

## His Divine Grace Śrīla Bhakti Raksaka Śrīdhara Deva-Goswāmī Mahārāja

83.1.30-31 + 83.2.1

**Guru Mahārāja:** We can approach God Himself and we can find such a near guardian that if we can live in His family as family man, we can live to serve Him. God is our family head. Sometimes sonhood. Sometimes consortherhood. Fatherhood. Somewhere fatherhood, somewhere consortherhood, somewhere sonhood, friendship. In different respects the God may deal very familiarly with every soul as is very near and dear, very close, like family man.

But in the Bible He's far off. He's our well-wisher. He supplies all our necessary things. He's good and great, God is good and great, but far off. But here Kṛṣṇa consciousness, He will come to live as your intimate friend in different forms. This is the gift of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, that is more deeper than Bible has given. The Bible is not antagonistic, not enemy, but a friend in the way, Bible is our friend in the way, not in the goal.

The goal is Kṛṣṇa consciousness. Kṛṣṇa. The father as Kṛṣṇa. And Kṛṣṇa He's sometimes son, sometimes consort, sometimes friend, sometimes master. In different stages He accepts us and our service very intimately, very lovingly, very sweetly. Love, sweetness, beauty, charm, similar things, and He represents that there. He's charming, He's sweet, He's beautiful, He's loving embrace. The ultimate reality is such. Our own heart of hearts is He. He is the heart of our heart. Paramātmā.

Hare Kṛṣṇa. Gaura Hari.

.....

**Devotee:** (reading another devotee's letter) - "According to this it is more than just eternal, normally *sat* means eternal, is that true?" But here he says: "It has no meaning if devoid of relationship with the *jīvas*." Then he says: "Is this connotation correct? Secondly the latter part of the statement that Brahman was without perception seems impersonal. Is this the correct meaning?"

Then he goes on: "I have read one of the Gauḍīya's yearly souvenirs where they criticise young men and women dancing in so called ecstasy throughout the streets of western cities. In our coming up issue I have tried to explain the reason we all dance through the streets in the west, or for that matter danced at all, being because our *guru* instructed us in that way. And that our dancing is not seen as *rāgānuga*, but is *vaidhi-bhakti*. Am I correct in taking such a stance? I can see the Gauḍīya's criticism. I think that they feel that our dancing is a false thing or imitation. But if we claimed to be in *samādhi* they would be absolutely right, but I do not think that we have ever claimed or implied such. Can you advise Mahārāja?"

Another item I read in the Gauḍīya was that at the ceremony honouring Bon Mahārāja's life, following his passing, there were some words of praise written by Your Divine Grace about the activities of His Divine Grace. I wanted to know if you would mind sharing those plaudits with us.

By Your Grace somehow I am surviving, even growing. But due to my past activities and conditioning it is a very painful experience, at the same time the only experience worth having. So my indebtedness to you is complete. I am bankrupt and I have nothing to give. But your sweetness lingers within me and I cannot fathom how I have come upon such Divine Grace. And I am praying to Mahāprabhu: "Please give me something that I

can give to Your Divine Grace. You are the possessor of everything my Lord and I am merely asking that You bless me with some aspect of Your indefatigable opulence so that I may in some small way make an effort to please my *Gurudeva*. Without Your mercy I am a useless fool, even with Your mercy I am a useless fool, but at least I can be the agent of some of Your value ridden transcendental jewels, for the pleasure of my *Gurudeva*."

In this way I am begging for Mahāprabhu's supreme mercy. First I beg from Śrīla Bhaktivedānta Prabhupāda, then from Śrīla Hansadhūta, then from Your Divine Grace, and now I am begging and begging and begging again. Even of the unapproachable for me, the Supreme Personality Śrīman Mahāprabhu. I think I am nothing but a mercy *wallah*, hankering for mercy. All I can do is take, I cannot give one *paisa* (a monetary unit of India and Pakistan worth one hundredth of a rupee), so actually I cannot call myself a mercy *wallah*, he would at least sell mercy, I am a mercy thief.

All *daṇḍavats* to you Śrī Gurudeva Bhakti Rakṣaka Śrīdhara Deva Goswāmī Mahārāja. Your useless *dacoit*. Dayādhara Gaurāṅga Dāsa."

Finished. Hare Kṛṣṇa.

.....

**Guru Mahārāja:**

*divyaṁ jñānaṁ yato dadyāt, kuryāt pāpasya saṅkṣayam  
tasmād dīkṣeti sā proktā, deśikais tattva-kovidaiḥ*

"The process by which divine knowledge (*divyaṁ jñānaṁ*) is given and sins are destroyed is called *dīkṣā* by the highly learned scholars who are expert in spiritual affairs."

(*Hari-bhakti-vilāsa*, 27 - from *Viṣṇu-Yamala*)

The spiritual specialist, they say: "What is *dīkṣā*? That is a process through which the spiritual knowledge is imparted." *Divyaṁ jñānaṁ yato dadyāt*. So new knowledge, new estimation about the environment, about the world, awakens in one's heart, new angle of vision arises within. What we saw, that is false, *māyā*, and what is reality, to want to realise that, to realise the reality. *Kuryāt pāpasya saṅkṣayam*. And the reaction was due to me, for my false calculation and activity, as a result of that false calculation. These things are cleared up. *Pāpa* means the reaction I acquired due to my false estimation and transaction with the environment. That is cleared when I get the real estimation of the environment, of the world outside. This is the result of *dīkṣā* - *divya jñāna*. Not knowledge from my standpoint, my narrow standpoint, but the standpoint of the most wide view. I see with my narrow selfish outlook. We must get rid of that false notion of selfish enterprise, and replace that by the proper, true, estimation of the environment, of the world outside. And accordingly we shall learn to make transaction with the world. This is *dīkṣā*.

In doing that we are to understand what is the nature of the world we are living in. We are not masters of what we see. I am not monarch of all I survey. This is totally wrong, down right falsehood. But there is some monarch, we are not monarch, I am not monarch, the monarch is there, and I am also within His survey. 'I am monarch of all I survey.' I am not surveyor but I am an object of being surveyed. The world is being surveyed and I am a part of this world. I am also being surveyed by the monarch of the world. And what is the result of that surveying? To know that and to learn to go on accordingly, according to the

instruction of the surveyor proper, Absolute Surveyor. That is *dīkṣā* - *divyaṃ jñānam* - divine knowledge, *divyaṃ jñānam* - what is divine knowledge?

*īśāvāsyam idaṃ sarvaṃ, yat kiñca jagatyāṃ jagat  
tena tyaktena bhujñīthā, mā gṛdhaḥ kasya svid dhanam*

"Everything animate or inanimate that is within the universe is controlled and owned by the Lord. One should therefore accept only those things necessary for himself, which are set aside as his quota, and one should not accept other things, knowing well to whom they belong." (*Śrī Īśopaniṣad*, v 1)

Not only is it false that I am the owner, but none is owner, but only one master. *Īśāvāsyā* - not one neither many, one but not myself. He is the master of the whole. That is God. The Lord. Kṛṣṇa. And not only the world belongs to Him but we also belong to Him. This knowledge. What are we? We are slave to the master of the world.

*jīvera 'svarūpa' haya-kṛṣṇera 'nitya-dāsa'  
kṛṣṇera 'tatasthā-śakti' bhedābheda-prakāśa'*

*kṛṣṇa bhuli sei jīva anādi-bahirmukha  
ataeva māyā tāre deya saṃsāra dukḥa*

"The constitutional nature of the *jīva* soul is that of an eternal servant of Kṛṣṇa; the *jīva* soul is a manifestation of divinity which is one with Kṛṣṇa and different from Him. The *jīva* souls are the marginal potency of the Lord. Though in reality they are servants of Kṛṣṇa, from time immemorial, they have been engaged in misconception, as exploiting agents."

(*Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, *Madhya-līlā*, 20.108 & 117)

To feel that this is the truth, I am very small, insignificant, very insignificant. My condition is very pitiful. To crave mercy, to crave help from high for my misguided life, misunderstood life. All these things are being dealt every day. This is the purpose of getting *dīkṣā* - *divya jñāna*. To do away with our local experience and to invite the perspective, the estimation from the centre, the surveyor from the centre. What is what. To be introduced newly to the environment. To forget my previous estimation and to invite the new estimation about the thing and to go on accordingly. To control my conduct accordingly. That what we see around us, that has got owner, not ownerless, neither I am owner of them, neither I am owner of what I see, what I survey. At the same time none is owner who are like myself. One owner there is and He's also my owner.

Now how to go on then? Mathematical calculation, this is also property, I am also property, I am a servant, this is His substance. According to the masters will I am to deal with all. That is serving. The Lord is to be served, not to be enjoyed, and His *things* are also to be served, not to be enjoyed. That will be the deduction, that will be deduced from *divya jñāna*. I am a serving unit in this world. Neither can I thrive by renunciation, no right to renounce. A slave cannot make any strike, that "I won't do the work," no, you are bound to do your duty. Neither you can go on with the work according to your own whim, nor can you strike, to say that I won't co-operate, no. Only one side open, that you

must have to discharge your duty. You do not do that you commit offence and offence means punishable, you will be punished. The fact is so stern, the reality is so cruel. We have no independence of our own. We must not think that we are owner.

At the same time you cannot think that we are owner of our own self, that 'according to my will I can deal with my environment.' No. You are bound. You're duty bound to treat your environment in a particular way, in a reverential way, serving way, then you are normal, otherwise you are abnormal, you are abnormal and you are to be punished. That is *aparādha*, offence. *Sevā*, neither *bhoga*, nor *tyāga*, neither enjoyment nor renunciation. No right, no right to enjoy, no right to renounce, non co-operate, but only one side open, that is to serve, and we are to face with this cruel reality. At first it may seem to be cruel, to be rough, cruel, but if we can understand the purpose, innate, underlying, then we shall gradually find that this is only the key to happy life.

Neither self aggrandisement, with the help of the others, one wanting to live on others energy, that is insulting, that is cowardice, improper. But because we cannot utilise it only for my selfish purpose, so I must leave it, that is also not honourable, not justifiable. We are living together, we must have some sort of duty towards my environment. I cannot see me cut off things from the environment. An organic whole, the parts are co-related, so we have also got co-relation with our environment, with our four sides things. This is natural. We are a part of organic whole and we have got our respective duty towards one another. Just as this body, one part has got some duty to discharge for the whole and through that to every part.

So neither *bhoga* (enjoyment) nor *tyāga* (renunciation). Like the *jñānī*'s (empiricists), the Buddhists, the Śāṅkarites, the *tyāgī*, neither their formula or estimation is right. Nor the exploitationist, "whatever I see it is for me, I am monarch of all I survey," That view also not true. To understand this deeply. Dayādhara Gaurāṅga is a good scholar but still he's perplexed, nonplussed almost, to understand, intellect. He's a doctor, research scholar, but intellect is not sufficient to make us understand all these difficulties of this life. Not only reading from the scriptures independently, independent reading of the scriptures cannot impart us the necessary light to understand things contained in the books, or scriptures.

*ya'o paḍa bhāgavata vaiṣṇavera sthane*

Mahāprabhu says: "Go and read, study *Bhāgavata* from a Vaiṣṇava, try to get the angle of vision from him."

...

*tad viddhi pranīpātena, paripraśnena sevayā  
upadekṣyanti te jñānam, jñāninas tattva darśinah*

Kṛṣṇa says: "You will be able to attain all this knowledge by satisfying the enlightened spiritual master with prostrate obeisances, relevant enquiry, and sincere service. Great souls who are most expert in scriptural knowledge and endowed with direct realisation of the Supreme Absolute Truth will teach you that divine knowledge." (*Bhagavad-gītā*, 4.34)

...

*ācāryavān puruṣo veda*

"Only one who has a *guru* can know the truth."  
(*Chāndogya-Upaniṣad*, 6.18.2)

You must have an *ācārya* if you want to study that revealed scripture, you can't study it alone, independently. Not in an empirical way, that we'll be able to understand, only in the descending method is it possible. It comes in a descending method, that knowledge. And that does not depend on our literary education. A literate man will understand more and an ordinary illiterate person won't be able to understand spiritual truth, not that. Illiterate can understand and literate may fail to understand. Independent of this worldly scholarship, that is.

Only *pranīpāta*, *paripraśna*, *sevā*, serving attitude, surrender. These things are necessary to be illuminated by the higher revealed truth. From *Guru*, from Vaiṣṇava, through them it will come down to my heart, then to my brain. Or really in my soul, soul will be awakened, soul's body will grow. I shall see it come out from the bondage. In this way, *divya jñāna* - *dīkṣā* means all these things. To engage oneself in the quest of the revealed truth through a particular process. *Pranīpāta*, *paripraśna*, *sevā* - surrender, honest enquiry, and serving attitude. We can acquire that sort of knowledge, understanding, and we are to adjust us accordingly to get the benefit of *dīkṣā*.

It is not a mere formal thing, it is not this, that we shall only repeat the *mantram* I have got. But the *mantram* wants to say something, he has got its meaning, and he wants to say something to *me*, and *ask* me to do that and I shall have to do that. Then I shall get the desired result. The purpose of the *dīkṣā* will be fulfilled. But mere repetition of a few technical sounds, that does not finish *dīkṣā*. Knowledge is transmitted and you must utilise that sort of knowledge in favour of your realisation of higher life, real life, proper life. And eternal life, life after death, life after so many deaths, death also, this will continue. Eternal knowledge of the eternal soul about the eternity. Both the knower and the known and the knowing. These three things are eternal. He'll find himself that I'm an eternal part of this world and there is eternity also, I'm a part of that, and eternal relationship is also there. And from that relation, so many functions, so many activities are presupposed and that should be done, that sort of duty should be discharged. This is *dīkṣā* - *divya jñāna* - *divya* means non mundane, supernatural, transcendental.

Hare Kṛṣṇa.

.....

**Guru Mahārāja:** In that very place a temple is constructed, he was born there.

**Devotee:** I didn't have a chance but I wanted very much to go there.

**Guru Mahārāja:** Just over the way, Jagannātha's chariot is drawn, on the left side, there in Purī he was born. In Grand Road, when chariot's going on the left side.

**Devotee:** Is it where the Gauḍīya Maṭh *āśrama* is now?

**Guru Mahārāja:** Yes. Mādhava Mahārāja has got *āśrama* there, he purchased the land and constructed a temple and *āśrama* there, Mādhava Mahārāja did it.

**Devotee:** Then I was there, my mistake.

**Guru Mahārāja:** Then that, another where Mahāprabhu lived, Mahāprabhu, He stayed there for eighteen years, that is Gambhīrā (a small room in Kāśī Mīśra's house in Jagannātha Purī. Through a small window of that house, which is still there, can be seen Mahāprabhu's original wooden sandals, water pot, and bed).

Then Haridāsa Ṭhākura's *samādhi* tomb. Then Gadādhara Pandit's temple, that Kīśora Gopinātha. Then this side there is a garden house, Jagannātha-vallabha where Rāmānanda stayed, lived, Rāmānanda Rāya. Then there is Sārvabhauma's Bhaṭṭācārya's house. So many. Hare Kṛṣṇa.

.....

Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, he was the son of Venkata Bhaṭṭa, in whose house Mahāprabhu stayed for four months continuously, on the banks of Kāverī, Śrī Raṅgam, the highest holy place of Rāmānuja *sampradāya*. Śrī Raṅgam, near Treatinopoli? Treychi? On the banks of Kāverī River. Śrī Raṅgam. There lived one Rāmānuja Vaiṣṇava, Venkata Bhaṭṭa. And Mahāprabhu was guest in house for four months continuous, during *cāturmāsya* (the four months of the rainy season in India, beginning in the month of Āṣāḍha (June-July), and his boy was Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, and his brother one Prabodhānanda, both of them followed Mahāprabhu to Vṛndāvana. By call of Mahāprabhu both of them came to Vṛndāvana. Prabodhānanda, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa's previous *guru* and paternal uncle, he lived in Śrī Kuṇḍa Kamavana in Vṛndāvana. And Gopāla Bhaṭṭa he lived in Vṛndāvana in the association of Rūpa and Sanātana as he was asked by Mahāprabhu to do so. Gopāla Bhaṭṭa once came from Vṛndāvana to Purī to see Mahāprabhu, Śrī Caitanya Deva, and Mahāprabhu asked: "You go stay in Vṛndāvana under the guidance of Rūpa and Sanātana."

He did that. He established a temple there, that Rādhāramaṇa Gira? at present in Vṛndāvana. That is the temple of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa. First he was, he came from *viśiṣṭādvaita-vāda* but he joined this Gauḍīya *sampradāya*. Gopāla Bhaṭṭa. It is said that he started the temple with *Śālagrāma-silā* (a Deity in the form of a stone from a holy river). But once some merchants came to visit Vṛndāvana and he offered many jewels, jewellery, the ornaments, to the Deities. And Gopāla Bhaṭṭa thought, "My Deity is only *Śālagrāma*, if mine would have been in a Deity figure then I could get many ornaments and decorate my Lord." It is said that in the morning he saw that from *Śālagrāma* a Deity has come out, a Kṛṣṇa concept Mūrti, and just on the back in a part, that *Śālagrāma* is connected. And that was spread, and the greatness of the Deity and temple had much admiration and propaganda. That Rādhā-ramaṇa was the Name of the Deity. Then at present, what, whom we find there, the householder disciple of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, they're living there and continuing the *sevā*. Generally they're scholars, study about Sanskrit and different scriptures.

Jīva Goswāmī has written this *Bhāgavata-Sandarbha*, he has mentioned there: "This original rough copy, copy of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, I have systematised them, I have grouped them in a system. First the epistemology, that is *Bhāgavata*, *Tattva-Sandarbha*, then

*Bhāgavat-Sandarbha*, *Paramātmā-Sandarbha*, *Kṛṣṇa-Sandarbha*, *Bhakti-Sandarbha*, *Ṛti-Sandarbha*. Six parts of *Bhāgavat-Sandarbha* or *Sat-Sandarbha*." That was compiled by Jīva Goswāmī and there is reference, "That Gopāla Bhaṭṭa left some notes scattered here and there, and I have taken, consulted the notes by Gopāla Bhaṭṭa and making a system, I have produced this book *Bhāgavat-Sandarbha*."

Sanātana Goswāmī Prabhu, he compiled *Hari-Bhakti-Vilāsa*, the Vaiṣṇava treatise book where this Deity worshipping and the formalities of *vaiṣṇava-dharma*, that how to fast on Janmāṣṭamī day (the time of Kṛṣṇa's appearance in this world), how to manage the worshipping, different Deities. All these things are mentioned in *Hari-Bhakti-Vilāsa*. *Vaiṣṇava-śruti*, how one, a devotee will pass his days, how you should worship, how the temples, how the *vrata*, vow, how *Hari-nāma* should be taken, details have been given in *Hari-Bhakti-Vilāsa*. A big (srudilanth?) He has also mentioned that: "I have taken, I have compiled this with the help of the southern *brāhmaṇa* Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, his collection, and I am only preparing the *tikā*, the commentary of it." Both Sanātana and Jīva referred to Gopāla Bhaṭṭa for their books. Gopāla Bhaṭṭa came from the Rāmānuja Vaiṣṇava section and also from the *brāhmaṇa* class.

There was one disciple of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa by the name of Harivamsa, he was of a little different type, something like *sahujiyā*. He was seen one day to chew betel nut in the *Ekādaśī* fasting day, but objection was raised by other disciples of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa against him, his godbrother Harivamsa. And there was some quarrel, and it is said that he got some support from Prabodhānanda, because Prabodhānanda wrote many Sanskrit books. Very good Sanskrit and very fervent and emotional. *Vṛndāvana-Sataka*, *Navadwīpa-Sataka*, *Rādhā-rasa-sudanidhi*, that famous book in praise of Rādhārāṇī. These books are very much appreciated by that section, Harivamsi, who came from the, Harivamsa is their main *guru*, first *guru* Harivamsa started a section named Harivamsi. Harivamsa himself was a disciple of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, but some difference, little slackness in the strict life of a austere life of a devotee, little slackness that Harivamsa. That comes from Gopāla Bhaṭṭa we are told.

Yesterday also was the disappearance of that Rāmacandra Kavirāja. Rāmacandra Kavirāja was a disciple of Śrīnivāsa Ācārya. We are told he had a very beautiful figure and a beautiful mind also. He had one house nearby Narottama Ṭhākura, Padar River, on the other side, the left side of Padara, big river coming from Ganges. There Narottama and this side, right side, the residence of Rāmacandra Kavirāja, and his elder brother Govinda Kavirāja. Govinda Kavirāja was a devotee of Śakti.....

End of side A . start of side B.

**Guru Mahārāja:** .....was devotee of Kṛṣṇa. He asked Govinda Kavirāja to hear about the grace of Kṛṣṇa, but he did not give his ear to that. But lastly, when he is almost to die, he prayed fervently to his worshipped Deity: "Please give me salvation."

But it is told that the Deity told: "I have no right to give liberation. I can give different enjoyment of this mundane world, but no emancipation, or liberation from this world."

"Then who can give it."

"That only Govinda, Nārāyaṇa, can give that."

"Then I ask your permission to worship Nārāyaṇa."

"Yes do that."

Then Govinda Kavirāja being disappointed, began his prayer to Nārāyaṇa, Govinda. There is a valuable song, commonly it is chanted.

(1)

*bhajahū re mana śrī-nanda-nandana-abhaya caraṇāravinda re  
durlabha mānava-janama sat-saṅge taroho e bhava-sindhu re*

(2)

*śīta ātapa bāta bariṣaṇa e dina jāminī jāgi re  
biphale sevinu kṛpaṇa durajana capala sukha-laba lāgi' re*

(3)

*e dhana, yaubana, putra parijana ithe ki āche paratīti re  
kamala-dala-jala, jīvana ṭalamala bhajahū hari-pada nīti re*

(4)

*śravaṇa, kīrtana, smarāṇa, vandana, pāda-sevana, dāsya re  
pūjana, sakhī-jana, ātma-nivedana govinda-dāsa-abhilāṣa re*

(1) "O mind, just worship the lotus feet of the Son of Nanda, which make one fearless. Having obtained this rare human birth, cross over this ocean of worldly existence through the association of saintly persons."

(2) "Both in the day and at night I remain sleepless, suffering the pains of the heat and cold, the wind and the rain. For a fraction of flickering happiness I have uselessly served wicked and miserly men."

(3) "What assurance of real happiness is there in all of one's wealth, youthfulness, sons, and family members? This life is tottering like a drop of water on a lotus petal; therefore you should always serve and worship the divine feet of Lord Hari."

(4) It is the desire and great longing of Govinda Dāsa to engage himself in the nine processes of *bhakti*, namely hearing the glories of Lord Hari and chanting those glories, constantly remembering Him and offering prayers to Him, serving the Lord's lotus feet, serving the Supreme Lord as a servant, worshipping Him with flowers and incense and so forth, serving Him as a friend, and completely offering the Lord one's very self."

(Govinda Kavirāja, *Songs of the Vaiṣṇava Ācāryas*, p 100)

Then he began to worship the Deity that was very much adored by his younger brother Rāmacandra Kavirāja. Govinda Kavirāja, Rāmacandra. Several Bengali poems, he has got

Sanskrit writings also. That was sent to Jīva Goswāmī and he, Jīva Goswāmī, gave his appreciation of those songs of Govinda Kavirāja. Rāmacandra Kavirāja was friendly to Narottama Ṭhākura. Narottama Ṭhākura and they on the two sides the same river, they lived. And sometime Rāmacandra went to Narottama Ṭhākura to meet him, sometime Narottama Ṭhākura used to come to Rāmacandra Kavirāja, very friendly. Śrīnivāsa Ācārya was of same rank and friendly to Narottama and in that connection Narottama had much affection towards Rāmacandra Kavirāja, his nephew in spiritual relation.

**Devotee:** In the *Hari-Bhakti-Vilāsa*, are the Vaiṣṇava's supposed to follow all those rituals? Is it important for us to follow all of those rituals?

**Guru Mahārāja:** Rituals? In *arcanā* that is in lower position, they are to follow rituals. *omis-adhikāra* ? *arcanā-adhikāra*. Strictly they should observe the rituals, formalities. But when the taste is created, *ruci*, then they begin the *bhāgavata-marga*. Then *śravaṇa* (hearing about Kṛṣṇa), *kīrtana* (chanting Kṛṣṇa's glories), *smaraṇa* (remembering Kṛṣṇa), *vandanam* (offering prayers to Kṛṣṇa), that will be principle, not much stress towards *arcanā*, rituals. But becomes more free when they make progress towards *bhajana*, *anurāga*, love, affection, taste. When taste is created, affection is created towards God, then the formalities of rituals are of less importance to them. But for the beginners they should try to follow strictly those rituals for their good, that is *vaidhi-bhakti*, rituals.

*vaidhi bhakta nikarastu raga vibhava navadhi ?*

*śāstroktayā prabalayā tat-tan-maryāda-yānvitā  
vaidhī bhaktiriyam kaiścīn-maryādāmārga ucyate*

"Devotional service which is governed by the rules and regulations of the scriptures (*vaidhī-sādhana-bhakti*) is also called *maryāda-mārga*, or the reverential path of devotion, the path of serving the Lord in opulence, by different scholars (such as Vallabhācārya)."

(*Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu*, *Pūrva-vibhāga*, 2.269)

Rūpa Goswāmī in *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu*, he gives these lines to us. That the *vaidhi bhakti*, the regulated devotion. The jurisdiction of regulating devotion is up to that stage when our taste for the service of the Lord awakens. *abhi-bhāva*, *pāvanāvati* ?

When our taste is created, our affection, attraction is created for Kṛṣṇa, then stress on the strictness of following the rituals has lessened, not so much place is given for rituals. Taste, *laulyam*, *lobha*, greed, greed. Before that we are to follow very strictly the rules and regulations of devotion as prescribed in the religious books, so many *Purāṇa*, so many *Smṛti*, *Samhitā*. And all collected and made *Hari-Bhakti-Vilāsa*. Meant for the devotees, Vaiṣṇava devotees.

**Devotee:** Guru Mahārāja, is that when one reaches the stage of *bhāva* ? Is that when the rituals become less important?

**Guru Mahārāja:** When *bhāva* arouses one is established in *rāga-marga*, even before that. *Ruciḥ*, *anartha-nivṛtti*, then *ruciḥ*. *Niṣṭhā*, *śraddhā*, then *bhajana-kriyā*, *sādhu-saṅga*, *bhajana-kriyā*, then *anartha-nivṛtti*, then *niṣṭhā*. *Niṣṭhā* means *nairantaryya*, continuous mentality towards Kṛṣṇa, no break, always thinking about Kṛṣṇa, not otherwise. This is *niṣṭhā*, the continued remembrance of Kṛṣṇa and His own. Then real taste is created after that. After continued remembrance *then* the taste. Otherwise in the lower position sometimes some taste is seen to be present within us and sometimes our mind is thrown in another way. That is not taste proper. Taste proper is to be located *after*, *niṣṭhā* means *nairantaryya*, that is continued recollection of Kṛṣṇa. Then if any taste we feel within us that is bona fide taste, and from there we can trace *rāga-marga*, *rāgānuga*. He can depend on his own inner tendency and he may not care much about the formality of worshipping, worshipping.

Just as suppose for a, who keeps the child, what is she? A lady who keeps another child, nurse? Not only nurse but *dhātrī*, midwife or what is she? Midwife, who is the representative of the mother, for her, rules and regulations necessary how to nurse the child, to take care of the child, regulations necessary for the midwife, for the nurse. But when there is affection of mother such regulations are not necessary. Out of affection the mother will look after the child, no rules or regulations necessary because her natural affection towards the child will force her to look after the child. But who is not a mother, her own child, for her formality is necessary. "That you must drink milk twice, thrice. Or do this thing, that thing, all these things are there." Duty, but when affection comes from within then the regulations are slackened. When affection, our inner awakening of the soul, and inner affection, the attraction we feel for Kṛṣṇa, the Lord of our heart, then regulations are slackened.

*vaidhi bhakta dikha restu raga eva bhava navati ?*

As long as that inner taste for the service of Kṛṣṇa does not arise we must take to the *śāstric* regulations in our daily activities and worshipping. And thereby we shall hope that inner awakening will be done and our inner taste will awaken for the service of the Lord. Do you follow? Am I clear?

**Devotee:** Guru Mahārāja, Vṛndāvana Dāsa Ṭhākura, there is mention of his mother, but I wanted to know why is there no mention of his father?

**Guru Mahārāja:** Because his father did not have any recognition in the Vaiṣṇava society, we are told, so the name of the father is not mentioned. But it is also a rumour created by the anti Vaiṣṇava that the Vṛndāvana Dāsa Ṭhākura's mother, Nārāyaṇī, who was a niece of Śrīvāsa Paṇḍit, she took, swallowed some betel after Mahāprabhu took it. Mahāprabhu took some betel and some remains offered to Nārāyaṇī. "You take it." And Nārāyaṇī after swallowing that betel nut, already chewed by Mahāprabhu, Mahāprabhu offered something to Nārāyaṇī, "Take it." And after taking that Nārāyaṇī had child within her womb and then Vṛndāvana Dāsa Ṭhākura came, from her womb. This rumour was spread by the anti Vaiṣṇavite.

But really we are told that when Nārāyaṇī was married, anyhow to a non Vaiṣṇava, who did not have devotion, or affection for the Vaiṣṇava cult. So his name is not mentioned as the father of Vṛndāvana, only Vṛndāvana Ṭhākura, he's acquainted by his mother's name,

Nārāyaṇī Nandana. Father's name not mentioned, only mother's name mentioned, Nārāyaṇī, because Nārāyaṇī was a devotee of Śrī Gaurāṅga Deva Mahāprabhu.

Just as Mahāprabhu is also told mostly as Śacī Nandana, not so much as Jagannātha Mīra Nandana. Very famous Śacī, because when He took *sannyāsa* before long ago Jagannātha departed. His *sannyāsa*, His *saṅkīrtana*, all these came out after His father left and mother Śacī had to bear all these troubles with the son. Leaving this ordinary pleasure of the worldly life, the only son given to exclusive devotion to Kṛṣṇa, showing so many fits, without caring for any improvements in the household affairs. Then after all He left the whole household, even the girl, wife, and He left, took *sannyāsa*, all these troubles Śacī Devi had to tolerate. So Śacī Nandana, Śacī Nandana, He's told not so much as Jagannātha Mīra Nandana, His father's name, not so much mentioned.

So also here Vṛndāvana Dāsa Ṭhākura's father, he was an atheist, but his mother, she was cent per cent devotee of Kṛṣṇa, Mahāprabhu. So her name is mentioned Nārāyaṇī Nandana, Vṛndāvana. Not any trace we find in the literature about his father. And some rumour also spread in the way, that some remains of the betel nut was given to Nārāyaṇī and that was the cause of her pregnancy and Vṛndāvana Dāsa Ṭhākura came. Amongst the *sahujiyā* such stories are going on.

**Devotee:** Guru Mahārāja, Prakāśānanda Sarasvatī, who Mahāprabhu converted.....

**Guru Mahārāja:** That was, and Prabodhānanda other person, Prabodhānanda was the uncle of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, came from south. And Prakāśānanda, some say that he's the founder of *Āmṛta Braja Pratika*, Sisish Gosh has mistaken there that Prakāśānanda was converted into Prabodhānanda, and he wrote all these things. But it is not, because Prabodhānanda he's reckoned as one of the original eight *sakhī*'s of Vṛndāvana. Rādhārāṇī had eight very intimate she friends, Tuṅgavidyā one of those eight, and Prabodhānanda was Tuṅgavidyā in Vṛndāvana. That Prabodhānanda cannot be *māyāvādī*.

*Prakāśānanda māyāvādī aparādhi*. Vṛndāvana Dāsa Ṭhākura writes in *Caitanya-Bhāgavata*: "Mahāprabhu says that in Benares there is a *māyāvādī* and a great offender, Prakāśānanda, he does not recognise My devotion and cuts to pieces My spiritual body." *conda conda* ?" In this way the Prakāśānanda Paṇḍit of Benares has been mentioned and also we find that he's a great *māyāvādī* Paṇḍit.

And Prabodhānanda he's reckoned as one of the eight principal she friends of Rādhārāṇī, so he cannot be a *māyāvādī*. These two are separate persons. Prabodhānanda was converted to Vaiṣṇavism but he also might have gone to Vṛndāvana, but not much recognition he got in the Vaiṣṇava society. Both rejected from this side and also not much respect from that side, almost gone to unknown quarters.

**Devotee:** Kavi Karṇapūra, who has written the *Gaura-Gaṇoddeśa-Dīpikā*, how does he know who those personalities are in Kṛṣṇa *līlā* ?

**Guru Mahārāja:** What is his inspiration? His father was one of those eight *sakhī*'s of Śrī Rādhārāṇī, Śivānanda Sena, former Śivānanda was one of the eight intimate *sakhī*'s of Rādhārāṇī (known as Champaka-latā). From him he got the inspiration. When

Mahāprabhu was in Purī and met that son Karṇapūra He asked him: "You boy, take *Kṛṣṇa-Nāma*, Hare Kṛṣṇa."

The boy did not take. Mahāprabhu tried His best but the boy did not pronounce Kṛṣṇa. Then Mahāprabhu told: "What is this? I am making so many chant in the world, chant this Kṛṣṇa Name, chanting Kṛṣṇa, chanting *Kṛṣṇa-Nāma*, to so many in the world widely and I fail to produce the Name of Kṛṣṇa from the mouth of this boy. What is this?"

Then Svarūpa Dāmodara came to relieve, he told that: "You have given this Name and the boy has taken it, he has *iṣṭa mantra*, and the *mantra* one should not speak out. So he has taken the *mantram* and kept it in the inner quarter of his heart, he won't speak it out." Svarūpa Dāmodara explained in that way.

Then Mahāprabhu out of affection put the big toe of His foot into the mouth of the boy and the boy began to suck Mahāprabhu's toe, and he became afterwards this Kavi Karṇapūra. Inspirations came in him. Such a good poem he has produced very charmingly. Hare Kṛṣṇa. So inspiration, seeing some sign, some sort of similarity, and they could connect, what is what.

**Devotee:** Also Guru Mahārāja, I have heard that there are twin other *Caitanya-Maṅgalas*, one by a Locana Dāsa, another by..... Locana Dāsa is one. It does not seem to be bona fide.

**Guru Mahārāja:** Not bona fide in all respects, more or less influenced by *gaurāṅga-nāgarī*, that is not accepted by the true Vaiṣṇava.

Vṛndāvana Dāsa Ṭhākura himself was in opposition. The first book about Mahāprabhu written by Vṛndāvana. The reference of that we find in *Caitanya-caritāmṛtam*. *Caitanya-Maṅgala* was written afterwards, and that had some contamination of *nāgarī vada*, that Gaurāṅga like Kṛṣṇa, He also mixed with so many girls in the *parakīya* line, but Vṛndāvana Dāsa he has discarded it wholly. Mahāprabhu never cast a glance towards the girls in this life, he told, not *nāgara*. Because He's a *brāhmaṇa* in *Ācārya* family, and Kṛṣṇa came in the milkman sect. And He has come to show the position of an *Ācārya Guru*, and *Guru* may not have such misconduct then who will care for him? Who will take him as *Guru* if he shows such slack character, mixing with the girls, who will come to take and accept him as *Guru*, *Ācārya*? So He never showed that sort of conduct that He mixed with so many girls, never, He was very particular about that, very careful. Still Vṛndāvana Dāsa Ṭhākura says: "He never by the corner of His eye cast any glance to any ladies or any girls. So the people must not give this name to Gaurāṅga, as *nāgara*, as a citizen, ordinary citizen. What is general temperament of a citizen, to mix with the man and woman, free mixing, not that. Gaurāṅga was not of that type, He was a very strict moralist, a life He maintained all through." So Vṛndāvana Dāsa Ṭhākura mentioned this:

*se heno nāma prabhu nama sane kane pathe gaurāṅga-nāgara heno sthali nahi boli ?*

So none should pronounce such that Gaurāṅga was a frivolous boy who mixed with the girls in a slackened way, none can blame Him in this way. He was very strict about that. It is written by Vṛndāvana Dāsa Ṭhākura in his book, original book.

But in Locana Dāsa's: "There are many who had connection with Viṣṇu Prīya, and they with the help of Viṣṇu Prīya, Mahāprabhu's wife, with Viṣṇu Prīya they came in connection with Gaurāṅga, Nimāi Paṇḍit."

"No." Vṛndāvana Dāsa Ṭhākura discarded. "This is all imaginary, this is only a tendency, foolish tendency to make Kṛṣṇa *lilā* and Gaura *lilā* similar, to prove that Gaurāṅga and Kṛṣṇa are one and the same. This sort of imagination has been taken resort to, resorted. So we are not at one with Locana Dāsa in that affair."

And many also. Rūpa Goswāmī, Sanātana Goswāmī, then (Raghunātha) Dāsa Goswāmī, Kavirāja Goswāmī, Vṛndāvana Dāsa Ṭhākura. So many, they have given description about Mahāprabhu but none mentioned in that way. Very strict moralist He was in His previous life. So Gaura *lilā* is a *lilā* of an *Ācārya*, a preceptor, that of a *Guru*, suiting the taste of a *Guru*. To please Kṛṣṇa *lilā*, why Kṛṣṇa *lilā* is so high, only in the position of Kṛṣṇa the Absolute can show that *lilā*, not otherwise. Even Nārāyaṇa or all other incarnations of Kṛṣṇa never did so, only with the exception of Kṛṣṇa and no other incarnation of Kṛṣṇa, or Nārāyaṇa, nowhere.

**Devotee:** Guru Mahārāja, it is sometimes said that Śrīdhara Swāmī in his commentaries sometimes agreed with Śaṅkarācārya.

**Guru Mahārāja:** No, he has refuted Śaṅkara, but he had his own *sampradāyic* creed which is *viśuddhādvaita*. Amongst Vaiṣṇava *sampradāya* there are four conceptions with slight differences from one another. *Śuddhādvaita* by Viṣṇu Swāmī and Śrīdhara Swāmī followed that *sampradāya*. Then *dvaitādvaita* by Nimbarka, and *śuddha-dvaita* was Madhvācārya. *Viśiṣṭādvaita* by Rāmānuja.

These four Vaiṣṇava specific *sampradāyas*. One coming from Brahmā, Śrī, Brahmā, Rudra, Sanaka. But there's little difference between them. Śrīdhara Swāmī he comes from *Śuddhādvaita*, or Viṣṇu Swāmī. And the Vallabhi *sampradāya* at present, the present time, they also come from the *Śuddhādvaita sampradāya*. And Mahāprabhu came from *Śuddhādvaita sampradāya*, Madhvācārya *sampradāya*, but with modification of *acintya-bhedābheda*.

So Jīva Goswāmī who was a strict follower of Mahāprabhu, Śrī Caitanya Deva, he differed in some point from Śrīdhara Swāmī. Mahāprabhu mainly supported Śrīdhara Swāmī because he has saved the devotees from the interpretation of Śaṅkarācārya, in *Gītā*, in *Bhāgavatam*. Personality of Godhead he has admitted, he has proved, revealed, but impersonalism he encouraged. So mainly Śrīdhara Swāmī is Vaiṣṇava but he followed *Viśuddhādvaita* and Mahāprabhu's creed was *acintya-bhedābheda*. So Jīva Goswāmī slightly differed from him here and there in the interpretation of *Bhāgavatam*.

Just as in *Bhāgavatam* in the first *śloka*:

*janmādy asya yato 'nvayād itararāś cārtheṣv abhijñāḥ svarāt  
tene brahma hṛdā ya ādi-kavaye muhyanti yat sūrayaḥ  
tejo-vāri-mṛdām yathā vinimayo yatra tri-sargo 'mṛṣā  
dhāmnā svena sadā nirasta-kuhakaṁ satyaṁ param dhīmahi*

"O my Lord, Śrī Kṛṣṇa, son of Vasudeva, O all pervading Personality of Godhead, I offer my respectful obeisances unto You. I meditate upon Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa because He is the

Absolute Truth and the primeval cause of all causes of the creation, sustenance and destruction of the manifested universes. He is directly and indirectly conscious of all manifestations, and He is independent because there is no other cause beyond Him. It is He only who first imparted the Vedic knowledge unto the heart of Brahmāji, the original living being. By Him even the great sages and demigods are placed into illusion, as one is bewildered by the illusory representations of water seen in fire, or land seen on water. Only because of Him do the material universes, temporarily manifested by the reactions of the three modes of nature, appear factual, although they are unreal. I therefore meditate upon Him, Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Who is eternally existent in the transcendental abode, which is forever free from the illusory representations of the material world. I meditate upon Him, for He is the Absolute Truth." (*Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, 1.1.1)

The meaning of the word *vinimayo*, Śrīdhara Swāmī has taken as ascription, he says that: "There is glass, we may take it for light, there is sun ray, *moritika* ? mirage, we may take it for water, the thing is one thing and we accept that thing as another, this is the meaning of the word, *vinimayo*."

But Jīva Goswāmī has not accepted that. He has said: "No, the word *vinimayo* that never means ascription, but it is transformation. The gas, air, may be transformed into water, the water may again be transformed into solid or, and transformation, the glass may come, the stone may come, from water. In this way, air, ether, air, fire, water, earth, all, one can come from the other. By transformation and not one is ascribing another." In this way Jīva Goswāmī has explained, he's differed from Śrīdhara Swāmī. So here and there a little difference he had.

**Devotee:** Is this transformation the same as *vikara* or not?

**Guru Mahārāja:** *Vikara* - yes. Not *vivarta*. *Vivarta* and *vikara* are of different kinds. Śaṅkara says *vivarta*, one thing misunderstood as another. A real transformation is there in the potency. *śakti parinam*. The potency may admit transformation of it in different kinds, it is possible. Hare Kṛṣṇa.

**Devotee:** How are we to take the differences we hear between great Vaiṣṇavas. Like you've just explained the difference between Śrīdhara Swāmī and Jīva Goswāmī. From our point of view they're both great Vaiṣṇavas, but they have some difference .....

**Guru Mahārāja:** Yes, amongst Vaiṣṇavas there are much differences. We are to follow the direction of Śrī Caitanya Deva.

In the conception of monarchy much difference. In the conception of democracy, communism, there is much difference. Some common, some different, it will always be there. Even in democracy, even in monarchy, every monarch is different from another monarch, one's rule is different. So this *vaicitrī*, variegatedness, will always be present. Not that you can find exactly congruent copy of one of the other, it is not possible, some sort of difference must be.

Even there is difference in Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇa Svayaṁ-Bhagavān, Svayaṁ-Rūpa, then Svayaṁ-Prakāśa, Prabhāva-Prakāśa, Vaibhava-Prakāśa, Prabhāva-Vilāsaḥ, Vaibhava-Vilāsaḥ, in the

conception of Kṛṣṇa Himself. So this distinction, not difference, rather distinction, we are to observe always, we must be alert to find.

A man, from mother, mother sees with some affection. Then his friend from another angle of vision, the wife from another vision, if he's a king the subjects from another vision, one and the same man, different conceptions. All cannot be congruent, some sort of difference there must be, according to their, the perception, the quality, the nature of the perceiver, the conceiver. But mainly something common, something different.

The main Vaiṣṇava groups, they're always after personal, eternal, personal God. These four, Madhvācārya, Rāmānuja, Viṣṇu Swāmī and Nimbarka. "The ultimate reality is personal." Then Śāṅkara and others, their group say: "No. He's impersonal is the highest conception of reality." The main difference but person of what type?

The Svayaṁ-Bhagavān characteristic personality, that is only seen by the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava. The Kṛṣṇa Svayaṁ-Bhagavān, to certain extent by the Nimbarka. But the *svakīyā* and *parakīyā*, the distinction is there. Then the *śuddhādvaita* school, they like more *vātsalya*. Then the Rāmānuja section they consider Nārāyaṇa to be the original and Kṛṣṇa to be His extension. So much difference there, all may not be congruent. The conception of the truth may also have some degree and difference there.

*Sajātīya-bheda*, then *vijātīya-bheda*, *sojātīya-bheda*. A tree is different from a stone, a tree is different from another tree, a tree has got it's difference within it's own, branch, leaf, root, trunk, all these things. *Sajātīya-bheda*, the banyan tree then so many other trees also there. *Sajātīya-bheda*. So in the conception of Godhead that sort of difference, distinction. This Nārāyaṇa. The Kṛṣṇa. The Dvārakeśa. Rāmacandra. Then so many incarnations here. Nṛsimha, Varāha .....

End of recording.

\* \* \* \* \*