transcendental Nature as Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa has his presence in the natural things such as the sun, fire, and cows. Basing the argument on such idea, Kṛṣṇa clarifies the matter to Uddhava: "One may worship Me within the sun and fire and one may worship Me among the *brāhmaṇas* by respectfully receiving them as guests, even when invented. I can be worshipped

within the cows by offering of grass and other suitable grains"<sup>150</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 11. 11: 43). This argument turns out to be valid when humans have their trend to see flora, fauna, and other things of Nature in relationship with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa consciousness is necessary everywhere. Mc Comas Taylor stresses on " Kṛṣṇa consciousness" (276) for the relation of human beings to animals and plants. The faith of the transcendental Nature motivates humans to love animals and other natural things. This argument warns human beings not to destroy the natural world regarding it as the form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

With all these logical descriptions about the transcendental world of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, naturalists, readers, and the scholars conclude that the transcendental world includes the remarkable images of Nature and its connection to Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* with its awareness. The activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are related to the transcendental world which inspire human beings for the restoration of Nature. Thus, the picture of the transcendental world shows us for the conservation of Nature from the system of afforestation.

### **Nature in the *Virāta* Form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa**

Sage Maitreya discloses Nature in the *Virātarūpa* ((universal form) of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to Vidura. The things of Nature resemble to the particular parts of the *Virāta Purūsa*'s body. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* inscribes the role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in his *virāta rūpa* to connect him to Nature. He shows his *Vishvarūpa* according to time and situation to make people conscious about him. This *rūpa* has innumerable faces, mouths, arms, and eyes. From this *rūpa*, the sage claims that all creatures are parts of his gigantic *rūpa*: "The gigantic *Virāta-puruṣa*, known as Hiraṇmaya, lived for one thousand celestial years on the water of the universe, and all the living entities lay with Him"<sup>151</sup> (3. 6: 6). In the *virāta rūpa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, one realizes the condition of

Nature in three forms: *Kāraṇodakaśāyī* Viṣṇu, *Garbhodakaśāyī* Viṣṇu, and the *Kṣīrodakaśāyī* Viṣṇu. These three forms of Viṣṇu are the manifestation of *Śrī Kṛṣṇa*. *Śrī Kṛṣṇa* myth confirms that *Kāraṇodakaśāyī* Viṣṇu generates innumerable universes from his skin holes and the *Garbhodakaśāyī* Viṣṇu enters into the every universe. There is the form of *Śrī Kṛṣṇa* in all creatures and this form of *Śrī Kṛṣṇa* is *Kṣīrodakaśāyī* Viṣṇu (Prabhupada 142). This principle claims that *Śrī Kṛṣṇa* is the form and substance of Nature so that one can realize the interrelationship between *Kṛṣṇa līlā* and Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

*Śrī Kṛṣṇa* myth clarifies that *Kāraṇodakaśāyī* Viṣṇu creates the innumerable worlds. In this sense, *Kṛṣṇa* is the base of Nature in his *virāta* form which is noted by sage *Śūta*:

In the beginning of the creation, the Lord first expanded Himself in the universal form of the *puruṣa* incarnation and manifested all the ingredients for the material creation. And thus at first there was the creation of the sixteen principles of material action. This was for the purpose of creating the material universe.<sup>152</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 1. 3: 1)

*Śrī Kṛṣṇa* changes his activities from human to divine based on Nature. The universal form of *Kṛṣṇa* provides the ground for the interpretation on Nature. In this regard, *Jīva Goṣvāmī* puts this idea in an authentic version: "The parts of the body are explained to be planets" (9). This dealing is based on the idea of the *virāta rūpa* of *Śrī Kṛṣṇa*. This form of *Śrī Kṛṣṇa* is huge for the solution of problems during the time of crisis. One can claim that there is no completion about the discussion of Nature in the absence of *Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā*.

In the *virāta rūpa* (universal form) of *Śrī Kṛṣṇa*, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* mentions the five elements (earth, water, fire, air, and sky) and those

elements become the material body of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In this line of logic, King Nimī exposes: "When Kṛṣṇa created His universal body out of the five elements produced from Himself and then entered within that universal body by His own plenary portion, He thus became known as *Puruṣa*"<sup>153</sup> (11. 4: 3). The consciousness of the *virātapuruṣa* manifests under the modes of material Nature. The physical Nature is the basis for his entertainment. Benjamin Preciado Solis is correct when he opines that cosmic manifestation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is his potency (124). It is apt to state that the *virāta rūpa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa includes the elements of Nature.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa manifests his *virāta rūpa* to give lessons to the less intelligent human beings for making them aware of Nature. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* describes fourteen planetary systems including seven upward planetary systems (*Bhūr, Bhuvar, Svar, Mahar, Janas, Tapas, and Satya*) and seven downward planetary systems (*Atala, Vitala, Sutala, Tālatala, Mahātala, Rasātala, and Pātāla*). In the words of Śūkadeva Goṣvāmī : " Persons who have realized it have studied that the planets known as *Pātāla* constitute the bottoms of the feet of the universal Lord, and the heels and the toes are the *Rasātala* planets. The ankles are the *Mahātala* planets, and His shanks constitute the *Tālatala* planets"<sup>154</sup> (2. 1: 26). From the above discussion, one can argue that the manifestation of the material and the transcendental world is the universal form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It shows that Kṛṣṇa incorporates the fourteen planets in different parts of his body. These downward planetary systems indicate the organs of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from his feet to thigh respectively. In this regard, G. Naganathan analyses: "The divine manifestation is a *līlā*, a sport, playing or dalliance" (30). Thus, the creation of the fourteen planets portrays the extended universal form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. If one regards the planetary systems as the organs of his *virāta rūpa*, he can not imagine

for the destruction of Nature. It suggests human beings to respect the earth and other natural things regarding them as the universal form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

The *virāta rūpa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa denotes the upward planetary system in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Śūkadeva concentrates on the relation of the body organs of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to the upper planetary system as follows:

The chest of the Original Personality of the gigantic form is the luminary planetary system, His neck is the *Mahar* planets, His mouth is the *Janas* planets, and His forehead is the *Tapas* planetary system. The topmost planetary system, known as *Satyaloka*, is the head of Him who has one thousand heads.<sup>155</sup> (2. 1: 28)

All these parts of the *virāta rūpa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa refer to the upper planetary systems.

There is transcendental Nature in those upper planetary systems and it suggests importance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa not only for the preservation of Nature but also for its origin.

In this connection, C. L. Goswāmī clarifies that *Tapaloka*, *Janaloka*, *Maharloka*, and *Satyaloka* are the *paurāṇic* planetary system (80). Human beings must understand that Śrī Kṛṣṇa incorporates both physical and the transcendental worlds in his *virāta rūpa*. Due to the connection of both physical and the transcendental worlds, he surpasses to other mythical heroes in relation to Nature.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses the objects of Nature as the body parts of the *virāta rūpa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. To extend the idea of Nature, Śūkadeva argues:

Modesty is the upper portion of His lips, hankering is His chin, religion is the breast of the Lord, and irreligion is His back. Brahmāji, who generates all living beings in the material world, is His genitals, and the Mitra- varuṇas are



His two testicles. The ocean is His waist, and the hills and mountains are the stacks of His bones.<sup>156</sup> (2. 1: 32)

These evidences prove that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is complete in everything and his body organs represent Nature. In this relation, Pushpendra Kumar argues: "the ocean is His belly and mountains are His banes"(79). It shows the supremacy of the universal form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Brahmāji, the creator of this world is in the *virāta rūpa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Humans should respect Nature as a part of the universal form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Rivers and trees are the main components of Nature and it is the *dharma* of human beings to conserve them. The *virāta rūpa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa reveals the natural things in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*: "The rivers are the veins of the gigantic body, the trees are the hairs of His body, and the omnipotent air is His breath. The passing ages are His movements, and His activities are the reactions of the three modes of material nature"<sup>157</sup> (2. 1: 33). Because of the things of Nature in the *virāta rūpa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, one can claim that Kṛṣṇa loves natural things as his organs of body. Destruction of Nature affects the gigantic body of Śrī Kṛṣṇa so that humans should love and care Nature for the benefits of all. In this line of thought, Campbell provides the ground for the interpretation of his ideas. He expresses that "the Word Navel is the symbol of the continuous creation" (38). Elaborating this argument, humans can evaluate that there is analogy of Nature to the universal appearance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. If human beings regard trees as the universal form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, they will hesitate cutting down trees.

To corroborate this notion, Brahmāji further explains the *virāta rūpa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in relation to Nature:

The hairs on His body are the cause of all vegetation, particularly of those trees which are required as ingredients for sacrifice. The hairs on His head and

face are reservoirs for the clouds, and His nails are the breeding ground of electricity, stones and iron ores.<sup>158</sup> (2. 6: 5)

There is no separation between the universal form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Nature. The hair of the *virāta puruṣa* represents clouds for the possibility of rain. In Tagare's understanding, "while his hair, beard, and nails produce rocks, iron, clouds, and lightning" (182), it proves that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is not only the preserver of Nature but also the creator.

The *virāta rūpa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is no more than the embodiment of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Śrī Kṛṣṇa compares similarities between his lotus feet and the Ganges in the matter of purity:

I am the master of My unobstructed internal energy, and the water of the Ganges is the remnant left after My feet are washed. That water sanctifies the three worlds, along with the Lord Śiva, who bears it on his head. If I can take the dust of the feet of the Vaiṣṇava on My head, who will refuse to do the same? <sup>159</sup> (3. 16: 9)

In this verse, Śrī Kṛṣṇa elucidates his *virāta rūpa* about his interrelation to Nature referring the Ganges. Prabhupāda further explores that "the material world is the shadow of the spiritual world" (721). From the scenario of the spiritual world, human beings can get ideas how to make an ecological balance in the physical world. If human beings have their respect to the deeds of Kṛṣṇa in interrelation to Nature, it may help them to change their attitude to environment. Thus, the *virāta rūpa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa belongs to the biocentric concepts of Nature.

In the universal form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, his veins refer to rivers. Devahūti, the mother of sage Kapila, prays Kṛṣṇa for his universal form: "The veins of the universal body became manifested and thereafter the red corpuscles, or blood. In their wake

came to rivers, and then appeared an abdomen"<sup>160</sup> (3. 26: 59). The mother of the sage is correct when he posits the rivers as the vein of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The vein should be fresh and healthy for the sound health of a person. Similarly, everybody should make rivers and lakes fresh for good health of creatures. To explain this idea further, Subrata Kumar Dās focuses that the universal form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa gives new insight (2). The idea is based on the analogy of the veins of the universal form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to rivers.

*Bāla* Kṛṣṇa shows his universal form in his mouth to his foster mother Yasodā. The mother thinks that her son is a child and does not believe in his universal form. The playmates of Śrī Kṛṣṇa complain mother Yasodā that her son has eaten dirt. When the mother Yasodā commands baby Kṛṣṇa to open the mouth, she sees his *virāta rūpa* there:

When Kṛṣṇa opened His mouth wide by the order of mother Yasodā, she saw within His mouth all moving and nonmoving entities, outer space, and all directions, along with mountains, islands, oceans, the surface of the earth, the blowing wind, fire, the moon, and the stars. She saw the planetary systems, water, light, air, sky, and creation by transformation of *ahaṅkāra*. She also saw the senses, the mind, sense perception, and the three qualities goodness, passion and ignorance. She saw the time allotted for the living entities, she saw the natural instinct and the reactions of *karma*, and she saw desires and different varieties of bodies, moving and nonmoving. Seeing all these aspects of the cosmic manifestation, along with herself and Vṛndāvana-*dhāma*, she became doubtful and fearful of her son's nature.<sup>161</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 8: 37-39)

The *virāta rūpa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is miraculous to mother Yaśodā and she is puzzled observing the universe within the mouth of her son. About this incident, Sārātha

Darśinī argues: "The universe was simultaneously inside Śrī Kṛṣṇa's belly and outside as well by the inconceivable power of *yogamāyā*" (216). The discussion shows the interrelation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature.

This cosmic manifestation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa establishes his heroic qualities. This universal form denotes that he is in the world of Nature and Nature is within his mouth. The mother thinks her son as innocent and needs her instructions to lead him in good path. By showing the universe within his mouth, Śrī Kṛṣṇa has his intention to break the illusion of his mother. It inspires the *Hindus* to see Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa from same perspective. He performs different kinds of *līlās* to motivate readers for respect of Nature. His power of *Yogamāya* shows Nature of the universe to his mother (Darśnī 216). This universal form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa forces human beings to be more careful for preservation of Nature.

Mother Yaśodā considers Kṛṣṇa's *virāta rūpaas* his mystic power. From this standpoint, Śūkadeva comments: "Is it a dream or is it an illusory creation by the external energy? Has this been manifested by my own intelligence, or is it some mystic power of my child?"<sup>162</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 8: 40). It is the self-argument of mother Yaśodā about the vision of the universal form of her child. This form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa compels his mother to perplex either it is her dream or reality because the scenario within the mouth of child Kṛṣṇa is beyond her expectation. On the base of this idea, Charles A. Filion views Kṛṣṇa *līlā*: "He is similar to Nārāyaṇa in terms of qualities"] (485). There is analogy between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Lord Nārāyaṇa in terms of their *līlās*. It is difficult for the mother Yaśodā to distinguish Śrī Kṛṣṇa from Nature due to the appearance of the universe within his mouth.

Akrūra, a chief of the Yadavas, is sent by Kāṁsa to Vṛndāvana for the invitation to Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma to participate in the *Dhanus Yajna* (Bow

Festival) organised by king Kaṁsa. When the messenger of the king of Mathura (Akrūra) meets Śrī Kṛṣṇa, he praises Śrī Kṛṣṇa's universal form in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*:

Earth; water; fire; air; ether and its source, false ego; the *mahat-tattva*; the total material nature and her source, the Supreme Lord's *puruṣa* expansion; the mind; the senses; the sense objects; and the senses' presiding deities- all these causes of the cosmic manifestation are born from Your transcendental body. <sup>163</sup> (10. 40: 2)

This verse proves that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the basis of Nature and Akrūra praises divine qualities of Kṛṣṇa. Devdutt Pattanaik stresses on the point that "Krishna dominates, overshadowing even Vishnu" (16). The remarkable images of the universal form in Nature are to make humans conscious about it. Thus, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is a perspective in favor of Nature which can change the mind of human beings to show their affinity with Nature.

Akrūra further clarifies the *virāta* form of Śrī Kṛṣṇa compared with a mountain: "As rivers are born from the mountains and filled by the rain flow from all sides into the sea, so do all these paths in the end reach You"<sup>164</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 40: 10). We get the comparison of the role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with the role of a mountain. There is the emanation of rivers from a mountain and the rivers become powerful and matured from rain. In this connection, Lance E. Nelson asserts "the ecological implications of *Hindu* geographical spirituality" (241). It shows that there is interrelation between geography and spirituality in the *Hinduism*.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa shows his appearance in the universal form to his mother Yasodā, Akrūra, and other characters in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. His intention to show the *virāta* form is to point out the interrelationship between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and

Nature. Nature has its miraculous activities on the earth with the help of the sun and rain so that there is fertility on land. As the awareness of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*, humans should be conscious about the effects of Nature in their lives. One must be aware of the natural works in which there should be no interruptions. If there are interruptions in the natural works, it affects directly in the life of human beings and other creatures. Śrī Kṛṣṇa has come to the earth to lessen the burden of the world and to make the world of Nature free from human intervention.

### **Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā* in Relation to Nature in *Māhātmya***

The epic *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* begins with the *māhātmya* (invocation) of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. This invocation about him exaggerates his heroic activities as the creator and destroyer of the universe. The *māhātmya* records that he is the cause of creation, sustenance, and destruction of Nature. The author remarks Nature in the invocation to highlight Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* as the base of Nature. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is the narration which associates the ideas of Nature and highlights the use of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. At the beginning of the epic, there is the comparison of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* with a tree to identify the similarities between the text and Nature:

O expert and thoughtful men, relish *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*, the mature fruit of the desire tree of *Vedic* literatures. It is emanated from the lips of Śrī Śukadeva Gośvāmī and it is interesting for the readers which is full of instructive lessons. Therefore this fruit has become even more tasteful, although its nectarine juice was already relishable for all, including liberated souls.<sup>165</sup> (1. 1: 3)

With the similar belief, one can note that a tree and the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* are useful for all creatures. This standpoint justifies the discussion of the

idea to respect both the text and Nature from the same perspective and everybody should preserve them. In this connection, Swami Ranganathananda argues: *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* means, that which deals with *Bhagavān*"(5). In this context, the invocation provokes the importance of text in interrelation to Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In the tree of the *Vedās*, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is a flavorsome fruit and everybody likes it. The discussion highlights literary quality of the *Vedic* knowledge. Its core ideas are to preserve the world of Nature.

A naturalist instructs human beings to preserve Nature from different techniques. Śrī Kṛṣṇa in his life works as a nature lover for its conservation: "We think that we have met Your Goodness by the will of providence, just so that we may accept you as captain of the ship for those who desire to cross the difficult ocean of *Kali*, which deteriorates all the good qualities of a human being"<sup>166</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 1. 1: 22). *Kalīyuga* (Iron Age) has many weaknesses so that the role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to save Nature is crucial. Other demonic characters make obstacles in his activities but he is able to suppress them using his *yogic* power. Śrī Kṛṣṇa resembles to a captain to rescue others and he is the means of expectation for the solution of crisis in Nature. Unlike the above discussion, Arthur H. Hirshorn rests on the argument: "People are learning, sometimes painfully, that they cannot physically isolate themselves from their natural environment" (8). This dealing is based on the idea that restoration of Nature is possible from plantation of trees. The effects of the *Kalīyuga* (ocean of faults) are seen in the destruction of Nature. Naturalists and the social activists should follow the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to aware of the destruction of Nature.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* praises the glory of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the form of Nature in the *māhātmya*. *Vedavyāsa* presents an authentic idea about Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*

in interrelation to Nature: "Everything that is mysterious is known to you because you worship the creator and destroyer of the material world and the maintainer of the spiritual world, the original Personality of Godhead, who is transcendental to the three modes of material nature"<sup>167</sup> (1. 5: 6). In the *māhātmya*, the writer judges Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the master of the physical and the spiritual Nature of the universe. He creates and destroys Nature according to his wills as a child plays with mud for making and breaking pots. In this line of thought, K. R. Srinivasa Lyengar investigates that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is "the breaker and maker of kingdoms" (116). In this sense, Kṛṣṇa is superior to Nature and kingdoms due to his control in Nature and society.

Kunti, the mother of Yudhishtira, Bhima, and Arjuna posits Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the cause of Nature. Instead of describing the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, she prays him:

All these cities and villages are flourishing in all respects because the herbs and grains are in abundance, the trees are full of fruits, the rivers are flowing, the hills are full of minerals and the oceans full of wealth. And this is all due to Your glancing over them.<sup>168</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 1. 8: 40)

Queen Kunti clarifies her idea about Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. If there is sufficient food for human beings, there is not necessary to kill poor and innocent animals. Kunti does not like to kill animals because the death of an animal affects the ecosystem. In this context, Jonathan Geen opines that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is celestial Viṣṇu himself (65). Being a creator, he is in favor of the conservation of natural things. The minerals in hillside and jewels in the ocean show the presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in Nature. In this *māhātmya*, Kunti prays Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the base of Nature. This *māhātmya* remarks that Śrī Kṛṣṇa has his role to enrich the valuable production of Nature. She sees the magnificence and glory of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in Nature. The prosperity of human beings flourishes from the gifts of Nature.



Sage Śūka portrays the message of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* to instruct human beings to change their social and cultural attitude towards Nature. The narrator argues in the *māhātmya*: "Those, who drink through aural reception, fully filled with the nectarine message of Lord Kṛṣṇa, the beloved of the devotees, purify the polluted aim of life known as material enjoyment and thus go back to Godhead, to the lotus feet of Him"<sup>169</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 2. 2: 37). In this *māhātmya*, the author exposes that human beings should follow the footsteps of the devotees for the conservation of Nature. It is "love for love's sake"(qtd. in Ranganathananda 13). The message of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is to restore Nature by changing their perspective. Thus, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is the torchlight for humans to conserve Nature.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* postulates the similarities between the laws of Nature and the laws of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In this context, Śukadeva formulates his ideas to King Parikshīt:

The right situation for the living entities is to obey the laws of the Lord and thus be in perfect peace of mind under the protection of the Supreme Personality of Godhead. The Manus and their laws are meant to give right direction in life. The impetus for activity is the desire for fruitive work.<sup>170</sup> (2. 10: 4)

The law of Nature is effective to all creatures equally and every creature of this planet has right to survive. The laws of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* are in favor of the survival of all creatures. In this regard, Richa Paurannik Clements retains the primary responsibility for "using the voice of Kṛṣṇa" (117) for the continuation of natural law in ecology. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* evokes the awareness of Nature from which human beings are advised to obey the laws of Nature. Law abiding people do not face problems in the world. If not, the hazards in Nature occur at any time.

Thus, this view is a catalogue for people how to remain in touch with Nature without harming her.

Sage Maitreya makes clear to Vidura about love of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to trees and other objects of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. To bring the *pārijāta* tree from the heaven to the earth, Śrī Kṛṣṇa makes hard efforts: "Just to please His dear wife, the Lord brought back the *pārijāta* tree from heaven, just as an ordinary husband would do. But Indra, the king of heaven, induced by his wives, ran after the Lord with full force to fight Him"<sup>171</sup> (3. 3: 5). Śrī Kṛṣṇa loves forest and gives a *pārijāta* tree to his wife Satyabhāmā as gift brought from the heaven. In this connection, Tagare elucidates that Śrī Kṛṣṇa grants the desire of his wife providing *apārijāta* tree as a gift (231). Being a lover of Nature, Śrī Kṛṣṇa adds one species of tree on this globe. The *pārijāta* gives sweet fragrance and everybody likes to plant this flower near his/her house. If there are special trees and flowers, human beings should supply from one place to other places. They must follow the actions of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to conserve Nature by supplying important plants and grains.

Maitreya further praises the glory of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *māhātmya* referring his love to Nature. To live in the forest with the natural things is his hobby and he sits under a banyan tree for self-satisfaction. Uddhava, an intimate friend and secretary of Kṛṣṇa, investigates Śrī Kṛṣṇa's condition in the richness of Nature: "The Lord was sitting, taking rest against a young banyan tree, with His right lotus foot on His left thigh, and although He had left all household comforts. He looked quite cheerful in that posture"<sup>172</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 3. 4: 8). According to Uddhava, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is fond of sitting at the bottom of a banyan tree for entertainment. This verse stresses the use of Nature for peace and satisfaction. With this conditioning, P.P. Barooah appreciates the fact that a banyan tree is considered auspicious that "brings

prosperity to the occupant of the house" (26). At present, the *Hindus* believe that a bunyān tree is supposed to bring fortune in their lives.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* makes a considerable impact of Nature in the life of human beings and other creatures through the character of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. To stress the scenario of Nature, there is reliability to mention the view of sage Maitreya about Saugandhika forest: "All these atmospheric influences unsettled the forest elephants who flocked together in the sandalwood forest, and the blowing wind agitated the minds of the damsels there for further sexual enjoyment"<sup>173</sup> (4. 6: 30). This beautiful scenario of forest with elephants draws the attention of readers as the base of happiness. Nature does not show the sign of pollution and the elephants hover to and fro without being disturbed. Śrī Kṛṣṇa likes to remain in such a dense forest where there is happiness for creatures. To highlight his glory, Prabhupāda argues: "This material nature is also a temporary creation of the Lord, as the cloud is a creation of the sun" (19). This analysis highlights similarities between the sun and Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the matter of creation. It shows that natural beauty causes fertility and the creatures get benefits from the freshness and purity of Nature.

The *māhātmya* relates between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature mentioning that his form lies in Nature. Brāhmaṇas eulogize Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the objects of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* as follows:

Dear Lord, You are sacrifice personified. You are the offering of clarified butter, You are the fire, You are the chanting of the *Vedic* hymns by which the sacrifice is conducted, You are the fuel, You are the flame, You are the *kuśa* grass, and You are sacrificial pots. You are the priests who perform the *yajna*, You are the demigods headed by Indra, and You are the sacrificial animal. Everything that is sacrificed is You or Your energy.<sup>174</sup> (4. 7: 45)

In the aforementioned expression, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is pervasive in the natural objects and his attachment to Nature is inseparable. Natural things such as fire, fuel, flame, pots, *kuśa* grass, and sacrificial animals are his embodiments. In relation to this idea, O.P. Dwivedi confirms that the *Hindus* see "divinity in Nature" (35). The human beings, who love him, should keep those things in their natural world without intervention.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* extends the popularity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa who remains happy with the products of Nature. The *Hindus* use the natural things such as fruits and flowers to please him. In this sense, the role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa changes from hero to the divine being. Human beings find everything in Nature and they are pleased using those things. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* further inscribes the association of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to Nature as next evidence: "You are full in every respect. You are certainly very satisfied when Your devotees offer You praying with flattering voices and in ecstasy bring You *tulasī* leaves, water, twigs, bearing new leaves, and newly grown grass. This surely makes You satisfied"<sup>175</sup> (5. 3: 6). *Tulasī* (basil) leaves, water, and twigs are favorite things of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and he likes to conserve not only trees but also shrubs and herbs to have continuation of Nature in fresh condition. Like the notions of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in favor of Nature, human beings are advised to preserve trees, grass, shrubs and herbs. *Tulasi* leaves are useful for medicine and everybody should use it realizing its value in the life of human beings.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa is pleased with the leaves of basil, grass, water, and other tiny objects of Nature stressing that humans should not neglect the minor natural things. On the base of this idea, George A. James further explores the utility of trees in the life of humans for several purposes: "Trees must be available to meet the needs of local people for food, fuel, fodder, fiber, and fertilizer. They could do so without being destroyed" (519). This analysis has its reliability to use the natural things for

our benefits. Similarly, humans use water of different places as medicine to cure diseases which are related to skin. Thus, there should be self-realization of human beings from the inspiration of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to apply small plants, trees and other natural things for the fulfillment of their needs.

The *māhātmya* further extends the role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa not only on this globe but also in the whole universe. Explaining this statement, Sukadeva tells King Parikshīt:

From the great leaders of the universe, such as Lord Brahmā and other demigods, down to the political leaders of this world, all are envious of Your authority. Without Your help, however, they could neither separately nor concertedly maintain the innumerable living entities within the universe. You are actually the only maintainer of all human beings, of animals like cows and asses, and of plants, reptiles, birds, mountains and whatever else is visible within this material world.<sup>176</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 5. 18: 27)

The connection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with Nature is inseparable and other demogods are envious with him. He establishes himself as a maintainer of Nature. In this connection, one can get contradictory ideas between hermits and householders. At this point, Devdutt Pattanaik claims: "The history of *Hinduism* is marked by tension between the hermit and the householder traditions" (7). Hermits are in favor of Nature whereas householders have their ideas to use Nature for the fulfillment of their needs. In this way, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is a path for us how to be conscious about the dominance of humans over Nature.

Prahlāda invokes Śrī Kṛṣṇa that one can see his influence in all creatures of Nature. He does not differentiate between higher and lower creatures: "My dear Lord, now I have complete experience concerning the worldly opulence, mystic power, longevity and other material pleasures enjoyed by all living entities

from Brahmā down to the ant"<sup>177</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 7. 9: 24). We find same crux of logic when Prahlāda admires the favor of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to Nature and creatures. From the standpoint of the mystic power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Pika Gosh shows how Śrī Kṛṣṇa drinks bonfire in forest to control the flames (82). From this evidence, one can claim that Śrī Kṛṣṇa takes any risk for the conservation of forest and other natural things. Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his followers are in favor of equal justice of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

King Bali makes comparison of a tree with human body. In the *māhātmya*, he supports the idea of Nature: "When a tree is uprooted it immediately falls down and begins to dry up. Similarly, if one doesn't take care of the body, which is supposed to be untruth-in other words, if the untruth is uprooted-the body undoubtedly becomes dry"<sup>178</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 8. 19: 40) . King Bali highlights that there are similarities between trees and human beings so that one should love trees as the body of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Similarities are drawn by Mark Stoll as he argues: "The ecological crisis is essentially a social crisis, and a religious solution to one entails a solution to the other" (274). Human beings need to understand that religious solution is necessary to address the environmental issues. One should care Nature as one's own body. The activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in interrelation to Nature are the guidance for readers to be sensitive about it.

Similarly, King Ambarīṣa realises Śrī Kṛṣṇa in Nature. In Ambarīṣa's words: "O *Sudarśana Cakra*, you are the most powerful sun, and you are the moon, the master of fall luminaries. You are water, earth and sky, you are the air, you are the five sense objects, and you are the senses also"<sup>179</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 9. 5: 3). This emphasis on the value of Nature in interrelation to the *Sudarśana Cakra* of Kṛṣṇa is identified with the disc. King Ambarīṣa regards the *Sudarśana Cakra* as Śrī

Kṛṣṇa. He argues that the *Sudarśana Cakra* is the embodiment of Kṛṣṇa. Tagare concurs that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the subtle elements (1149) and the knowledge of *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is necessary to understand him. The belongings of Śrī Kṛṣṇa denote Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. As the sun, the *Sudarśana Cakra* is useful for King Ambarīṣa to save him from crisis. Thus, different problems have their solution from Nature.

Śukadeva hints Kṛṣṇa's form in the appearance of Viṣṇu immediately after his birth in the prison of Kāmsa. The narrator mentions the following lines for the admiration of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*: "Vasudeva then saw the newborn child, who had very wonderful lotus like eyes and who bore in His four hands the four weapons *śaṅkha*, *cakra*, *gada*, and *padma*. On His chest was the mark of *Śrīvatsa* and on His neck the brilliant *Kaustubha* gem"<sup>180</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 3: 9). These lines show how Śrī Kṛṣṇa is attached to Nature from the time of his birth. One can see Nature in the form of *śaṅkha*, *cakra*, *gada*, *padma*, and *Śrīvatsa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The objects such as lotus, *śaṅkha*, *cakra*, *gada*, and *padma* have their association with Nature. These marks on his body trace the symbol of Nature. In this context, Jiva Gośvāmī expresses his idea: "The beauty of His colour was even superior to the splendor of a dense rain cloud" (qtd. in Filion 494). This discussion shows the supremacy of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in appearance to others. If the natural things are observed on his body, the *Hindus* realize that his body is the replica of Nature.

The *Yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa denotes the similarities between himself and Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. This scenario highlights the character of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and readers regard him as a miraculous hero. This power promotes *māhātmya* in the *paurāṇic* literature when the mother Yasodā sees Nature within the mouth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

When child Kṛṣṇa was almost finished drinking His mother's milk and mother Yasodā was touching Him and looking at His beautiful, brilliantly smiling face, the baby yawned, and mother Yasodā saw in His mouth the whole sky, the higher planetary system and the earth, the luminaries in all directions, the sun, the moon, fire, the seas, islands, mountains, rivers, forests, and all kinds of living entities, moving and non-moving.<sup>181</sup> (10. 7: 35-36)

Mother Yasodā sees not only Nature within the mouth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa but also observes the whole universe. There is the whole and part relationship between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Nature. In this line of argument, Sanātana Gośvāmī claims: "He has power to show the universe within the abdomen, through the mouth, at once merely by His desire" (qtd. in Fillion 473). It indicates the miraculous activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the establishment of him as a hero. Basing this argument on such idea, one can opine that there is there is the manifestation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the universe.

Brahmā has similar discussion in connection between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Nature. He incorporates his ideas in interrelation to Nature from Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*: "Just at this entire universe, including You, was exhibited within Your abdomen, so it is now manifested here externally in the same exact form. How could such things happen unless arranged by Your inconceivable energy"<sup>182</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 14: 17). There is analogy between the external universe and inside the belly of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It motivates readers to analyze Śrī Kṛṣṇa due to his manifestation of the world within his belly. On this ground, Sūradās examines: "He opened to her heavens, the nether world, the earth, the forests and the mountains in his mouth"(qtd. in White 174). Śrī Kṛṣṇa has divine characteristics during the time of his childhood. This activity is incredible for readers and researchers. It shows that there are *pancatatta* (five elements of Nature) within human body.



Brahmā further proves that Śrī Kṛṣṇa protects common people, animals, and trees from the oppression of the demonic rulers:

My dear Kṛṣṇa, You bestow happiness upon the lotuslike *vṛṣṇi* dynasty and expand the great oceans consisting of the earth, the demigods *brāhmaṇas* and the cows. You dispel the dense darkness of irreligion and oppose the demons who have appeared on this earth. O Supreme Personality of Godhead, as long as this universe exists and as long as the sun shines, I will offer my obeisances unto You.<sup>183</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 14: 40)

This discussion proves that Śrī Kṛṣṇa controls the demonic activities against Nature. On this background, Charles S. J. White postulates that "Kṛṣṇa is not really a solar god in his own right but rather that he acquires this characteristics through combination with Viṣṇu" (158). Here, Śrī Kṛṣṇa has double roles: a nature lover and a social activist.

The *māhātmya* has a noticeable evidence between human beings and Nature. In the words of Śukadeva: "While Kṛṣṇa was going to the fruit vendor very hastily, most of the grains He was holding fell. Nonetheless, the fruit vendor filled Śrī Kṛṣṇa's hands with fruits, and her fruit basket was immediately filled with jewels and gold"<sup>184</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 11: 11). Śrī Kṛṣṇa provides jewels and gold to a vendor for exchange with fruits. It shows similarities between gold and fruits for the use of humans. It indicates what we do for Nature, get more benefits from her. Filion incorporates his ideas saying that Kṛṣṇa does not take anything freely from others (723). Likewise, human beings should not take the objects of Nature freely without protecting her.

Human beings have tendency not to care about the value of Nature. They are unable to make good relationship with Nature. In this connection, Śrutis in the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* argues:

Members of the renounced order who fail to uproot the last traces of material desire in their hearts remain impure, and thus You do not allow them to understand You. Although You are present within their hearts, for them You are like a jewel worn around the neck of a man who has totally forgotten it is there. O Lord, those who practice *yoga* only for sense gratification must suffer punishment both in this life and the next: from death, who will not release them, and from You, whose kingdom they cannot reach.<sup>185</sup> (10. 87: 39)

This invocation proves that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a jewel for human beings for precepts. Nature is as important as a jewel for humans but they neglect about its value. In the similar vein, Sārātha Darśinī notes that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is precious jewel for humans. She argues that human beings are unable to get benefits from his precepts (2093). People use Nature even though degradation in it is going on due to lack of self-awareness. It is a satire upon the activities of human beings in relation to Nature.

The evidences of the *māhātmya* provide the ground for interpretation in connection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* to Nature in the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The foil characters praise the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa through invocation. The *māhātmya* makes human beings ecologically conscious and educates them for the restoration of Nature. Human beings are warned not to destroy Nature for the fulfillment of their needs. Nowadays, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is praised as a Nature lover after five thousand years due to his awareness in favor of Nature. Human beings who base the trend of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to conserve Nature in the global level will be praised in the future. It is necessary to establish a new trend for humans how to conserve Nature for future generation.

### Exploration of Nature from *Rāsa Līlā*

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* discusses *Rāsa Līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with *gopīs* of Vraja in five chapters (twenty nine to thirty three) of the tenth *skandha* (canto). To make *Rāsa Līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with *gopīs* more informative, Monier Williams further explores: "*Rāsa* is the dance of one male with several females"(qtd in Solis 84). Supporting this logic, one can expose that *Rāsa Līlā* is the sporting of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with several *gopīs* in which he remains in centre to please all of them. It is an interesting playful activity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in which there is the involvement of a large number of *gopīs* (Filion 504). It takes place during the time of the full moon night in the forest of Vṛndāvana. The readers of *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* require predisposition for the rapture from this *līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Rapture, a part of *bhaktirāsa*, is brought by transcendental potency. The *Rāsa Līlā* has its connection to Nature for its utility to human beings and other creatures. It shows how there is attraction between *Prakṛiti* and *Purūsa*. Śūkadeva deals with beauty of Nature: "Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, full in all opulence, yet upon seeing those autumn nights scented with blossoming jasmine flowers, He turned His mind toward loving affairs"<sup>186</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 29: 1). Richness in Natural beauty motivates Śrī Kṛṣṇa dance with *gopīs* in forest. Śrī Kṛṣṇa has intention to link the beauty of Nature to the beauty of the *gopīs*. In a similar note, it is crucial to remember the amalgamation of the natural beauty with the beauty of women. In this connection, Swāmī Sivananda argues that he was cupid for *gopīs* (19). He arranges to provide them everlasting peace and bliss during the time of *Rāsa Līlā* at night in the forest of Vṛndāvana . It indicates the proofs in the perfection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* by arranging *Rāsa Līlā*.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa uses his power of *Yogamāyā* to make impossible things possible in the shelter of forest. This argument turns out to be valid when Śrī Kṛṣṇa "defeats the vanity of Cupid" (Filion 20). There is harmony in the *Rāsa* dance with the beauty of Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa enjoys with *gopīs*. The moon is a significant component of Natural beauty, has her crucial role in the *Rāsa Līlā*. This idea, further, points to the reality: "The moon rose, anointing the face of the eastern horizon with the reddish hue of his comforting rays, and thus dispelling the pain of all who watched him rise"]<sup>187</sup> (10. 29: 2). The moon seems to be a lover who stares to his beloved after a long time and raises her emotions. The rising moon inspires Śrī Kṛṣṇa to originate the mood for union with *gopīs*. The aforementioned expression creates the background of "jungle *mein mangal*" (Pattanaik 17) for both Śrī Kṛṣṇa and *gopīs*.

Unlike Filion and Pattanaik, David Kinsley expresses the power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's magical flute in the forest for the background of *Rāsa Līlā*:

The sound of Kṛṣṇa's flute is no earthly sound. Its vibrations fill the heavens and distract even the gods from their usual activities. Even nature cannot remain unaffected. When he plays his flute, the river and the reeds from which the flute grew weep tears of delight. When the clouds hear his flute, they hover over him to provide the shade and shower him with drops of fresh water.

Rivers slow down when they hear his flute and grow lotuses for him. (172)

The magical music of the flute's motion creates feelings of closeness for natural things. The rivers, reeds, and clouds are attracted listening the music. Both plants and animals lose their patience and they are distracted from their normal activities. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* presents sufficient evidences of *Rāsa Līlā* in the background with the manifestation of Nature.

In the autumn, Śrī Kṛṣṇa enters into the forest of Vṛndāvana with cows. Jasmine, *kumuda*, *kunkuma* flowers are blossoming there. Śūkadeva presents the background from melodious sound of his flute:

Kṛṣṇa saw the unbroken disk of the moon glowing with the red effulgence of newly applied vermillion, as if it were the face of the goddess of fortune. He also saw the *kumuda* and lotuses opening in response to the moon's presence and the forest gently illumined by its rays. Thus, Kṛṣṇa began to play sweetly on his flute, attracting the minds of the beautiful-eyed *gopīs*.<sup>188</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 29: 3)

The moon, which originates the mood of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for romance, has prominent role for preparation of the *rāsa* dance. It motivates him to play the flute during the time of this happy moment. In relation to this idea, Muhammad Khan further explains his points: “The flute is the human heart, a heart which is made hollow, which becomes a flute for the god of love to play” (4). This discussion hints that the heart of human beings should be emptied to help others. As the sound of the flute, one should try to please others as far as possible. From the perspective of the flute, one can argue that hollowness of the flute symbolizes simplicity.

The melodious sound from the music of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's flute arouses desires of the world due to its attraction to plants and animals. Everybody stops his/her work during the time of listening the sound. Similarly, the wives of demigods stop their works from the impression of the sound. With this conditioning, Śūkadeva expresses: “The wives of the demigods, observing Śrī Kṛṣṇa's playful activities were entranced and became agitated with lust. Indeed, even the moon and his entourage, the stars, became astonished”<sup>189</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 33: 18). Women and the objects of Nature such as the moon and stars are affected by the sound of

Kṛṣṇa's flute. There is accompanying of Nature with the sound of his flute. Explaining this statement, David Kingsley further elucidates: "A bamboo flute is the only musical instrument which is most natural and does not contain any mechanical parts. This is the reason why the flute is very close to nature"(32). The echo sound of the flute is delightful for creatures. The flute player might realize the celestial experiences.

The simplicity of the flute is the sign of simple and cooperative activities of human beings. In this regard, Bhattacharya supports Kingsley about the utility of the flute of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He extends the scope of the flute from his following argument: "The flute has eight holes, using which divine music is brought out by the player. Eight is number of Indian god Kṛṣṇa; the eight holes control the eight parts of the body and mind: eyes, ears, nose, tongue, skin, mind, intellect, and ego" (21). The flute has its spiritual importance in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. It reveals common lifestyle of human beings. The music of the flute attracts *gopīs* to Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the performance of the *Rāsa Līlā*. A person should be as a hollow flute in the absence of vanity to whom everybody likes.

*Rāsapañcādhyāyī* (five chapters) enthuse the profound devotion and bitter scorn in the character of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In Jarow's word: "In *Rāsa Līlā*, the world of *māyā*, is about to be turned upside down" (98). With the support of this idea, one can debunk that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is criticised despite his dedication to rescue good humans of his contemporary time. Moving ahead in this line of logic, Śukadeva rightly argues about the position of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and *gopīs* in the *rāsa* dance:

Among the assembled *gopīs*, the infallible Lord Kṛṣṇa appeared just like the moon surrounded by stars. He whose activities are so magnanimous made their faces blossom with His affectionate glances, and His broad smiles

revealed the effulgence of His jasmine-bud-like teeth.<sup>190</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 29: 43)

Śrī Kṛṣṇa seizes the minds of *gopīs* and they participate in the *Rāsa Līlā* having suspended their works. They have unchained themselves from the attachment of family. In reality, there are moral issues of women to leave home at night but the *gopīs* neglect ethics and the moral issues. In the theistic mode, Richa Pauranik Clements incorporates: "*Gopīs* are *tāmas* devotees, and for them Kṛṣṇa is no more than an irresistible lover"] (129). This analysis shows that they are hunger for physical proximity and have intention to make a union with him.

In *Rāsa Līlā*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa pleases *gopīs* from his songs, dance, and music using the flute. By indicating the way of his dance, Śukadeva informs king Parīkṣit:

There Kṛṣṇa threw His arms around the *gopīs* and embraced them. He aroused Cupid in the beautiful young ladies of Vraja by touching their hands, hair, thighs, belts and breasts, playfully scratching them with His fingernails, and also by joking with them, glancing at them and laughing with them. In this way, the Lord enjoyed His Pastimes.<sup>191</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 29: 46)

The *Yogic* power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa takes place "out of time and out of mind" (Jarow 114) to make impossible works possible. There is the depiction of attachment and cleverness in the commencement of this *rāsa* dance. He hugs the *gopīs* from the extension of his arms and they have the realization of bliss. In this context, McKim Marriott confirms "Krishna's miraculous and amorous boyhood" (201) from this performance. Due to his *Rāsa Līlā* with *gopīs*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa turns from childhood to boyhood. He knows the techniques to please *gopīs* during the time of *Rāsa Līlā* and proves himself as a perfect lover.

*Gopīs* realize good fortune to get Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a lover. In this relation, Śrī Kṛṣṇa proves himself as a womanizer during the time of his adolescence. During the time of the *rāsa* dance, some *gopīs* including Vṛṣabhanu-nandinī try to possess Śrī Kṛṣṇa for them (Filion 236) and become jealous each other. Śrī Kṛṣṇa realizes possessive psychology of the *gopīs*. Then, he persuades: "“just climb on my shoulder.” But as soon as He said this, He disappeared. His beloved consort then immediately felt great remorse"<sup>192</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 30: 38). This evidence proves defeat of lust in Platonic Love. Rādhā shows anguish during *rāsa* dance. To please Rādhā and to make *gopīs* free from jealousy each others, Śrī Kṛṣṇa disappears. Solis gives reason why the *gopīs* are attracted with Śrī Kṛṣṇa: "the *gopīs* dance around Śrī Kṛṣṇa, giving him the place of the original phallic symbol" (84). Readers analyze that phallus is the sign of attraction for women and the condition of *gopīs* is same. For Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the *Rāsa Līlā* is not possessive but pleasing for creatures and vegetation. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is against the possessive love which is flourished in the life of human beings. Sudden disappearance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa indicates that he has self-awareness and wants to detach from the sensual pleasure. But the case of *gopīs* contradicts from the condition of Śrī Kṛṣṇa on the basis of the *rāsa* dance. They have their desires to have continuation in their dance and do not like to be separated from him. In this regard, one can appraise if there is union between soul and senses for a short time, the soul tries to remain free but senses run after pleasure (Filion 72). The reality is that the soul should guide the senses for good deeds. Sudden disappearance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from *gopīs* is justifiable in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

The minds of *gopīs* have fully absorbed in ideas of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and they start looking for him everywhere in forest. Their climax of bliss shatters from the disappearance of their consort. Filion confirms: "Śrī Kṛṣṇa disappeared for the sake of



special bliss" (319). He knows that absence in love increases its frequency during the time of reunion. On the basis of this relation, Śūkadēva focuses on the psychology of *gopīs*: "When Lord Kṛṣṇa disappears, the *gopīs* suffered in His absence. Their condition is as the condition of the female elephants from the loss of their mate"<sup>193</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 30: 1). This discussion reflects analogy of the *gopīs* to the female elephants during the time of separation. In relation to this idea, one postulates that human beings have qualities of animals according to time and situation. A human has the characteristics of different animals and the *gopīs* show the quality of the female elephants during the time of separation. From this standpoint, Purnendu Narayana Sinha argues: "They gave up their search when it was dark" (419). Explaining this statement, one argues that dark night creates obstacle for *gopīs* to search Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In this context, dark night is a component of Nature and it is superior to humans. The *gopīs* cannot do anything against it in the dense forest.

The *gopīs* love passionately to Śrī Kṛṣṇa and they feel emptiness in the absence of him. They rest on the argument that the plants and trees know where Śrī Kṛṣṇa is and start asking questions to trees. Tagare formulates his logic with the sufficient evidences to show the psychology of *gopīs* when they personify the trees by asking them:

Oh mango tree! Oh jackfruit tree, apple tree, the sun plant, the wood- apple tree, *Kadamba* and *Nipa* and other trees on the bank of the Yamuna-Born as you are for the benefit of others! May you direct the path of Kṛṣṇa to use whose minds are vacant due to separation from Hari. (1444)

It is an evidence of the idyllic state of youth from the above manifestation of the *gopīs*'s situation. The *gopīs* have their queries for reunion with Śrī Kṛṣṇa to quench their thirst of love. They realize the futility in effort to identify his location even

though they "do not die of separation" (Jarow 110). They have their illusion thinking that the objects of Nature may help for the solution of their problems. Positive attitude towards trees becomes the base of consolation for *gopīs* during the time of separation.

Prabhupāda explores that “*gopīs* felt that the trees had not replied because they were male”<sup>194</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10: 30. 7). The same trees, rivers, birds, and animals which had pleased them in the presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, make them unhappy during the time of his absence. From the activities of *gopīs*, one can corroborate that human psychology is very important to gain pain and pleasure from same object. If a person is unhappy due to some psychological problems, he cannot be happy in the place of beautiful scenario of Nature as *gopīs*.

The analysis of the text discussed in this context indicates that the *gopīs* express the sign of jealousy to creepers. On the basis of this relation, Śūkadeva appraises: "Let us ask these creepers about Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Even though they are embracing the arms of their husband, this tree, they certainly must have been touched by Śrī Kṛṣṇa's fingernails, since out of joy they are manifesting eruptions on their skin"<sup>195</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 30: 13). The above discussion shows that the *gopīs* lose the sense of their judgement due to the ailment of their lust. This state of sorrow of the *gopīs* asserts their stressful condition at night. In the same line of argument, Devi Dayal Aggarwal points out that being favorite of all, Śrī Kṛṣṇa has stolen the heart of everyone. He is therefore a *chittachor* (173). The heart is the most sensitive organ of human body and Śrī Kṛṣṇa steals the hearts of those persons who are sensitive in their feelings. Nature affects the *gopīs* negatively and they regard it as selfish and uncooperative to share their sympathy and empathy.

The love of *gopīs* turns into *bhakti* (devotion) due to their emotional attachment with Śrī Kṛṣṇa and they go to the Yamunā River to pray him. In this

connection, David. L. Haberman exposes: "Yamunā Devī initiates into the world of divine love the soul of those who bathe in and drink her water, and unites them with Kṛṣṇa " (347). Expecting for the reunion with Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the *gopīs* start singing songs. *Gopī-gītā* relates to the transcendental pain of separation of *gopīs*. The songs of love-stricken *gopīs* highlight the glory of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to forget pain of separation in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. According to *gopīs*:

O beloved, Your birth in the land of Vraja has made it exceedingly glorious, and thus Indirā, the goddess of fortune, always resides here. It is only for Your sake that we, Your devoted servants, maintain our lives. We have been searching everywhere for You, so please show Yourself to us<sup>196</sup> (10. 31: 1)

This discussion is related to the qualities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the motivation of *gopīs*. It reflects intolerable agony of *gopīs* during the time of separation. For them, Vraja is more glorious than Vaikuntha because of the performance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's *Rāsa Līlā*.

For *gopīs*, their lover is the embodiment of *śṅgāra-rasa*- feeling of beauty and they have agitation to see his presence. Basing this interpretation, Prabhupāda argues: "They expect eagerly that Kṛṣṇa will come to meet them again. It shows that the *gopīs* want to continue *Rāsa Līlā* of Kṛṣṇa. The *geet* relieves the agony of those suffering from the burning pain of separation from Kṛṣṇa and which bestows supreme consciousness" (611). It reflects queries of *gopīs* for the memory of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in their maddened condition of separation. For the sake of consolation, as the *gopīs* start singing the song, their role changes from beloveds to devotees. They are really good devotees who leave their houses for the sake of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Keeping the love of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in hearts, the *gopīs* express their nostalgia as follows: "When You leave the cowherd village to herd the cows, our minds are disturbed with the thought that Your feet, more beautiful than a lotus, will be pricked

by the spiked husks of grain and the rough grass and plants"<sup>197</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 31: 11). This discussion oscillates that the *gopīs* do not like to see and hear the pain of Śrī Kṛṣṇa during the time of tending cows in the pasture of Vraja. They are sensitive not to hurt him from any natural objects when he is far from them. On the basis of this relation, Richa Pauranik Clements is apt to state that "In the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, *viraha bhakti* is primarily associated with the *gopīs*" (136). With the similar beliefs, human beings know that the *gopīs* are worried about the obstacles that Kṛṣṇa faces in forest. From this evidence, one can declare that the *gopīs* are worried too much about Śrī Kṛṣṇa than their lives.

There is the fulfilment of eagerness of the *gopīs* when Śrī Kṛṣṇa appears among them again in a silken yellow garment with a flower garland. From his presence, the pain *gopīs* have felt from his separation is dispelled. The *gopīs* remark that Śrī Kṛṣṇa understands their agony during the time of his absence. From the presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the *gopīs* forget their anxieties and remain happy with his company. As Śrī Kṛṣṇa comes to the bank of the Yamunā River, they make a seat for him using their shawls. Due to excessive devotion of those *gopīs*, there is the reappearance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa among them which is a matter of ecstasy for them. In this regard, Śūkadeva discusses the appearance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa: "One *gopī* respects Kṛṣṇa in her eyes and places Him within her heart. Having closed her eyes, the thirsty *gopī* of love embraces Him within. The *gopī* has the realization of the transcendental ecstasy meditating upon the Lord"<sup>198</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 32: 8). This discussion reveals the suppressed emotions of the love-lorn *gopīs*. With this conditioning, it shows that the *gopīs* are portrayed as the ornaments of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to highlight his character. The appearance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa makes the *gopīs* worship him both physically and mentally. The presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa embalms the injured hearts

of the *gopīs* and they express their love from their eyes, hearts, and activities. They tolerate sorrows but do not make any inconvenience for him. They love both Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa without any sign of complaints. In this regard, Śrīnāth Paṇḍita proves that “Kṛṣṇa is the soul, the topmost *Purūsa*” (Filion 96). Being *nirguṇa*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa engages in romance with the divine *gopīs* (Filion 110). The moment of reunion is the base of bliss for the sake of the *gopīs*.

Śūkadeva proves that the *gopīs* forget their distress of separation from the sudden appearance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa among them. For them, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the goal and substance in their lives and they feel great relief from his reappearance. The beauty and purity of Nature creates background of reunion for them. The sage further exemplifies the reality:

The almighty Lord then took the *gopīs* with Him to the bank of the Kālindī, who with the handle of her waves had scattered piles of soft sand upon the shore. In that auspicious place, the breeze, bearing the fragrance of blooming *kunda* and *mandāra* flowers, attracted many bees.<sup>199</sup> (10. 32: 12)

In this context, Nature is the most visible aspect for the clarification of the *Rāsa Līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. With this conditioning, Hanumanprasād Poddar presents sufficient evidences about Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s dance in Vrindāvana: “It was through the influence of *Yogamāyā* that Śrī Kṛṣṇa when He was only a child of seven years appeared as a grown up lad to the eyes of the damsels of Vraja” (53). With the help of influence from his *Yogamāyā*, he plays the sports of *rāsa* dance. The night time with beautiful scenario of forest plays a crucial role as the background for the *Rāsa Līlā*.

The base of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *caritra* is the eagerness of mind and independence of thoughts. These opinions further point to the reality from the statement of Śūkadeva

referring the scenario of the *rāsa* dance: "The festive *rāsa* dance commenced, with the *gopīs* arrayed in a circle. Lord Kṛṣṇa expanded Himself and entered between each pair of *gopīs*, and as that master of mystic power placed His arms around their necks, each girl thought He was standing next to her alone"<sup>200</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 33: 3). This idea is the ultimate implementation of the *Yogic* Power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It should be appraised that dance is the point of focus for the *gopīs* but not Śrī Kṛṣṇa (Jarow 115). To strengthen the argument, Devdutt Pattanaik incorporates his idea that at the beginning of the *rāsa* dance, Śrī Kṛṣṇa had a single form. Then, he disappears and appears again and multiplies himself into many forms (98). It is an incredible matter for readers to believe that a person changes into different forms as the time of need. His work is as the works of a magician in front of the *gopīs*. It hints that Śrī Kṛṣṇa makes impossible works possible from his *yogic* power.

The analysis of the above discussion traces that the *Rāsa Līlā* "is a meeting of contradictory forces, and that all its happiness comes from this union of the opposites" (Osho 256). It is related to the union between the energies of male and female for creation. On the base of this argument, one realizes the union between *Prakṛiti* (female energy) and *Puruṣa*-male energy. Without the union of these two opposite energies, there is no creation in this world. This divine dance symbolizes the flow of male and female attraction. The attraction between the two opposite forces is inevitable for the existence of the creation of plants and animals. In the similar vein, there is the existence of planets and stars in the universe from the existence of the opposite forces (Osho 260). From the *Rāsa Līlā*, human beings come to the conclusion that attraction between a man and a woman is necessary because there is no completion between them in the absence of another.

## Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā* with Nature in the Union of Characters

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* interrelates incredible activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the conservation of land, creatures, and vegetation. The maintenance of Nature is necessary by human beings following the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The text stands for mutual relationship between the characters and the objects of Nature. When demons try to create problems in Nature from their selfish activities, Śrī Kṛṣṇa makes harmony by destroying demons and rescues human beings and other creatures. The role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is unforgettable to make a union among good human and animal characters.

Nature has its own importance for the union of characters at the beginning of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Eighty-eight thousand sages gather in the Naimisāraṇya forest for *yajna*. This venue of the forest is the ground for gathering sages. In Nārada's words: "Once, in a holy place in the forest of Naimisāraṇya, great sages headed by the sage Śaunaka assembled to perform great *yajna* for thousand years for the satisfaction of the Lord and His devotees"<sup>201</sup> (1. 1: 4). The sages thought that the smoke from the *yajna* was useful to make the environment fresh.

The sages select the area of richness in natural beauty as a suitable place for the performance of *yajna*. On the basis of this idea, Devi Dayal Aggarwal exposes: "The narration starts as usual with the gathering of many *rishis*, then development of a desire to listen to *Bhāgwat* and then finding a suitable and capable narrator" (17). The setting of the *yajna* is an appropriate venue and different sages gather there to instruct human beings how the glory of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* helps for the union of people. In the different way, Nature has a crucial role for the union of humans for different purposes at present either to fulfil their needs or for excursion.

Human civilization depends on the production of the material Nature. The text refers how rain is the basis for the union of people in the time of king Yudhishtira: "During the reign of King Yudhishtira, the clouds showered all the water that people needed, and the earth produced all the necessities of man in profusion. Due to its fatty milk bag and cheerful attitude, the cow used to moisten the grazing ground with milk".<sup>202</sup> (*Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 1. 10: 4). The rain in the kingdom of Yudhishtira is useful to gather humans for farming. The economic development is possible for farmers from rain. All farmers are happy when it rains and go to their farm making groups. The rain causes the union among farmers and they are grateful with the raingod. Unlike the scenario of the rain, Prabhupāda further shows: "Material assets are like seasonal flowers only" (7). This analysis points out human nature for the collection of property but their physical objects are transitory. In this regard, one can see the analogy of the material prosperity in rainy time. When the rain stops, the scenario changes. Nowadays, humans gather in the field for farming after the rain thanking Nature for the sake of rain during the time of their needs. In this regard, *paurāṇic* farmers and modern farmers are similar in a sense that both of them gather in the fields after the rain.

When there is the birth of king Parikshīt, there is the union of characters on that occasion. The objects of charity are made from Nature: "Upon the birth of a son, the king, who knew how, where and when charity should be given, gave gold, land villages, elephants, horses and good food grains to the *brāhmanas*"<sup>203</sup> (*Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 1. 12: 14). The king uses the objects of Nature as gifts for the *brāhmanas*. We survive on this globe using the things of Nature. A child is joined with the mother from the umbilical cord in the womb. In the similar vein, people are related to Nature and our existence is not possible without it. Nature is a mother for



the sake of creatures but they use it unnecessarily to complete their needs. In the view of Prabhupāda, Nature is the "well-being of the entire society" (668). The natural things which are used for the well-being of society can make good relationship each other. Thus, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is the cause of the natural awareness and well-being of society.

King Priyavarta is a ruler in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* and his love for Nature resembles to Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. According to Śūkadeva: "To stop the quarrelling among different peoples, king Priyavarta marked boundaries at rivers and at the edges of mountains and forests so that no one would capture another's property"<sup>204</sup> (5. 1: 39). Here, king Priyavarta uses Nature to make peace in his country and his citizens do not get chance to dispute to each other. Basing the argument on such idea, Pushpendra Kumar ponders that king Priyavarta uses Nature to save his citizens from outside invasion (395). At present, Nature is used as the boundary in the form of mountains, hills, rivers, and canals. Thus, the use of Nature is significant for maintenance of rules and regulations in local and cosmic levels.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* instructs human beings to love all creatures regarding them as the components of Nature. It maintains harmony in Nature and this concept discourages human beings to challenge the ecological harmony. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* elucidates: "One should treat animals such as deer, camels, asses, monkeys, mice, snakes, birds, and flies exactly like one's own son. How little differences there actually in between children and these innocent animals"<sup>205</sup> (7. 14: 9). Kṛṣṇa's awareness about Nature confirms that there is no difference between children and animals. In this connection, Anna King expresses how Śrī Kṛṣṇa pleases the cowherd community by expanding himself from his *yogic* power for the creation of cows, calves, and the cowherd boys in the same forms after the lose of animals and

the cowherd boys (183). This discussion proves that Śrī Kṛṣṇa does not discriminate between humans and animals because both have the equal role to maintain the ecological balance on the earth. This indicates that Śrī Kṛṣṇa has a leading personality and behaves as a celebrity in interrelation to Nature and creatures.

Certain mission is the base for the union of gods, demons, humans, and animals. The mission of churning in the Tshirasāgara makes a union between Gods and demons in the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. During the time of churning using the Mandarā Mountain, the sea animals get disturbance and remain in crisis:

The fish, sharks, tortoises, and snakes were most agitated and perturbed. The entire ocean became turbulent, and even the large aquatic animals like whales, water elephants, crocodiles and *timīṅgila* fish came to the surface. While the ocean was being churned in this way, it first produced a fiercely dangerous poison called *hālāhala*.<sup>206</sup> (8. 7: 18)

The confluence between gods and demons create problems for creatures of the Tshirasāgara. During the time of churning, fatal poison (*hālāhala*) emerges and it starts affecting the environment. On this ground, C. L. Goswāmī is apt to state that the *hālāhala* poison which is originated from the ocean during the time of churning creates problems in the environment (764). This illustration is a notable example of the destruction of Nature in the ocean.

There is friendship between Rāmachandra and monkey soldiers in the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* and they build a bridge on the Indian Ocean. The mission to build a bridge on the ocean is to make union between human beings and animals:

After constructing a bridge over the ocean by throwing into the water the peaks of mountains whose trees and other vegetation had been shaken by the hands of great monkeys, Lord Rāmachandra went to Lankā to release Sītādevī

from the clutches of Rāvana. With the direction and help of Vibhīṣaṇa, Rāvana's brother, the Lord, along with the monkey soldiers, headed by Sugrīva, Nīla, and Hanumān, entered Rāvana's kingdom, Laṅkā, which had previously been burnt by Hanumān.<sup>207</sup> (9. 10: 16)

Śrī Kṛṣṇa is associated with cows whereas Rāmachandra is associated with monkeys and gets help from them. On the base of this idea, Parbhupāda writes: "He can do anything and everything He likes, because He is not under the control of the material nature" (330). From this evidence, humans come to know that they can solve many problems of their lives using animals as the use of monkeys by Rāmachandra for the construction of bridge.

There is the reunion between Rāma and Sītā in a cottage under a tree in the forest of Aśoka trees. The condition of Sītā is different from her condition of the previous time. In this connection, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* describes: "Thereafter, Lord Rāmachandra found Sītādevī sitting in a small cottage beneath the tree named Śīmśapā in a forest of Aśoka trees. She was lean and thin, being aggrieved because of separation from Him"<sup>208</sup> (9. 10: 30). The above incident reminds Rukmiṇī *haraṇa* (abduction) in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Moving ahead in this line of logic, one can argue when Śrī Kṛṣṇa goes for *haraṇa* to Rukmiṇī, she is pretty with pouncing eyes but the condition of Sītā is different due to her abduction by Rāvaṇa, the king of Laṅkā. She is lean and thin because Nature is not in favor of her due to her loneliness in forest. This natural imagining is one of the memorable moments for her. In this connection, Tagare explores: "She was emaciated and suffering from the agony" (1182). In this context, the union of Sītā with Rāma does not bring her pleasure. If human beings are not happy within themselves, they cannot become happy despite their presence in the richness of natural beauty.

Nature becomes the main setting for the union of characters in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Śrī Kṛṣṇa arranges a picnic for cowherd boys in forest. In this context, Śūkadeva narrates the scenario:

One day, Kṛṣṇa decided to take His breakfast as a picnic in the forest. Having risen early in the morning, He blew His bugle made of horn and woke all the cowherd boys and calves with its beautiful sound. Then Kṛṣṇa and the boys, keeping their respective groups of calves before them, proceeded from Vrajabhumi to the forest.<sup>209</sup> (10. 12: 1)

Śrī Kṛṣṇa is interested for the union of characters by arranging a picnic in Vr̄ndāvana forest. He might have been the first person to arrange picnic on the earth. In this context, his *līlā* shows intimacy with Nature. In a similar vein, Sārātha Darśinī focuses that Śrī Kṛṣṇa makes good relation with his cowherd mates in forest from the arrangement of picnic (291). At present, human beings are the followers of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the celebration of picnic in the beauty of Nature.

Cows and calves make a union and share their happiness to each other in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. In the beautiful Nature of Govardhan Hillock, the cows run seeing their calves in a far distance:

When the cows saw their own calves from the top of Govardhan Hill, they forgot themselves and their caretakers because of increased affection, and although the path was very rough, they ran towards their calves with great anxiety, each running as if with one pair of legs. Their milk bags full and flowing with milk, their heads and tails raised, and their humps moving with their necks, they ran forcefully until they reached their calves to feed them.<sup>210</sup> (10. 13: 29)

Animals are not less than human beings in love and affection. The pasture of Govardhan Hillock pleases the cows and their calves and makes a union between them. Anna S. King's view in the union of cows and calves refers to "the fertility represented by the cows' "fatty milkbags"" (183). One understands that the cows during the time of Śrī Kṛṣṇa were better than modern mothers in love and affection with their children. From this evidence, human beings must know the importance of union among the family members. It is a satire upon the behaviors of the so-called civilized modern parents who give more priority to money than children regarding that money is sweeter than honey.

There is the reunion of the cowherd boys and their cows with Śrī Kṛṣṇa after one year from the disappearance by Brahmā. The scenario for the reunion in Nature is as follows: "After granting His son Brahmā permission to leave, the Supreme Personality of Godhead took the calves, who were still where they had been taking His meal and where His cowherd boyfriends remained just as before"<sup>211</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 14: 42). It is a prominent scenario of Nature in which there is the performance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. It identifies that Śrī Kṛṣṇa has his heroic activities to perform incredible works from the *yogic* power for reunion. Basing his argument on such idea, J. L. Mason elucidates: "The idyllic surroundings of Vṛndāvana are just such a world of contentment and physical gratification" (457). On the basis of this idea, we evaluate the importance of Nature for the completion of our needs. Vṛndāvana is the venue of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to perform impossible works using his *Yogic* Power. Natural awareness and its restoration is the mission of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*.

The skin of a dead serpent Aghāsura becomes the means for the union of the characters. Śrī Kṛṣṇa shows the skin of a large python which concentrates the minds of the cowherd boys: "Kṛṣṇa, smiling, finished His lunch in the company of His

cowherd friends. While they were returning from the forest to their homes in Vraja, Lord Kṛṣṇa showed the cowherd boys the skin of the dead serpent Aghāsura"<sup>212</sup> (10. 14: 46) . The death Aghāsura is justifiable in Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* because the python has swallowed many cowherd boys and Kṛṣṇa kills the giant python for the rescue of his friends. We can argue if an animal creates problems in Nature, it is better to kill it for the protection of many creatures. The skin of the python draws the attention of the cowherd boys (Venugopala 63). This discussion hints that new things draw the attention of human beings. The exhibition of the python's skin creates curiosity for the cowherd boys. At present, everybody is Aghasura (which is never satisfied from food) for earning property and gaining power. As the exhibition of the python's skin, humans show their property for superiority to others. This standpoint shows that it is our responsibility to use natural objects without any sign of harm.

There is a union of *gopīs* with Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the forest of Vṛndāvana. This union of Kṛṣṇa creates emotions for the cowherd maids and they are pleased with him.

Śūkadeva mentions the union of *gopīs* with Śrī Kṛṣṇa:

When the young women of Vṛndāvana heard Śrī Kṛṣṇa's flute song, which arouses romantic feelings, their minds were captivated by the Lord. They went to where their lover waited, each known to the others, moving so quickly that their earrings swung back and forth.<sup>213</sup> (10. 29: 4)

The sound of the flute draws attention of the *gopīs* and they rush to the natural beauty forgetting their duty. It points out that Nature is the base for the union of *gopīs* with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In the statement of Viśvanātha Cakravartī, it is informative to clarify that Śrī Kṛṣṇa "stole their minds along with the great wealth that is their patience" (qtd. in Filion 53). In this line of logic, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a great thief (Cupid) who steals the hearts

of *gopīs*. The setting of beautiful Nature creates the background for the union of *gopīs* with Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

After the union of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with *gopīs* in Vṛndāvana, they go to the bank of the Kālindi for refreshment. The scenario changes from forest to river for their union. In the view of sage Śūka: "In that auspicious place the breeze, bearing the fragrance of blooming *kunda* and *mandāra* flowers, attracted many bees, and the abundant rays of the autumn moon, dispelled the darkness of night"<sup>214</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 32: 11). Here is the description of the bank of the Yamunā River indicating that the magnificent scenario of Nature is the central motif for the characters. With this notion, Filion explores that the venue of Vṛndāvana was "fit for the fun of *Rāsa*" (458). For the performance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*, Nature creates a suitable background.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa appears after the sudden departure listening the *gopī-gīta* (songs of *gopīs*) and his reunion pleases the cowherd maides. The condition of *gopīs* from the observation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is as follows: "When the *gopīs* saw that their dearest Kṛṣṇa had returned to them, they all stood up at once, and out of their affection for Him their eyes bloomed wide. It was as if the air of life had reentered their bodies"<sup>215</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 32: 3). The moment of reunion is the joy for pleasure to *gopīs* and they have desires to remain with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The *gopīs* are satisfied from the appearance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in front of them. This scenario of the reunion becomes the base of the *rāsa* dance in the world of Nature. In this regard, K. R. Srinivasa Lyengar appraises the validity about the popularity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa arguing that "Krishna is a universal favourite" (112). Śrī Kṛṣṇa attracts not only the *gopīs* of Vraja but also all ceatures and vegetation.

One can get the union of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with Rukmiṇī for elopement before the time of her wedding with Śishupāla in Kundiṇpure. The scenario draws the attention of the characters because it is against the custom of the social rituals. In this connection, Sukadeva expresses his view to King Parikshīt:

With the fingernails of her left hand, she pushed some strands of hair away from her face and shyly looked from the corners of her eyes at her kings standing before her. At that moment she saw Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Then, while His enemies looked on, the Lord seized the princess, who was eager to mount his chariot.<sup>216</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 53: 54-55)

The temple of the Goddess Ambikā is the setting for the elopement of Rukmiṇī. Moving away in this line of argument, Devdutt Pattanaik clarifies the matter: "Kṛṣṇa entered the royal garden and carried Rukmiṇī away, right from under the noses of her kinsmen" (154). It traces fearless disposition of Śrī Kṛṣṇa due to his courage to elope Rukmiṇī among people on her wedding day.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna make a union in Dvārakā taking the lost sons of a *brāhmaṇa* there and this union of the two important personalities with Dvārakā inhabitants pleases them. The presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the way of solution to the problems in Dvārakā:

Thus instructed by the Supreme Lord of the topmost planet, Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna assented by chanting *om*, and they bowed down to almighty Lord Mahā-Viṣṇu. Taking the *brāhmaṇa*'s sons with them, they returned with great delight to Dvārakā by the same path along which they had come. There they presented the *brāhmaṇa* with his sons, who were in the same infant bodies in which they had been lost.<sup>217</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 89: 60-61)



The writer highlights greatness of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* from his embalm to the bereaved family members of the *brāhmaṇa* by taking his dead sons back to him. From this standpoint, Tagare expresses: "They restored to the Brāhmaṇa his sons grown up according to their age" (1840). It is important to remember that Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna have their *yogic* power to restore dead persons.

One can conclude that Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is admirable for the union of characters to solve problems, to please Rukmiṇī and the *gopīs*. The union of characters bring them pleasure from company of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He has his power to collect cows by playing his flute in the forest of Vṛndāvana. Nature becomes an important setting for the union of characters and both plants and animals remain happy from company of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Both human and animal characters make a union among them in the setting of Nature. Thus, Nature is the focal point for the union of characters in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

### **Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā* with Nature in the Separation of Characters**

Nature plays a role to separate characters according to time and situation. The natural forces create obstruction in the life of characters and they have an obligation for separation. The characters remain inferior and they become puppets against the force of Nature. During the time of separation, the characters feel loneliness but it helps them to achieve the aims of their lives. When the characters are separated from Śrī Kṛṣṇa, they realize the value of Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. The text instructs audience not to expect union with others all time because separation is a way of life. Union is not possible without separation and these kinds of incidents give lesson to writers and audience to accept separation in different moments of their lives.

The birth of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is possible from the separation of king Parīkṣit from his palace. The king goes to the bank of the Ganges at

the end of his life thinking that he will die within seven days as the curse of the young sage Sringī, the son of Samika. In this connection, Sage Śaunaka elaborates the idea: "He was a great emperor and possessed all the opulences of his acquired kingdom. He was so exalted that he was increasing the prestige of the Pāṇdu dynasty. Why did he give up everything to sit down on the bank of the Ganges and fast until death?"<sup>218</sup> (1. 4: 10).

This discussion shows that king Parīkṣit is a good administrator although he is separated from his kingdom for the sake of mental peace. Basing the interpretation on such idea, C. L. Goswamī claims that King Parīkṣit goes to the Ganges and takes fast until his death (12). On this ground, one can argue that human beings take the shelter of Nature during the time of crisis.

This explanation in favor of Nature supports that in the *Vedic* and the *Paurānic* periods, there was a trend of sages to go to forest for the creation of knowledge. The remarkable images of Nature became the parts and parcels in their lives. The creation of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is possible from the separation of Vedavyāsa from others. The scenario of the area of the Sarasvatī River inspires him for the composition of the text. Vedavyāsa writes the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* sitting on the bank of the Sarasvatī River being separated from his kith and kins. In Sūta's words: "Once upon a time he as the sun rose, took his morning ablution in the waters of the Sarasvatī and sat alone to concentrate"<sup>219</sup> (1. 4: 15). This statement shows that the shelter of Nature is necessary for the creation of knowledge. As Vedavyāsa goes to the bank of the Sarasvatī River, he gets motivation from Nārada Munī to compile the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* for highlighting Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. When the author has separation from others, he is able to create the glory of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the form of text. In this connection, Prabhupāda explains that the

premises of the Sarasvatī River motivate Nārada Munī to suggest Vedavyāsa for the composition of the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* (216). Nature is a base for the creation of the literary texts. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* encourages writers to create new ideas sitting in the beautiful scenario of Nature.

King Dhṛtarāṣṭra, following the instructions of Vidura, goes to forest in his old age with his wife Gāndhārī. Gāndhārī follows her husband and becomes happy in forest regarding that Nature is sure to bring mental peace for her:

The gentle and chaste Gāndhārī, who was the daughter of King Subhala of Kandahar, followed her husband, seeing that he was going to the Himalaya Mountains, which are the delight of those who have accepted the staff of the renounced order like fighters who have accepted a good lashing from the enemy.<sup>220</sup> (1. 13 :30)

Having given credit to Vidura, Gāndhārī goes to take the shelter of mountain. To strengthen the argument, Pushpendra Kumar analyzes that Gāndhārī "followed him wending his course towards the Himālaya the joy of ascetics, as the heroes take delight in a battle" (48). In this context, Gāndhārī pleases herself when she is separated from the palace and goes to forest with her blind husband. There was no trend in case for women to go to forest in old age in the very ancient time. But Gāndhārī breaks the trend going to forest. This *paurāṇic* event is motivational proof of Nature for the sake of *moksha*-salvation.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* affects the life of human beings and animals and they have keen interest for company of Kṛṣṇa. After the completion of his *līlas*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa departs from this world and his departure affects human beings and animals. Yudhishtira refers the effects from the departure of Śrī Kṛṣṇa: "The calves do not suck the teats of the cows, nor do the cows give milk. They are standing, crying, tears in their eyes,

and the bulls take no pleasure in the pasturing grounds"<sup>221</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 1. 14: 19). The separation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from this world affects humans, calves, cows, other animals and vegetation. The same idea is ascertained by Tagare from his argument that every one is unhappy during the time of departure of Kṛṣṇa from this world (111). Separation is a part in the life of creatures even though the creatures feel difficulties to accept it.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* encourages human beings to leave their houses: "One should leave home and practice self-control. In a sacred place he should bathe regularly and sit down in a lonely place duly sanctified"<sup>222</sup> (2. 1: 16). This verse instructs human beings how to realize self-consciousness in Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The text suggests humans to follow strict rules to have knowledge of Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature. C. L. Goswamī confirms that one "should quit the house" (86) for self-awareness and for the generation of new ideas remaining in the beautiful scenario of Nature. But Nature should be fresh, clean, and sacred. Loneliness causes self-awareness for human beings.

Like King Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Prince Dhruva is separated to fulfil the goal of his life from severe austerities. King Dhṛtarāṣṭra goes to forest for severe penance in his old age whereas Prince Dhruva goes to forest for penance in his childhood. The separation from biting words of his stepmother Surīci has compelled him to go to forest.

Being insulted by sharp words spoken by the co-wife of the king, even in his presence, Prince Dhruva, though only a boy took a severe penance in the forest. And the Lord, being satisfied by his prayer, awarded him the Dhruva planet, which is worshipped by great sages, both upward and downward.<sup>223</sup>

(*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 2. 7: 8)

Sometimes biting words of family members, friends, and relatives become the means of success in the life of people. Enmity in the behavior of the stepmother leads Dhruva to the climax of success. In this context, it is reliable to quote: "One can debunk that every body has Sunīti (good will) and Surīci (bad will) in his mind" (Prabhupāda 372) and it is necessary to be ware of bad wills which generates jealousy for others like Surīci. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* instructs audience to accept the enmity of others for success. Sometimes biting words become more powerful and effective for the improvement of a person rather than suggestions. The precepts of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are to accept negative thoughts of others for success.

A great achievement for Dhruva is the separation from palace in his childhood. He becomes a popular king from perfection of penance. His austerity is the base of his power. In this context, it is interesting to refer the bounty of Nārāyana (Śrī Kṛṣṇa is in the appearance of Nārāyana) to Dhruva: "After your father goes to the forest and awards you the rule of his kingdom, you will rule continuously the entire world for thirty-six thousand years, and all your senses will continue to be as strong as they are now. You will never become old"<sup>224</sup> (4. 9: 22). Elucidating this idea, one can argue that Dhruva becomes the ruler of the planet named polestar and is able to be one of the renowned rulers of the world. In this relation, Swāmi Ranganathananda presents the background how child Dhruva becomes perfection in penance: "After six months of meditation and hard life, the indwelling God of all, Hari, appeared in front of Dhruva" (22-23) and provided him bounty. This discussion remarks that child Dhruva becomes perfection in penance in a short duration.

This action of child Dhruva inscribes that dedication, imagination; critical thinking, and hard works are the basis of success. There is an incredible consequence in the life of Dhruva after his severe austerities in Madhuvana forest. The way of

perfection was different in the *paurānic* era and an austerity is the base for ascetics to succeed. In this regard, both Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Dhruva have similar dedication in their works for the sake of success. Unlike Dhruva, other characters go to forest in their retired life for the sake of severe austerities. Thus, the separation of Dhruva from the his family members during the time of his childhood establishes himself as a different character in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* refers that even gods have their tendency to go to forest for the sake of penance. In the similar vein, Nature is favourable for Rudra and goes to forest for the sake of severe austerities: "Thus, Rudra, having been ordered by Brahmā, circumambulated his father, the master of the *Vedas*. Addressing him with words of assent, he entered the forest to perform austere penances"<sup>225</sup> (3. 12: 20). Nature is the base for the austerities of Rudra and he follows instructions of Brahmā and goes to richness of Nature. Meditation is one of the methods of the *Vedic* philosophy and it makes the health of people good. In this context, Pushpendra Kumar ventures to debunk that Rudra "went to forest to carry on austerities" (164) for knowledge. With this conditioning, one can argue that both Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Rudra like to remain in forest for the achievements of their aims. In the *Vedic* and the *Paurānic* periods, forest was the base for the creation of knowledge from the severe austerities.

Sage Kaśyapa takes shelter of Nature for penance as Rudra and his separation brings perfection in his austerities. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the goal of austerities and Kaśyapa meditates about Kṛṣṇa: "Thereafter the brāhmaṇa took his bath in the water and controlled his speech by practicing trance, meditating on the eternal effulgence and chanting the holy *Gāyatrī* hymn within the mouth"<sup>226</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 3. 14: 32). The sage realizes peace and bliss within himself from the effect of his penance. In this connection, Prabhupāda is correct when he stresses on

the meditation of Kaśyapa: "Kaśyapa Munī meditated on the impersonal *brahmajyoti* by chanting the Gāyatrī *mantra* within his mouth" (620). The separation of Kaśyapa is meaningful in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

Sage Maitreya tells Vidura about the separation of Kardama Muni for the sake of penance on the bank of the Sarasvati River. This separation of the sage is for perfection and he meditates of Kṛṣṇa who is in the form of Nārāyan: "Commanded by Lord Brahmā to beget children in the worlds, the worshipful Kardama Muni practiced penance on the bank of the River Sarasvati for a period of ten thousand years"<sup>227</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 3. 21: 6). Like Dhruva, Rudra and Kasyapa Muni, sage Kardama goes to the bank of the Sarasvati River for completion of his mission. During that time, severe austerity was necessary for the background of giving birth to sons and Kardama Muni follows the same trend. To explain this idea further, C. L. Goswāmī contemplates that sage Kardama is able to beget children after his penance as the precepts of Brahmā for him (228). The severe austerity of the sage is completed from the grace of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the form of Nārāyana.

There was a trend for *yogis* to go to Nature regarding as a secluded place. During the time of retirement, king Pṛthu is separated from family members, friends, neighbours, and relatives and goes to Tapovana forest for the sake of penance. The text mentions the ways of his penance: "In the tapo-vana, King Pṛthu sometimes ate the trunks and roots of trees, and sometimes he ate fruits and dried leaves, and for some weeks he drank only water. Finally, he lived simply by breathing air"<sup>228</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 4. 23: 5). King Pṛthu realizes to be separated from his kingdom for the perfection in penance and goes to nearby forest. In this connection, Tagare incorporates his view: "He lived upon bulbous and ordinary roots and fruits, and occasionally on dry lives" (563). He reaches to the level of thinking everything

from the level of severe austerities during the time of separation. The objects of Nature such as fruits and roots are the sources of energy. Like king Pṛthu, Śrī Kṛṣṇa makes impossible works possible using his *yogic* power for the completion of his *līlās*.

Pracetās, ten sons of King Prācīnabarhi, are separated from palace and enter into the ocean for the performance of austerities:

When all the Pracetās were ordered by their father to marry and beget children, they all entered the ocean and practice austerities and penances for ten thousand years. Thus they worshipped the master of all austerity, the Supreme Personality of Godhead.<sup>229</sup> (*Śrīmad Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 4. 24: 14)

The Pracetās realize that penance is better than the family life. In the *paurāṇic* period, there was the trend to leave home for the sake of knowledge from the system of austerities. Supporting this point, Prabhupāda writes in favor of the devotional service: "If one does not attain the perfect stage of devotional service, all austerities and penances actually have no meanings" (313). Pracetās do not like to waste their austerities so that they go to the bottom of the ocean for penance. Their intimacy to Nature during the time of boyhood inspires readers to perform their works remaining in Nature.

Similarities are drawn in the separation of king Bharata from his palace to forest. The king concludes that Nature is an appropriate place for pleasure and for penance. Śūkadēva explores the richness of Nature in the garden of King Bharata:

In the garden of Pulaha-āśrama, King Bharata lived alone and collected a variety of flowers, twigs, and *tulasī* leaves. He also collected the water of the Gaṇḍakī River, as well as various roots, fruits and bulbs. With these he offered



food to the Supreme Personality of Godhead, Vāsudeva, and, worshipping Him, he remained satisfied. In this way his heart was completely uncontaminated, and he did not have the least desire for material enjoyment. All material desires vanished. In this steady position, he felt full satisfaction and was situated in devotional service.<sup>230</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 5. 7: 11)

Love for Nature purifies the soul of King Bharata and he remains peaceful in the beauty of Nature. Moving ahead in this line of argument, Ramesh Menon states: "In time, he sat unmoving, absorbed in the *Brahman*" (268). This analysis deals with the way of penance of King Bharata on the bank of Gandaki River. This expression gives further insight that humans can spend the time of their retirement on the bank of rivers or forest.

Sage Agastya is like King Bharata for separation from others for penance. The sage has faith on the power of Śrī Kṛṣṇa so that he believes in separation from others and goes to Malaya Hills. In the perspective of Yama, the sage sees divine power in Nature: "When the great sage Agastya, the son of Kumbha, was residing in the Malaya Hills and worshipping the Supreme Personality of Godhead, I approached him, and he explained to me this confidential history"<sup>231</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 6. 3: 35). Yamarāja explains about separation of the sage for natural awareness. From this standpoint, Ramesh Menon expresses that sage Agastya worships god Viṣṇu on the top of Malaya Mountain (495). Like Śrī Kṛṣṇa, sage Agastya is a nature lover and gets perfection from his penance on the mountain. In this context, Yamarāja appreciates Agastya due to his respect to Nature.

Unlike Sage Agastya, the separation of Hiraṇyakaśipu from his society is a notable example in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* and his achievement denotes

how a person reaches in the apex of success remaining in the world of Nature. In Śūkadēva's words: "In the valley of Mandarā Hill, Hiranyakaśipu began performing his austerities by standing with his toes on the ground, keeping his arms upward and looking toward the sky. This position was extremely difficult, but he accepted it as a means to attain perfection"<sup>232</sup> (7. 3: 2). Remaining close to Nature, the ascetic does hard works to achieve his aim. According to Leibniz's discussion: "Such a perfect God is power which is the source of all" (qtd. in Masih 187). If someone has belief that there is the existence of God in Nature, he can perform austerities for the perfection of *yoga* as Hiranyakaśipu.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* instructs human beings to follow four *āśram*s strictly and *vānaprasthāśram* is compulsory. This *āśram*s motivates human beings to be separated from family members and one should go to Nature to spend the life of hermitage. In Nārada's words: "A *vānaprastha* should prepare a thatched cottage or take shelter of a cave in a mountain only to keep the sacred fire, but he should personally practice enduring snowfall, wind, fire, rain, and the shining of the sun"<sup>233</sup> (7. 12: 20). The separation from others makes a person to have special interrelation to Nature. Prabhupāda has similar ideas about *vānaprasthāśram* with Nature. He argues that senior citizens should take the shelter of Nature for inner peace (698). Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* insists in the *vānaprasthāśram* to maintain the relation between human beings and Nature.

The separation of Prahlāda from palace is a remarkable example in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* and it makes him one of the memorable characters. He is intentionally separated from his father and other family members and goes to Sahya Mountain. In this connection, Nārada further formulates his ideas:

Prahlada King, the dearest servitor of the Supreme Personality of Godhead, once went out touring the universe with some of his confidential associates just to study the nature of saintly persons. Thus he arrived at the bank of the Kāvarī, where there was a mountain known as Sahya. There he found a great saintly person who was lying on the ground, covered with dirt and dust, but who was deeply spiritually advanced.<sup>234</sup> (7. 13: 13)

Prahlada realizes the significance of Nature in the life of human beings so that he goes to mountainous area. From this standpoint, Swāmī Ranganathanda further explores: "The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam* provides us with a standard measure our experiences of love" (31). This discussion inspires human beings to love both plants and animals like Śrī Kṛṣṇa did. One can observe the activities of Prahlāda like the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in relation to Nature.

As Prahlada, Svāyambhuva Manu makes up his mind to go to Nature with his wife for austerities. He comes to know that Nature is a part for the completion of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and gets self-realization there. In King Parīkṣit's words: "Svāyambhuva Manu, the husband of Śatarūpā, was by nature not at all attached to enjoyment of the senses. Thus, he gave up his kingdom of sense enjoyment and entered the forest with his wife to practice austerities"<sup>235</sup> (8. 1: 7). From this evidence, Svāyambhuva Manu is a perfect king who does not have any desires for the gratification of senses and goes to Nature with the queen. C. L. Goswamī stresses on the same idea that Svāyambhuva Manu is "Fed up with the enjoyment of sense-objects" (736). This discussion stresses that human beings should not be the slave of senses in old age like Svāyambhuva Manu.

King Indradyumna too follows the trend of other kings and sages and goes to Malaya Hill for austerities:

Indradyumna King retired from family life and went to the Malaya Hills, where he had a small cottage for his *āśrama*. He wore matted locks on his head and always engaged in austerities. Once, while observing a vow of silence, he was fully engaged in the worship of the Lord and absorbed in the ecstasy of love of Godhead.<sup>236</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 8. 4: 8).

It gives a lesson to human beings to neglect body in old age for self-realization and salvation. When a king turns for the detachment of life in his old age, his citizens may follow the same path. In this relation, Ramesh Menon is apt to state: "He is awake when the world sleeps" (470). It hints that King Indradyumna has consciousness of Nature and soul so that he is linked to Nature as Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Thus, the separation from the royal family is meaningful in the life of king Indradyumna.

Sometimes, separation of a person from a group is necessary for the betterment of others. When there is the time of churning in the Kṣīrasāgara, snake Vāsuki is to be used as a rope for churning but the Nāga is frightened to come there because of the presence of Garuḍa. The bird is requested to be separated from that place for the feasible of Vāsuki Nāga: "Thereafter, Garuda, the chief of birds, unloaded Mandara Mountain from his shoulder and brought it near the water. Then, he was asked by the Lord to leave that place, and he left"<sup>237</sup> (*Śrīmad Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 8. 6: 39). The separation of Garuḍa is necessary for the performance of churning in the ocean without any hint of fear for Vāsuki Nāga. In this connection, Prabhupāda argues that snake Vāsuki is the natural food for Garuda (239). In the similar vein, human beings should understand the problems of others and if any problems may occur for others, it is better to depart from there.

Sudyumna, the son of Vaivasvata Manu, is apt to follow *vānaprastha āśrama* and goes to forest on the bank of the Yamunā River. His separation from his family to

forest pleases him during the time of retirement. In this context, Śukadeva Gośvāmī argues: "Thereafter, when his son Sudyumna had thus gone to the forest to accept the order of vānaprastha, Vaivasvata Manu, being desirous of getting more sons, performed severe austerities on the bank of the Yamunā for one hundred years"<sup>238</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 9. 2: 1). Sudyumna goes to forest near the Yamunā River for penance as the order of his father. Supporting this opinion, Tagare formulates his view that Sudyumna goes to nearby forest for severe austerities despite his sensual lifestyle (1130). Vaivasvata Manu stresses the importance of Nature and motivates his son to go there for penance.

The trend of Sudyumna is followed by King Ambarīṣa for going to forest for the sake of penance. The separation of King Ambarīṣa from his throne is a notable example of love and dedication to Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The king gives up his facilitated lifestyle and goes to forest to follow the *vānaprastha āsrama*. In this regard, Śukadeva stresses on the point:

Thereafter, because of his advanced position in devotional life, King Ambarīṣa, who no longer desired to live with material things, retired from active family life. He divided his property among his sons, who were equally as qualified and he himself took the order of *vānaprastha* and went to the forest to concentrate his mind fully upon Lord Vāsudeva.<sup>239</sup> (9. 5: 26)

This action of King Ambarīṣa instructs human beings to divide their property equally to sons. It is the responsibility of a father to divide property without discrimination among his sons before the time of retirement. Urmila Devi Dasi confirms that King Ambarish "bathed in the Yamunā River" (5). This incident proves that the king purifies himself bathing in the river. The aging father gets retirement from family life

and he purifies himself by bathing. It inspires humans to love both Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa at least in old days for the precepts of young generation.

Sage Saubhari follows the same trend as other sages and kings for penance in old age. The sage has attached to the material life but decides to follow the rules of *vānaprastha āsrama* as King Ambarīṣa. His separation from the family life is meaningful: "When Saubhari Muni, who was quite conversant with the self, went to the forest, he performed severe penances. In this way, in the fire at the time of death, he ultimately engaged himself in the service of the Supreme Personality of Godhead"<sup>240</sup> (*Śrīmad Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 9. 6: 54). When one wants to remain free from the gross material body, he should go to forest for penance as sage Saubhari. The sage goes to forest for knowledge which makes him self-satisfaction. It is more informative to corroborate that "The self-controlled sage performed there a severely austere penance which reduced his body" (qtd. in Tagare 1159). This incident encourages human beings to attach to Nature.

Unlike other sages and kings, Rohita, son of Hariścandra, has his obligation to go to forest to save his life in childhood. It shows that some human beings take the shelter of Nature for safety: "Rohita could understand that his father intended to offer him as the animal for sacrifice. Therefore, just to save himself from death, he equipped himself with bow and arrows and went to the forest"<sup>241</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 9. 7: 16). The case of Rohita for separation from family members is different from others in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The child knows that he will be sacrificed so that Nature is the means to save his life. In this connection, C. L. Goswāmī formulates that "Rohita was anxious to save his life" (30). To go to forest is an obligation for Rohita and the role of Nature plays the role of parents for him. It

shows that Nature is the solution of problems. In the *paurānic* period, human beings had used Nature for the betterment of positive works.

Unlike others, the departure of Rāmachandra is the matter of discussion in the *Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. He has obligation to go to forest for the fulfillment of his father's promise. His mission to go to forest is to kill time for fourteen years as the order of his father. The same idea is ascertained by Śukadeva: "Carrying out the order of His father, who was bound by a promise to his wife, Lord Rāmachandra left behind His kingdom, opulence, friends, well-wishers, residence and everything else, just as a liberated soul gives up his life, and went to the forest with Sītā"<sup>242</sup> (9. 10: 8). During the time of Rāmachandra, to go to forest was not for reward as the previous sages and kings but as a sign of punishment. From this standpoint, Devdutt Pattanaik explores that in the stories of the Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata, going to forest was a punishment (16). Like Rāmachandra, the Pāndava Brothers had been sent to forest for punishment.

The mission of Rāmachandra going to forest is not for penance as others, but he goes there for the obedience of his father Dasaratha. Basing his argument on such idea, Prabhupāda postulates: "He left everything without hesitation, just as a liberated soul or great *yogi* gives up his life without material attraction" (318). In this connection both Rāmachandra and Śrī Kṛṣṇa are similar for the love of Nature. But Śrī Kṛṣṇa remains in forest willingly with cows and cowherd community but Rāmachandra does not tend cows. Rāmachandra is an ideal son and the ruler of the world who regards Nature as his parents and remains happy. Both Rāma *līlā* and Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* motivate the minds of humans beings to love Nature and to act according to its condition.

Unlike Rāmachandra, Pṛṣṇi and Sutapā separate themselves from society and go to Nature for performance of severe austerities. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* supports this argument from the view of the Lord to Devaki and Vasudeva about austerities of their previous birth: "Thus you spent twelve thousand celestial years performing difficult activities of *tapasyā* in consciousness"<sup>243</sup> (10. 3: 36). It expresses that Vasudeva and Devakī were Pṛṣṇi and Sutapā in their previous birth (Prabhupāda 253) and they achieved their aim from their penance . The role of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the omniscient and tells present, past, and future of other human beings. Śrī Kṛṣṇa has perfection in power and knowledge and his role is retrospection in this context.

In the different line of argument, the separation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and *Gopī* is a notable episode in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* and this separation makes *gopīs* unhappy. Their madness in love to Śrī Kṛṣṇa is elucidated by Śukadeva to king Parikṣit: "Singing loudly of Kṛṣṇa, they searched for Him throughout the Vṛndāvana forest like a band of mad women. They even asked the trees about Him, who as the Supersoul is present inside and outside of all created things, just like the sky"<sup>244</sup> (10. 30: 4). The grief-stricken *gopīs* inquire trees about Śrī Kṛṣṇa showing *unmāda* state. In this regard, Viśvanātha Cakravartī has different opinion about the separation of Kṛṣṇa with *gopīs*. He is correct when he posits: "Kṛṣṇa *svarūpa* is not delimited, because He pervades everything" (qtd. in Filion 252). The separation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from *gopīs* is different from other characters in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. He remains in the hearts of the *gopīs* despite his separation because distance is not the boundary for lovers. The *gopīs* express their loneliness in words and actions when they have separation with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. They ask plants and trees about the whereabouts



of Kṛṣṇa. Similarly, they imitate the activities of their hero for pleasure during the time of his absence.

The prime reason to ask trees by *gopīs* is the trees are taller than humans and might notice Śrī Kṛṣṇa. According to *gopīs*: "O *aśvattha* tree, O *plakṣa*, O *nyagrodha*, have you seen Kṛṣṇa? That son of Nanda King has gone away after stealing our minds with His loving smiles and glances"<sup>245</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 30: 5). The *gopīs* question the trees about the location of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and it is the sign of their madness. Moving ahead in this line of argument, Sanātana Gośvāmī explores the psychology of *gopīs* to Śrī Kṛṣṇa: "He stole their minds. This suggests that their minds are jewels" (qtd. in Filion 254). In this context, Śrī Kṛṣṇa has the characteristics of Cupid for the attraction to *gopīs* of Vraja.

The *gopīs* turn to the earth (land) during the time of loneliness in the forest of Vṛndāvana and focus their attention to the earth. For them, the earth is the witness about the disappearance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. They address the earth:

O mother earth, what austerity did you perform to attain the touch of Lord Keśava's lotus feet, which has brought you such great joy that your bodily hairs are standing on end? You appear very beautiful in this condition. Was it during the Lord's current appearance that you acquired this ecstatic symptom, or was it perhaps much easier, when He stepped upon you in His form of the dwarf Vāmanadeva, or even earlier, when He embraced you in His form of the boar Varāhadeva?"<sup>246</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 30: 10)

The *gopīs* do not get the answer about Śrī Kṛṣṇa from trees thinking that they are in trance. But the earth is the real witness of Śrī Kṛṣṇa because they know that Kṛṣṇa always walks on the earth. They personify the earth as human being to find out whereabouts of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Sārātha Darśinī highlights that "Since Kṛṣṇa always walks

on the earth; she is never separated from Him" (780). The *gopīs* are worried for reunion with Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

*Gopīs* express selfishness of creatures after the fulfillment of their needs. For the proof of their logic, they assert that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is disappeared having betrayed them. On the basis of this idea, Śūkadeva expresses: "Birds abandon a tree when its fruits are gone, guests a house after they have eaten, animals a forest that has burnt down, and a lover the woman he has enjoyed, even though she remains attached to him" <sup>247</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 47: 8). This expression of *gopīs* shows selfishness of human being. They use objects and people according to their needs and after use; it is their habit to abandon them. In this line of thought, Tagare surmises that it is the disposition of humans to show their selfish activities after use (1540). The activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa reflect humans who do not think about others after use.

The separation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from *gopīs* has made a considerable impact in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. When he is in Mathurā, *gopīs* realize emptiness in Vṛndāvana due to their hearts and minds with him. Later, the *gopīs* inform Uddhava (friend of Śrī Kṛṣṇa) about the richness of Nature in the presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa but the same things of Nature are futile for them during the time of his absence. Their nostalgia is noted as follows: "When Kṛṣṇa was here in the company of Saṅkarṣaṇa, He enjoyed all these rivers, hills, forests, cows, and flute sounds"<sup>248</sup> (10. 47: 49). It is the reminiscences of *gopīs* about their love with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. When Śrī Kṛṣṇa is in Vṛndāvana, he remains close to Nature and spends his life happily there. The natural beauty resembles to the beauty of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his memory becomes joy for *gopīs*. Kamala Subramaniam is apt to state: "The flowers had all blossomed and the air was laden with their perfume" (477). On the base of this idea, one can show that flowers become different for *gopīs* during the time of presence and absence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

We can get continuation about the feelings of separation of Uddhava with Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He sees the presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in Natural things and gets information about him: "That servant of Lord Hari, seeing the rivers, forests, mountains, valleys and flowering trees of Vraja, enjoyed inspiring the inhabitants of Vṛndāvana by reminding them of Kṛṣṇa"<sup>249</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 47: 56). Explaining this statement, Uddhava shares his feelings to the inhabitants of Vṛndāvana and enjoys himself. He gets information about Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* as inseparable things and there is the projection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* from allusion of Nature. In relation to this idea, Devdutt Pattanaik argues: "flowers secreted nectar to wash the earth" (95). This discussion corroborates that the presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa makes different in feelings of both plants and animals. Human beings should see Śrī Kṛṣṇa in natural things for conservation of Nature.

After the curse of Durvāsā, Uddhava is separated from Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the achievements of his goal. In King Parīkṣhit's words: "After the great devotee Uddhava left for the forest, what did the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the protector of all living beings, do in the city of Dvārakā?"<sup>250</sup> (11. 30: 1). Like Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Uddhava is a nature lover and he returns to forest. The fact is that forest was supposed to be the base of spiritual life during the *paurāṇic* era. His intention is to link with Nature regarding that it is his ultimate objective of life. Uddhava goes to forest because of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's "internal potency and personal will" (Prabhupāda 746). From this standpoint, one can remark that Śrī Kṛṣṇa makes someone go to forest.

The separation of Pradyumna, the son of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from his family members is a noticeable episode. Sambara, a demon, kidnaps Pradyumna when he is ten days old regarding him as an enemy and throws the baby into the ocean. Rukminī bemoans in the absence of the baby. Later, a fisherman gets the infant and provides it to the

maidservant Māyāvātī. The maidservant knows the agony of baby's mother during the time of separation and she exposes Pradyumna: "Your poor mother, having lost her son, cries for You like a *kurarī* bird. She is overwhelmed with love for her child, just like a cow that lost its calf"<sup>251</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 55: 15).

Mother Rukminī bewails in separation of her beloved baby Pradyumna from her. Sārātha Darśinī has similar opinions about this incident that the condition of Rukminī is as the condition of a *kurarī* bird during the time of separation (398). In the above discussion, there is analogy of human feelings to a *kurarī* bird. This argument shows that there is equality between human beings and birds in feelings.

Like *gopīs*, the queens of Śrī Kṛṣṇa realize the presence of their husband in Nature. To support this opinion, they complain with Malayan breeze: "O Malayan breeze, what have we done to displease you, so that you stir up lust in our hearts, which have already been shattered by Govinda's sidelong glances?"<sup>252</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 90: 19). This condition of the queens shows that the presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa affects to the gust of air and they regard Malayan breeze as their beloved husband. The consorts of Śrī Kṛṣṇa regard the breeze as obstacle in their happiness with the husband. The gust of wind arouses emotions of those consorts which have already been shattered by glances of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The queens remember every moment with Śrī Kṛṣṇa and cannot see their existence in absence of him. They realize Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa because of the origin of same emotions in heart. Love-lorn queens complain breeze for consolation during the time of absence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In the words of Lyengar, every consort thought that "Krishna was by her side" (114). In this line of discussion, the readers come to know that the better-halves of Śrī Kṛṣṇa have keen interest for his company.

The queens of Śrī Kṛṣṇa complain mountains and rivers during the time of separation. The queens further refer their complaints as follows:

O magnanimous mountain, you neither move nor speak. You must be pondering some matter of great importance. Or do you, like us; desire to hold on your breasts the feet of Vasudeva's darling son? O rivers, wives of the ocean, your pools have now dried up. Alas, you have shriveled to nothing, and your wealth of lotuses has vanished. Are you, then, like us, who are withering away because of not receiving the affectionate glance of our husband, the Lord of Madhu, who has cheated our hearts? <sup>253</sup> (*Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* 10. 90: 22-23)

Mountains and rivers might have desires for union with Śrī Kṛṣṇa as his consorts. In this connection, Nita Mathur shows similarity between the earth and women: "Both women and earth are ploughed, pierced and dug into; both possess tremendous capacity to bear pain" (25). In this context, the complaints of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's consorts' are justifiable. They see their condition in relation to the earth and other natural things. With the similar beliefs, one can appraise that Śrī Kṛṣṇa uses his efforts for protection of both women and Nature.

After the performance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*, truth, *dharma*, and faithfulness leave the world and Nature starts facing the problems. In this connection, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* rests on the argument: "As soon as Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa left the earth, Truth, Religion, Faithfulness, Glory, and Beauty immediately followed Him. Kettledrums resounded in the heavens and flowers showered from the sky"<sup>254</sup> (11. 31: 7). The separation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from this world affected in the life of plants and animals and the crisis in Nature began on the earth. Moving ahead in this line of argument, Tagare incorporates that truth; righteousness and respect to Nature have

disappeared from this globe after the departure of Kṛṣṇa (2120). It shows that the death of a great personality affects in society, country, and the world. To support the idea of Nature, one can point out that a good person is able to control the exploitation in Nature.

Many characters are separated from society to go to forest and mountain for penance, to save life from difficulties, to take entertainment from the scenario of Nature, to express loneliness with natural things and for the fulfillment of their goals. Gods, kings, sages, and human beings with their remarkable identity go to forest for the completion of mission. There is the majority of the major characters who go to forest for austerities. The characters see the possibilities to succeed in their aim in forest either from penance or by making good relationship with Nature.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### ŚRĪ KṚṢṢṢA LĪLĀ THRIVES IN NATURE

This dissertation began with the objective of finding out how Śrī KṚṢṢṢa *līlā* is interrelated to Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa*. In this chapter, the researcher proves the thesis statement of the hypothesis to show interrelation between Śrī KṚṢṢṢa *līlā* and Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa* with evidences. The research questions of the dissertation have been answered in the textual analysis systematically in different titles for the linkages between the objectives and the analytical section. It discusses how this dissertation undertaken for its preparation can contribute to contemporary academic field. The conclusion reveal that Śrī KṚṢṢṢa *līlā* has interrelation to Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa* and it evokes readers to follow the path of Śrī KṚṢṢṢa for conservation of Nature. It shows how Śrī KṚṢṢṢa *līlā* is a useful framework as a doctrine to tackle present problems in Nature.

This dissertation explores that love of Nature is the prime philosophy of Śrī KṚṢṢṢa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa*. The first chapter is introduction in which present woes have been noted down. The argument supports this idea and indicates the prime causes of present problems in Nature. Vedavyāsa manifests the importance of Nature for well-being of human beings in which one can see harmony between Nature and creatures for the maintenance of Nature-friendly society. Śrī KṚṢṢṢa *līlā* reflects the biological intimacy given by Nature as gracefully as for the unity with soul and God and it teaches humans how to make equilibrium with Nature in modern society. The core reason to face diverse problems in modern civilized society is the lack of Śrī KṚṢṢṢa consciousness about Nature. There is association of Nature with human beings. Nature reflects the *panchamahābhūtas* (Five Elements of

Nature) in our bodies. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* influences human beings for friendship with Nature and its preservation for their benefits.

In Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*, Nature has prominent role and it behaves as a character with human feelings and activities. Sūkadeva mentions the condition of Nature during the birth time of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in harmony. All planets and stars are situated in their respective position for the sake of good stars. The water is clean and calm. Later, mother Yasodā sees harmony of Nature within the mouth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The reality is that Nature is humanized and it has both positive and negative impacts in the life of characters in the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa*. The objects of Nature such as rivers, trees, seasons, and land influence living world of creatures.

The writer has conveyed the natural objects in the life of humans and the other creatures in the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa*. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* has manifested Vedavyāsa's earnest love, gratitude, and sense of respect to Nature. In the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa*, the writer carries out a harmony between plants and animals for their existence. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* flourishes in the objects of Nature such as Kadamba, Peepal, parijat trees, Yamunā River, Indian Ocean, creepers, plants, sky, day, night, clouds, the sun, the moon, cows, calves, and monkeys. The hero has found similarities of the *gopīs* in every aspect of natural objects. The writer has infused feelings in every objects of Nature as humans. Śrī Kṛṣṇa has set harmony between Nature and human beings from ecosystem and the dependency of humans in Nature for their existence.

Nature has become the part and parcel of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in which he has expressed his attraction to it and such activities have established him as a worshipper of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa*. One can get the reflection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's beauty in the beauty of Nature. The hero has come to know that Nature



possesses human feelings and ideas. In the text, Nature has own way of communication and there is the depiction of its sensation. Śrī Kṛṣṇa, cowherd boys, and other characters of the text dedicate their lives to serve Nature. There is the tendency to worship the natural objects such as rivers, earth, the sun, the moon and this indicates the awareness of Nature. Śrī Kṛṣṇa has not done any activities without respecting Nature and he has broken the trend to worship Indra, the god of rain and fertility. He has established a new trend to worship Govardhan Hillock realizing that it is the source of bread and butter for the dwellers of that place. In the similar vein, one can find the concept of *Yajna* through Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa* for the purification of mind and respect to Nature.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa is fond of cottages surrounded by natural setting, and he has had his intention to stay there peacefully but he has faced different sorts of demons sent by Kāmsa and has suppressed the demons in the form of animals and objects such as Batsāsura, Bakāsura, Sakatāsura and Aghāsura. Śrī Kṛṣṇa has removed fear of the cowherd community by killing demons without using weapons. He has maintained peace and security in the natural world and it has shown his sense of favor towards Nature. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* has projected Nature and the glory of the territory of Nature is reflected from the manifestation of the scenario of the Yamunā River, Vṛndāvana Forest, Govardhan Hillock, lakes with lotuses and other sites of Nature. The beauty of the full moon night has had its own role for the background of the *rāsa līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with *gopīs*. Human needs are so well addressed from plants, so they are the gifts of Nature.

One can appraise that different activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are related to the awareness of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa*. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* has its relevance for the present-day scenario of the degrading condition of Nature. The

philosophy of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is to bring harmony for the existence of modern human beings from natural disaster. The *līlās* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are abundant with innumerable ethical lessons for the protection of all living and non-living objects of Nature. Vedavyāsa shows that pure mind of human beings motivates them for the performance of good activities for the substance of Nature. If one follows the instructions and the activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in interrelation to Nature, it becomes useful for solution of the environmental hazards. Thus, the aspects of Nature and *līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa* are important for modern humans.

The beauty of Nature evokes him for the background of *Rāsa Līlā* and Śrī Kṛṣṇa has pleased himself and the other *gopīs* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa*. When cowherd boys tend cows in Vṛndāvana, it is not necessary for them to use sticks. As Śrī Kṛṣṇa plays the flute, the cows follow him wherever he goes like lovers to their sweet hearts and children to mothers. Natural objects such as trees, shrubs, herbs, and other creatures have been pleased by *Rāsa Līlā*. He has not only got pleasure from Natural objects but also has pleased Nature from his activities. He belongs to the lunar dynasty so that the importance of the moon becomes the base in his *Rāsa Līlā*. The full moon night of the autumn season has promoted the *Rāsa Līlā* to please *gopīs*, other creatures, plants, and trees. After the *rāsa* dance, they go to the Yamunā River for the water sports for the promotion of romance. The things and beings of Vṛndāvana forest and the Yamunā River are the real witnesses of the *Rāsa Līlā*.

This dissertation has analyzed that Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* has been the base for the reflection of Nature and suggests that readers should control intervention over Nature. By mentioning the destruction of the twin Arjuna trees by innocent child, Kṛṣṇa has portrayed that modern humans are as careless as a child for the destruction of natural

objects. Similarly, the example of conflagration in the forest shows that Śrī Kṛṣṇa has taken risk of his life to extinguish conflagration. *Yogamāyā*, a *yogic* force for the performance of impossible works, has been the base for the performance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Without *Yogamāyā* there would not have been the significance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. His *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* guides human beings to work not only for themselves but also for the sake of others by establishing good relation with Nature.

In reality, human beings at present have been acting contrary to Nature. The aforementioned ideas of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in interrelation to Nature confirms that duty in connection to the path of *dharma* and for the conservation of environment is more important than personal and familial works. This interrelation has encouraged humans to conserve Nature. In the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa has punished the wicked humans and animals for the protection of *sādhus*- good humans. His admirable activities are related to the fact that we have to establish harmonious relationship between plants and animals in Nature. His heroic activities have established him as the great mythical hero of Indian sub-continent.

Nature is within the subject of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* and Śrī Kṛṣṇa has performed his activities without creating any harm to Nature. The flute- bannered Śrī Kṛṣṇa has attracted human beings, animals, birds, insects, plants, and trees. Nature is the main root behind his *līlā*. The objects which are found in Nature can also be realized in the perfection of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Association with Śrī Kṛṣṇa is no more than the association with the sun. If there is sunshine, there is no darkness. In the same way, Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is useful to control environmental hazards. The devotees of Śrī Kṛṣṇa believe that their progress in chanting helps to

purify Nature. Human beings do not care Śrī Kṛṣṇa, but they care Nature so that it is necessary to study Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in interrelation to Nature.

Analysis on Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* shows origin, development, and destruction of the natural world. The discussion of Nature is observed as a pace of devotion. If there is implementation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the life of human beings, it helps for conservation of Nature. The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* shows interest both to the study of Nature and devotion. Śrī Kṛṣṇa believes that Nature is not just Nature as an entity but it is a righteousness of human beings to conserve it. The role of *dharma* and Nature is similar to sustain the existence of human beings and other creatures. Thus, human body and Nature are made of same gross elements of Nature. The *bhakti* literature helps to serve both Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Nature for the well-beings of human beings.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* shows Kṛṣṇa's *bāla līlā* (childhood activities) in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. His dynamic activities are related to Nature and it is the prime setting to show his interrelation to Nature. As Nature, the hero pleases plants and animals from his sign of love to them. From his playful activities, everybody analyses that humans should try to be Śrī Kṛṣṇa to love plants and animals. It is necessary to take out Śrī Kṛṣṇa from temples for the knowledge of his philosophy of life. In his childhood, the hero lives in Vṛndāvana tending calves and cows. He can make friendship with calves, cows, and monkeys and remains happy with them. Humans cannot imagine Śrī Kṛṣṇa without calves, cows, and monkeys. The childhood age of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in Vṛndāvana identifies his pastoral lifestyle.

When Śrī Kṛṣṇa is in Vṛndāvana, he swallows conflagration to control bonfire for the preservation of forest. The hero sacrifices his life for the control of the conflagration. It shows his victory over fire and saves the cowherd community,

animals, birds, and insects using his *yogic* power. The hero understands the psychology of his cowherd mates and suggests them to close their eyes to avoid their fear. In this connection, one can analyze that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is ready to do for the conservation of forest. Śrī Kṛṣṇa kills different demons such as Batshāsura, Bakāsura, Trinavarta, Shakatāsura, Aghāsura, and Kesi to make the forest free from demons. Of course, humans can realize demons within their hearts so that they destroy forest without thinking its significance in their lives. Śrī Kṛṣṇa believes that everybody should be careful with the demons in the heart of humans. The people who have devilish nature are sure to destroy the objects of Nature. This Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* instructs humans to remain free from devilish Nature for the conservation of forest.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa's interrelation to Nature is reflected in his fighting with the Kāliya *Nāga* in the Kālindī pond of the Yamuna River. The venoms of the *nāga* kills animals, birds, and the cowherd boys and animals are in panic. Śrī Kṛṣṇa as a Nature lover, dives into the pond from the Kadamba tree and controls the *nāga* by dancing on its hoods and sends it to Raivatak Forest to save Nature and creature. When Śrī Kṛṣṇa remains fighting with the *nāga*, cows, monkeys, and other animals drop tears. In this context, one can argue that Śrī Kṛṣṇa does not distinguish between humans and other creatures. Due to his interrelation to Nature, animals, plants, and insects remain inseparable from him and become happy and satisfied from his company. When Śrī Kṛṣṇa is in problem, the cowherd boys and animals show the sign of empathy for him. It shows that Śrī Kṛṣṇa solves different problems in his childhood relating to forest and other objects of Nature.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa concludes that humans should not pollute water so that he hides the clothes of *gopīs* when they are bathing in the Yamuna River. It indicates that people should not bathe in rivers, lakes, ponds, seas, and oceans directly. Humans should

bathe by taking water out of rivers, lakes, ponds, seas, and oceans to control water pollution. The hero emphasizes to look after hills and mountains because they stop the rain bearing clouds. Instead of worshipping Indra, Śrī Kṛṣṇa breaks the social convention of his contemporary society and establishes new trend to worship hills and mountains. The hero is the innovator of new trend to strengthen his *līlā* to Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. It is the scientific conclusion in the interrelation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

During the time of childhood, Śrī Kṛṣṇa eats mud to show his interrelation to Nature. One can examine that everything grows in soil for food and shelter for creatures so that the hero gives a lesson to humans to respect land. Mother Yasodā examines the mouth of her son to know either there is mud or not but she comes to know that the whole universe is inside his mouth. The mother sees planets, stars, all creatures, and herself in his mouth. It shows that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the world despite his existence in this world. The hero has evidence to prove himself as Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Like Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the five elements of Nature (earth, water, light, air, and sky) are the bases for the creation of creatures. Śrī Kṛṣṇa proves that humans cannot separate Nature from their lives. The creation of creatures is inseparable from the objects of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Thus, humans need Śrī Kṛṣṇa's consciousness and love for Nature for its conservation.

As Nature, Śrī Kṛṣṇa serves human beings for the sake of justice and peace. Nature is his Goddess and Govardhan Hillock is his God so that he worships the hillock thinking that it stops rain bearing cloud. As a Nature lover, he worships mountains, trees, the sun, and small plants. He does not use any idols to worship in his life. He has intimacy with cows, calves, and monkeys so that he becomes happy serving animals. He is satisfied from his name "Gopāla" due to his interrelation to

cows. He uses feathers which peacocks discard as a crown. It shows that nothing is wasted in Nature.

In the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa*, readers find the reflection of Nature in the Yamunā River, cloud, flute, vegetation, and land. Śrī Kṛṣṇa identifies the land of Vṛndāvana, Gokula, and Dwārakā from his playful activities. He is the emperor of natural beauty and his *bāla* (childhood) *līlā* and *kishor* (adolescent) *līlā* are interrelated to natural scenery and beauty. Having used the beauty of Nature, the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa* has revealed the use and importance of ethics from the manifestation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. The presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa becomes the base of pleasure for plants and animals. The images of Nature have inspired human beings to control exploitation over Nature.

Objects of Nature such as Yamunā River, Vṛndāvana forest, cows, calves, and birds have extended the value of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. His playful activities have been associated with diverse aspects of Nature such as the Universal Form, subduing the Kāliya Nāga, devouring conflagration, lifting the Govardhan Hillock, and killing the demonic rulers. Nature has been identified as the prime career in the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgāvata Mahāpurāṇa*. His *līlās* have been used for conservation of Nature. Nature manifests through plants and animals and these are for benefits of human and non-human characters. Vedavyāsa has presented multiple issues in Nature through Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. Śrī Kṛṣṇa has brought changes in the life of plants and animals. He has regarded the world of Nature as the divine form and it is pointed out that there have been no differences between Nature and divine form. To deal with Nature in the text, Śrī Kṛṣṇa has made a balance between its mild and destructive forms and has accepted both forms of Nature as necessity of life.

The scientific conclusion in the interrelation between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* is humans should love and respect Nature. Nature is the mother for all creatures and plants because she provides us everything. If not, the earth turns from the loving mother into the wrathful goddess and natural disasters such as landslides, siltation of rivers, desertification, *tsunami*, hurricane, and tornado occur on the earth. Nature is the base of *dharma* so that Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is the path for humans to be conscious about the dominance of humans over Nature. From the Govardhan *līlā*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa instructs humans to love and respect their dwelling places. Both spiritual and historical landscapes are identified from the stories of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

The *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*'s approach of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in interrelation to Nature have been analysed within its larger discussion. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlās* are the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in Gokula, Vṛndāvana, Mathura, and Dwārakā. His activities in Vraja promote his pastoral lifestyle. One can get the representation of Nature in Vṛndāvana under the supervision of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlās* become dim in the absence of Nature in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The Yamunā River, human beings, plants, animals, birds, and insects are the witnesses of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlās*. Vraja is the place that serves as the background for the performance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. Nature is the ground for the *līlās* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

The remarkable Nature images in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* for the promotion of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlās* are Kadamba, Arjuna, *Kalpavṛkṣa* (*Parijat*), banyans, mangoes, sandalwood trees, jasmine flowers, and basil (*tulasi*) plants. Similarly, Yamunā River, Govardhana Hillock, Indian Ocean, and Vṛndāvana forest are other prime Nature images to highlight Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. The five elements of Nature such as earth, water, fire, air, and space are inseparable from Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā*. These basic



elements are found in Nature and in the life of all creatures and plants. It shows sameness of natural elements in Nature and creatures. Śrī Kṛṣṇa respects to all these elements and remains in favor of Nature. He positions himself as the guardian of Nature and *dharma*. By making intimacy with Nature, Śrī Kṛṣṇa establishes himself as a transformational leader. He makes conscious to human beings for the conservation of Nature. His playful activities help for self-realization to humans for the conservation of Nature. Nowadays, people are not careful to conserve forest and deforestation has made air, water, and land pollution. By swallowing bonfire, Śrī Kṛṣṇa proves himself as an environmentalist in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. The contribution of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to save Nature is admirable and other human beings should follow his footsteps.

There should be the realization of readers about the harmony between human beings and Nature. The text challenges the present practices relating to Nature. It does not differentiate between creatures and plants and Śrī Kṛṣṇa realizes sameness between cows and monkeys. Like *gopās*, *gopīs*, and other cowherd community, he loves cows, monkeys and other animals. In this context, Nature is the basis of love and intimacy between human beings and other creatures. The land of Vraja is manifested in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* to show interrelationship between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and Nature. The venue is simple with rustic characters such as Devaki, Vasudeva, Nanda Bābā, Yasodā, and Rukmiṇī. This venue serves as a background for the performance of the playful activities of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Readers find the portrayal of Nature in detail for the interrelation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*.

Readers should regard Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* as the basis of philosophy. Śrī Kṛṣṇa participates in fighting for *dharma* but does not reject the law of *karma*. His love of

Nature traces his tribal character. His efforts to make the forest free from demons indicate that he is worried to save forest. Śrī Kṛṣṇa has ideal lifestyle to teach human beings. He is an ideal son, an ideal brother, an ideal friend, and an ideal husband. Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* focuses that love is the central theme and everybody should love and support others for right actions for the sake of *dharma*. For him, rules and regulations are common and one can break the social rules for the sake of *dharma*. Some social rules may be the barrier of *dharma*. To save Nature is the main *dharma* of human beings.

The Govardhana *līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa indicates that he convinces the cowherd community to look after forest, pasture, and their dwelling places. In the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*, the characteristics of divine beings begin with the enquiry about the origin, development, and the destruction of the natural world. For Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Nature is not only physical environment, it is *dharma* for human beings. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is an originator of new thoughts, planner, leader, shaper of future, and Nature lover from the time of childhood. In hot season, he uses branches of trees as umbrellas. It shows that he uses the objects of Nature to make him comfortable. Śrī Kṛṣṇa goes to the Yamunā River because he realizes that water is life for creatures and plants. We can highlight historical and spiritual landscapes from the stories of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The presence of Śrī Kṛṣṇa is necessary for all creatures for pleasure during his contemporary society so that he is inseparable from Nature. Thus, each and every being and thing of Nature has intrinsic value and Śrī Kṛṣṇa *līlā* and its interrelationship with humans and nonhuman worlds motivates everyone for assimilating self with Nature.

### Proposed Topics for Future Research

Apart from the discussed ideas in the foregoing chapters of this dissertation, the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa Purāṇa* carries broad subject matters for academic research. The researcher has not covered those topics in this dissertation.

Some probable areas for further study are as follows:

- i. Exploration of Eco Spirituality in Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā*
- ii. Impacts of the Five Elements of Nature in Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā*
- iii. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a Tribal Character
- iv. Intimacy between Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā* and Nature in *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*
- v. Analysis of Nature from Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā* in *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*
- vi. Interconnection between Nature and Śrī Kṛṣṇa *Līlā* in *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*

## APPENDIX: I

**Glossary**

**Ācārya-** an ideal teacher, who teaches by his personal example; a spiritual leader.

**Aghasura-** a demon (*rākshasa*) in the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa Purāṇa*. He was one of Mathura's King Kāmsa's generals, elder brother of the demoness Putana.

**Akṣauhiṇī-** a military division consisting of 21,870 chariots, 21,870 elephants, 109,350 infantrymen and 65,610 horses.

**Āśrama-** one of four spiritual orders of life. These four spiritual orders of life are *Brahmacārya, Gṛhastha, Vānaprastha, and Sannyāsa*.

**Avatāra-** a descent, or incarnation, of the Supreme Lord.

**Bakāsura-** a demon in the form of a crane. He was sent by Kāmsa to kill infant Kṛṣṇa but Kṛṣṇa kills the demon.

**Balarāma (Baladeva)-** the first plenary expansion of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. He appeared as the son of Rohiṇī.

**Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa-** anything related to *Bhagavān*, the Supreme Lord, especially the devotee of the Lord and the scripture *Śrīmad Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*.

**Bhakta-** a devotee of the Supreme Lord.

**Bhakti-** devotional service to the Supreme Lord.

**Bhaktivedānta-** advanced transcendentalist who have realized the conclusion of the *Vedas* through devotional service.

**Bhakti- yoga-** linking with the Supreme by devotional service.

**Brahman-** the Absolute Truth; especially the impersonal aspect of the Absolute.

**Brāhmaṇa-** a person wise in *Vedic* knowledge, fixed in goodness and knowledgeable of Brahman, the Absolute truth; a member of the first *Vedic* social order.

**Brahmāstra-** a nuclear weapon produced by chanting *mantras*.

**Dharma-** duty, responsibility, and righteousness, especially everyone's eternal service nature.

**Dhenukāśura-** a mystic demon who took the form of a donkey and was killed by Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

**Dvāpara- yuga-** the third in the cycle of four ages. It lasts 864,000 years.

**Dvāraka-** the island kingdom of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, lying of the west coast of India, where he performed pastimes five thousand years ago.

**Gajendra-** the king of the elephants. He was saved from a crocodile by Lord Viṣṇu.

**Godhead-** the ultimate source of all energies.

**Gopīs-** Kṛṣṇa's cowherd girl friends, who are his most surrendered and confidential devotees.

**Gosvāmī-** a controller of the mind and senses; title of the one in the renounced, or *sanyāsa*, order.

**Govardhana-** a hillock dear to Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his devotees. Śrī Kṛṣṇa held it up for seven days to protect the cowherd community in Vṛndāvana from a devastating storm sent by Indra.

**Kāliya-** Name of the *Hindu* mythological multi-hooded serpent which poisoned in the Yamunā River. Śrī Kṛṣṇa controlled the Kāliya *Nāga* and took to Raivatak Forest.

**Kali-yuga-** the present age, characterized by quarrel; it is last in the cycle of four and began five thousand years ago.

**Kaṁsa-** a demonic king of the Bhoja dynasty and maternal uncle of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

**Karma-** material, fruitive activity and its reactions.

**Kātyāyāni-** the material energy personified. She is also known as Durgā and Kālī.

**Līlā-** (Sanskrit: “play,” “sport,” “spontaneity,” or “drama”) in *Hinduism*, a term that has several different meanings, most focusing in one way or another on the effortless or playful interrelation between the Absolute, or brahman, and the contingent world.

**Mahat-tattva-** the original, undifferentiated form of the total material energy, from which the material world is manifested.

**Mathurā-** Śrī Kṛṣṇa's abode, surrounding Vṛndāvana, where he took birth and to which he later returned after performing his childhood Vṛndāvana pastimes.

**Māyā-** the inferior, illusory energy of the Supreme Lord, which rules over this material creation; forgetfulness of one's interrelationship with Kṛṣṇa.

**Mokṣa-** liberation from material bondage.

**Nirguṇa-** without material qualities.

**Parakiyā-** the interrelationship between a married woman and her paramour;  
particularly the interrelationship between the damsels of Vṛndāvana and  
Kṛṣṇa.

**Prakṛiti-** material nature, the energy of the Supreme; the female principle enjoyed by  
male puruṣa.

**Purāṇa-** the *Vedic* supplementary literature, discussing such topics as the creation of  
the universe, incarnation of the supreme Lord and demigods, and history of  
dynasties of saintly kings.

**Pūtānā-** a witch who was sent by Kāṁsa to appear in the form of a beautiful woman  
to kill baby Kṛṣṇa, but who was instead killed by him and granted liberation.

**Rāsa- līlā-** the pure exchange of spiritual love between Kṛṣṇa and his most advanced,  
confidential servitors, the cowherd damsels of Vrajabhūmi.

**Sakatāsura-** a ghost who had taken shelter of the handcart and was looking for the  
opportunity to do mischief to Kṛṣṇa. When Kṛṣṇa kicked the cart with his  
small and very delicate legs, the ghost was immediately pushed down to the  
earth and his shelter dismantled.

**Sāṅkhya-** analytical discrimination between spirit and matter; also, the path of  
devotional service described by Lord Kapila, the son of sage Kardama and  
Devahuti.

**Śrīvatsa-** the sign of the goddess of fortune on the chest of Lord Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa.

**Sudarśana Cakra-** the spinning, discus weapon with 108 serrated edges, used by the *Hindu* god Vishnu or Srī Kṛṣṇa.

**Śukadeva Gosvāmī-** the great devotee sage who spoke *ŚrīmadŚrīmad Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa Mahāpurāṇa* to king Parikṣit just prior to the king's death.

**Upaniṣads-** 108 philosophical works that appear within the *Vedas*.

**Vaijayantī-** a garland containing flowers of five colours and reaching down to the knees. It is worn by Srī Kṛṣṇa.

**Vaiṣṇava-** a devotee of the Supreme Lord, Viṣṇu or Kṛṣṇa.

**Vāmana-** the incarnation of the Supreme Lord as a dwarf brāhmaṇa. balimahā surrendered to him.

**Vedas-** the original revealed scriptures (*R̥g, Yajur, Sāma* and *Atharva*)

**Virāṭ-rūpa-** the conception likening the physical the physical form of the universe to the Lord's bodily form.

**Vṛndāvana-** The holy town of Vrindavan, near Mathura is an important pilgrimage hub in Braj region that attracts many pilgrims every year. This is the place where Srī Kṛṣṇa is believed to have spent his childhood. The name of Vṛndāvan comes from words 'vrinda', which means basil, and 'van' meaning forest.

**Yadu (Yadava) dynasty-** the dynasty in which Srī Kṛṣṇa appeared.

**Yajña-** a ritual sacrifice with a specific objective.



**Yavana-** a low-class person, generally a meat-eater; a barbarian.

**Yoga-** spiritual discipline undergone to link oneself with the Supreme.

**Yogamāyā-** the internal, spiritual energy of the Supreme Lord; also, its personification as Kṛṣṇa's younger sister.

**Yugas-** ages in the life of the universe, occurring in a repeated cycle of four- *Satya*, *Tretā*, *Dvāpara* and *Kali Yugas*.

## APPENDIX: II

## Vowel Alphabets of Sanskrit Transliteration

Sanskrit Letters in <i>Devanāgarī</i>	Vowel Letters	Transliteration	Sounds Like
अ	a, A	<i>a, A</i>	a in <i>gun</i>
आ	Aa	<i>ā, Ā</i>	ā in <i>war</i>
इ	l, l	<i>i, l</i>	i in <i>if</i>
ई	ee, Ee	<i>ī, Ī</i>	ee in <i>geese</i>
ऋ	Hṛi	<i>ṛ, Ṛ</i>	Hṛi in Hṛiṣi
उ	u, U	<i>u, U</i>	u in <i>full</i>
ऊ	oo, Oo	<i>ū, Ū</i>	Oo in <i>fool</i>
ए	e, E	<i>e, E</i>	e in <i>pen</i>
ओ	o, O	<i>o, O</i>	o in <i>oven</i>
अनुस्वार	m, M	<i>m̄, M̄</i>	m in <i>hum</i>
विसर्गः	ha, Ha	<i>h̄, H̄</i>	h in <i>huh !</i>

(Adapted from *Śrīmad Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* by A. C. Bhaktivedānta

Swāmī Prabhupāda)

## APPENDIX: III

## Consonant Alphabets of Sanskrit Transliteration

Sanskrit Letters	Consonant Letters in <i>Devanāgarī</i>	Transliteration	Sounds Like
क	K	<i>ka</i>	k in <i>king</i>
ख	kh	<i>kh</i>	ckh in <i>blockhead</i>
ग	g	<i>g</i>	g in <i>mug</i>
घ	gh	<i>gh</i>	gh in <i>ghee</i>
ङ	ng	<i>ṅ</i>	ng in <i>sing</i>
च	ch	<i>c</i>	ch in <i>chicken</i>
छ	chh	<i>ch</i>	chh in <i>catch him</i>
ज	j	<i>j</i>	j in <i>jug</i>
झ	jh	<i>jh</i>	dgeh in <i>hedgehog</i>
ञ	n	<i>ñ</i>	n in <i>vyanjana</i>
ट	t	<i>ṭ</i>	t in <i>ten</i>
ठ	th	<i>ṭh</i>	th in <i>ant-hill</i>
ड	d	<i>ḍ</i>	d in <i>door</i>
ढ	dh	<i>ḍh</i>	dh in <i>godhood</i>
ण	n	<i>ṇ</i>	n in <i>phaṇa</i>
त	t	<i>t</i>	t in <i>taraju</i>
थ	th	<i>th</i>	th in <i>thanatos</i>

द	d	<i>d</i>	th in <i>their</i>
ध	dh	<i>dh</i>	dh in <i>breathe</i>
न	n	<i>n</i>	n in <i>den</i>
प	p	<i>p</i>	p in <i>pen</i>
फ	ph	<i>ph</i>	ph in <i>loop-hole</i>
ब	b	<i>b</i>	b in <i>ball</i>
भ	bh	<i>bh</i>	v in <i>van</i>
म	m	<i>m</i>	m in <i>mongoose</i>
य	y	<i>y</i>	y in <i>yak</i>
र	r	<i>r</i>	r in <i>room</i>
ल	l	<i>l</i>	l in <i>love</i>
व	v	<i>v</i>	v in <i>avert</i>
श	sh (palatal)	<i>ś</i>	sh in <i>shoot</i>
ष	s (cerebral)	<i>ṣ</i>	sh in <i>shame</i>
स	s	<i>s</i>	s in <i>sin</i>
ह	h	<i>h</i>	h in <i>house</i>
क्ष	ksh	<i>kṣ</i>	ksh in <i>kshetri</i>
त्र	tr	<i>tr</i>	tr in <i>trailokya</i>
ज्ञ	jñ	<i>jñ</i>	jñ in <i>jnan</i>

(Adapted from *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa* by A. C. Bhaktivedānta Svāmī Prabhupāda)

## APPENDIX: IV

## Important Incidents and Dates in Interrelation to Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa

S.N.	Date	Month	Day	Activities in Interrelation to Kṛṣṇa
1.	3230 BC	13 <sup>th</sup> July	Thursday	Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa was born in Mathura in the prison house of Kāṁśa.
2.	3222 BC	3 <sup>rd</sup> October	Friday	Performance of <i>Rāsa Līlā</i> in the forest of Vṛndāvana.
3.	3219 BC	9 <sup>th</sup> February	Friday	Kṛṣṇa killed Kāṁśa on the day of Śivarātri.
4.	3153 BC	26 <sup>th</sup> February	Friday	Kṛṣṇa killed Śiśupāla during <i>Rājasuya Yagna</i> .
5.	3154 BC	30 <sup>th</sup> September	Wednesday	Bhima killed Jarāsandha in duel as the sign of Kṛṣṇa from a twig in the assembly.
6.	3153 BC	4 <sup>th</sup> May	Wednesday	<i>Bastraharaṇa</i> of Draupadi by Duśśāsana in the hall in the presence of renowned personalities from Kauraba Family.
7.	3140 BC	8 <sup>th</sup> May	Tuesday	The <i>Pāndava</i> Brothers went to forest for thirteen years with their wife Draupadi after their defeat in the game of dice from <i>Kauraba</i> Brothers.
8.	3140 BC	31 <sup>st</sup> May	Thursday	The <i>Pāndava</i> Brothers reached the palace of King Virata.
9.	3140 BC	2 <sup>nd</sup> November	Friday	Commencement of the Mahābharata War
10.	3102 BC	15 <sup>th</sup> January	Friday	Commencement of the <i>Kaliyuga</i>

11.	3103BC	1 <sup>st</sup> October	Friday	Destruction of the Yadu Dynasty and Departure of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to Goloka.
-----	--------	-------------------------	--------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------

(Adapted from *Dates and Events of Incarnation of Lord Krishna in Dvapara Yuga* by

Dr. Sapam Nakishor Singh [www.e-pao.net](http://www.e-pao.net)>Manipur and Religion)

## APPENDIX: V

## VERSUS FROM THE SANSKRIT TEXTS USED IN THIS DISSERTATION

१. अग्निर्मुखं तेस्वनिरङ्घ्रिरीक्षणं

सूर्यो नभो नाभिरथो दिशः श्रुतिः ।

द्यौः कं सुरेन्द्रास्तव बाहवोऽर्णवाः

कुक्षिर्मरुत्प्राणबलं प्रकल्पितम् ॥ १३ ॥

रोमाणि वृक्षौषधयः शिरोरुहा

मेघाः परस्यास्थि नखानि तेऽद्रयः ।

निमेषणं रात्र्यहनी प्रजापतिर्मेद्वस्तु

वृष्टिस्तव वीर्यमिष्यते ॥ १४ ॥ (१०. ४०: १३-१४)

*agnir mukhaè te 'vanir aighrir ékñāëaà*

*sūryo nabho nābhir atho diṣaù çrutiù*

*dyaùè kaè surendräs tava bāhavo 'rëaväù*

*kukñir marut präëa-balaè prakalpitam*

*romäëi vākñauñadhayaù çiroruhä*

*meghäuè parasyästhi-nakhäni te 'drayaù*

*nimeñaëaà rätry-ahané prajāpatir*

*meòhras tu vāñöis tava véryam iñyate*

२. अष्टभेभमातमानो नित्यम्,

तथापि तेहसज्ज्योम्भियोगात्मकं जुनम्री तिस्तता एभ ॥

इत्यतः अहा अथा इति ॥ ३४

*astvevamātmano nityam*

*tathāpi dehasañayogaviyogātmañjunmritīsta eva*

*/ityata aha atha iti*

३. न मे पार्थास्ति कर्तव्यं त्रिषु लोकेषु किञ्चन ।

नानवाप्तमवाप्तव्यं वर्त एव च कर्मणि ॥ ३-२२ ॥ (गीता)

*na mepaarthaasti kartavyam trisu lokesukincana  
naanavaatam avaaptavyam varta evaca karmani*

४. प्रयुक्तान् भोजराजेन मायिनः कामरूपिणः ।

लीलया व्यनुदत्तांस्तान् बालः क्रीडनकानिव ॥ ३० ॥ ( ३. २: ३०)

*prayuktān bhoja-rājena*

*māyinaḥ kāma- rūpiṇaḥ*

*līlāya vyanudat tāms tān*

*bālaḥ krīḍanakān iva*

५. विष्वक्स्फुरन्तं ग्रहणातुरं हरिव्यालो

यथाऽऽखुं कुलिशाक्षतत्वचम् ।

द्वार्यूर आपात्य ददार लीलया

नखैर्यथाहिं गरुडो महाविषम् ॥ २९ ॥ (७. ८: २९)

*viṣvak sphurantam grahaṇāturaṁ harir*

*vyālo yathākhum kuliśākṣata-tvacam*

*dvāry ūrum āpatya dadāra līlayā*

*nakhair yathāhiṁ garuḍo mahā-viṣam*

६. यदि ह्यहं न वर्तेयं जातु कर्मण्यतन्द्रितः ।

मम वत्मानुवर्तन्ते मनुष्याः पार्थ सर्वशः ॥ ३-२३ ॥ (गीता)

*yadi hayaṁ na varteyaṁ jātu karmanyatandritaḥ*

*mama vatmānurvate manusyā pārtha sarvaṣḥ*

७. भूमिपुत्र महाभाग वेभेक्शेन्द्रमा पिनाकिन ।

रुपाथिमत्भाम प्रपकशोहम् गृहायार्थं नमोस्तुते ॥ (मत्स्यपुराण ३२. २१: ७)

*bhūmiputra mahābhāga/ vvekṣendva pinākina//*

*rūpārthim tvām prapakṣoaham/ grihāyārtha namoastu te*

८. आकाशवायुतेजाम्नि सलिलम पृथ्वी तथा ।

शब्दादिभिर्गुणैर्ब्रह्मान समियुक्तान्युतरोक्तरैः ॥



*ākāśavāyutejāmsi salilam pṛthivī tathā*

*śabdādibhiringūnaibrahyaṅ saṃyuktānyutarottaraiḥ*

९. सत्यम् वृहदोः ऋतमउग्रदिक्सा तपो ब्रह्मायग्री पृथ्वी धारयन्ति ।

सानोधुतस्य भवयस्यपतिउरुमलोकम् पृथ्वी नहकृनोतु ॥ (अथर्ववेद १२. १: २३)

ननाविर्यापृथाभुता सततस्ते संहतिम विना ॥

नाशक्नुमनप्रजाः ससतुममागम्य कृष्णश ॥ विष्णुपुराण (१. २: ४८-५०)

*satyam vrihaṛtamaugramdiksā*

*śāntā ghorāśca muḍhaśva viśeṣāstena te smṛtāḥ*

*nānāviryāḥ pṛthagbhutāstataste saṃhatim vinā*

*nāśaknuvan prajāḥ sraṣtumamāgamyā kṛṣṇaśaḥ*

१०. मार्ग आगच्छतो वीक्ष्य पुरुषान् पुरुषर्षभ ।

तान् शुल्कदान् वित्तवतः कान्तान् मेनेऽर्थकामुका ॥ २४ ॥

*mārga āgacchha vīkṣa tapo brahmāyagni pṛthvi dhārayanti*

*sānodhutasya bhayasyapatiurūmalokam pṛthvi nahakṛnotu*

*purūṣān purūṣaṣarva*

*tāna śulkaḍāna vittavata: kāntān menearthakāmukā*

११. गिरयस ते पर्वता हिमन्तो अरनियम ते पृथ्वी सयोनम अस्तु

भवरुप कृष्णाम रोहिणीम विश्वरुपम् ध्रुवम् भूमिम् पृथिविम् इन्द्र गुप्ताम्

अजिते अहतो अक्सतो अध्यास्थाम् पृथिविम् अहम् ॥ (अथर्ववेद १२. ११: २१)

*girayas te parvatā himanto arinayas te pṛthvi sayonama astu*

*bhavarūpa kṛṣṇām rohiṇim biśvarūpam dhruvam bhūmim pṛthvim indra guptām*

*ajite ahato aksato adhyāsthām pṛthivim aham*

१२. विमरिगनरिम पृथ्वीम् वदमिचयम भूमिम् ब्रह्माण

नब्रीधनम् उर्जपुस्तमविव्रतिमत्राभागम् धृतम्

त्याभिनी सिदेमभूमि ॥ अथर्ववेद (१: २९:२२)

*Bimrigwarim prithivima badamichayamam*

*Bhumim bramhana babridhanam*

*Urjapustam bibhratimannabhagam ghritam*

*Tyabhini sidem bhumī*

१३. नतत्रसुरमो भाति नचन्द्र ।

तारक मनेमा विद्युतोभाकुतोयम् अगुइह

तम एम भान्तम अन्भासर्वम्

तसोभस । सर्वभम् इदम् विभति ॥ (मुण्डकोपनिषद ७७)

*na tatraṣu: ryo bhāti, na candra*

*tārakam, nemā vidyuto bhāākuto `yam aguih*

*tam eva bhāntam anubhāāsarvam, tasta bhasa/ sarvam, idam vibhati*

१४. स्वभवमे कवयोवादन्ति

कालथान्वे परिमुन्यमाना देवस्येश महिमतुलोके एनेदम ब्रह्मधते वह्नचक्रम् ॥

श्वेतवराह उपनिसद (हतनाढी) ९६. १: २०)

*swabhawame kawayo wadanti*

*kālatthānye parimu:nya mānā*

*devasyesa mahimatu:loke*

*yenedam bhramyate bramhachakram*

१५. आरामच यलोत्तरो मार्गभा भृक्सरोपकाह ।

भ्रजन्ति यमलोकम च अतपेअपि गतक्कलमाहा ।

यन्ति पुष्पकयानेन पुष्पारामकरानरह ॥ शिवपुराण। (५. ११: ३१२)

*ārāmacchayalorttaro marge vā vṛkṣaropakāh*

*vrajanti yamalokam ca atape api gatakāmāh*

*yānti puṣpakayānena puṣpārāmakarānarah*

१६. मनुष्यम् किन्नरान मत्स्यन वराहंसच विहमगमान ।

गजानस्भानथा पशुन्मृगान्या किन्नरान मत्स्यन वराहंसच विहमगमान ।

गजानस्भाननथ पशुन्मृगान्यालमश्च भरत

क्रिमी किटपतमाशी च युफ कलीसकामत्कुनान

सर्भम् च दशमशकम् स्थावरम् च प्रिहगविदम् ॥ (भविष्यपुराण १९०)

*manusyām kinnarān matsyān varāhāmsca vihamgamān/  
 gajansbhānantha pashūnmṛganyālmāscā bharata  
 gajānasvānatha pasūnmṛgānvyālamśca bharata //  
 kṛmikitapatamgās'ica yūḥkalikṣakāmatkunān/  
 sarvam ca dasamaśakam sthāvaram ca prihagvidham*

१७. शौचममूत्रस्थिवनदी वस्त्रक्सलनमैथुने ।

गत्रसम्मरजनम वरिकन्दम सन्तरमेव च ॥

न कुर्यतिर थनैरमल्यनसकम् किञ्चिदप्यहो ॥ (वरमाण्डपुराण ३. १२: ४५)

*that saucam mutrasthivanadi Vastraksalanamaithune  
 gtrasammarjanam varikndam samtarameva ca  
 na kuryattirthanairmalyanasakam kincidapyaho*

१८. भुमल्दनेन ये लोकगोदनेन च क्कितित ।

ते लोक प्रप्यते पमभिह पदपनम् प्ररोहने ॥ (वराहपुराण २. २६: २१)

*bhumldanena ye lokah godanena ca kirttitah  
 te lokah prapyate pumbhih padapanam prarohane*

१९. वातवर्षातपहिमान् सहन्तो वारयन्ति नः ॥ ३२ ॥

अहो एषां वरं जन्म सर्वप्राण्युपजीवनम् ।

सुजनस्येव येषां वै विमुखा यान्ति नार्थिनः ॥ ३३ ॥

पत्रपुष्पफलच्छाया मूलवल्कलदारुभिः ।

गन्धनिर्यासभस्मास्थितोक्मैः कामान् वितन्वते ॥ ३४ ॥ (१०. २२: ३३-३४)

*vātavarṣātpahimān sahanto vārayanti nah  
 aho eṣam varam janma sarvaprānyupajivanam  
 sujanasyeva yeṣam vai vimukhāyanti narthinah  
 patrapuṣpaphalacchayamulavalkaladarubhi  
 gandhaniryasabhasmasthitokmaih Kāmān vitanvat*

२०. निगमकल्पतरुर्गलितं फलं

शुकमुखादमृतद्रवसंयुतम् ,

पिबत भागवतं रसमालयं

मुहुरहो रसिका भुवि भावुकाः ॥ ३॥ (१. १: ३)

*nigama-kalpa-taror galitaà phalaà*

*çuka-mukhäd amâta-drava-saàyutam*

*pibata bhägavataà rasam älayaà*

*muhur aho rasikä bhuvi bhävukäù*

२१. सान्द्रनीलाम्बुदैव्योम सविद्युत्स्तनयित्नुभिः ।

अस्पष्टज्योतिराच्छन्नं ब्रह्मेव सगुणं बभौ ॥ ४॥ (१०. २०: ४)

*sändra-nélämbudair vyoma*

*sa-vidyut-stanayitnubhiù*

*aspañöa-jyotir äcchannaà*

*brahmeva sa-guëaà babhau*

२२. केचिदाहरजं जातं पुण्यश्लोकस्य कीर्तये ।

यदोः प्रियस्यान्ववाये मलयस्येव चन्दनम् ॥ ३२॥ (१. ८: ३२)

*kecid ähur ajaà jätaà*

*punya-çlokasya kértaye*

*yadoh priyasyänvaväye*

*malayasyeva candanam*

२३. नद्यः प्रसन्नसलिला हृदा जलरुहश्रियः ।

द्विजालिकुलसन्नादस्तवका वनराजयः ॥ ३॥ (१०. ३: ३)

*nadyaù prasanna-salilä*

*hradä jalaruha-çriyaù*

*dvijäli-kula-sannädastavakä*

*vana-räjayaù*

२४. श्रुत्वा पर्जन्यनिनदं मण्डुकाः व्यसृजन् गिरः ।

तूष्णीं शयानाः प्राग्यद्ब्रह्मणो नियमात्यये ॥ ९॥ (१०. २०: ९)

*çrutvā parjanya-ninadaà*

*maëdukäù sasājur giraù*

*tüñëéè çayänäù präg yadvad*

*brähmaëä niyamätyaye*

२५. व्यसृजन् वायुभिर्नुन्ना भूतेभ्योऽथामृतं घनाः ।

यथाऽऽशिषो विशपतयः काले काले द्विजेरिताः ॥ २४॥ (१०. २०: २४)

*vyamuican väyubhir nunnä*

*bhütebhyaç cämâtaè ghanäù*

*yathäçiño viç-patayaù*

*käle kale dvijeritäù*

२६. निश्चलाम्बुरभूत्तूष्णीं समुद्रः शरदागमे ।

आत्मन्युपरते सम्यङ्मुनिर्व्युपरतागमः ॥ ४०॥ (१०. २०: ४०)

*niçcalämbur abhüt tüñëéè*

*samudraù çarad-ägame*

*ätmany uparate samyai*

*munir vyuparatägamaù*

२७. नद्यस्तदा तदुपधार्य मुकुन्दगीत -

मावर्तलक्षितमनोभवभग्नवेगाः ।

आलिङ्गनस्थगितमूर्मिभुजैर्मुरारेःगृह्णन्ति

पादयुगलं कमलोपहाराः ॥ १५॥ (१०. २१: १५)

*nadyas tadā tad upadhārya mukunda-gītam*

*āvarta-lakṣita-manobhava-bhagna-vegāḥ*

*ālmngana-sthagitam ūrmi-bhujair murārer*

*grhṇanti pāda-yugalam kamalopahārāḥ*

२८. एकायनोऽसौ द्विफलत्रिमूल -

श्रतूरसः पञ्चविधः षडात्मा ।

सप्तत्वगष्टविटपो नवाक्षो

दशच्छदी द्विखगो ह्यादिवृक्षः ॥ २७॥ (१०. २: २७)

*ekäyano 'sau dvi-phalas tri-mūlas*

*catü-rasaù païca-vidhaù ñaò-ätmä*

*sapta-tvag añña-viöapo naväkñö*

*daça-cchadé dvi-khago hy ädi-våknäù*

२९. गौर्भूत्वाश्रुमुखी खिन्ना क्रन्दन्ती करुणं विभोः ।

उपस्थितान्तिके तस्मै व्यसनं स्वमवोचत ॥ १८॥ (१०. १: १८)

*gaur bhütväçru-mukhé khinnä*

*krandanté karuëaà vibhoù*

*upasthitäntike tasmai*

*vyasanaà samavocata*

३०. मातरं पितरं भ्रातृन् सर्वाश्च सुहृदस्तथा ।

घ्नन्ति ह्यसुतृपो लुब्धा राजानः प्रायशो भुवि ॥ ६७॥ (१०. १: ६७)

*mätaraà pitaraà bhrätèn*

*sarvääç ca suhådas tathä*

*ghnanti hy asutåpo lubdhä*

*räjänaù präyaço bhuvi*

३१. भावयत्येष सत्त्वेन लोकान् वै लोकभावनः ।

लीलावतारानुरतो देवतिर्यङ्गनरादिषु ॥ ३४॥ (१. २: ३४)

*bhävayaty eña sattvena*

*lokän vai loka-bhävanaù*

*lélävatäränurato*

*deva-tiryai-narädiñu*

३२. नमः पङ्कजनाभाय नमः पङ्कजमालिने ।

नमः पङ्कजनेत्राय नमस्ते पङ्कजाङ्घ्रये ॥ २२॥ (१. ८: २२)

*namaḥ paikaja-nābhāya*

*namaḥ paikaja-māline*

*namaḥ paikaja-netrāya*

*namas te paikajāṅghraye*

३३. नैमिषेऽनिमिषक्षेत्रे ;यः शौनकादयः ।

सत्रं स्वर्गाय लोकाय सहस्रसममासत ॥ ४॥ (१. १: ४)

*naimiṣe 'nimiṣa-kṣetre*

*āñayaṁ ṣaunakādayaṁ*

*satraṁ svargāya lokāya*

*sahasra-samam āsata*

३४. तस्मिन् स्व आश्रमे व्यासो बदरीषण्डमण्डिते ।

आसीनोऽप उपस्पृश्य प्रणिदध्यौ मनः स्वयम् ॥ ३॥ (१. ७: ३)

*tasmin sva āśrame vyāso*

*badarē-ṣaṇḍa-maṇḍite*

*āsēno 'pa upaspṛśya*

*praṇidadhyau manaḥ svayam*

३५. धर्मं प्रवदतस्तस्य स कालः प्रत्युपस्थितः ।

यो योगिनश्छन्दमृत्योर्वाञ्छितस्तूत्तरायणः ॥ २९॥ (१. ९: २९)

*dharmaṁ pravadataḥ tasya*

*sa kālaḥ pratyupasthitaḥ*

*yo yoginaḥ chanda-mātyor*

*vāñchitaḥ tūttarāyaṇaḥ*

३६. वृषं मृणालध्रुवलं मेहन्तमिव विभ्यतम् ।

वेपमानं पदैकेन सीदन्तं शूद्रताडितम् ॥ २॥ (१. १७: २)

*vṛṣaà mṛṇāla-dhavalāè*

*mehantam iva bibhyatam*

*vepamānaè padaikena*

*sédantaè çüdra-tāḍitam*

३७. तामसादपि भूतादेर्विकुर्वाणादभून्नभः ।

तस्य मात्रा गुणः शब्दो लिङ्गं यद्द्रष्टृदृश्ययोः ॥ २५॥ (२. ५: २५)

*tāmasād api bhūtāder*

*vikurvāṇād abhūn nabhaḥ*

*tasya mātrā guṇaḥ śabdo*

*liṅgam yad draṣṭṛ-dṛśyayoḥ*

३८. स चिन्तयन् द्वाक्षरमेकदाम्भसि

उपाशृणोद्विर्गदितं वचो विभुः ।

स्पर्शेषु यत्षोडशमेकविंशं

निष्किञ्चनानां नृप यद्धनं विदुः ॥ ६॥ (२. ९: ६)

*sa cintayan dvy-akṣaram ekadāmbhasy*

*upāçṛṇod dvir-gaditaè vaco vibhuḥ*

*sparçeṣu yat ṣoḍaçam ekaviṅçaè*

*niṣkūcanānāè nṛpa yad dhanaè viduḥ*

३९. अन्तर्हितेन्द्रियार्थाय हरये विहिताञ्जलिः ।

सर्वभूतमयो विश्वं ससर्जेदं स पूर्ववत् ॥ ३९॥ (२. ९: ३९)

*antar hitendriyārthāya*

*haraye vihitāñjaliḥ*

*sarva-bhūtamayo viśvam*

*sasarjedam sa pūrvavat*

४०. स इत्थमुद्वीक्ष्य तदब्जनाल -

नाडीभिरन्तर्जलमाविवेश ।

नार्वाग्गतस्तत्त्वरनालनालनाभिं



विचिन्वंस्तदविन्दताजः ॥ १९॥ (३. ८: १९)

*sa ittham udvékñya tad-abja-nālanādebhira*

*antar-jalam āviveṣa*

*nārvāg-gatas tat-khara-nāla-nālanābhīā*

*vicinvaṣe tad avindatājāu*

४१. यैस्तत्त्वभेदैरधिलोकनाथो

लोकानलोकान् सह लोकपालान् ।

अचीकृत्पद्यत्र हि सर्वसत्त्व -

निकायभेदोऽधिकृतः प्रतीतः ॥ ८॥ (३. ५: ८)

*yais tattva-bhedair adhiloka-nātho*

*lokān alokān saha lokapālān*

*acékypad yatra hi sarva-sattvanikāya-*

*bhedo 'dhikātaṁ pratētaṁ*

४२. सप्तमो मुख्यसर्गस्तु षड्विधस्तस्थुषां च यः।

वनस्पत्योषधिलता त्वक्सारा वीरुधो द्रुमाः ॥ १९॥ (३. १०: १९)

*saptamo mukhya-sargas tu*

*ṣaḍ-vidhas tasthuṣām ca yaḥ*

*vanaspaty-oṣadhi-latā-*

*tvaksārā vīdrumāḥ*

४३. आन्वीक्षिकी त्रयी वार्ता दण्डनीतिस्तथैव च ।

एवं व्याहृतयश्चासन् प्रणवो ह्यस्य दहतः ॥ ४४॥ (३. १२: ४४)

*ānvékñiké trayé vārtā*

*daēḍa-nētis tathaiva ca*

*evaṁ vyāhātayaṣ cāsan*

*praēavo hy asya dahrataṁ*

४४. देवोऽदेवाञ्जनतः सृजति स्मातिलोलुपान् ।

त एनं लोलुपतया मैथुनायाभिपेदिरे ॥ २३॥ (३. २०: २३)

*devo 'deväi jaghanatai*

*sâjati smätihilupän*

*ta enaè lolupatayä*

*maithunäyâbhipedire*

४५. स्रवन्ति सरितो भीता नोत्सर्पत्युदधिर्यतः ।

अग्निरिन्ध्रे सगिरिभिर्भूर्न मज्जति यद्भ्रूयात् ॥ ४२॥ (३. २९: ४२)

*sravanti sarito bhétä*

*notsarpaty udadhir yatai*

*agnir indhe sa-giribhir*

*bhür na majjati yad-bhayät*

४६. देवतिर्यङ् मनुष्याणां सरीसृपसवीरुधाम् ।

सर्वजीवनिकायानां सूर्य आत्मा दृगीश्वरः ॥ ४६॥ (५. २०: ४६)

*deva-tiryai-manuñyääää*

*sarésâpa-savérudhäm*

*sarva-jéva-nikäyanää*

*sürya ätmä dâg-éçvaraù*

४७. स एष भगवानादिपुरुष एव साक्षा -न्नारायणो लोकानां स्वस्तय आत्मानं

त्रयीमयं कर्मविशुद्धिनिमित्तं कविभिरपि च वेदेन विजिज्ञास्यमानो द्वादशधा

विभज्य षट्सु वसन्तादिष्वृतुषु यथोपजोषमृतुगुणान् विदधाति ॥ ३॥ (५. २२: ३)

*sa eña bhagavän ädi-puruña eva säkñän näräyaëo lokänää svastaya ätmänaè*

*trayémayaà karma-viçuddhi-nimittaà kavibhir api ca vedena*

*vijijäsyamänodvädaçadhä*

*vibhajya ñaösu vasantädiñv ätuñu yathopa-joñam ätu-guëän vidadhâti.*

४८. आतिष्ठत सतां मार्गं कोपं यच्छत दीपितम् ।

पित्रा पितामहेनापि जुष्टं वः प्रपितामहैः ॥ ११ ॥ (६. ४: ११)

*ätiñöhata satäà märgaà*

*kopaà yacchata dépitam*

*piträ pitämahenäpi*

*juñöaà vaù prapitämahaiù*

४९. पुरा स्वयम्भूरपि संयमाम्भ -

स्युदीर्णवातोर्मिरवैः कराले ।

एकोऽरविन्दात्पतितस्ततार

तस्माद्भ्रूयाद्येन स नोऽस्तु पारः ॥ २४ ॥ (६. ९: २४)

*purä svayambhür api saàyamämbhasy*

*udérëa-vätormi-ravaiù karäle*

*eko 'ravindät patitas tatära*

*tasmäd bhayäd yena sa no 'stu päraù*

५०. आत्मन्यग्नीन् समारोप्य सत्र्यस्याहंममात्मताम् ।

कारणेषु न्यसेत्सम्यक् सङ्घातं तु यथार्हतः ॥ २४ ॥ (७. १२: २४)

*ätmany agnén samäropya*

*sannyasyähaà mamätmatäm*

*käraëënu nyaset samyak*

*saighätaà tu yathärhataù*

५१. अम्भस्तु यद्रेत उदारवीर्यं

सिध्यन्ति जीवन्त्युत वर्धमानाः ।

लोकास्त्रयोऽथाखिललोकपालाः प्रसीदतां

ब्रह्म महाविभूतिः ॥ ३३ ॥ (८. ५: ३३)

*ambhas tu yad-reta udära-véryaà*

*sidhyanti jévanty uta vardhamänäù*

*lokä yato 'thäkhila-loka-päläü*

*prasédatäè naü sa mahä-vibhütiü*

५२. क्रीडार्थमात्मनइदं त्रिजगत्कृतं ते

स्वाम्यं तु तत्र कुधियोऽपर ईश कुर्युः ॥ २०॥ (८. २२:२०)

*kréðärtham ätmana idaè tri-jagat kåtaè te*

*svämyaè tu tatra kudhiyo 'para éça kuryuü*

५३. मातरं पितरं भ्रातृन् सर्वांश्च सुहृदस्तथा ।

व्रन्ति ह्यसुतृपो लुब्धा राजानः प्रायशो भुवि ॥ ६७॥ (१०. १: ६७)

*mätaraè pitaraè bhrätèn*

*sarvääç ca suhådas tathä*

*ghnanti hy asutåpo lubdhä*

*räjänau präyaço bhuvi*

५४. वत्सान् मुञ्चन् क्वचिदसमये क्रोशसञ्जातहासः

स्तेयं स्वाद्वत्त्यथ दधि पयः कल्पितैः स्तेययोगैः ।

मर्कान् भोक्ष्यन् विभजति स चेन्नात्ति भाण्डं भिन्नति

द्रव्यालाभे स गृहकुपितो यात्युपक्रोश्य तोकान् ॥ २९॥ (१०. ८: २९)

*vatsän müican kvacid asamaye kroça-saijåta-håsau*

*steyaè svädv atty atha dadhi-payau kalpitaiü steya-yogaiü*

*markän bhokñyan vibhajati sa cen nätti bhäèdaè bhinnatti*

*dravyälåbhe sagåha-kupito yäty upakroçya tokän*

५५. ततोऽतिकायस्य निरुद्धमार्गिणो

ह्युद्गीर्णदृष्टेर्भ्रमतस्त्वितस्ततः ।

पूर्णोऽन्तरङ्गो पवनो निरुद्धो

मूर्धन् विनिष्पाद्य विनिर्गतो बहिः ॥ ३१॥ (१०. १२: ३१)

*tato 'tikåyasya niruddha-mårgiëo*

*hy udgërëa-dånëer bhramatas tv itas tataü*

*pürëo 'ntar-aige pavano niruddho*

*mürdhan vinirbhidya vinirgato bahiù*

५६. हन्तायमद्रिरबला हरिदासवर्यो

यद्रामकृष्णचरणस्पर्शप्रमोदः ,

मानं तनोति सह गोगणयोस्तयोर्यत्

पानीयसूयवसकन्दरकन्दमूलैः ॥ १८॥ (१०. २९: १८)

*hantāyam adrir abalā hari-dāsa-varyo*

*yad rāma-kṛṣṇa-caraṇa-sparaśa-pramodaḥ*

*mānaṁ tanoti saha-go-gaṇayos tayor yat*

*pānīya-sūyavasa-kandara-kandamūlath*

५७. तर्हि भग्नगतयः सरितो वै

तत्पदाम्बुजरजोऽनिलनीतम् ।

स्पृह्यतीर्वयमिवाबहुपुण्याः

प्रेमवेपितभुजाः स्तिमितापः ॥ ७॥ (१०. ३५: ७)

*tarhi bhagna-gatayah sarito vai*

*tat-padāmbuja-rajo 'nila-nītam*

*spṛhayatīr vayam ivābahu-punyāḥ*

*prema-vepita-bhujāḥ stimitāpaḥ*

५८. स वीक्ष्य क्षुल्लकान्मर्त्यान् पशून् वीरुद्वनस्पतीन् ।

मत्वा कलियुगं प्राप्तं जगाम दिशमुत्तराम् ॥ २॥ (१०. ५२: २)

*samvīkṣya kṣullakān martyān*

*paśūn virud-vanaspatīn*

*matvā kalī-yugaṁ prāptaṁ*

*jagāma diśam uttarām*

५९. स्थलेऽभ्यगृह्णाद्रस्त्रान्तं जलं मत्वा स्थलेऽपतत् ।

जले च स्थलवद्भ्रान्त्या मयमायाविमोहितः ॥ ३७॥ (१०. ७५: ३७)

*sthale 'bhyagrḥṇād vastrāntam*

*jalam matvā sthale 'patat*

*jale ca sthala-vad bhrāntyā*

*maya-māyā-vimohitaḥ*

६०. न घटत उद्भवः प्रकृतिपूरुषयोरजयोः

उभययुजा भवन्त्यसुभृतो जलबुद्बुदवत् ।

त्वयि त इमे ततो विविधनामगुणैः परमे

सरित इवार्णवे मधुनि लिल्युरशेषरसाः ॥ ३१॥ (१०. ८७: ३१)

*na ghaṭata udbhavaḥ prakṛti-pūruṣayor ajayor*

*ubhaya-yujā bhavanty asu-bhṛto jala-budbuda-vat*

*tvayi tai me tato vividha-nāma-guṇaiḥ parame*

*sarita ivārṇave madhuni lilyur aśeṣa-rasāḥ*

६१. भो भोः सदा निष्ठनसे उदन्व -

न्नलब्धनिद्रोऽधिगतप्रजागरः ।

किंवा मुकुन्दापहृतात्मलाञ्छनः

प्राप्तां दशां त्वं च गतो दुरत्ययाम् ॥ १७॥ (१०. ९०: १७)

*bho bhoḥ sadā niṣṭhanase udanvann*

*alabdha-nidro 'dhigata- prajāgaraḥ*

*kiṁ vā mukundāpahṛtātma-lānchanah*

*prāptām daśām tvam ca gato duratyayām*

६२. अपां रसश्च परमस्तेजिष्ठानां विभावसुः ।

प्रभा सूर्येन्दुताराणां शब्दोऽहं नभसः परः ॥ ३४॥ (११. १६: ३४)

*apām rasaś ca paramas*

*tejiṣṭhānām vibhāvasuḥ*

*prabhā sūryendu-tārāṇām*

*śabdo 'ham nabhasaḥ paraḥ*

६३. पुरग्रामत्रजान् सार्थान् भिक्षार्थं प्रविशंश्चरेत् ।

पुण्यदेशसरिच्छैलवनाश्रमवतीं महीम् ॥ २४॥ (११. १८: २४)

*pura-grāma-vrajān sārthān*

*bhikṣārtham praviśamś caret*

*puṇya-deśa-saric-chila-*

*vanāśrama-vatīm mahīm*

६४. वनं वृन्दावनं नाम पशव्यं नवकाननम् ।

गोपगोपीगवां सेव्यं पुण्याद्रितृणवीरुधम् ॥ २८॥ (१०. ११: २८)

*vanaè vāndāvanaè nāma*

*paçavyaè nava-kānanam*

*gopa-gopé-gaväà sevyäà*

*puëyädri-tāëa-vérudham*

६५. एवं विहारैः कौमारैः कौमारं जहतुर्व्रजे ।

निलायनैः सेतुबन्धैर्मर्कटोत्प्लवनादिभिः ॥ ५९॥ (१०. ११: ५९)

*evaè vihāraiù kaumāraiù*

*kaumāraè jahatur vraje*

*nilāyanaiù setu-bandhair*

*markaötplavanädibhiù*

६६. यदि दूरं गतः कृष्णो वनशोभेक्षणाय तम् ।

अहं पूर्वमहं पूर्वमिति संस्पृश्य रेमिरे ॥ ६॥ (१०. १२: ६)

*yadi düraè gataù kãñëo*

*vana-çobhekñäëäya tam*

*ahaè pürvam ahaè pürvam*

*iti saèspåçya remire*

६७. गावो मृगाः खगा नार्यः पुष्पिण्यः शरदाभवन् ।

अन्वीयमानाः स्ववृषैः फलैरीशक्रिया इव ॥ ४६॥ (१०. २०: ४६)

*gävo mãgäù khagä näryaù*

*puñpiëyaù çaradäbhavan*

*anvéyamänäù sva-vãñaiù*

*phalair éça-kriyã iva*

६८. अहोऽतिरम्यं पुलिनं वयस्याः

स्वकेलिसम्पन्मृदुलाच्छवालुकम् ।

स्फुटत्सरोगन्धहृतालिपत्रिक -

ध्वनिप्रतिध्वानलसद्द्रुमाकुलम् ॥ ५॥ (१०. १३: ५)

*aho 'tiramyã pulinaè vayasyäù*

*sva-keli-sampan mãduläccha-bälukam*

*sphuöat-saro-gandha-hãtäli-patrikadhvani-*

*pratidhvãna-lasad-drumäkulam*

६९. एवं वृन्दावनं श्रीमत्कृष्णः प्रीतमनाः पशून् ।

रेमे सञ्चारयन्नद्रेः सरिद्रोधःसु सानुगः ॥ ९॥ (१०. १५: ९)

*evaè vändävanaè çrémat*

*kãñëaù préta-manäù paçün*

*reme saïcärayann adreù*

*sarid-rodhaùsu sänugaù*

७०. क्वचिद्गायति गायत्सु मदान्धालिष्वनुव्रतैः ।

उपगीयमानचरितः स्रग्वी सङ्कर्षणान्वितः ॥ १०॥ (१०. १५: १०)

*kvacid gäyati gäyatsu*

*madändhãliñv anuvrataiù*

*upagéyamãna-caritaù*

*pathi saïkarñãëänvitaù*

*anujalpati jalpantaè*

*kala-väkyaiù çukaè kvacit*



७१. वरुणप्रेषिता देवी वारुणी वृक्षकोटरात् ।

पतन्ती तद्वनं सर्वं स्वगन्धेनाध्यवासयत् ॥ १९॥ (१०. ६५: १९)

*varuṇa- preṣitā devī*

*vāṇī vṛkṣa-kaṭarāt*

*patantī tad vanam*

*sva-gandhenādhyavāsayat*

७२. दृष्ट्वा कुमुद्वन्तमखण्डमण्डलं

रमाननाभंनवकुङ्कुमारुणम्

वनं च तत्कोमलगोभिरञ्जितं

जगौ कलं वामदृशां मनोहरम् ॥ ३॥ (१०. २९: ३)

*dṛṣṭvā kumudvantam akhaṇḍa-maṇḍalam*

*ramānanābham nava-kuṅkumāruṇam*

*vanam ca tat-komala-gobhī rañjitam*

*jagau kalam vāma-dṛśām manoharam*

७३. इति वै वार्षिकान् मासान् राजा सोऽभ्यर्थितः सुखम् ।

जनयन् नयनानन्दमिन्द्रप्रस्थौकसां विभुः ॥ १२॥ (१०. ५८: १२)

*iti vai vārṣikān māsān*

*rāñjña so 'bhyarthitaḥ sukham*

*janayan nayanānandam*

*indraprasthaukasām vibhuḥ*

७४. स्वराजधानीं समलङ्कृतां ध्वजैः (१०. ६३: ५२)

सतोरणैरुक्षितमार्गचत्वराम् ।

विवेश शङ्खानकदुन्दुभिस्वनै -

रभ्युद्यतः पौरसुहृद्भिजातिभिः ॥ ५२॥

*sva-rājadhānīm samalaṅkṛtām dhvajaiḥ*

*sa-toraṇair ukṣita- mārga- catvarām*

*viveśa śaṅkhānaka- dundhubi-svanair  
abhyudyataḥ paura-suhṛad- dvijātibhiḥ*

७५. सर्वतुसर्वविभवपुण्यवृक्षलताश्रमैः ।

उद्यानोपवनारामैर्वृतपद्माकरश्रियम् ॥ १२॥ (१. ११: १२)

*sarvartu-sarva-vibhava*

*punya-vṛkṣa-latācramaiḥ*

*udyānopavanārāmair*

*vṛta-padmākara-çriyam*

७६. इत्युत्सुको द्वारवतीं देवर्षिर्द्रष्टुमागमत् ।

पुष्पितोपवनारामद्विजालिकुलनादिताम् ॥ ३॥ (१०. ६९: ३)

*ity utsuko dvāratīm*

*devarṣir draṣṭum āgamat*

*puspitopavan ārāma-*

*dvijāli-kula-nāditām*

७७. वनं तु सात्त्विको वासो ग्रामो राजस उच्यते ।

तामसं द्यूतसदनं मन्त्रिकेतं तु निर्गुणम् ॥ २५॥ (११. २५: २५)

*vanam tu sāttviko vāso*

*grāmo rājasa ucyate*

*tāmasam dyūta--sadanam*

*man-niketaṁ tu nirguṇam*

७८. कुरुजाङ्गलपाञ्चालान् शूरसेनान् सयामुनान् ।

ब्रह्मावर्तं कुरुक्षेत्रं मत्स्यान् सारस्वतानथ ॥ ३४॥ (१. १०: ३४)

*kuru-jāṅgala-pāñcālān*

*çürasenān sayāmunān*

*brahmāvartaṁ kurukṣetraṁ*

*matsyān sārasvatān atha*

७९. येन स्वरोचिषा विश्वं रोचितं रोचयाम्यहम् ।

यथार्कोऽग्निर्यथा सोमो यथर्क्षग्रहतारकाः ॥ ११ ॥ (२. ५: ११)

*yena sva-rociñā viçvaà*

*rocitaà rocayāmy aham*

*yathārko 'gnir yathā somo*

*yatharkṣa-graha-tārakāḥ*

८०. मुहूर्तमभवद्गोष्ठं रजसा तमसाऽऽवृतम् ।

सुतं यशोदा नापश्यत्तस्मिन् न्यस्तवती यतः ॥ २२ ॥ (१०. ७: २२)

*muhūrtam abhavad goṣṭham*

*rajasā tamaāvṛtam*

*sutaṁ yaśodā nāpaśyat*

*tasmin nyastavatī yataḥ*

८१. तृणावर्तः शान्तरयो वात्यारूपधरो हरन् ।

कृष्णं नभो गतो गन्तुं नाशक्रोद्भूरिभारभृत् ॥ २६ ॥ (१०. ७: २६)

*tṛṇāvartaḥ śānta-rayo*

*vātyā-rūpa-dharo harana*

*Kṛṣṇaṁ nabho-gato gantuṁ*

*nāśaknod bhūri-bhāra-bhṛt*

८२. गलग्रहणनिश्चेष्टो दैत्यो निर्गतलोचनः ।

अव्यक्तरावो न्यपतत्सह बालो व्यसुर्ब्रजे ॥ २८ ॥ (१०. ७: २८)

*gala-grahaṇa-niśceṣṭo*

*daityo nirgata-locanaḥ*

*avyakta- rāvo nyapatat*

*sahabālo vyasur vraje*

८३. ऋषेर्भागवतमुख्यस्य सत्यं कर्तुं वचो हरिः ।

जगाम शनकैस्तत्र यत्रास्तां यमलार्जुनौ ॥ २४ ॥ (१०. १०: २४)

*ṛṣer Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa - mukhyasa*

*satyaṃ kartuṃ vaco hariḥ*

*jagāma sānakais tatra*

*yatrāstām yamalārjunau*

८४. बालेन निष्कर्षयतान्वगुलूखलं

तद्दामोदरेण तरसोत्कलिताङ्घ्रिबन्धौ

निष्पेततुः परमविक्रमितातिवेष -

स्कन्धप्रवालविटपौ कृतचण्डशब्दौ ॥ २७॥ (१०. १०: २७)

*bālena niṅkarñayatānvag ulūkhalaà tad*

*dāmodareëa tarasotkalitāṅghri-bandhau*

*niṅpetatuù parama-vikramitātivepaskandha-*

*pravāla-viöapau kāta-caëöa-çabdau*

८५. विषाम्भस्तदुपस्पृश्य दैवोपहतचेतसः ।

निपेतुर्व्यसवः सर्वे सलिलान्ते कुरूद्वह ॥ ४९॥ (१०. १५: ४९)

*viṣāmbhas tad upaspṛśya*

*daivopahata-cetasah*

*nipeturVyāsavaḥ sarve*

*salilānte kurūdvaha*

८६. एवं परिभ्रमहतौजसमुन्नतांसमानस्य

तत्पृथुशिरःस्वधिरूढ आद्यः ।

तन्मूर्ध्निरत्ननिकरस्पर्शतिताम्र -

पादाम्बुजोऽखिलकलादिगुरुनर्त ॥ २६॥ (१०. १६: २६)

*evaà paribhrama-hataujasam unnatäèsam*

*ānamya tat-pāthu-çiraùsv adhirüðha ädyau*

*tan-mürdha-ratna-nikara-sparçäti-tāmra*

*pädāmbujo 'khila-kalädi-gurur nanarta*

८७. अजा गावो महिष्यश्च निर्विशन्त्यो वनाद्वनम् ।

इषीकाटवीं निर्विविशुः क्रन्दन्त्यो दावतर्षिताः ॥ २॥ (१०. १९: २)

*ajä gävo mahiñyaç ca*

*nirviçantyo vanäd vanam*

*éñékäöavèà nirviviçuè*

*krandantyo däva-tarñitäu*

८८. ततः समन्ताद्वनधूमकेतु -

र्यदृच्छयाभूत्क्षयकृद्वनौकसाम् ।

समीरितः सारथिनोल्बणोल्मुकै -

र्विलेलिहानः स्थिरजङ्गमान् महान् ॥ ७॥ (१०. १९: ७)

*tataù samantäd dava-dhümaketur*

*yadâcchayäbhüt kñaya-kâd vanaukasäm*

*saméritaù särathinolbaëolmukair*

*vilelihänaù sthira-jaigamän mahän*

८९. कृष्ण कृष्ण महावीर हे रामामितविक्रम ।

दावाग्निना दह्यमानान् प्रपन्नान्त्रातुमर्हथः ॥ ९॥ (१०. १९: ९)

*kãñëa kãñëa mahä-vëra*

*he rämämogha vikrama*

*dävâgninä dahyamänän*

*prapannäàs trätum arhathau*

९०. तथेति मीलिताक्षेषु भगवानग्निमुल्बणम् ।

पीत्वा मुखेन तान् कृच्छ्राद्योगाधीशो व्यमोचयत् ॥ १२॥ (१०. १९: १२)

*tatheti mélitäkñëñu*

*bhagavän agnim ulbaëam*

*pétvä mukhena tän kâcchräd*

*yogädhéço vyamocayat*

९१. एषोऽवजानतो मर्त्यान् कामरूपी वनौकसः ।

हन्ति ह्यस्मै नमस्यामः शर्मणे आत्मनो गवाम् ॥ ३७॥ (१०. २४: ३७)

*eṣo 'vajānato martyān*

*kāma-rūpī vanaukaśaḥ*

*hanti hy asmai namasyāmaḥ*

*śarmaṇe ātmano gavām*

९२. स्थूणास्थूला वर्षधारा मुञ्चस्त्वभ्रेष्वभीक्ष्णशः ।

जलौघैः प्लाव्यमाना भूर्नादृश्यत नतोल्लतम् ॥ १०॥ (१०. २५: १०)

*sthūṇā-sthūlā varṣa-dhārā*

*muñcatsv abhreṣv abhīkṣṇaēśaḥ*

*jalaughaiḥ plāvyaṁānā bhūr*

*nādrśyata natonnatam*

९३. अत्यासारातिवातेन पशवो जातवेपनाः ।

गोपा गोप्यश्च शीतार्ता गोविन्दं शरणं ययुः ॥ ११॥ (१०. २५: ११)

*aty-āsārāti-vātena*

*paśavo jāta-vepanāḥ*

*gopā gopyaś ca śītārtā*

*govindaṁ śaraṇaṁ yayuḥ*

९४. कृष्ण कृष्ण महाभाग त्वन्नाथं गोकुलं प्रभो ।

त्रातुमर्हसि देवान्नः कुपिताद्भक्तवत्सल ॥ १३॥ (१०. २५: १३)

*Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa mahā-bhāga*

*tvan-nāthaṁ gokulaṁ prabho*

*trātuṁ arhasi devān naḥ*

*kupitād bhakta- vatsala*

९५. इत्युक्त्वैकेन हस्तेन कृत्वा गोवर्धनाचलम् ।

दधार लीलया कृष्णश्छत्राकमिव बालकः - सगोनासंगोगो ॥ १९॥ (१०. २५: १९)

*ity uktvaikena hastena*

*kṛtvā govardhanācalam*

*dadhāra līlayā viṣṇuś*

*chatrākam iva bālakaḥ*

९६. तथा निर्विविशुर्गतं कृष्णाश्रासितमानसाः ।

यथावकाशं सधनाः सत्रजाः सोपजीविनः ॥ २२॥ (१०. २५: २२)

*tathā nirviviśur gartam*

*kṛṣṇāśvāsita-mānasaḥ*

*yathāvakāśam sa-dhanāḥ*

*sa-vrajaḥ sopajīvinah*

९७. मघोनि वर्षत्यसकृद्यमानुजा

गम्भीरतोयौघजबोर्मिफिनिला ।

भयानकावर्तशताकुला नदी

मार्गं ददौ सिन्धुरिव श्रियः पतेः ॥ ५०॥ (१०. ३: ५०)

*maghoni varñaty asakāḍ yamānujā*

*gambhēra-toyauḡha-javormi-phenilā*

*bhayānakāvarta-ṣatākulā nadé*

*mārgaà dadau sindhur iva ṣriyaù pateù*

९८. तं चण्डवेगविषवीर्यमवेक्ष्य तेन

दुष्टां नदीं च खलसंयमनावतारः ।

कृष्णः कदम्बमधिरुह्य ततोऽतितुङ्गमास्फोट्य

गाढरशनो न्यपतद्विषोदे ॥ ६॥ (१०. १६: ६)

*taà caèḍa-vega-viña-véryam avekñya tena*

*duñöàè nadéà ca khala-saàyamanāvatāraù*

*kāñëaù kadambam adhiruhya tato 'ti-tuìgam*

*äspoöya gäḍha-raçano nyapatad viñode*

९९. नद्यं कदाचिदागत्य तीरे निक्षिप्य पूर्ववत् ।

वासांसि कृष्णं गायन्त्यो विजह्वः सलिले मुदा ॥ ७॥ (१०. २२: ७)

*nadyāḥ kadācid āgatya*

*tīre nikṣipya pūrva-vat*

*vāsānsi kṛṣṇaṁ gāyantyo*

*vijahruḥ salile mudā*

१००. तत्रोपस्पृश्य पानीयं पीत्वा मृष्टं मणिप्रभम् ।

वृक्षपण्डमुपत्रज्य सरामो रथमाविशत् ॥ ३९॥ (१०. ३९: ३९)

*tatropaspr̥śya pānīyaṁ*

*pītvā mṛṣṭaṁ maṇi-prabham*

*vṛkṣa-ṣaṇḍam upavrajya*

*sa-rāmo ratham āviśat*

१०१. तमाह भगवानाशु गुरुपुत्रः प्रदीयताम् ।

योऽसाविह त्वया ग्रस्तो बालको महतोर्मिणा ॥ ३९॥ (१०. ४५: ३९)

*tam āha bhagavān āśu*

*guru-putraḥ pradīyatā*

*yo 'sāv iha tvayā grasto*

*bālako mahatormiṇā*

१०२. तत्रोपस्पृश्य विशदं पीत्वा वारि महार्थौ ।

कृष्णौ ददृशतुः कन्यां चरन्तीं चारुदर्शनाम् ॥ १७॥ (१०. ५८: १७)

*tatropaspr̥śya viśadam*

*pītvā vāri mahā-rathau*

*Kṛṣṇau dadṛśatuḥ kanyām*

*carntīm cāru-darśanām*

१०३. यस्यामलं दिवि यशः प्रथितं रसायां

भूमौ च ते भुवनमङ्गल दिग्वितानम् ।



मन्दाकिनीति दिवि भोगवतीति चाधो  
 गङ्गेति चेह चरणाम्बु पुनाति विश्वम् ॥ ४४॥ (१०.७०: ४४)  
*yasyāmalam divi yaśaḥ prathitam rasāyām*  
*bhūmau ca te bhuvana- maṅgala dig-vitānam*  
*mandākinī divi bhogavatīti cādho*  
*gaṅgeti ceḥa caraṇāmbhu punāti viśvam*  
 १०४. राजभ्यो विभ्यतः सुभूः समुद्रं शरणं गतान् ।  
 बलवद्भिः कृतद्वेषान् प्रायस्त्यक्तनृपासनान् ॥ १२॥ (१०. ६०: १२)  
*rājabyo bibhyataḥ su-bhru*  
*samudraṁ śaraṇaṁ gatān*  
*balavadbhiḥ kṛta-dvesān*  
*prāyas tyakta-nṛpāsānā*  
 १०५. न त्वया भीरुणा योत्स्ये युधि विक्लवतेजसा ।  
 मथुरां स्वपुरीं त्यक्त्वा समुद्रं शरणं गतः ॥ ३१॥ (१०. ७२: ३१)  
*na tvayā bhīruṇā yotsye*  
*yudhi viklava-tejasā*  
*mathurām sva-purīm tyaktvā*  
*samudraṁ śaraṇaṁ gataḥ*  
 १०६. ततः प्रविष्टः सलिलं नभस्वता  
 बलीयसैजद्वृहदूर्मिभूषणम् ।  
 तत्राद्भुतं वै भवनं द्युमत्तमं  
 भ्राजन्मणिस्तम्भसहस्रशोभितम् ॥ ५२॥ (१०. ८९: ५२)  
*tataḥ praviṣṭaḥ salilam nabhasvatā*  
*balīyasaijad-brhad-ūrmi-bhūṣaṇam*  
*tatrādbhutaṁ vai bhavanaṁ dhumat-tamaṁ*  
*bhṛājan-maṇi—stambha-sahasra-śobhitam*

१०७. धर्मः पदैकेन चरन् विच्छायामुपलभ्य गाम् ।

पृच्छति स्माश्रुवदनां विवत्सामिव मातरम् ॥ १८॥ (१. १६: १८)

*dharmah padaikena caran*

*vicchāyām upalabhya gām*

*pr̥cchati smāśru-vadanām*

*vivatsām iva mātaram*

१०८. धेनूनां नियुते प्रादाद्विप्रेभ्यः समलङ्कृते ।

तिलाद्रीन् सप्त रत्नौघशातकौम्भाम्बरावृतान् ॥ ३॥ (१०. ५: ३)

*dhenūnāṅ niyute prādād*

*viprebhyaṅ samalāṅkṛte*

*tilādriṅ sapta ratnaugha*

*çātakaumbhāambarāvātān*

१०९. अनुचरैः समनुवर्णितवीर्यं

आदिपूरुष इवाचलभूतिः ।

वनचरो गिरितटेषु चरन्ती -

वेणुनाऽऽह्वयति गाः स यदा हि ॥ ८॥ (१०. ३५: ८)

*anucaraiḥ samanuvārṇita-vīrya*

*ādi-pūruṣa ivācala-bhūtiḥ*

*vana-caro giri-taṭeṣu carantī*

*veṇunāhvayati gāḥ sa yadā hi*

११०. उलूखलाङ्घ्रेरुपरि व्यवस्थितं

मर्काय कामं ददतं शिचि स्थितम् ।

हैयङ्गवं चौर्यविशङ्कितेक्षणं

निरीक्ष्य पञ्चात्सुतमागमच्छनैः ॥ ८॥ (१०. ९: ८)

*ulūkhalāṅghrer upari vyavasthitaṅ*

*markāya kāmaṅ dadataṅ çici sthitam*

*haiyaigavaà caurya-viçaikitekñāëää*  
*nirékñya paçcät sutam ägamac chanaiù*

१११. हन्यन्ते पशवो यत्र निर्दयैरजितात्मभिः ।

मन्यमानैरिमं देहमजरामृत्यु नश्वरम् ॥ ९॥ (१०. १०: ९)

*hanyante paçavo yatra*  
*nirdayair ajitätmabhiù*  
*manyamänair imaà deham*

*ajarämättyu naçvaram*

११२. ऐरावतकुलेभांश्च चतुर्दन्तांस्तरस्विनः ।

पाण्डुरांश्च चतुःषष्टिं प्रेषयामास केशवः ॥ ३७॥ (१०. ५९: ३७)

*airāvata-kulebhāmś ca*  
*catur-dantāms tarasvinaḥ*  
*pāṇḍurāmś ca catuḥ-ṣaṣṭim*  
*prerayām āsa keśavaḥ*

११३. कृष्णस्तु गृहकृत्येषु व्यग्रायां मातरि प्रभुः ।

अद्राक्षीदर्जुनौ पूर्वं गुह्यकौ धनदात्मजौ ॥ २२॥ (१०. ९: २२)

*kāñëas tu gāha-kātyeñu*  
*vyagräyää mätari prabhuè*

*adräkñéd arjunau pürvaà*

*guhyakau dhanadätmajau*

११४. स तत्र तत्रारुणपल्लवश्रिया

फलप्रसूनोरुभरेण पादयोः ।

स्पृशच्छिखान् वीक्ष्य वनस्पतीन् मुदा

स्मयन्निवाहाग्रजमादिपूरुषः ॥ ४॥ (१०. १५: ४)

*sa tatra taträruëa-pallava-çriyä*  
*phala-prasünoru-bhareëa pädayoè*

*spåçac chikhän vékñya vanaspatén mudä*

*smayann ivähägra-jam ädi-püruñau*

११५. वनं कुसुमितं श्रीमन्नदञ्चित्रमृगद्विजम् ।

गायन्मयूरभ्रमरं कूजत्कोकिलसारसम् ॥ ७॥ (१०. १८: ७)

*vanaà kusumitaà çréman*

*nadac-citra-måga-dvijam*

*gåyan mayüra-bhramaraà*

*küjat-kokila-sårasam*

११६. बलः प्रविश्य बाहुभ्यां तालान् सम्परिकम्पयन् ।

फलानि पातयामास मतङ्गज इवौजसा ॥ २८॥ (१०. १५: २८)

*balau praviçya bāhubhyā*

*tālān samparikampayan*

*phalāni pātayām āsa*

*matai-gaja ivaujasā*

११७. चीराणि किं पथि न सन्ति दिशन्ति भिक्षां

नैवाङ्घ्रिपाः परभृतः सरितोऽप्यशुष्यन् ।

रुद्धा गुहाः किमजितोऽवति नोपसन्नान्

कस्माद्भजन्ति कवयो धनदुर्मदान्धान् ॥ ५॥ (२. २: ५)

*cérāni kiā pathi na santi diçanti bhikṣā*

*naivāṅghripāḥ para-bhṛtaḥ sarito 'py açuṣyan*

*ruddhā guhāḥ kim ajito 'vati nopasannān*

*kasmād bhajanti kavayo dhana-durmadāndhān*

११८. पीत्वापः पादपाः पद्भिरासन् नानात्ममूर्तयः ।

प्राक्शामास्तपसा श्रान्ता यथा कामानुसेवया ॥ २१॥ (१०. २०: २१)

*pétvāpau pādapāu padbhir*

*āsan nānātma-mūrtayaù*

*prāk kñāmās tapasā çrāntā*

*yathā kāmānusevayā*

११९. निदाघार्कातपे तिग्मे छायाभिः स्वाभिरात्मनः ।

आतपत्रायितान् वीक्ष्य द्रुमानाह ब्रजौकसः ॥ ३०॥ (१०. २२ :३०)

*nidaghārkātape tigme*

*chāyābhiḥ svābhir ātmanaḥ*

*ātapatrāyitān vīkṣya*

*drumān āha vrajaukasaḥ*

१२०. सञ्चिन्त्यारिवधोपायं भीमस्यामोघदर्शनः ।

दर्शयामास विटपं पाटयन्निव संज्ञया ॥ ४१॥ (१०. ७२: ४१)

*sañcintyāri-vadhopāyaṁ*

*bhīmasyāmogha-darśanaḥ*

*darśayām āsa viṭapaṁ*

*pāṭann iva sañjñayā*

१२१. तासां वासांस्युपादाय नीपमारुह्य सत्वरः ।

हसद्भिः प्रहसन् बालैः परिहासमुवाच ह ॥ ९॥ (१०. २२: ९)

*tāsām vāsāmsy upādāya*

*nīpam āruhya satvaraḥ*

*hasadbhiḥ prahasan bālaiḥ*

*parihāsam uvāca ha*

१२२. चूतप्रियालपनसासनकोविदार -

जम्ब्वर्कविल्वबकुलाम्रकदम्बनीपाः ।

येऽन्ये परार्थभवका यमुनोपकूलाः

शंसन्तु कृष्णपदवीं रहितात्मनां नः ॥ ९॥ (१०. ३०: ९)

*cūta-priyāla-panasāsana-kovidāra*  
*jambv-arka-bilva-bakulāmra-kadamba-nīpāḥ*  
*ye 'nye parārtha-bhava-kā yamunopakūlāḥ*  
*śamsantu kṛṣṇa-padavīm rahitātmanām naḥ*

१२३. चूतैः कदम्बैर्नीपैश्च नागपुन्नागचम्पकैः ।

पाटलाशोकबकुलैः कुन्दैः कुरबकैरपि ॥ १५ ॥ (४.६: १५)

*cūtaiḥ kadambair nīpaiś ca*  
*nāga-punnāga-campakaiḥ*  
*pāṭalāśoka-bakulaiḥ*  
*kundaiḥ kurabakair api*

१२४. ततोऽभवत्पारिजातः सुरलोकविभूषणम् ।

पूरयत्यर्थिनो योऽर्थैः शश्वद्भुवि यथा भवान् ॥ ६ ॥ (८. ८: ६)

*tato 'bhavat pārijātaḥ sulokbibhūṣaṇa*  
*pūryatyarthinosrthaiḥ śaśvadbhuvi yatha bhavan*

१२५. चोदितो भार्ययोत्पाद्य पारीजातं गरुत्मति ।

आरोप्य सेन्द्रान् विबुधान् निर्जित्योपानयत्पुरम् ॥ ३९ ॥ (१०. ५९: ३९)

*codito bhāryayatpāṭya*  
*pārijātaḥ garutmati*  
*āropyasendrān vibudhān*  
*nirjityopānayat puram*

१२६. ताः समादाय कालिन्ध्या निर्विश्य पुलिनं विभुः ।

विकसत्कुन्दमन्दारसुरभ्यनिलषट्पदम् ॥ ११ ॥ (१०. ३२: ११)

*tāḥ samādāya kālindya*  
*nirviśya pulinaḥ vibhuḥ*

*vikasat-kunda-mandāra*

*surabhy-anila-ṣaṭpadam*

१२७. हे स्तोक कृष्ण हे अंशो श्रीदामन् सुबलार्जुन ।

विशालवृषभ तेजस्विन् देवप्रस्थ वरूथप ॥ ३१ ॥

पश्यतैतान् महाभागान् परार्थैकान्तजीवितान् ।

वातवर्षातपहिमान् सहन्तो वारयन्ति नः ॥ ३२ ॥ (१०. २२: ३१-३२)

*he stoka-kṛṣṇa he amśo*

*śrīdāman subalārjuna*

*viśāla vṛṣabhaujasvin*

*devaprastha varūthapa*

*paśyataitān mahā-bhāgān*

*parārthaikānta-jīvitān*

*vāta-varṣātapa-himān*

*sahanto vārayanti naḥ*

१२८. यमुनोपवनेऽशोकनवपल्लवमण्डिते ।

विचरन्तं वृतं गोपैः साग्रजं ददृशुः स्त्रियः ॥ २१ ॥ (१०. २३: २१)

*yamunopavane 'śoka*

*nava-pallava-maṇḍite*

*vicarantaṁ vṛtaṁ gopaiḥ*

*sāgrajam dadṛśuḥ striyaḥ*

१२९. स्वयं च तदनुजाता वृष्णयः कृष्णदेवताः ॥ ११ ॥

भुक्त्वोपविविशुः कामं स्निग्धच्छायाङ्घ्रिपाङ्घ्रिपु । (१०. ८२: ११)

*svayaṁ ca tad-anujātā*

*Vṛṣṇayaḥ Kṛṣṇa-devatāḥ*

*bhuktvopaviviśuḥ kāmam*

*snigdha-cchāyāghripāṅghriṣu*

१३०. उपगीयमान उद्गायन् वनिताशतयूथपः ।

मालां विभ्रद्वैजयन्तीं व्यचरन्मण्डयन् वनम् ॥ ४४॥ (१०. २९: ४४)

*upagīyamāna udgāyan*

*vanitā-śata-yūthapaḥ*

*mālām bibhrad vaijayantīm*

*vyacaran maṇḍayan vanam*

१३१. द्वीपवर्षसमुद्राणां गिरिनद्युपवर्णनम् ।

ज्योतिश्चक्रस्य संस्थानं पातालनरकस्थितिः ॥ (१२. १२: १६)

*sura-loka-vibhūṣaṇam*

*pūrayaty arthino yo 'rthaiḥ*

*śaśvad bhuvi yathā bhavān*

१३२. नद्यः समुद्रा गिरयः सवनस्पतिवीरुधः ।

फलन्त्योषधयः सर्वाः काममन्वृतु तस्य वै ॥ ५॥ (१. १०: ५)

*nadyauḥ samudrā girayaḥ*

*savanaspati-vérudhaḥ*

*phalanty oṇadhayaḥ sarvāḥ*

*kāmam anvātu tasya vai*

१३३. गुणैर्गुणानुपादत्ते यथाकालं विमुञ्चति ।

न तेषु युज्यते योगी गोभिर्गा इव गोपतिः ॥ ५०॥ (११. ७: ५०)

*guṇair guṇān upādatte*

*yathā-kālam vimuñcati*

*na teṣu yujyate yogī*

*gobhir gā iva go-patiḥ*

१३४. प्रायशः साधवो लोके परैर्द्वन्द्वेषु योजिताः ।

न व्यथन्ति न हृष्यन्ति यत आत्मागुणाश्रयः ॥ ५०॥ (१. १८ : ५०)

*prāyaśaḥ sādhave loka*



*parair dvandvesu yojitäh*

*na vyathanti na hr̥ṣyanti*

*yata ätmäguṇäçrayah*

१३५. कस्तां त्वनादृत्य परानुचिन्तामृते

पशूनसतीं नाम युञ्ज्यात् ।

पश्यन् जनं पतितं वैतरण्यां

स्वकर्मजान् परितापाञ्जुषाणम् ॥ ७॥ (२. २: ७)

*kas täà tv anädṛtya paränucintäm*

*ṛte paçün asatéà näma kuryät*

*paçyai janaà patitaà vaitaranyäà*

*sva-karmajän paritöpäi juṣänam*

१३६. स्वर्धुन्युदाद्रेः स्वजटाकलापै -

रुपस्पृशन्तश्चरणोपधानम् ।

पद्मं यदर्चन्त्यहिराजकन्याः

सप्रेमनानाबलिभिर्वरार्थाः ॥ ५॥ (३. ८ :५)

*svardhuny-udärdraiü sva-jaöä-kaläpair*

*upaspåçantaç caraëopadhänam*

*padmaà yad arcanty ahi-räja-kanyäü*

*sa-prema nänä-balibhir varärthäü*

१३७. ततोऽनेकसहस्रकोटिविमानानीकसङ्कुलदेव -

यानेनावतरन्तीन्दुमण्डलमावार्यं ब्रह्मसदने निपतति ॥ ४॥ (५. १७: ४)

*tato 'neka-sahasra-koṭi- vimānānīka-saṅkula-deva-*

*yānenāvatar-antīndu maṇḍalam āvārya Brahmā-sadane nipatati*

१३८. न ह्येतत्परमाश्चर्यं स्वर्धुन्या यदिहोदितम् ।

अनन्तचरणाभोजप्रसूताया भवच्छिदः ॥ १४॥ (९. ९: १४)

*na hy etat param äçcaryaà*

*svardhunyä yad ihoditam*

*ananta-caraëämbhoja-*

*prasütäyābhava-cchidaù*

१३९. आपस्तेऽङ्घ्र्यवनेजन्यस्त्रील्लोकान् शुचयोऽपुनन् ।

शिरसाधत्त याः शर्वः स्वर्याताः सगरात्मजाः ॥ १५॥ (१०. ४९: १५)

*āpas te 'nghry-avanejanyas*

*trīl lokān śucayo 'punan*

*śirasādhatta yāḥ śarvaḥ*

*svar yātāḥ sagarātmajāḥ*

१४०. यत्र नैःश्रेयसं नाम वनं कामदुघैर्द्रुमैः ।

सर्वतुश्रीभिर्विभ्राजत्कैवल्यमिव मूर्तिमत् ॥ १६॥ (३. १५: १६)

*yatra naiuṣreyasaà nāma*

*vanaè käma-dughair drumaiù*

*sarvartu-ṣrébhir vibhrājat*

*kaivalyam iva mürtimat*

१४१. उत्पाता बहवस्तत्र निपेतुर्जायमानयोः ।

दिवि भुव्यन्तरिक्षे च लोकस्योरुभयावहाः ॥ ३॥ (३. १७: ३)

*utpätä bahavas tatra*

*nipetur jāyamānayoù*

*divi bhuvy antarikñe ca*

*lokasyoru-bhayāvahäù*

१४२. नन्दा चालकनन्दा च सरितौ बाह्यतः पुरः ।

तीर्थपादपदाम्भोजरजसातीव पावने ॥ २४॥ (४. ६: २४)

*nandä cälakanandä ca*

*saritau bāhyataù purai*

*térthapāda-padāmbhojar*

*ajasätéva pāvane*

१४३. यस्यामु ह वा एते षडिन्द्रियनामानःकर्मणा दस्यव एव ते तद्यथा

पुरुषस्यधनं यत्किञ्चिद्धर्मोपयिकं बहु कृच्छ्राधिगतं साक्षात्परमपुरुषा

राधनलक्षणो योऽसौधर्मस्तं तु साम्पराय उदाहरन्ति । तद्धर्म्यं

धनं दर्शनस्पर्शनश्रवणास्वादनावघ्राण-सङ्कल्पव्यवसायगृहग्राम्योपभोगेनकुनाथस्या

जितात्मनो यथा सार्थस्य विलुम्पन्ति ॥ २॥ (५. १४: २)

*yasyām u ha vā ete ñaò-indriya-nāmānaù karmaëä dasyava eva te; tad yathä  
puruñasya dhanaè yat küicid dharmaupayikaè bahu-kácchrädhigataè säkñät  
parama-puruñärädhana-lakñäëo yo 'sau dharmas taè tu sämparäya udäharanti;  
tad-dharmyaè dhanaè darçana-sparçana-çravaëäsvädanävaghräëa-saikalpa-  
vyavasäya-gåha-grämyop abhogena kunäthasyäjitätmano yathä särthasya vilum-  
panti.*

१४४. यस्त्विह वा उग्रः पशून् पक्षिणो वा प्राणत

उपरन्धयति तमपकरणं पुरुषादैरपि

विगर्हितममुत्र यमानुचराः कुम्भीपाके तप्ततैले

उपरन्धयन्ति ॥ १३॥ (५. २६: १३)

*yas tv iha vā ugraù paçün pakñiëo vā präëata  
uparandhayati tam apakaruëaàpuruñädair api  
vigarhitam amutra yamānucaräù kumbhépäke tapta-taile  
uparandhayanti*

१४५. न दद्यादामिषं श्राद्धे न चाद्याद्धर्मतत्त्ववित् ।

मुन्यन्नैः स्यात्परा प्रीतिर्यथा न पशुर्हिसया ॥ ७॥ (५. १५: ७)

*na dadyäd ämiñaè çräddhe*

*na cädyäd dharmatattvavit*

*muny-annaiù syät parä prétir*

*yathä na paçu-hiäsayä*

१४६. यावत्तपत्यसौ गोभिर्यावदिन्दुः सहोडुभिः ।

यावद्वर्षति पर्जन्यस्तावती भूरियं तव ॥ ३०॥ (८. २१: ३०)

*yāvat tapaty asau gobhir*

*yāvad induù sahoðubhiù*

*yāvad varñati parjanyaś*

*tāvaté bhūr iyaà tava*

१४७. वृन्दावनं गोवर्धनं यमुनापुलिनानि च ।

वीक्ष्यासीदुत्तमा प्रीती राममाध्वयोर्नृप ॥ ३६ ॥ (१०. ११: ३६)

*vāndāvanaà govardhanaà*

*yamunā-pulināni ca*

*vékñyāséd uttamā prété*

*rāma-mādhvayor nāpa*

१४८. योऽस्मिन् स्नात्वा मदाक्रीडे देवादींस्तर्पयेज्जलैः ।

उपोष्य मां स्मरन्नर्चेत्सर्वपापैः प्रमुच्यते ॥ ६२ ॥ (१०. १६: ६२)

*yo 'smin snātvā mad-ākréðe*

*devādéàs tarpayej jalaiù*

*upoñya mää smarann arcet*

*sarva-pāpaiù pramucyate*

१४९. खं वायुज्योतिरापो भूस्तत्कृतेषु यथाशयम् ।

आविस्तिरोऽल्पभूर्येको नानात्वं यात्यसावपि ॥ २५ ॥ (१०. ८५: २५)

*kham vāyur jyotir āpo bhūs*

*tat-kṛteṣu yathāśayam*

*āvis tiro-'lpa-bhūry eko*

*nānātvam yāty asāv api*

१५०. सूर्ये तु विद्यया त्रय्या हविषाग्नौ यजेत माम् ।

आतिथ्येन तु विप्राग्रे गोष्वङ्ग यवसादिना ॥ ४३ ॥ (११. ११: ४३)

*sūrye tu vidyayā trayyā*

*haviṣāgnau yajeta mām*

*ātithyena tu viprāgrye*

*goṣv aṅga yavasādinā*

१५१. हिरण्मयः स पुरुषः सहस्रपरिवत्सरान् ।

आण्डकोश उवासाप्सु सर्वसत्त्वोपबृंहितः ॥ ६॥ (३. ६: ६)

*hiraëmayau sa puruñau*

*sahasra-parivatsarän*

*äëða-koça uväsäpsu*

*sarva-sattvopabâhitau*

१५२. जगृहे पौरुषं रूपं भगवान् महदादिभिः ।

सम्भूतं षोडशकलमादौ लोकसिसृक्षया ॥ १॥ (१. ३: १)

*jagâhe pauruñau rüpa*

*bhagavän mahad-ädibhiu*

*sambhüta èṣoḍaça-kalam*

*ädau loka-sisṛkñayä*

१५३. भूतैर्यदा पञ्चभिरात्मसृष्टैः

पुरं विराजं विरचय्य तस्मिन् ।

स्वांशेन विष्टः पुरुषाभिधानमवाप

नारायण आदिदेवः ॥ ३॥ (११. ४: ३)

*bhutair yadä pañcabhir ätma-sṛṣtaiḥ*

*puram virājam viracayya tasmin*

*svämśena viṣtaḥ puruṣābhidhānam*

*avāpa nārāyaṇa ädi-devaḥ*

१५४. पातालमेतस्य हि पादमूलं

पठन्ति पार्ष्णिप्रपदे रसातलम् ।

महातलं विश्वसृजोऽथ गुल्फौ

तलातलं वै पुरुषस्य जङ्घे ॥ २६॥ (२. १: २६)

*pätālam etasya hi päda-mūlaà*  
*paöhanti pärṣṇēi-prapade rasätalam*  
*mahätalaà viçva-srjo 'tha gulphau*  
*talätalaà vai puruṣasya jaighe*

१५५. उरःस्थलं ज्योतिरनीकमस्य

ग्रीवा महर्वदनं वै जनोऽस्य ।

तपो रराटीं विदुरादिपुंसः

सत्यं तु शीर्षाणि सहस्रशीर्ष्णः ॥ २८ ॥ (२. १: २८)

*urah-sthalaà jyotir-anékam asya*  
*grévā mahar vadanaà vai jano 'sya*  
*tapo varätéà vidur ädi-puàsaḥ*  
*satyaà tu çérṣāṇi sahasra-çérṣēaḥ*

१५६. कस्तस्य मेढ्रं वृषणौ च मित्रौ

कुक्षिः समुद्रा गिरयोऽस्थिसङ्घाः ॥ ३२ ॥ (२. १: ३२)

*kas tasya meðhraà vṛṣaëau ca mitrau*  
*kukṣiù samudrä girayo 'sthi-saighäh*

१५७. नद्योऽस्य नाड्योऽथ तनूरुहाणि

महीरुहा विश्वतनोर्नृपेन्द्र ।

अनन्तवीर्यः श्वसितं मातरिश्वा

गतिर्वयः कर्म गुणप्रवाहः ॥ ३३ ॥ (२. १: ३३)

*nadyo 'sya näòyo 'tha tanü-ruhāṇi*  
*mahé-ruhā viçva-tanor nrpendra*  
*ananta-véryaù çvasitaà mätariçvä*  
*gatir vayah karma guṇa-pravāhaḥ*

१५८. रोमाण्युद्धिज्जजातीनां यैर्वा यज्ञस्तु सम्भृतः ॥ ४ ॥

केशश्मश्रुनखान्यस्य शिलालोहाभ्रविद्युताम् । (२. ६: ५)

*romāny udbhijja-jäténäè*

*yair vä yajias tu sambhṛtaḥ*

*keṣa-ṣmaṣru-nakhāny asya*

*ṣilā-lohābhra-vidyutām*

१५९. येषां विभर्म्यहमखण्डविकुण्ठयोग -

मायाविभूतिरमलाङ्घ्रिरजःकिरीटेः ।

विप्रांस्तु को न विषहेत यदर्हणाम्भः

सद्यः पुनाति सह चन्द्रललाम लोकान् ॥ ९॥ (३. १६: ९)

*yeñää bibharmy aham akhaëöa-vikuëöha-yoga*

*māyā-vibhūtir amalāṅghri-rajau kiréöaiù*

*viprääs tu ko na viñaheta yad-arhaëämbhau*

*sadyau punäti saha-candra-laläma-lokän*

१६०. नाड्योऽस्य निरभिद्यन्त ताभ्यो लोहितमाभृतम् ।

नद्यस्ततः समभवत्सुदरं निरभिद्यत ॥ ५९॥ (३. २६: ५९)

*näöyo 'sya nirabhidyaanta*

*täbhyo lohitaṃ äbhātam*

*nadyas tataù samabhavann*

*udaraà nirabhidyaata*

१६१. सा तत्र ददृशे विश्वं जगत्स्थास्तु च खं दिशः ।

साद्रिद्वीपाब्धिभूगोलं स वाय्वग्नीन्दुतारकम् ॥ ३७॥

ज्योतिश्चक्रं जलं तेजो नभस्वान् वियदेव च ।

वैकारिकाणीन्द्रियाणि मनो मात्रा गुणास्त्रयः ॥ ३८॥

एतद्विचित्रं सह जीवकाल -

स्वभावकर्माशयलिङ्गभेदम् ।

सूनोस्तनौ वीक्ष्य विदारितास्ये

ब्रजं सहात्मानमवाप शङ्काम् ॥ ३९॥ (१०. ८: ३७-३९)

*sā tatra dadṛše viśvam*

*jagat sthāsnu ca kham diśaḥ*  
*sādri-dvīpābdhi-bhūgolam*  
*sa-vāyu-agnīndu- tārakam*  
*jyotiś-cakram jalam tejo*  
*nabhasvān viyad eva ca*  
*vaikārikāṅdriyāṅi*  
*mano mātrā guṇās trayah*  
*etad vicitram saha-jīva-kāla-*  
*svabhāva-karmāśaya-liṅga-bhedam*  
*sūnos tanau vīkṣya vidāritāsye*  
*vrajam sahātmānam avāpa śaṅkām*

१६२. किं स्वप्न एतदुत देवमाया

किं वा मदीयो बत बुद्धिमोहः ।

अथो अमुष्यैव ममाभकस्य

यः कश्चनौत्पत्तिक आत्मयोगः ॥ ४० ॥ (१०. ८: ४०)

*kiṁ svapna etad uta devamāyā*  
*kiṁ vā madīyo bata buddhi-mohaḥ*  
*atho amuṣyaiva mamārbhakasya*  
*yaḥ kaścānautpattika ātma-yogaḥ*

१६३. भूस्तोयमग्निः पवनः खमादि -

महानजादिर्मन इन्द्रियाणि ।

सर्वेन्द्रियार्था विबुधाश्च सर्वे

ये हेतवस्ते जगतोऽङ्ग भूताः ॥ २ ॥ (१०.४०: २)

*bhūs toyam agniḥ pavanam kham ādir*  
*mahān ajādir mana indriyāṅi*  
*sarvendriyārthā vibudhā śca sarve*  
*ye hetavas te jagato 'nga-bhūtāḥ*



१६४. यथाद्रिप्रभवा नद्यः पर्जन्यापूरिताः प्रभो ।

विशन्ति सर्वतः सिन्धुं तद्वत्त्वां गतयोऽन्ततः ॥ १०॥ (१०. ४०: १०)

*yathādrī-prabhavā nadyaḥ*

*parjanyaṅpūrītāḥ prabho*

*viśanti sarvataḥ sindhum*

*tadvat tvām gatayo 'ntataḥ*

१६५. निगमकल्पतरोगलितं फलं

शुकमुखादमृतद्रवसंयुतम् ,

पिबत भागवतं रसमालयं

मुहुरहो रसिका भुवि भावुकाः ॥ ३॥ (१. १: ३)

*nigama-kalpa-taror galitā phalā*

*ṣuka-mukhād amṛta-drava-saṅyutam*

*pibata bhāgavataḥ rasam ālayaḥ*

*muhur aho rasikā bhuvī bhāvukā*

१६६. त्वं नः सन्दर्शितो धात्रा दुस्तरं निस्तितीर्षताम् ।

कलिं सत्त्वहरं पुंसां कर्णधार इवार्णवम् ॥ २२॥ (१. १: २२)

*tvāḥ naḥ sandarṣito dhātrā*

*dustaraḥ nistitīrṣatām*

*kalim sattva-harṁ puṁsām*

*karā-dhāra ivārṇavam*

१६७. स वै भवान् वेद समस्तगुह्यमुपासितो

यत्पुरुषः पुराणः ।

परावशेषो मनसैव विश्वं

सृजत्यवत्यत्ति गुणैरसङ्गः ॥ ६॥ (१. ५: ६)

*sa vai bhavān veda samasta-guhyam*

*upāsito yat puruṣaḥ purāṇaḥ*

*parävareço manasaiva viçvaè*

*sâjaty avaty atti guṇair asaigaḥ*

१६८. इमे जनपदाः स्वृद्धाः सुपक्वौषधिवीरुधः ।

वनाद्रिनद्युदन्वन्तो ह्येधन्ते तव वीक्षितैः ॥ ४० ॥ (१. ८: ४०)

*ime jana-padâḥ svâddhâù*

*supakvauṣadhi-vérudhaḥ*

*vanädri-nady-udanvanto*

*hy edhante tava vékṣitaiḥ*

१६९. पिबन्ति ये भगवत आत्मनः सतां

कथामृतं श्रवणपुटेषु सम्भृतम् ।

पुनन्ति ते विषयविदूषिताशयं

ब्रजन्ति तच्चरणसरोरुहान्तिकम् ॥ ३७ ॥ (२. २: ३७)

*pibanti ye bhagavata ätmanaḥ satâà*

*kathämṛtaè çravaṇa-puṭeṣu sambhâtam*

*punanti te viṣaya-vidüsitâçayaà*

*vrajanti tac-caraṇa-saroruhântikam*

१७०. स्थितिर्वैकुण्ठविजयः पोषणं तदनुग्रहः ।

मन्वन्तराणि सद्धर्म ऊतयः कर्मवासनाः ॥ ४ ॥ (२. १०: ४)

*sthitir vaikuëöha-vijayau*

*poñaëaè tad-anugrahaù*

*manvantaräèi sad-dharma*

*ütayau karma-vâsanâù*

१७१. प्रियं प्रभुर्ग्राम्य इव प्रियाया

विधित्सुरार्च्छद् द्युतरं यदर्थे ।

वज्याद्रवत्तं सगणो रुषान्धः

क्रीडामृगो नूनमयं वधूनाम् ॥ ५ ॥ (३. ३: ५)

*priyaà prabhur grāmya iva priyāyā*  
*vidhitsuṛ ārcchad dyutaruà yad-arthe*  
*vajry ādravat taà sa-gaëo ruñāndhau*  
*kréòä-māgo nūnam ayaà vadhūnām*

१७२. वाम ऊरावधिश्चित्य दक्षिणाङ्घ्रिसरोरुहम् ।

अपाश्रितार्भकाश्चत्थमकृशं त्यक्तपिप्पलम् ॥ ८॥ (३. ४: ८)

*vāma ūrāv adhiçritya*  
*dakñiëäighri-saroruham*  
*apāçritārbhakāçvattham*  
*akāçāà tyakta-pippalam*

१७३. वनकुञ्जरसङ्घृष्टहरिचन्दनवायुना ।

अधि पुण्यजनस्त्रीणां मुहुरुन्मथयन् मनः ॥ ३०॥ (४. ६: ३०)

*vana-kuijara-saighāñña*  
*haricandana-vāyunā*  
*adhi puëyājana-stréëäa*  
*muhur unmathayan manau*

१७४. त्वं क्रतुस्त्वं हविस्त्वं हुताशः स्वयं

त्वं हि मन्त्रः समिद्भिर् पात्राणि च ।

त्वं सदस्यर्त्विजो दम्पती देवता

अग्निहोत्रं स्वधा सोम आज्यं पशुः ॥ ४५॥ (४. ७: ४५)

*tvaà kratus tvaà havis tvaà hutāçau svayaà*  
*tvaà hi mantrau samid-darbha-pātrāëi ca*  
*tvaà sadasyartvijo dampaté devatā*  
*agnihotraà svadhā soma äjyaà paçuu*

१७५. परिजनानुरागविरचितशबलसंशब्द -

सलिलसितकिसलयतुलसिकादूर्वाङ्कुरैरपि

सम्भृतया सपर्यया किल परम परितुष्यसि ॥ ६॥ (५. ३: ६)

*parijanänuräga-viracita-çabala-saàçabda-  
salila-sita-kisalaya-tulasikä-dürvääikurair api  
sambhätayä saparyayä kila parama parituñyasi.*

१७६. यं लोकपालाः किल मत्सरज्वरा

हित्वा यतन्तोऽपि पृथक्समेत्य च ।

पातुं न शेकुर्द्विपदश्चतुष्पदः

सरीसृपं स्थाणु यदत्र दृश्यते ॥ २७॥ (५.१८: २७)

*yaè loka-päläu kila matsara-jvarä  
hitvä yatanto 'pi pãthak sametya ca  
pätuà na çekur dvi-padaç catuñ-padaù  
sarésãpaè sthääu yad atra dãçyate*

१७७. तस्मादमूस्तनुभृतामहमाशिषो ज्ञ

आयुः श्रियं विभवमैन्द्रियमाविरिञ्चयात् ।

नेच्छामि ते विलुलितानुरुविक्रमेण

कालात्मनोपनय मां निजभृत्यपार्श्वम् ॥ २४॥ (७. २: १४)

*tasmäd amiis tanu-bhätäm aham äçïño 'jia  
äyüè çriyaè vibhavam aindriyam äviriicyät  
necchämi te vilulitän uruvikrameëa  
kälätmanopanaya mäè nija-bhätya-pärçvam*

१७८. तद्यथा वृक्ष उन्मूलः शुष्यत्युद्धर्ततेचिरात् ।

एवं नष्टानृतः सद्य आत्मा शुष्येन्न संशयः ॥ ४०॥ (८. १९: ४०)

*tad yathä vâkña unmuläu  
çuñyaty udvartate 'cirät  
evaè nañöänätäu sadya  
ätmä çuñyen na saàçayaù*

१७९. त्वमग्निर्भगवान् सूर्यस्त्वं सोमो ज्योतिषां पतिः ।

त्वमापस्त्वं क्षितिर्व्योम वायुर्मात्रेन्द्रियाणि च ॥ ३॥ (९. ५: ३)

*tvam agnir bhagavān sūryas*

*tvaà somo jyotiṅāà patiù*

*tvam āpas tvaè kñītir vyoma*

*vāyur mātrendriyāēi ca*

१८०. तमद्भुतं बालकमम्बुजेक्षणं

चतुर्भुजं शङ्खगदाद्युदायुधम् ।

श्रीवत्सलक्ष्मं गलशोभिकौस्तुभं

पीताम्बरं सान्द्रपयोदसौभगम् ॥ ९॥ (१०. ३: ९)

*tam avdbhutaṁ bālakamambujekṣaṇaṁ*

*catur-rbhujam śaṅkha-gadaāryudham*

*śrībatsa-lakṣmaṁ gala-śobhi-kaustubhaṁ*

*pītāmbaram sāndra-payoda-saubhagam*

१८१. पीतप्रायस्य जननी सा तस्य रुचिरस्मितम् ।

मुखं लालयती राजञ्जृम्भतो ददृशे इदम् ॥ ३५॥

खं रोदसी ज्योतिरनीकमाशाः

सूर्येन्दुवह्निश्वसनाम्बुधींश्च ।

द्वीपान् नगांस्तदुहितुर्वनानि

भूतानि यानि स्थिरजङ्गमानि ॥ ३६॥ (१०. ७: ३५-३६)

*pēta-prāyasya janané*

*sutasya rucira-smitam*

*mukhaà lālayaté rājai*

*jāmbhato dadāçe idam*

*khaà rodasé jyotir-anékam äçāù*

*sūryendu-vahni-çvasanāmbudhéaç ca*

*dvépān nagāàs tad-duhitèr vanāni*

*bhütāni yāni sthira-jaiṅgamāni*

१८२. यस्य कुक्षाविदं सर्वं सात्मं भाति यथा तथा ।

तत्त्वय्यपीह तत्सर्वं किमिदं मायया विना ॥ १७॥ (१०. १४: १७)

*yasya kukñāv idaà sarvaà*

*sātmaà bhāti yathā tathā*

*tat tvayy apéha tat sarvaà*

*kim idaà mäyayä vinä*

१८३. श्रीकृष्ण वृष्णि कुलपुष्करजोषदायिन्

ध्मानिर्जरद्विजपशूदधिवृद्धिकारिन् ।

उद्धर्मशार्वरहर क्षितिराक्षसध्रु -

गाकल्पमार्कमर्हन् भगवन् नमस्ते ॥ ४०॥ (१०. १४: ४०)

*çré-kāñëa vāñëi-kula-puñkara-joña-däyin*

*kñmä-nirjara-dviija-paçüdadhi-vāddhi-kärin*

*uddharma-çärvara-hara kñiti-räkñasa-dhrug*

*ä-kalpam ärkam arhan bhagavan namas te*

१८४. फलविक्रयिणी तस्य च्युतधान्यं करद्वयम् ।

फलैरपूरयद्रत्नैः फलभाण्डमपूरि च ॥ ११॥ (१०. ११: ११)

*phala-vikrayiëé tasya*

*cyuta-dhänya-kara-dvayam*

*phalair apürayad ratnaiù*

*phala-bhäëòam apiüri ca*

१८५. यदि न समुद्धरन्ति यतयो हृदि कामजटा

दुरधिगमोऽसतां हृदि गतोऽस्मृतकण्ठमणिः ।

असुतृयोगिनामुभयतोऽप्यसुखं भगवन्

अनपगतान्तकादनधिरूपदाद्भवतः ॥ ३९॥ (१०. ८७: ३९)

*yadi na samuddharanti yatayo hr̥di kāma-jaṭā*

*duradhigamo 'satām hr̥di gato 'smṛta-kaṇṭha-maṇiḥ*

*asu-trpa-yoginām ubhayato 'py asukhaṁ bhagavann*

*anapagatāntakād anadhirūḍha-padād bhavataḥ*

१८६. भगवानपि ता रात्रीः शरदोत्फुल्लमल्लिकाः ।

वीक्ष्य रन्तुं मनश्चक्रे योगमायामुपाश्रितः ॥ १॥ (१०. २९: १)

*bhagavān api tārātrīḥ*

*śārdotphulla-mallikāḥ*

*vīkṣya rantuṁ /manaś cakre*

*yoga-māyām upāśritaḥ*

१८७. तदोडुराजः ककुभः करैर्मुखं

प्राच्या विलिम्पन्नरुणेन शन्तमैः ॥ २॥ (१०. २९: २)

*tadoḍurājaḥ karair mukhaṁ*

*prācyā vilimpann aruṇena śantamaḥ*

१८८. दृष्ट्वा कुमुद्वन्तमखण्डमण्डलं

रमाननाभंनवकुङ्कुमारुणम्

वनं च तत्कोमलगोभिरञ्जितं

जगौ कलं वामदृशां मनोहरम् ॥ ३॥ (१०. २९: ३)

*dr̥ṣṭvā kumudvantam akhaṇḍa-maṇḍalaṁ*

*ramānanābhaṁ nava-kuṅkumāruṇam*

*vanaṁ ca tat-komala-gobhī rañjitaṁ*

*jagau kalaṁ vāma-dr̥śāṁ manoharam*

१८९. कृष्णविक्रीडितं वीक्ष्य मुमुहुः खेचरस्त्रियः ।

कामार्दिताः शशाङ्कश्च सगणो विस्मितोऽभवत् ॥ १९॥ (१०. ३३: १८)

*Kṛṣṇa- vikrīḍitaṁ vīkṣya*

*mumuhuḥ khe-cara-striyah*

*kāmārditaḥ śasāṅkaś ca*

*sa-gaṇo vismito `bhavat*

१९०. ताभिः समेताभिरुदारचेष्टितः

प्रियेक्षणोत्फुल्लमुखीभिरच्युतः ।

उदारहासद्विजकुन्ददीधति -

व्यरोचतैणाङ्क इवोडुभिर्वृतः ॥ ४३ ॥ (१०. २९: ४३)

*tābhiḥ sametābhir udāra-ceṣṭitaḥ*

*priyekṣaṇotphulla-mukhībhir acyutaḥ*

*Udāra-hāsa-dviija-kunda-dīdhatir*

*vyarocataiṅkā ivoḍubhir vṛtaḥ*

१९१. नीवीस्तनालभननर्मनखाग्रपातैः ।

ध्वेल्यावलोकहसितैर्त्रजसुन्दरीणा -

मुत्तम्भयन् रतिपतिं रमयांचकार ॥ ४६ ॥ (१०. २९: ४६)

*nīvi-stanālabhana-narma-nakhāgra-pātaiḥ*

*kṣvelyāvaloka-hasitair vraja-sundarīṅam*

*uttambhayan rati-patiṁ ramayāṁ cakāra*

१९२. एवमुक्तः प्रियामाह स्कन्ध आरुह्यतामिति ।

ततश्चान्तर्दधे कृष्णः सा वधूरन्वतप्यत ॥ ३८ ॥ (१०. ३०: ३८)

*evam uktaḥ priyām āha*

*skandha āruhyatām iti*

*tataś cāntardadhe Kṛṣṇaḥ*

*sā vadhūr anvatapyata*

१९३. अन्तर्हिते भगवति सहसैव व्रजाङ्गनाः ।

अतप्यंस्तमचक्षाणाः करिण्य इव यूथपम् ॥ १ ॥ (१०. ३०: १)

*antarhite bhagavati sahasaiva vrajan ganah*

*atapyams acaksanah karinya iva yuthapam.*

१९४. कञ्चित्तुलसि कल्याणि गोविन्दचरणप्रिये ।

सह त्वालिकुलैर्विभ्रद्दृष्टेऽतिप्रियोऽच्युतः ॥ ७ ॥ (१०. ३०: ७)



*kaccit talasi kalyāṇi*

*govinda-carāṇa-priye*

*saha tvāli-kulair bibhrad*

*dr̥ṣṭas te 'ti-priyo 'cyutaḥ*

१९५. पृच्छतेमा लता बाहूनप्याश्लिष्टा वनस्पतेः ।

नूनं तत्करजस्पृष्टा विभ्रत्युत्पुलकान्यहो ॥ १३॥ (१०. ३०: १३)

*pr̥cchatemā latā bāhūn*

*apy āśliṣṭā vanaspate/*

*nūnaṁ tat-karaja-spr̥ṣṭā*

*bibhraty utpulkāny aho*

१९६. जयति तेऽधिकं जन्मना व्रजः

श्रयत इन्दिरा शश्रदत्र हि ।

दयित दृश्यतां दिक्षु तावकास्त्वयि

धृतासवस्त्वां विचिन्वते ॥ १॥ (१०. ३१: १)

*jayati te `dhikaṁ janmanā vrajaḥ*

*śarayata indirā śaśvad atra hi*

*dayita dr̥śyatām dikṣu tāvakās*

*tvayi dhṛtāsavas tvām vicinvate*

१९७. चलसि यद्ब्रजाञ्चारयन् पशून्

नलिनसुन्दरं नाथ ते पदम् ।

शिलतृणाङ्कुरैः सीदतीति नः

कलिलतां मनः कान्त गच्छति ॥ ११॥ (१०. ३१: ११)

*calasi yad vrajāc cārayan paśūn*

*nalina-sundaram nātha te padam*

*śila-tr̥ṇāṅkuraiḥ sīdatīti naḥ*

*kalilatām manaḥ kānta gacchati*

१९८. तं काचिन्नेत्ररन्ध्रेण हृदिकृत्य निमील्य च ।

पुलकाङ्ग्युपगुह्यास्ते योगीवानन्दसम्प्लुता ॥ ८॥ (१०. ३२: ८)

*tam kachin netra- randhrena*

*hardikrtva nimilya ca*

*pulakangy upaguhyaste*

*vgivananda- sampluta*

१९९. शरच्चन्द्रांशुसन्दोहध्वस्तदोषातमः शिवम् ।

कृष्णाया हस्ततरलाचितकोमलवालुकम् ॥ १२ (१०. ३२: १२)

*śarac-candrāmāśu-sandoha-*

*dhvasta- doṣā-tamaḥ śivam*

*kṛṣṇāyā hasta-taralā*

*cita-komala-vālukam*

२००. रासोत्सवः सम्प्रवृत्तो गोपीमण्डलमण्डितः ।

योगेश्वरेण कृष्णेन तासां मध्ये द्वयोर्द्वयोः ।

प्रविष्टेन गृहीतानां कण्ठे स्वनिकटं स्त्रियः ॥ ३॥ (१०. ३३: ३)

*rāsotsavaḥ sampravṛtto*

*gopī-maṇḍala-maṇḍitaḥ*

*yogeśvar eṇa kṛṣṇena*

*tāsām madhye dvayor dvayor*

*praviṣṭena grhītānām*

*kaṇṭhe sva-nikaṭam striyaḥ*

२०१. नैमिषेऽनिमिषक्षेत्रे ;यः शौनकादयः ।

सत्रं स्वर्गाय लोकाय सहस्रसममासत ॥ ४॥ (१. १: ४)

*naimiṣe 'nimiṣa-kṣetre*

*āñayaḥ ṣaunakādayaḥ*

*satraḥ svargāya lokāya*

*sahasra-samam āsata*

२०२. कामं ववर्ष पर्जन्यः सर्वकामदुघा मही ।

सिषिचुः स्म व्रजान् गावः पयसोधस्वतीर्मुदा ॥ ४॥ (१. १०: ४)

*kāmaà vavarña parjanyaḥ*

*sarva-kāma-dughā mahé*

*siṣicuḥ sma vrajān gāvāḥ*

*payasodhasvatér mudā*

२०३. हिरण्यं गां महीं ग्रामान् हस्त्यश्वाच्चपतिर्वरान् ।

प्रादात्स्वन्नं च विप्रेभ्यः प्रजातीर्थे स तीर्थवित् ॥ १४॥ (१. १२: १४)

*hiraṇyaà gāè mahéà grāmān*

*hasty-açvān nṛpatir varān*

*prādāt svannaà ca viprebhyaḥ*

*prajā-térthe sa térthavit*

२०४. भूसंस्थानं कृतं येन सरिद्विरिवनादिभिः ।

सीमा च भूतनिर्वृत्यै द्वीपे द्वीपे विभागशः ॥ ३९॥ (५. १: ३९)

*bhü-saàsthānaà kātaà yena*

*sarid-giri-vanādibhiù*

*sémā ca bhüta-nirvātyai*

*dvépe dvépe vibhāgaçaù*

२०५. मृगोष्ट्रखरमर्काखुसरीसृष्ट्वगमक्षिकाः ।

आत्मनः पुत्रवत्पश्येतैरेषामन्तरं कियत् ॥ ९॥ (७. १४: ९)

*māgoñōra-khara-markākhusarésāp*

*khaga-makñikāù*

*ātmanaù putravat paçyet*

*tair eñām antaraà kiyat*

२०६. निर्मथ्यमानादुदधेरभूद्विषं

महोल्बणं हालहलाह्वमग्रतः ।

सम्भ्रान्तमीनोन्मकराहिकच्छपा

त्तिमिद्विपग्राहतिमिडिगलाकुलात् ॥ १८॥ (८. ७: १८)

*nirmathyamänäd udadher abhüd viñäà*

*maholbaëaè hälalälhvam agrataù*

*sambhränta-ménonmakarähi-kacchapät*

*timi-dvipa-gräha-timügiläkulät*

२०७. बद्धवोदधौ रघुपतिर्विधाद्रिकूटैः

सेतुं कपीन्द्रकरकम्पितभूरुहाङ्गैः ।

सुग्रीवनीलहनुमत्प्रमुखैरनीकैर्लङ्कां

विभीषणदृशाऽऽविशदग्रदग्धाम् ॥ १६॥ (९. १०: १६)

*baddhvodadhau raghu-patir vividhädri-küöaiù*

*setuè kapéndra-kara-kampita-bhüruhägaiù*

*sugréva-néla-hanumat-pramukhair anékair*

*laikää vibhéñäëa-dâçäviçad agra-dagdhäm*

२०८. ततो ददर्श भगवानशोकवनिकाश्रमे ।

क्षामां स्वविरहव्याधिं शिंशपामूलमास्थिताम् ॥ ३०॥ (९. १०: ३०)

*tato dadarçä bhagavän*

*açoka-vanikäçrame*

*kñämää sva-viraha-vyädhià*

*çiàçapä-mülam-äçritäm*

२०९. क्वचिद्वनाशाय मनो दधद्रजाल्प्रातः

समुत्थाय वयस्यवत्सपान् ।

प्रबोधयञ्छृङ्गरवेण चारुणा

विनिर्गतो वत्सपुरःसरो हरिः ॥ १॥ (१०. १२: १)

*kvacid vanäçäya mano dadhad vrajät*

*prätaù samutthäya vayasya-vatsapän*

*prabodhayai chāiga-raveëa cāruëä*

*vinirgato vatsa-puraüsaro hariù*

२१०. दृष्ट्वाथ तत्तेह्वशोऽस्मृतात्मा

स गोत्रजोऽत्यात्मपदुर्गमार्गः ।

द्विपात्कुकुद्वीव उदास्यपुच्छो -

ऽगाद्धुङ्कृतैरास्रुपया जवेन ॥ ३०॥ (१०. १३: ३०)

*dāñövätha tat-sneha-vaço 'smätätmä*

*sa go-vrajo 'tyätmapa-durga-märgau*

*dvi-pät kakud-gréva udäsya-puccho*

*'gäd dhuikätair äsru-payä javena*

२११. ततोऽनुज्ञाप्य भगवान् स्वभुवं प्रागवस्थितान् ।

वत्सान् पुलिनमानिन्ये यथापूर्वसखं स्वकम् ॥ ४२॥ (१०. १४: ४२)

*tato 'nujñāpya bhagavān*

*sva-bhuvanṁ prāg avasthitān*

*vatsān pulinam āninye*

*yathā-pūrva-sakham svakam*

२१२. ततो हसन् हृषीकेशोऽभ्यवहृत्य सहाभकैः ।

दर्शयंश्चर्माजगरं न्यवर्तत वनाद्ब्रजम् ॥ ४६॥ (१०. १४: ४६)

*tato hasan hāñékeço*

*'bhyavahātya sahārbhakaiù*

*darçayaàç carmājagaraà*

*nyavartata vanād vrajam*

२१३. निशम्य गीतं तदनङ्गवर्धनं

ब्रजस्त्रियः कृष्णगृहीतमानसाः ।

आजग्मुरन्योन्यमलक्षितोद्यमाःसयत्र कान्तो जवलोलकुण्डलाः ॥ ४॥ (१०. २९: ४)

*niśamya gītam tad anaṅga-varadhanam*

*vraja-striyaḥ Kṛṣṇa-grhīta-mānasāḥ*

*ājagmur anyonyam alakṣitodyamāḥ*

*sa yatra kānto java-lola-kuṇḍalāḥ*

२१४. ताः समादाय कालिन्द्या निर्विश्य पुलिनं विभुः ।

विकसत्कुन्दमन्दारसुरभ्यनिलषट्पदम् ॥ ११ ॥ (१०. ३२: ११)

*tāḥ samādāya kālindyā*

*nirviśya pulinaṁ vibhuḥ*

*vikasat-kunda-mandāra*

*surabhy-anila-ṣaṭpadam*

२१५. विलोक्यागतं प्रेष्ठं प्रीत्युत्फुल्लदृशोऽबलाः ।

उत्तस्थुर्युगपत्सर्वास्तन्वः प्राणमिवागतम् ॥ ३ ॥ (१०. ३२: ३)

*taṁ vilokyāgataṁ preṣṭhaṁ*

*prīty-utphulla-dr̥śo 'balāḥ*

*uttasthur yugapat sarvās*

*tanvaḥ prāṇam ivāgatam*

२१६. प्राप्तान् द्वियैक्षत नृपान् ददृशेऽच्युतं सा ॥ ५४ ॥ (१०. ५३: ५४-५५)

तां राजकन्यां रथमारुरुक्षतीं

जहार कृष्णो द्विषतां समीक्षताम् ।

*prāptān hariyaikṣata*

*nṛpān dadṛśe 'cyutaṁ ca*

*tāṁ rāja-kanyām ratham āruruḥṣatīm*

*jahāra Kṛṣṇo dviṣatām samīḥṣatām*

२१७. इत्यादिष्टौ भगवता तौ कृष्णौ परमेष्ठिना ।

ओमित्यानम्य भूमानमादाय द्विजदारकान् ॥ ६० ॥

न्यवर्ततां स्वकं धाम सम्प्रहृष्टौ यथागतम् ।

विप्राय ददतुः पुत्रान् यथारूपं यथावयः ॥ ६१ ॥ (१०. ६९: ६०-६१)

*ity ādiṣṭau bhagavatā*  
*tau Kṛṣṇau parame-ṣṭhinā*  
*om ity ānamya bhūmānam*  
*ādāya dvija-dārakān*  
*nyavartetām svakām dhāma*  
*samprahrṣṭau yathā-gatam*  
*viprāya dadatuḥ putrān*  
*yathā-rupaṁ yathā-vayaḥ*

२१८. स सम्राट् कस्य वा हेतोः पाण्डूनां मानवर्धनः ।

प्रयोपविष्टो गङ्गायामनादृत्याधिराट् श्रियम् ॥ १०॥ (१. ४: १०)

*sa samrāö kasya vä hetou*  
*päëöünäè mäna-varadhanau*  
*präyopaviñöo gaigäyäm*  
*anädätüädhiräö-çriyam*

२१९. स कदाचित्सरस्वत्या उपस्पृश्य जलं शुचिः ।

विविक्तदेश आसीन उदिते रविमण्डले ॥ १५॥ (१. ४: १५)

*sa kadäcit sarasvatyä*  
*upaspåçya jalaè çuciḥ*  
*vivikta eka äséna*  
*udite ravi-maṇḍale*

२२०. पतिं प्रयान्तं सुबलस्य पुत्री

पतिव्रता चानुजगाम साध्वी ।

हिमालयं न्यस्तदण्डप्रहर्षं

मनस्विनामिव सत्सम्प्रहारः ॥ ३०॥ (१. १३: ३०)

*patiè prayäntaè subalasya putré*  
*pati-vratä cānujagāma sädhvé*

*himālayaà nyasta-danda-praharṣaà*

*manasvinām iva sat samprahāraḥ*

२२१. न पिबन्ति स्तनं वत्सा न दुहन्ति च मातरः ।

रुदन्त्यश्रुमुखा गावो न हृष्यन्त्यृषभा व्रजे ॥ १९॥ (१. १४: १९)

*na pibanti stanaà vatsä*

*na duhyanti ca mätaraḥ*

*rudanty açru-mukhä Gävo*

*na hãñyanty řṣabhä vraje*

२२२. गृहात्प्रव्रजितो धीरः पुण्यतीर्थजलाप्लुतः ।

शुचौ विविक्त आसीनो विधिवत्कल्पितासने ॥ १६॥ (२. १: १६)

*gṛhät pravrajito dhérah*

*punya-tértha-jaläplutaṣ*

*çucau vivikta äséno*

*vidhivat kalpitäsane*

२२३. विद्धः सपत्न्युदितपत्रिभिरन्ति राज्ञो

बालोऽपि सन्नुपगतस्तपसे वनानि ।

तस्मा अदाद्ध्रुवगतिं गुणते प्रसन्नो

दिव्याः स्तुवन्ति मुनयो यदुपर्यधस्तात् ॥ ८॥ (२. ७: ८)

*viddhaḥ sapatny-udita-patirbhir anti räjäo*

*bälo 'pi sann upagatas tapase vanäni*

*tasmä adäd dhruva-gatià grëate prasanno*

*divyäh stuvanti munayo yad upary-ad*

२२४. प्रस्थिते तु वनं पित्रा दत्त्वा गां धर्मसंश्रयः ।

षट्त्रिंशद्वर्षसाहस्रं रक्षिताव्याहतेन्द्रियः ॥ २२॥ (४. ९: २२)

*prasthite tu vanaà piträ*

*dattvä Gäà dharma-saàçrayaù*



*ñäö-triàçad-varña-sāhasraè*

*rakñitävvyāhatendriyaù*

२२५. एवमात्मभुवाऽऽदिष्टः परिक्रम्य गिरां पतिम् ।

वाढमित्यमुमामन्त्र्य विवेश तपसे वनम् ॥ २०॥ (३. १२: २०)

*evam ätmabhuvādiñöaù*

*parikramya girāè patim*

*bäòham ity amum ämantrya*

*viveça tapase vanam*

२२६. अथोपस्पृश्य सलिलं प्राणानायम्य वाग्यतः ।

ध्यायञ्जजाप विरजं ब्रह्मज्योतिः सनातनम् ॥ ३२॥ (३. १४: ३२)

*athopaspāçya salilāè*

*präëän äyamyā väg-yataù*

*dhyäyāi jajāpa virajāè*

*brahma jyotiù sanātanam*

२२७. प्रजाः सृजेति भगवान् कर्दमो ब्रह्मणोदितः ।

सरस्वत्यां तपस्तेपे सहस्राणां समा दश ॥ ६॥ (३. २१: ६)

*prajāù sṛjeti bhagavān*

*kardamo brahmaöditaù*

*sarasvatyāè tapas tepe*

*sahasräëääè samā daça*

२२८. कन्दमूलफलाहारः शुष्कपर्णाशनः क्वचित् ।

अब्भक्षः कतिचित्पक्षान् वायुभक्षस्ततः परम् ॥ ५॥ (४. २३: ५)

*kanda-müla-phalähäraù*

*çuñka-parëäçanaù kvacit*

*ab-bhakñāù katicit pakñān*

*väyu-bhakñas tataù param*

२२९. पित्राऽऽदिष्टाः प्रजासर्गे तपसेऽर्णवमाविशन् ।

दशवर्षसहस्राणि तपसार्चस्तपस्पतिम् ॥ १४ ॥ (४. २४: १४)

*pitṛādīñöü prajā-sarge*

*tapase 'rëavam äviçan*

*daça-varña-sahasrëi*

*tapasärcaàs tapas-patim*

२३०. तस्मिन् वाव किल स एकलः पुलहाश्रमो-पवने विविधकुसुमकिसलय तुलसिकाम्बुभिः

कन्दमूलफलोपहारैश्च समीहमानो भगवत्ताराधनं

विविक्त उपरतविषयाभिलाषउपभृतोपशमः परां निर्वृतिमवाप ॥ ११ ॥ (५. ७: ११)

*tasmin väva kila sa ekalaù pulahäçramopavanevividha-kusuma-kisalaya-*

*tulasikämbubhiù*

*casaméhamäno bhagavata äradhanaà*

*vivikta uparata-viñayäbhiläñau pabhåtopaçamaù paräè nirvâtim aväpa.*

२३१. इतिहासमिमं गुह्यं भगवान् कुम्भसम्भवः ।

कथयामास मलये आसीनो हरिमर्चयन् ॥ ३५ ॥ (६. ३: ३५)

*itihäsam imaè guhyaè*

*bhagavän kumbha-sambhavaù*

*kathayäm äsa malaya*

*äséno harim arcayan*

२३२. स तेपे मन्दरद्रोण्यां तपः परमदारुणम् ।

ऊर्ध्वबाहुर्नभोदृष्टिः पादाङ्गुष्ठाश्रितावनिः ॥ २ ॥ (७. ३: २)

*sa tepe mandara-droëyää*

*tapaù parama-däruëam*

*ürdhva-bähur nabho-dãñöiù*

*pädäiguñöhäçritävaniù*

२३३. अग्न्यर्थमेव शरणमुटजं वाद्रिकन्दराम् ।

श्रयेत हिमवाय्वग्निवर्षाकार्कितपषाट् स्वयम् ॥ २०॥ (७. १२: २०)

*agny-artham eva çaraëam*

*uöajaà vädri-kandaram*

*çrayeta hima-väyv-agnivar*

*ñärkätapa- ñäö svayam*

२३४. तं शयानं धरोपस्थे कावेर्यां सह्यसानुनि ।

रजस्वलैस्तनूदेशैर्निगूढामलतेजसम् ॥ १२॥ (७. १३: १३)

*taà çayänaà dharopasthe*

*käveryäà sahya-sänuni*

*rajas-valais tanü-deçair*

*nigüdhämala-tejasam*

२३५. विरक्तः कामभोगेषु शतरूपापतिः प्रभुः ।

विमृज्य राज्यं तपसे सभार्यो वनमाविशत् ॥ ७॥ (८. १: ७)

*viraktaḥ kāma-bhogeṣu*

*śatarūpā-patiḥ prabhuḥ*

*visrjyaṁ tapase*

*sabhāryo vanam āviśat*

२३६. स एकदाऽऽराधनकाल आत्मवान्

गृहीतमौनव्रत ईश्वरं हरिम् ।

जटाधरस्तापस आप्लुतोऽच्युतं

समर्चयामास कुलाचलाश्रमः ॥ ८॥ (८. ४: ८)

*sa ekadärädhana-kāla ätmavän*

*gāhéta-mauna-vrata éçvaraà harim*

*jaöä-dharas täpasa äpluto 'cyutaà*

*samarcayäm äsa kuläcaläçramaù*

२३७. अवरोप्य गिरिं स्कन्धात्सुपर्णः पततां वरः ।

ययौ जलान्त उत्सृज्य हरिणा स विसर्जितः ॥ ३९॥ (द. ६: ३९)

*avaropya girià skandhät*

*suparëaü patatää varau*

*yayau jalänta utsåjya*

*hariëä sa visarjitaü*

२३८. एवं गतेऽथ सुद्युम्ने मनुर्वैवस्वतः सुते ।

पुत्रकामस्तपस्तेषु यमुनायां शतं समाः ॥ १॥ (९. २: १)

*çré-çuka uväca*

*evaè gate 'tha sudyumne*

*manur vaivasvataü sute*

*putra-kåmas tapas tepe*

२३९. अथाम्बरीषस्तनयेषु राज्यं

समानशीलेषु विसृज्य धीरः ।

वनं विवेशात्मनि वासुदेवे

मनो दधद्द्वस्तगुणप्रवाहः ॥ २६॥ (९. ५: २६)

*athämbarëñas tanayeñu räjyaè*

*samäna-çéleñu visåjya dhëraü*

*vanaè viveçätmani väsudeve*

*mano dadhad dhvasta-guëa-pravähaü*

२४०. तत्र तस्त्वा तपस्तीक्ष्णमात्मदर्शनमात्मवान् ।

सहैवाग्निभिरात्मानं युयोज परमात्मनि ॥ ५४॥ (९. ६: ५४)

*tatra taptvä tapas tékñëam*

*ätma-darçanam ätmavän*

*sahaivägnibhir ätmänaè*

*yuyoja paramätmani*

२४१. रोहितस्तदभिजाय पितुः कर्म चिकीर्षितम् ।

प्राणप्रेप्सुर्धनुष्पाणिररण्यं प्रत्यपद्यत ॥ १६॥ (९. ७: १६)

*rohitas tad abhijāya*

*pituè karma cikérñitam*

*prāëa-prepsur dhanuñ-päëir*

*araëyaà pratyapadyata*

२४२. यः सत्यपाशपरिवीतपितुर्निदिशं

स्त्रैणस्य चापि शिरसा जगृहे सभार्यः ।

राज्यं श्रियं प्रणयिनः सुहृदो निवासं

त्यक्त्वा ययौ वनमसूनिव मुक्तसङ्गः ॥ ८॥ (९. १०: ८)

*yaù satya-pāça-parivéta-pitur nideçaà*

*straiëasya cāpi çirasä jagåhe sabhāryaù*

*rājyaà çriyaà praëayinaù suhådo niväsaà*

*tyaktvä yayau vanam asiün iva mukta-saigau*

२४३. एवं वां तप्यतोस्तीव्रं तपः परमदुष्करम् ।

दिव्यवर्षसहस्राणि द्वादशयुर्मदात्मनोः ॥ ३६॥ (१०. ३: ३६)

*evaà väà tapyatos tévraà*

*tapaù parama-duñkaram*

*divya-varña-sahasräëi*

*dvādaçeyur mad-ätmanoè*

२४४. गायन्त्य उच्चैरमुमेव संहता

विचिक्युरुन्मत्तकवद्वनाद्वनम् ।

पप्रच्छुराकाशवदन्तरं बहिर्भूतेषु

सन्तं पुरुषं वनस्पतीन् ॥ ४॥ (१०. ३०: ४)

*gāyantya uccair amum eva samhatā*

*vicikyur unmattaka-vad vanād vanam*

*papracchur ākāśa-vad antaram bahir*

*bhūteṣu santam puruṣam vanaspatīn*

२४५. दृष्टो वः कच्चिदश्वत्थ प्लक्ष न्यग्रोध नो मनः ।

नन्दसूनुर्गतो हृत्वा प्रेमहासावलोकनैः ॥ ५॥ (१०. ३०: ५)

*dr̥ṣṭo vaḥ kaccid aśvattha*

*plakṣa nyagrodha no manaḥ*

*nanda-sūnur gato hṛtvā*

*prema-hāsāvalokanaiḥ*

२४६. किं ते कृतं क्षिति तपो बत केशवाङ्घ्रि -

स्पर्शोत्सवोत्पुलकिताङ्गरुहैर्विभासि ।

अप्यङ्घ्रिसम्भव उरुक्रमविक्रमाद्वा

आहो वराहवपुषः परिरम्भणेन ॥ १०॥ (१०. ३०: १०)

*kiṁ te kṛtam kṣiti tapo bata keśavāṅghri-*

*sparśotsavotpulakitāṅga-nahair vibhāsi*

*apy aṅghri-sambhava urukrama-uikramād vā*

*āho varāha-vapuṣaḥ parirambhaṇena*

२४७. खगा वीतफलं वृक्षं भुक्त्वा चातिथयो गृहम् ।

दग्धं मृगास्तथारण्यं जारो भुक्त्वा रतां स्त्रियम् ॥ ८॥ (१०. ४७: ८)

*khagā vīta-phalam vṛkṣam*

*bhuktvā cātithayo gṛham*

*dagdham mṛgās tathāraṇyam*

*jārā bhuktvā ratām striyam*

२४८. सरिच्छैलवनोद्देशा गावो वेणुरवा इमे ।

सङ्कर्षणसहायेन कृष्णेनाचरिताः प्रभो ॥ ४९॥ (१०. ४७: ४९)

*saric-chaila-vanoddeśā*

*gāvo veṇu-ravā ime*

*saṅkarṣaṇa-sahāyena*

*Kṛṣṇenācaritāḥ prabho*

२४९. सरिद्धनगिरिद्रोणीर्वीक्षन् कुसुमितान् द्रुमान् ।

कृष्णं संस्मारयन् रेमे हरिदासो ब्रजौकसाम् ॥ ५६॥ (१०. ४७: ५६)

*sarid-vana-giri-droṇīr*

*vīkṣan kusumitān drumān*

*kṛṣṇaṁ saṁsmārayan reme*

*hari-dāso vrajaukasām*

२५०. ततोमहाभागवते उद्धवे निर्गते वनम् ।

द्वारवत्यां किमकरोद्भगवान् भूतभावनः ॥ १॥(११. ३०: १)

*tato mahā-Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*

*uddhave nirgate vanam*

*dvāravatyāṁ kim akarod*

*bhagavān bhūta-bhāvanaḥ*

२५१. परिशोचति ते माता कुररीव गतप्रजा ।

पुत्रस्नेहाकुला दीना विवत्सा गौरिवातुरा ॥ १५॥ (१०. ५५: १५)

*parīśocati te mātā*

*kurarīva gata-prajā*

*putra-snehākula dīna*

*vivatsā gaur ivāturā*

२५२. किन्त्वाचरितमस्माभिर्मलयानिल तेऽप्रियम् ।

गोविन्दापाङ्गनिर्भिन्ने हृदीरयसि नः स्मरम् ॥ १९॥ (१०. ९०: १९)

*kiṁ nv ācaritam asmābhir*

*malayānīla te 'priyam*

*govindāpāṅga-nirbhinne*

*hṛdīrayasi naḥ smaram*

२५३. न चलसि न वदस्युदारबुद्धे

क्षितिधर चिन्तयसे महान्तमर्थम् ।

अपि बत वसुदेवनन्दनाङ्घ्रिं

वयमिव कामयसे स्तनैर्विधर्तुम् ॥ २२॥ (१०. ९०: २२-२३)

*na calasi na vadasy udāra-buddhe*

*kṣiti-dhara-cintayase mahāntam artham*

*api bata vasudeva-nandanāṅghriṃ*

*vayam iva kāmāyase stanair vidhartum*

२५४. दिवि दुन्दुभयो नेदुः पेतुः सुमनसश्च खात् ।

सत्यं धर्मो धृतिर्भूमेः कीर्तिः श्रीश्रानु तं ययुः ॥ ७॥ (११. ३१: ७)

*divi dundubhayo neduḥ*

*petuḥ sumanasāś ca khāt*

*satyaṃ dharmā dhṛtir bhūmeḥ*

*kīrtiḥ śrīś cānu taṃ yayuḥ*



### Works Cited

- Abraham, T.J. "Ecocriticism, Ethics and the Vedic Thought". *Indian Literature*. vol. 51. No. 6. Sāhitya Academy, 2000.
- Abrams, M. H. and Geoffrey Galt Harpham. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 11<sup>th</sup> ed. Cengage Learning, 2016.
- Aggarwal, Devi Dayal. *Protocol in Śrīmad Bhāgwat*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Kaveri Books, 1999.
- Amma, Vimala Padmavati. *A Comparative Study of Similes in Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa Purāṇa with Reference to Self-Realisation Through Bhakti-Jñāna- Vairāgya with Selected Advaita Philosophy Texts*. Doctoral Dissertation. Department of Sanskrit. The Kavikulaguru Kalidas Sanskrit University. 2014.
- Aristotle. *Ethics*. Translated by Bishop Welldon. Macmillian, 1926.
- , *What does Nature Mean?* Translated by Frédéric Ducarme Denis. Couvethttps://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02554932
- Attfield, R. Christianity and Nature Introduction. <https://orca.cf.ac.uk/...Attfield%20Preprint%20CHRISTIANITY%2526NATURE.pdf>
- Aurobindo, Śrī. *Letters on Yoga*. vol. 28. Śrī Aurobindo Ashram Trust, 2012.
- . *The Secret of the Veda*. 8<sup>th</sup> ed. Sri Aurobindo Ashram Trust, 2015.
- Babineau, Edmour J. *Love of God and Social Duty in the Rāmacarīmanas*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Motilal Banarsidass, 1979.
- Bailey, Alice. *The Labours of Hercules*. <http://www.bailey.it/files/Labours-of-Hercules.pdf>
- Barooah, P.P. *The Tale of Trees*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. David C. Cook, 2016.
- Basel, Peter Charles. *The Śāṃkhya System in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa Purāṇa*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Iowa, 2012.

- Bercik, Katherine. *Cow Protection and Hare Krishna Philosophy at New Vrindaban, West Virginia*. Ohio University, pluralism.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/2011\_Cow-Protection.pdf
- Berkeley. *The State of Nature*. bev.berkeley.edu › 3
- Bernet, Rudolf. *Transcendental Phenomenology*. Springer, 2015.
- Bhattacharya, A.D. *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Akshaya Prakashan, 2010.
- Bhattacharya, Siddheshwar. *Some Philosophical Problems in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. Doctoral Dissertation. The University of London, 1947.
- Bhattacharya, S. K. *Kṛṣṇa Cult in Indian Art*. MD Publications, 1996.
- Bidari, Basanta. *Forests and Trees Associated to Śrī Kṛṣṇa*.  
himalaya.socanth.cam.ac.uk journals pdf
- Binachi, Baruna". Ecofeminist Thought and Practice". *Third International Conference on Degrowth for Ecological and Sustainability and Social Equity*  
[http://www.unive.it/nqcontent.cfm?a\\_id=139250](http://www.unive.it/nqcontent.cfm?a_id=139250)
- Bodini, Antonio. *The Science of Ecology for a Sustainable World*. vol.1<sup>st</sup>. Department of Environmental Science, 2009.
- Bora ,Tanuja and Dhruvajyoti. "The Figure of Rama in India and Thailand": A Comparative Study". *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. vol.19. Issue 4. Swahid Peoli Phukan College, 2014. P. 39.
- Börner, Gerhard. *The Wondrous Universe: Creation Without Creator*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Springer, 2011.
- Brooks, Charles R. *The Hare Krishna in India*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Motilal Banarsidass, 1992.
- Brophy, Brigid. "The Rights of Animals". *Creative Delights*. Eds. Shreedhar Lohani and Rameshwar Adhikary. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1997.

- Brown, C. Mackenzie. "The Origin and Transmission of the Two Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa: A Canonical and Theological Dilemma". *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. vol. 51. No. 4. Oxford UP, 1983. p.553.<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1462581>
- Brown, Sara Black. "Krishna, Christians, and Colors: The Socially Binding Influence of Kirtan Singing at a Utah Hare Krishna Festival". *Ethnomusicology*. vol. 58. No. 3. *University of Illinois Press on behalf of Society for Ethnomusicology*. 2014. PP. 473 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5406/ethnomusicology.58.3.0454>
- Bryant, Edwin F. *Krishna*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Replica Press, 2016.
- . *Krishna*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford University Press, 2016.
- , Edwin. *Krishna: The Beautiful Legend of God*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Penguin Classics, 2003.
- Buck, Gertrude. *The Metaphor: A Study in the Psychology of Rhetoric*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. The Inland Press, 1998.
- Buhler, G. *The Laws of Manu*. [vhttps://www.amazon.com/Laws-Manu-SBE-vol-25/dp/BooD3B2AQ0](https://www.amazon.com/Laws-Manu-SBE-vol-25/dp/BooD3B2AQ0)
- Burgin, Mark. *Principles of General Ecology*. University of California, 2017.
- Burley, Mikel. *Classical Sāṃkhya and Yoga: An Indian Metaphysics of Experience*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Routledge, 2007.
- Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero with Thousand Faces*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Carson, Rachel. *Silent Spring*. 14<sup>th</sup> ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962.
- Chakravarty, Anindyadyuti. *Leadership Style and Management Techniques of Lord Krishna: Mahabharata Perspectives*. Doctoral Dissertation. Department of Public Administration. Utkal University, 2008.

- Chandler, Kenneth. *Origins of Vedic Civilization*. <https://sanskrit.safire.com> › pdf ›
- Chapple, Christopher Key and Mary Evelyn Tucker. *Hinduism and Ecology*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Chattopadhyay, Pratima. *Sāṃkhya Elements in Vedic and Purāṇic Thought*. PhD Dissertation. Department of Sanskrit. The Calcutta University, 1980.
- Chaturvedi, B.K. *Yamunā*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Books for All, 1998.
- . *Yamunā*. 2nd ed. Books for All, 2003.
- Choudhary, Parul. *The Concept of Purusa, Prakriti and Lila in Sankaradeva's Philosophy*. K. R. B. Girls' College, 2005.
- Clements, Richa Pauranik. "Embodied Morality and Spiritual Destiny in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. *International Journal of Hindu Studies*. vol.6 No. 2. Springer, 2002. pp. 117-36.
- Coleman, Tracy. "Viraha- Bhakti and Strīdharmā: Re-Reading the Story of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and the Gopīs in the Harivaṃśa and the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. vol. 130, No. 3. American Oriental Society, 2010. P. 390-95. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23044958>
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda. "A Pastoral Paradise". *Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts*. vol.28. No.166. 1930. P. 64. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4170249>
- Cooperman, Matthew. "A Poem Is a Horizon Notes Toward an Ecopoetics". *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*. vol.8. No. 2. Oxford UP, 2001. PP, 182-86. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44085904>
- Cowles, Henry Chandler and Eduard Suess. *History of Ecology*. [www.environment.gen.tr](http://www.environment.gen.tr) › history-of-ecology › 132-history-of-ecology
- . *The Theological Interrelations of the Vegetation on the Sand Dunes of Lake Michigan*. 1<sup>3rd</sup> ed. The University of Chicago, 1899.

- Cremona, Michael and Mukunda Goswāmī. *Divine Nature*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1995.  
[www.artsinhealth.ca](http://www.artsinhealth.ca) › [divine-nature-a-spiritual-perspective-on-the-environ](#) pdf
- . *Divine Nature*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 1998.
- Corcoran, Maura. *Vṛṇḍāvāna in Vaiṣṇava Braj Literature*. Doctoral Dissertation.  
 University of London, 1980.
- Cuddon, J. A. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and literary Theory*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Maya  
 Publishers, 1998.
- Das, Rajorshi. "Nation and Censorship: A Reading of Aubrey Menen's Rāma Retold".  
*Postcolonial Text*. vol. 13. No.2. 2018. P.3.
- Dās, Subrata Kumar. *Tribute to Lord Krishna*. [www.academia.edu](http://www.academia.edu) ›  
[Tribute\\_to\\_Lord\\_Krishna](#)
- Dāsa, Gopīparāṇadhana. *Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā Stava*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. The Bhaktivedanta Book Trust,  
 2007.
- Dasi, Urmila Devi. *The Story of King Ambarisha*. [urmiladevidasi.org](http://urmiladevidasi.org) › [wp-content](#) ›  
[uploads](#) › [Illumination](#) › [Ambarish](#)
- Darśinī, Sārārtha. *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol. 7. Bhaktivedanta  
 Book Trust, 2011.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol. 8. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust,  
 2011. pp. 1094-2093.
- Davies, Marian Wynne. Ed. *The Bloomsbury: The Dictionary of English Literature*.  
 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 1995.
- Debroy, Bibek. Ed. *The Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Penguin Books,  
 2019.
- Devi, Śrī Mātā Amritannadamayi. *The Life of Śrī  
 Krishna*. <https://www.amritapuri.org/3605/sri-krishna.aum>

- Dhawan, Meetu. *Lord Krishna in the Art of Haryana: A Compprehensivw Study* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Department of Philosophy and Fine arts. Punjabi University, 2011.
- Dickinson, Roscoe. *The Combination of Hydrogen and Oxygen in the Presence of Activated Mercury*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Vol. 10. California Institute of Technology, 1924. p.409.
- Dimmitt, Cornelia and J.A. B. Van Buitenen. *Classical Hindu Mythology: A Reader in the Sanskrit Purāṇas*. 1<sup>st</sup>ed. Motilal banarsidass, 2015.
- Dutreuil, Sébastien. *James Lovelock's Gaia Hypodissertation: A New Look at Life on Earth*. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/file/Dutreuil-2018-Lovelock>
- Dwivedi, O.P. "The Heritage of Environmental Stewardship". *Worldviews*. vol.1. No.1. Brill, 1997. p.35. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43809624>
- Edgerton, Franklin. *The Bhagavad Gītā*. [https://archive.org/details/The\\_Bhagavad\\_Gītā\\_Part\\_I\\_Edgerton\\_Franklin](https://archive.org/details/The_Bhagavad_Gītā_Part_I_Edgerton_Franklin)
- . *The Śrīmad Bhāgavata Gītā*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Motilal Banarsidass, 1994.
- Emeneau, M. B. " Kṛṣṇa Steals the Gopīs Clothes: A Folktale Motif". *Journal of the Oriental Society*. vol. 109. No. 4. American Oriental Society, 1969. p.525. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/604074>
- Fiedorczuk, Julia. *Can Poetics Save the Earth? An Interview with Gary Snyder*. [https://depot.ceon.pl/bitstream/handle/01\\_pjas8](https://depot.ceon.pl/bitstream/handle/01_pjas8)
- Fiesar, James and Bradley Dowden (Eds). *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://www.iep.utm.edu/eds/>
- Filion, Charles A. *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam: A Symphony of Commentaries on the Tenth Canto*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol.1. Rasbihari Lal and Sons, 2018.

- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam: A Symphony of Commentaries on the Tenth Canto*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol. 2. Rasbihari Lal and Sons, 2018.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam: A Symphony of the Commentaries on the Tenth Canto*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol.6. Rasbihari Lal and Sons, 2018.
- Forde, Steven. *The Moral and Rational Requirements of Locke's Liberalism*.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2669348>
- Forster, E. M. *A Passage to India*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Penguin, 2001.
- Frye, Northrop. *Biblical and Classical Myths*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. University of Toronto, 2004.
- Gaard, Greg. . *Ecofeminism, Women, Animals, Nature*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Temple University Press, 1993.
- Gandouz, Olfa. *Mother Nature in Silko's Yellow Woman : An Ecofeminist Dimension*. vol.7. No.3. HSS, 2018.
- Garrard, Greg. *Ecocriticism*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Routledge, 2004.
- Geen, Jonathan. "Kṛṣṇa and His Rivals in the *Hindu* and *Jaina* Traditions". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. Vol. 72. No.1. Cambridge University Press, 2009. p. 65. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4037884>
- George, Anna. *Krishna: The Myth and History Across Ages*. [www.academia.edu/11924776/Krishna-the -myth-and history](http://www.academia.edu/11924776/Krishna-the_myth_and_history)
- Glaesar, Bernhard. *The Changing Human-Nature Interrelationship*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Zitierweise, 2001.
- Goldman, Aaron James. *Decartes and His Ecological and animal Ethicist*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Indiana University, 2008.
- Gosh, Pika. "Narrating Kṛṣṇa's Biography: Temple Imagery". *Oral Performance, and Vaiṣṇava Mission in Seventeenth Century Bengal*. vol. 65. No. 1. Artibus Asiae, 2005. P. 75. [http:// www.jstor.org. stable/ 25261819](http://www.jstor.org/stable/25261819)

Gośvāmī , C.L. *Śrīmad Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāna*. 13<sup>th</sup> ed. vol. 2. Gitā Press, 2014.

---. *Srīmad Bhagavatam*. 13<sup>th</sup> ed. vol.3. Gita Press, 2014.

Goswāmī, Jiva. *Gopal Campu*. ebooks.iskcondesiretree.com › pdf › Jiva\_Goswami

---. *Kṛṣṇa Sandarbha*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Sri Vaikunta Enterprises, 2014.

Goswami, Tamal Krishna and Graham M. Schweig. "A Living Theology of Śrī Kṛṣṇa

Bhakti". *Asian Ethnology*. vol. 72. No. 2. 2013. Pp. 351-54. [https://www.](https://www.jstor.org/stable/23595488)

[jstor.org/stable/23595488](https://www.jstor.org/stable/23595488)

Gottlieb, Roger S (Ed). *This Sacred Earth*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Routledge, 2006.

Gregg, Stephen. *Swāmī Vivekananda and Non- Hindu Traditions: A Universal Advaita*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Routledge, 2019.

Grey, John. *The Metaphysics of Natural Right in Spinoza*.

[www.marcsandersfoundation.org/wp-content/.../Spinoza-Natural-Right-to-be-posted](http://www.marcsandersfoundation.org/wp-content/.../Spinoza-Natural-Right-to-be-posted).

Griffin, Susan. *Woman and Nature: The Roaring Inside Her*, Harper and Row, 1918.

Grimes, John. *Problems and Perspectives in Religious Discourse: Advaita Vedanta Implications*.

<https://www.jstor.org> › stable

Gruen, Lori. Greta Gaard. (Ed). "Dismantling Oppression: An Analysis of the

Connection Between Women and Animals". *Ecofeminism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.. Temple UP, 1993.P. 80.

Guerin, Wilfred L. and et.al. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed.

Oxford UP, 1999.

Guyer, Paul. *Kant's System of Nature and Freedom*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. 2005. Oxford UP, 2005.



- Haberman, David L. "River of Love in an Age of Pollution". *Environmental Sociology*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Routledge, 2006. PP. 339-46. <https://www.quora.com/Who-is-the-husband-of-Yamuna-Yami-who-is-the-daughter-of-Surya-Dev>
- Haeckel, Ernest. *Art Forms in Nature*. Arina Books Inc, 2011.
- Hagood, Amanda. "Wonders of the Sea: Rachel Carson's Ecological Aesthetic and the Mid-Century Reader". *Environmental Humanities*. vol.2. Hendrix College, 2013. P.58.
- Haigh, Martin. *Environment as God, Instruction and Call to Service: Toward a Manifesto for the Vaishnava Environmentalist*. Oxford Brookes University. 2015. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287201487>
- Hannigan, John. *Environmental Sociology*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Routledge, 2006.
- Hargrove, Nancy Duvall. *Landscape as Symbol in the Poetics of T.S. Eliot*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. University Press of Mississippi, 1978.
- Hari, D. K. and D.K. Hema Hari. *Historical Krishna*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol. 1. Sri Sri Publication Trust, 2016.
- . *Historical Krishna*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol. 2. Sri Sri Publication Trust, 2016.
- . *Historical Krishna*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol.3. Sri Sri Publication Trust, 2016.
- Harrison, Peter. *Descartes on Animals*. vol. 42, No. 167 (Apr., 1992), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2220217>
- Harrison, Robert Pogue. *Forests: The Shadow of Civilization*. The University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Hattangadi. *Shvetasvatara Upanishad*. <https://estudentdavedanta.net> › Svetasvatara\_Upaniśad

- Hawley, John Stratton. "Yoga and Viyoga: Simple Religion in Hinduism". *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol. 74. No. 1. Cambridge UP, 1981.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1509763>
- Heyman, Steven L. "The Light of Nature: John Locke, Natural Rights, and the Origins of American Religious Liberty". *Religion Law Commons*. vol. 101. Issue. 3. 2018.
- Hindess, Barry. "Locke's State of Nature". *History of the Human Science*. vol.1. No. 3. Sage Publication, 2007. P. 5.
- Hirshorn, Arthur H. "Earth Saving Strategies". *Science and Children*. vol.14. No.8. National Science Teachers Association, 1980. P.8.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4314815>
- Honnighausen, Lothar. "On Poetological Poems by Gary Snyder and Wendell Berry". *Poetica*. vol. 28. No.3/4. 1996. P.356.<http://www.jstor/stable/43028111>
- Hospital, Clifford George. "The Enemy Transformed Opponents of the Lord in the "Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa Purāṇa". *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. vol. 46. No.2. Oxford UP, 1976. P. 206.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1462225>
- Howley, John Stratton. *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa Purāṇa*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Sage Publication, 2011.
- Huang, Hsinya. "Toward trans pacific Eco-poetics: Three Indigenous Texts". *Comparative Literature Studies*. vol.50.No.1. Penn State UP, P. 144.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/complitstudies.50.1.0120>
- Hudson, Dennis. "Bathing in Krishna: A Study in Vaiṣṇava Hindu Theology". *The Harvard Theological Review*. Cambridge UP, vol. 73. No.3/4. 1980. P. 558.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1509739>

- Indich, William M. *Consciousness in Advaita Vedanta*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Motilal Banarsidass, 1980. State University of New York Press, 1994.
- Inglis, Julian. *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Concepts and Cases*. vol.7<sup>th</sup>. International Development Research Centre, 1993.
- James, George A. "Ethical and Religious Dimensions of Chipko Resistance". *Hinduism and Ecology*. Christopher Key Chapple and Mary Evelyn Tucker. Eds. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Harvard UP, 2000. p. 519.
- Janik, Del Ivan. "Environmental Consciousness in Modern literature". (Ed). George Session. *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Shambala Publications, 1995.
- Jarow, E. H. Rick. *Tales for Dying: The Death Narrative of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. State University of New York Press, 2003.
- Joshi, Veneemadhava Shastri. "Rukmiṇī's Love- Letter to Śrī Kṛṣṇa." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*. vol. 67. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 2006. P. 215. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41692057>
- Jumaili, Firas A. Nasif. *An Ecocritical Reading of Gary Snyder's Select Poetics*. vol.5. Issue.2 Al Buraimi University, 2014.
- Kalyāṇa. *Kṛṣṇāṅka*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Gita Press, 1931.
- Kant, Immanuel. *The Aesthetic of Nature*. Translated by Alexander Ruege. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. British Society, 2007.
- . *The Idea of God*. Translated by Alexandru Petrescu. West University of Timisoara, 2013. [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)
- Karnapura, Kavi. *Ananda Vrindavana Campu*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. 2016. [www.krishnapath.org](http://www.krishnapath.org) ›  
Kavi\_Karnapura-Ananda\_Vrindavana\_Campu

- Kaushik, Dheeraj and B.K. Goswami. "The Importance of the Shri Ram Charit Manas in Modern Society". *Recent Research Development in Environment Social Sciences and Humanities*. 2017. P. 65. [data.conferenceworld.in](http://data.conferenceworld.in) › IETES
- Kenghe, C. T. *The Sāṁkhya of the Bhāgavata and The System of Isvarakṛṣṇa*. PhD Dissertation. Department of Sanskrit and Prakṛti. University of Poona, 1959.
- Kennedy, Deniel Rom. "The Child Krishna, Christianity, and Gajur". *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*. Cambridge UP, 1907. PP. 505-21. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25210492>
- Hawley, John Stratton. *Krishna: The Butter Thief*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. UP, 1983. PP. 427-28.
- Khandewala, Madhu. *Śrīmad Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa Mahāpurāṇa me Śrī Kṛṣṇa līlā Ki Prabandha Yojanā, ek Adhyan* [Study on *Kṛṣṇa Līlā* in the *Śrīmad Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa Purāṇa*]
- Khan, Muhammad. *The Maulana Who Loved Krishna*. [www.columbia.edu/itc/mealc/ac/pritchett/00litlinks/naim/txt\\_naim\\_mohani\\_2013.pdf](http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealc/ac/pritchett/00litlinks/naim/txt_naim_mohani_2013.pdf)
- Khoshoo, T.N. "The Dharma of Ecology". *Current Science Association*. vol.77. No.9.1999.P.1147. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24103696>
- Killingsworth, Jimmie. "The Case of Cotton mather's Dog: Reflection and Resonance in American Eco-poetics". *College English*. vol.73.No. 5. National Council of Teachers of English, 2011. PP.498-99. <http://www.jstor/stable/23052338>
- King, S. Anna. "Krishna's Cows: ISKCON's Animal Theory and Practice". *Journal of Animal Ethics*. vol. 2, No. 2 (Fall 2012). PP. 179- 204. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/10.5406/janimalethics.2.2.0179](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5406/janimalethics.2.2.0179).
- Kinsley, David. "Learning the Story of the Land: Reflection on the Liberating Power of Geography and Pilgrimage in the Hindu Tradition". *Purifying the Earthly Body of God: Religion and Ecology in Hindu India Suny Series in Religious*

- Study*. Lance E. Nelson. Ed. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. State University of New York, 1998.  
pp.231-234.
- . *The Divine Player*. Motilal Banarasidass, 1999.
- . *Without Śrī Kṛṣṇa There is No Song*: vol.12. No. 2. (Nov. 1972). The University of Chicaga Press. [http://www. Jstor. Org/stable/1062103](http://www.Jstor.Org/stable/1062103)
- Kosambi, Paru. *Krishna*. <https://www.konsula.com/en/dokter/...paru...faal->
- Krishna, Gopi. *Kundalini: The Secret of Yoga*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Kundalini Research Foundation, 1990. P. i.
- Krishnanda, Swami. *The Mundakopnishad*. <https://www.swami-krishnananda.org> › mundak › Mundaka\_Upanishad
- Krishnaswami. *The Rig Veda for the First Time Reader*. A Vidya Vrikshah Publication, <http://www.vidyavrikshah.org/THEṚIGVEDA.pdf>  
University of Chicaga Press. [http://www. Jstor. Org/stable/1062103](http://www.Jstor.Org/stable/1062103)
- Kumar, Pushpendra. *The Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol.1. Eastern Book Linkers, 2009.
- . *The Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol.2. Eastern Book Linkers, 2009.
- . *The Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol.3. Eastern Book Linkers, 2009.
- Kumar, Rohit. *Ānandavrndavana- Campu Mein Varnita Kṛṣṇa Līlā on Para Śrimad Bhāgavata Purāṇaka Prabhava* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Panjab University, 2012.
- Kupferman, Judy. *Creation of the World According to Science*. Ben-Gurion University, 2012. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234131637>
- Lacewing, Michael. *The State of Nature*. Routledge,cw.routledge.com › alevelphilosophy › data › WhyShouldIBeGoverned
- Lancaster, S. Percy. *The Sacred Plants of the Hindus*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 2016.  
[pwww.researchgate.net](http://www.researchgate.net) › publication › 291303973\_Percy\_Lancasters-\_  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1062381>

- Larson, Gerald James. *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of its History and meaning*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Motilal Banarsidass, 1998.
- Laudari, Dhruba. "Implications of Traditional Ecological Knowledge on Forest Resource Management". *Himalayan Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*. vol.IV. 2010. P.79.
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. *Principles of Nature and Grace Based on Reason*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Bennett, 2006.
- . *Machine of Nature and Corporal Substances*. <https://www.springer.com/gp/book/97894>
- Locke, John. *Second Treatise of Government*. 2008.
- [https://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/locke1689a\\_3.pdf](https://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/locke1689a_3.pdf)
- . *Wherever the Law Ends, Tyranny Begins*. 1689.
- <http://files.libertyfund.org/pll/quotes/115.html>
- . *Questiones Concerning the Law of Nature with an Introduction*. Translated by Robert Horwitz, Jenny Strauss Clay, and Diskin Clay. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Cornell University Press, 1990.
- . *The State of Nature*. Translated by Thomas Huhne. 2012.
- <https://www.grin.com/document/209611>
- Love, Glen A. *Practical Ecocriticism*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. University of Virginia Press, 2003.
- Lowrey, Belen. *The Hero as a Reflection of Culture*. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Hero-as-a-Reflection-of-Culture-Lowrey/cb650b>
- Lyengar, K.R. Srinivasa. "The Krishna Myth". *Indian Literature*. vol.35. No.2 Sahitya Akademi, 1992. pp.112-16. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23338822>

- Māhārāja, Śrī Śrīmad Bhaktivedanta Nārāyan. *Krishna-The Butterthief*.  
[www.rivieramaison.de/krishna-butter-thief-princeton-legacy-library.pdf](http://www.rivieramaison.de/krishna-butter-thief-princeton-legacy-library.pdf)
- Mahoty, William K. "Perspectives on Kṛṣṇa's various Personalities". *History of Religions*. vol. 24. No.3. The University of Chicago Press, 1987. Aggarawl, Devi Dayal. Sri Ramcharitmanas. Kaveri Books, 1998. P. 20.
- Mallica, G. M. *The Philosophy of Advaita*. PHD Dissertation. University of Madras, 1981.
- Marriott, McKim. "The Feast of Love". *Krishna: Myths, Rites, and Attitudes*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. East-West Center Press, 1966. p.201.
- Marshall, Ian and Megan Simpson. "Eco-poetics and the Eco- Narrative". *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies*. vol.10.No.2. Penn State UP, 2009. PP.1-4.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41210014>
- Masih, Y. *Introduction of Religious Philosophy*. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Motilal Banarsidass, 2017.
- Massimi, Michela and Angela Breitenbach. *Kant and the Laws of Nature* .1<sup>st</sup> ed. Cambridge UP, 2017.
- Masson, J.L. "The Childhood of Kṛṣṇa: Some Psychoanalytic Observations". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. vol. 94. No.4.. American Oriental Society, 1974. P. 459. [http://www. Jstor. Org./stable/ 600588](http://www.Jstor.Org./stable/600588)
- Mathur, Nita. "Myth, Image and Ecology." *Indian Anthropologist*. vol.31. No.1. Indian Anthropological Association, 2001. p.25. [http:// www.jstor.org/stable.org/ stable/41919881](http://www.jstor.org/stable.org/stable/41919881)
- Mcgee, Mary. "State Responsibility for Environmental Management: Perspectives from the Hindu Texts on Policy". *Hinduism and Ecology*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Harvard UP, 2000.
- "Medieval Indian Tradition". *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*. vol.55. 1994.p.99.<https://www.jstor.org/stable/44143336>

- Mehta, Manjulata. *Hindi Kṛṣṇa Bhakti Sāhityame Līlā Bhāwanā Aur Usaka Srota*. Chandigarh University, 1977.
- Meinert, Carmen (Ed). *Nature, Environment and Culture in East Asia*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Brill, 2013.
- Menon, Ramesh. *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. vol. 1. Rupa Publication, 2016.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. vol. 2. Rekha Printers, 2016.
- . *Krishna: Life and Song of the Blue God*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol. 2<sup>nd</sup>. Rupa Publications, 2006.
- Mercon, Juliana. *Environmental Ethics and Spinoza's Critique of Anthropocentrism*. [https://www.uv.mx/personal/jmercon/files/2011/08/Ethica\\_GamaFilho.pdf](https://www.uv.mx/personal/jmercon/files/2011/08/Ethica_GamaFilho.pdf)
- Mickey, S. "Cosmology and Ecology." *The Encyclopedia of the Anthropocene*. vol.4. Elsevier Inc. 2018.
- Miller, Mary Ann. *The Thematic Imagery in Lord Byron's Don Juan*. Texas. Rice University, 1964.
- Milton, Kay. *Loving Nature*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Routledge, 2002.
- Mishra, Mahendra Kumar. *Parijata Harana: An Episode of the Mahabharata in the Context of Power and Gender*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327545020>
- Monaghan, Patricia. *Gāia*. [users.clas.ufl.edu/bron/ern/G.pdf](https://users.clas.ufl.edu/bron/ern/G.pdf)
- Montaño, Orlando José Ferrer. "Ecology for Whom? Deep Ecology and the Death of Anthropocentrism". *Opeión*. vol.22. No.50. 2006. P.188.
- Morton, Timothy. *The Ecological Thought*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Harvard Up, 2010.
- Murty, K. S. *Revelation and Reason in Advaita Vedānta*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Naess, Arne. *Environmental Ethics*. Translated by Robert Session. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. 1984. Cross Ref Google Scholar



- Naganathan G. *Ecological Spirituality: Hindu Scriptural Perspective*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. New Age Books, 2004.
- Nair. Somraj Sivadas. *Critical Analysis of Valmiki Rāmāyāṇa*. 2016.  
shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in › bitstream › 10\_chapter 5 cr...
- Najam, Adil and David Runnals. *Environment and Globalization*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Winnipeg, 2007.
- Nambiar, Kunjan. *Krishna Charitram*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Jico Publishing House, 2014.
- Nandakumara, Mattur Narayanavadhani. *Kṛṣṇa in Kannanda Literature with Special Reference to Purandaradāsa and Kanakadāsa* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). 1<sup>st</sup> ed. University of London, 1983.
- Narah, Jiban. "Krishna Līlā Transformation". *Indian Literature*. vol. 52. No. 6. Sahitya Academy, 2006.
- Narayanan, Vasudha. "One Tree is equal to Ten Sons: Hindu Responses to the problems of Ecology, Population, and Consumption". *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. vol. 65. No. 2. 1997. PP. 11, 307.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1465767>
- Nath, Jumli. *Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sanskrit Under the Faculty of Arts*. PhD Dissertation. Department of English. University of Guhati, 2017.
- Nelson, E. Lance. Edwin Bryant. Ed. "Krishna in AdvaitaVedanta: The Supreme Brahman in Human Form". *Krishna*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Oxford UP, 2007.
- . *Purifying the Earthly Body of God: Religion and Ecology in Hindu India* *Suny Series in Religious Studies*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. State University of New York. 1998.
- Nelson P. Michael. *Encyclopedia of Environmental Ethics and Philosophy*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 2008.

- Nielsen, Lisbeth Witthofft. "The 'Nature' of 'Nature': The concept of nature and its complexity in a Western cultural and ethical context". *Global Bioethics*. vol. 17. 2014. p. 32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11287462.2004.10800840>
- Novetzke, Christian Lee. " Bhakti and Its Public". *International Journal of Hindu Studies*. vol. 11. No. 3. 2007. P. 256. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25691067>
- Ogle, Martin. *Gāia Theory: Model and Metaphor for the Twenty-first Century*. [www.Gaiatheory.org/.../Gāia-Theory-Model-and-Metaphor-for-the-21st-Century1.pdf](http://www.Gaiatheory.org/.../Gāia-Theory-Model-and-Metaphor-for-the-21st-Century1.pdf)
- Ojha, Purna Chandra. *Flora In the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Department of Sanskrit. Utkal University, 2008.
- Okley, Francis. " Locke, Natural Law, and God". *Natural Law Forum Paper*. 1966. [http://scholarship.law.nd.edu/nd\\_naturallaw](http://scholarship.law.nd.edu/nd_naturallaw)
- Orr, David W. *The Nature of Design*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford UP, 2002.
- Osho. *Krishna: The Man and His Philosophy*. 25<sup>th</sup> ed. Jaico Publishing House, 2015.
- Pal, Tapas. "Physical Geography During Vedic-Civilization: A Literature Survey". *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*. vol.1. No.1.
- Pandā, Gangādhara and Brījeśkumār Śukla. *ŚrīmadŚrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa Mahāpurāṇa Tattva-vimarśh*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Rainbo Printers, 2011.
- Pandey, Sudhakar. *The Gaṅgā and Yamunāin Sanskrit literature and Art* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). The Faculty of Arts. Panjab University, 1972.
- Panikkar, Raimundo. *The Vedic Experience: Mantramajari*. Motilal Banarsidass, 2016. [www.responsible.org > uploads > 2018/06 > Raimundo-Deusdar---RT13](http://www.responsible.org/uploads/2018/06/Raimundo-Deusdar---RT13).

Paramasivan, Vasuda. *Between Text and Sect: Early Nineteenth Century Shifts in the Theology of Rām* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation) . Department of South Asian Studies, 2010.

Pattanaik, Devdutt. *An Indian Approach to Power: The Leadership Sutra*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Aleph Book Company, 2016.

---. *Devlok*. p. 17. [www.amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com) › Devlok-Devdutt-Pattanaik-3-ebook

---. *Indian Mythology*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Lake Book Manufacturing Inc., 2003.

---. *Shyam: An Illustrated Retailing of the Śrimad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Penguin Random House, 2018.

---. *The Secrets of Kṛṣṇa* . 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Westland Ltd., 2011.

Paul, John. *Rachel Carson, a Voice for Organics-the First Hundred Years*. Australian National University, 2007.

---. "The Ecological Crisis: A Common Responsibility." *This Sacred Earth*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Routledge, 2004.

Pawels, Heidi. "Stealing a Willing Bride: Women's Agency in the Myth of Rukmiṇī's Elopement". *Journal of the Asiatic Society*. vol. 17. No. 4. Cambridge UP, 2007. P.407. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25188760>

Peacock, James Lovelock. *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Oxford UP, 2000.

---. *The Vanishing Face of Gaia*. Basic Books, 2009. ISBN 978-0-465-01549-8

Petix, Bill. *Love: Krishna and Radha*. Love in rasa leela.pdf. Abode Reader

Petry, M.J. *Hegel's Philosophy of Nature* .. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol. 1. George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1970.

Phillips, Dana. *The Truth of Ecology: Nature , Culture and Literature in America*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Oxford UP, 2003.

- Pitkow, Marlene B." Pūtanā's Salvation in Kathakali: Embodying the Sacred Journey". *Asian Journal*. vol. 18. No. 2. University of Hawai'i Press, 2001. PP. 238-48.
- Poddar, Hanumanprashad. *Gopīs' Love for Śrī Kṛṣṇa*. 15<sup>th</sup> ed. Gita Press, 2010.
- Pollock, Sheldon. "Rāmāyāṇa and Political Imagiantion in India". *The Journal of Asian Studies*. vol.52. No.2. The Association for Asian Studies, Inc, 1993. P.261.
- Pope, Alexander. *Essay on Criticism*. <https://www.phrases.org.uk/meanings/a-little-knowledge-is-a-dangerous-thing.html>
- Posh, Thomas. *Philosophy on Nature*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 2011.
- Prabhupada, A.C. Bhaktivedanta. "Ādi-Līlā." *Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed.vol.1. The Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2014. P.xiii.
- . *Heritage Test*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2016.
- . *KṚṢṆA: The supreme Personality of Godhead*. 13<sup>th</sup>ed. The Bhakti Vedanta Book Trust, 2010.
- . *Light of the Bhagavatam*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2015.
- . *Light of Śrīmad Bhāgavata*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. vol. 3. Bahktivedanta Book Trust, 1984.
- . *Spiritual World*. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2013.
- www.jiva.org > no-one-falls-from-vaikuntha-part-9-bhagavat-sandarb.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 14<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto.1<sup>st</sup>. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 14<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto. 2nd. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 14<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto. 3rd. vol.1<sup>st</sup>. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.

- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 14<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto. 3rd. vol. 2<sup>nd</sup>. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 13<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto. 4<sup>th</sup>. vol. 1st. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 13<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto. 4<sup>th</sup>. vol. 2<sup>nd</sup>. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 14<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto. 5<sup>th</sup>. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 14<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto. 6<sup>th</sup>. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 14<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto. 7<sup>th</sup>. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 14<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto. 8<sup>th</sup>. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 13<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto. 9<sup>th</sup>. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 13<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto. 10<sup>th</sup>. vol.1st. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012 .
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. Canto.10<sup>th</sup>.vol. 2nd. The Bhakti Vedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 13<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto. 10<sup>th</sup>. vol.3rd. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 13<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto. 10<sup>th</sup>. vol. 4<sup>th</sup>. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.

- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 13<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto.11<sup>th</sup>. vol.1<sup>st</sup> Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 13<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto.11<sup>th</sup>. vol.2<sup>nd</sup>.Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 13<sup>th</sup> ed. Canto.12<sup>th</sup>. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2012.
- . *The Laws of Nature*. 20<sup>th</sup> ed. Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2016.
- . *The Stories of Kṛṣṇa*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. vol.1. The Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 2018.
- . *The Topmost Yoga System*. ISKCON, Press, 1970.
- Premanande, Nitai Gaur. *Rukmiṇī Haraṇa*. Motilal Banarsidass, 2003.
- Prime, Ranchor. *Hinduism and Ecology of Truth*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Motilal Banarsidass, 1994.
- Prophet, Elizabeth Clare and Patricia Spadaro. *Karma and Reincarnation*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Jaico Publishing House, 2016.
- Puligandla, R. *Fundamentals of Indian Philosophy*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Abingdon Press, 1975.
- Radha Krishnan, S. Translated by Badarayanā. *The Philosophy of Spiritual Life*.<[https://www. Amazon.com/Brahma-Sutra-Philosophy of Spiritual Life/dp/1258007533](https://www.Amazon.com/Brahma-Sutra-Philosophy%20of%20Spiritual%20Life/dp/1258007533)>
- Raghunathan.N. *Introduction to Srimad Bhagavatam*.<https://www.amazon.com/Books-N-Raghunathan/s?ie=UTF8...%20Raghunathan>
- Ramanujacharya. ramanujacharya. files. wordpress.com › 2015/01 pdf
- Ranganathananda, Swami. *The Central Theme of Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Advaita Ashram, 2002.
- Ricard, Michel. *Ecological Principle and Function of Natural Ecosystem*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Amfissa, 2014.

Rom, Danial. *The Suffering Heracles: An Analysis of Heracles as a Tragic Hero in the Trachiniae and the Heracles*.

[https://scholar.sun.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10019.1/./rom\\_suffering\\_2016.pdf](https://scholar.sun.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10019.1/./rom_suffering_2016.pdf).

Rosen, Steven J. "1965 was a Very Good Year and 2005 is Better Still." *The Hare Kṛṣṇa Movement: Forty Years of Chant and Change*. Ed. Richard J. Cole and Graham Dwyer. I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd., 2007. 11-25.

Rukmani, T.S. "The Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa and the Empowerment of Women". *Journal for the Study of Religion*. vol. 8. No. 1. 1995. PP. 276-277. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24764147>

Rutherford, Donald. *Leibniz and the Rational Order of Nature*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Cambridge UP, 1998.

Sagar, Sri Mohan (Ed). *Ramanuja Darshanam: Philosophy of Ramanuja*. Vol.1<sup>st</sup>. Sept. 2003. <http://www.vedics.net>

Sandford, A. Whitney. "Almost Heaven, West Virginia:: Food, Farming, and Utopian Dreams at New Vrindaban". *Utopia Studies*. vol. No. 26. 2015. P. 299. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/utopianstudies.26.2.0289>

---."Tasting Sound: Visions of Krishna in Paramānand's Sixteenth-Century Devotional Poetry". *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. vol.70. No. 1. Oxford UP, 2002. P. 61. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1466369>

Śankarāchārya. *Four Basic Principles of Advaita Vedanta*. <https://www.scribd.com> >

Saraswatiji, Swami Girishanand. *Mahā Rāsa*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Saket Dham Ashram, 2008.

Sarneel, J. T. *Descartes and the Control of Nature*.

[https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/37321/PHD-dissertation.pdf?](https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/37321/PHD-dissertation.pdf)

Sastri, Rakesh. "Vedesu Paryāvaranam". *Samskitamañjarī*. vol.2. No.4. 2008. p. 26.

Satyamurti, Carole. *The Mahabharatā A Modern Retelling*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Ww. Norton and Company, Inc, 2017.

Schiemann, Gregor. *Context of Nature According to Aristotle and Descartes*. Philosophical Society of Turkey, 2007.

Sessions, Robert. "Deep Ecology Verses Ecofeminism: Healthy Differences or Incompatible Philosophies". *Hypatia*. vol.6. No.1. Wiley, 1991. PP.91, 93.  
http:// www. jstor.org/stable/3810035

Shah, Kerman. *Vedic Mother of Mankind, Daughter of Surya and Saranja, and Yama's Twin*. <https://git.linux-al1y.org>

Shankaracharya. *Manisha Panchakam*. [https://sanskritdocuments.org > sites > snsastri > Manishapanchakam.pdf](https://sanskritdocuments.org/sites/snsastri/Manishapanchakam.pdf)

Sharma, Krishna. *Bhakti and Bhakti Movement with New Perspective*.  
[www. amazon.in > Books-Krishna-Sharma > rh=n:9763...](http://www.amazon.in/Books-Krishna-Sharma/rh=n:9763...)

Shashi, Deepshiksha. *Advaita as a Global International Interrelations Theory*. 1st ed. Routledge, 2021.

Sheth, Noel. "Kṛṣṇa's Stealing of the Herdsmaidens' Clothes". *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*. vol. 66. No.1/4. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1985. [http://www.jstor.org/ stable/41693602](http://www.jstor.org/stable/41693602)

---. *The Good Thief: The Justification of Kṛṣṇa's Acts of Stealing*. Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens / Vienna Journal of South Asian Studies. vol.36. Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 1992. P.151.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/24010815>

---."The Significance of Kṛṣṇa's Childhood Sports". *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*. vol. 74. No. 1/4. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1993. PP. 108-9. [http://www. Jstor.org/stable/4397719](http://www.Jstor.org/stable/4397719)



- Shutan, Nicholas. *Krishna Bhakti*. <http://o-pdflibros.gq/publications/ebooks-for-free-download-pdf>
- Silveria, Marcos Silva da. *The Universalization of the Bhakti Yoga of Chytania Mahaprabhu*. vol.11. No. 2. Vibrant, 373-75.
- Simonis, Udo E. "Global Environmental Governance Speeding up the Debate on a World Environment Organization". *Econstor*. <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream>
- Singh, Sony. *Emerson's Transcendentalism: A Reappraisal*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Lucknow, 2016.
- Sinha, Purnendu Kumar. *A Study on the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa Purāṇa*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. The Theosophical Publishing House, 1901.
- Sivananda, Sri Swami. *Lord Krishna: His Lilas and Teachings*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. The Divine Trust Society, 1996.
- Slovic, Scott. Ecocriticism. [https://www.uwosh.edu/facstaff/barnhill/pp\\_outline/Nature Writing](https://www.uwosh.edu/facstaff/barnhill/pp_outline/Nature_Writing)
- Snyder, Gary. *The Practice of the Wild*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. North Point Press, 1990.
- Solis, Benjamin Preciado. *The Kṛṣṇa Cycle in the Purāṇas*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.
- Sonde, Nagesh D. *Srī Madhavacharya Bhasya and Taparya Nīrnaya on Bāhgavad Gīta*. Nagesh D. Sande, 2011.
- Spinoza, Baruch. *Benedictus: Ethics*. Translated by Will Durant. Everyman's Library, 1926.
- . *Principles of Cartesian Philosophy*. Translated by Philip H. Gray. Philos Library, 1961.

- . *Complete Works of Spinoza*. Translated by Samuel Shirley. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Hackett Publishing Company, 2002.
- . *Ethics and Other Works*. Translated by Edwin Curley. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Princeton University, 1994.
- Steele, Dean A. *A Comparison of Hobbes and Locke on Natural Law and Social Contract*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. University of Texas, 1993.
- Stoll, Mark. "Review Essay: The Quest for Green Religion". *Religion and American Culture: A Journal Of Interpretation*. vol. 22.No. 2. University of California Press, 2012. p.274. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/rac.2012.22.2.265>
- Subramaniam, Kamala. *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam*. 13<sup>th</sup> ed. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 2013.
- Sukthankar, V. S. "Epic Studies". *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*. vol. 18. No.1. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1936-37. PP. 1-77. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41688328>
- Sullivan, M. Bruce. "Theology and Ecology in the Birthplace of Kṛṣṇa". *Purifying the Earthly Body of God: Religion and Ecology in Hindu India Sunny Series in Religious Studies*. Ed. Lance E. Nelson. State University of New York Press, 1998. p.253.
- Swami, Lokanath. *Lord Krishna, the Butter Thief*. Lokanathswami. [info/lord -krishna-the butter-thief-2/?print=pdf](http://www.lokanathswami.info/lord-krishna-the-butter-thief-2/?print=pdf)
- . "The Stealing of the Boys and Calves by Brahm? "*Brahma Vimohan Lila*. [lokanathswami.info/the-stealing-of-the-boys-and-calves-by-brahma-\"brahma-vimoha.pdf](http://www.lokanathswami.info/the-stealing-of-the-boys-and-calves-by-brahma-\)
- Svami, Shreedhar. *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. [https://www.advaita-vedanta.org › archives › advaita-1 › 2012-](https://www.advaita-vedanta.org/archives/advaita-1/2012-)

- Swami, Sivananda. *Lord Krishna*. 7<sup>th</sup>ed. A Divine Life Society Publication, 1996.
- Swami, Viresnanda. *Brahma Sutras*. www. swami-krishnananda.org › Brahma\_Sutra  
pdf
- Svāmin, Govindācārya. "The Birthplace of Bhakti." *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*. Cambridge UP, pp. 481-483.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/25190043>
- Tagare, Ganesh Vasudeo Tagare. (Ed.) *The Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. vol. 1. Motilal Banarsidass, 2007.
- . (Ed.) *The Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. vol. 2. Motilal Banarsidass, 2007.
- . (Ed.) *The Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. vol. 10. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Motilal Banarasidass, 2007.
- Tagore, Ravindranath. *Prācīn Sāhitya*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Brahmamission Press, 1973.
- Taylor, McComas. "Stories of God: Contemporary Oral Performance of Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇakatha". *International Journal of Hindu Studies*. vol.17. No. 3. Springer, 2013. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24713645>
- Taylor, Paul W. "Biocentric Outlook on Nature". *Respect for Nature*. 25<sup>th</sup> ed. Princeton UP, 2011.
- Thakar, Manik. S. *Environmental Awareness in the Agnipurāṇa*. EARSL, 1991.
- Thakkar, Muktaben Dasharathbhai. *Bhakti Cult of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. Doctoral Dissertation. Faculty of Arts. The Maharaja Sayajirani University of Baroda, 1966.
- Thakur, Vijaya Kumar. *Bhakti as an Ideology: Perspective in Deconstructing the Early Medieval Indian Tradition*. <https://www.jstor.org/stable>
- Thakur, Visvanatha Cakravarti. *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇam: Commentary*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Sri Vaikuntha Enterprises, 2011.

- Theodor, Ithamar. *Rāsa and Personhood in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa: The Integration of Aesthetic Theory with Vedānta*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. University of Oxford, 2005.
- Thomas, Berry. "The Visible Human". *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*. 1st ed. Shambhala, 1995.
- Thompson, Richard L. *God and Science: Divine Causation and the Laws of Nature*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Motilal Banarsidass, 2010.
- Tiwari, B.G." Bhakti Marga in Vraja Bhumi". *Proceedings of Indian History Congress*. vol.19. 1956. P. 414. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44140871>
- Tripathi, Shantilata. *A Critical and Comparative Study of Kṛṣṇa Problem*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Utkal University, 1982.
- Tyson, Louis. *Critical Theory Today*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Routledge, 2006.
- Upadhyay, Rajiv Ranjan. "Paryāvaran pradūsan evaṁ paryāvaran cetanā prasār ke prayās". *Vigyan Prakash*. vol. 4. No. 2. 2006.
- Vachaspatyam. <https://www.vedrishi.com> > book > vachaspatyam > wpp\_export=pdf
- Vaidya, Prachi. *Is Lord Krishna a Thief of Butter?* 2015. <https://www.quora.com> > Is-Lord-Krishna-a-thief-of-butter.pdf.
- Vanamali, Devi. *The Complete Life of Krishna Based on the Earliest Oral Traditions and The Sacred Scriptures*. Vanamali Gita Yogashram, 2012.
- Varma, Pawan K. *Krishna: The Playful Divine*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Penguin books, 1995.
- Varshney, Dinesh Chandra. "Krishna Legend and Mathura." *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*. Vol. 54. Indian History Congress, 1993. P. 80. Proceedings of the Indian History Congress. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44142926>

Venugopala, Jayashree. *KrishnaLīlā : Childhood Stories*. Vasan Book Depot, 2000.

Verma, Anupama. *Concept of Ecocriticism in T.S. Eliot's Poetics*. vol.6. Issue.7.

College of Agriculture Waraseoni, 2018.

Verna, Arun. *Ramayana Sympasium*. sscguides.com › arun-sharma-quantitative-aptitude-book-pdf

Vireswarananda, Swami. *Brahmasutra*. Avaita AshRāma, 1936.

Vyāsa, Veda. *Atharva-Veda Samhitā*. upload.vedpuran.net › Uploads › 73543Atharvaveda

---. *Bhabisyā Purāṇa*. <https://soolaba.files.wordpress.com/2010/06>

[/bhavisya-translation.pdf](#)

---. *The Agnipurāṇa*. [www.vrindavana.net/academy/wp-content/uploads/](http://www.vrindavana.net/academy/wp-content/uploads/)

[/Agni-Purāṇa-incompleteo.pdf](#)

---. *The Matsya Purāṇa*. Taluqdar . Ed. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Apurva Krishna Bose, 1916.

---. *The Śrīmad Bhagavata*. Ed. Jay Majo. International Gītā Society,

<[https://www.amazon.com/Bhagavata Purana-jay-Mazo/dp.187919399](https://www.amazon.com/Bhagavata-Purana-jay-Mazo/dp.187919399)>

---. *Taittiriya Upaniṣads*. Translated by Swami Sharvananda. The Rāma Kṛṣṇa Math, 1921.

[https://www.google.com/search?source=hp&ei=3ZWYXLOIA9me9QPQs5m4DQ&q=taittiriya+upanishad+1.3+pdf&oq=Taittiriya+Upaniṣads+1.3+pdf&gs\\_l=psy-ab.1.0.33i22i29i30i110.7047.13365..26890...1.0..0.418.3325.3-8j1.....0.....2j1..gws-wiz.....6...35i39j0i22i30j33i160.UOW0tEOh1Mw](https://www.google.com/search?source=hp&ei=3ZWYXLOIA9me9QPQs5m4DQ&q=taittiriya+upanishad+1.3+pdf&oq=Taittiriya+Upaniṣads+1.3+pdf&gs_l=psy-ab.1.0.33i22i29i30i110.7047.13365..26890...1.0..0.418.3325.3-8j1.....0.....2j1..gws-wiz.....6...35i39j0i22i30j33i160.UOW0tEOh1Mw)

---. *Śivapurāṇa*. [https://www.amazon.com/Shiva-Purāṇa-Saint-Veda-](https://www.amazon.com/Shiva-Purāṇa-Saint-Veda-Vyasa/dp/818451042X)

[Vyasa/dp/818451042X](https://www.amazon.com/Shiva-Purāṇa-Saint-Veda-Vyasa/dp/818451042X)

---. *The Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. <https://krishnamurti.abundanthope.org> ›

[index\\_hm\\_files](https://krishnamurti.abundanthope.org) › The-Bhagavata.

---. The *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Gita Press, 2006.

---. *The Viṣṇu Purāṇa*. [vedicilluminations.com](http://vedicilluminations.com) › [downloads](#) › [Puranas](#) › [Visnu Purana](#)  
› [Vishnu...pdf](#)

Wadley, Susan. *Spotlight on Rāmāyanas: An Induring Tradition*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. American Global Education, 1995.

Wallaert, Josh. "The Eco-poetics of Perfection: William Carlos Williams and nature in Spring and All". *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*. vol.12. No.1. 2005. P .93. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44086361>

Weinstein, Josh. "Marianne Moore's Eco-poetics Architectonics". *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*. vol.17. No.2. Oxford Up, 2010. P. 386. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44086822>

White, Charles, J. "Kṛṣṇa as a Divine Child". *History of Religion*. vol. 10. No. 2. The University of Chicago Press, 1970. P.158. [http://www. Jstor.org/stable/1061907](http://www.Jstor.org/stable/1061907)

Yatiswarananda, Swami. *Tulsidās*. Vedanta Magazine, 2002. [estudentedavedanta.net](http://estudentedavedanta.net) ›  
Tulsidās-By-Swami-Yatiswarananda`!

Zaveri, Vikram H. *Evolution of Sāṃkhya Philosophy*. 2018  
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/32224>

