

His Divine Grace Śrīla Bhakti Rakṣaka Śrīdhara Deva Goswāmī Mahārāja

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: ... to certain extent, Advaita-siddhi. He has embraced devotional school and almost accepting both as parallel. *nirvikalpa-samādhi* and *Viṣṇu-bhakta*, one and same, in his introduction in *Bhagavad-gītā* he says:

*nirodita tasi punar, sarvikalpa samadhi na,  
nirvikalpa samadhi stu, bhavi ratra tri bhumika (?)  
.....(?)*

The *samādhi* of the *yogis* is of three classes. In the beginning, sometimes in *samādhi* and sometimes he awakes not so much. In the second stage when he's in *samādhi*, if any interruption, disruption, disturbance comes from outside, then he comes out, awake to this world, otherwise not. And in the third stage, he never rises from his *samādhi*, always continuing. No external pressure can bring him back to the world consciousness, that's all. And he comes here to say

*visnu bhaktas ca katyate (?)*

At that time we can say also that *Viṣṇu-bhakta*. Puzzling all, ha, ha. So *Viṣṇu-bhakta* is not conscious of any ... he's conscious of the *līlā*, Person, all these, but he anyhow draws this to *Viṣṇu-bhakti* in *Vaikuṅṭha*. This *nirvikalpa-samādhi*, the highest stage of *samādhi* and it becomes *Viṣṇu-bhakti*, it's similar, that is his argument.

Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura has warned against him. And many things, he has also compiled a commentary of the first three *ślokas* of *Bhāgavatam*, accepted *Bhāgavatam*, but in his own way he has taken it, he has taken *bhakti*. *Tadīya*, in the first ray of devotion 'we belong to Him,' that is the conception. In the second stage 'He belongs to me.' A puzzle here. In the case of Candravālī she thinks that 'I belong to Kṛṣṇa.' And in the stage of Rādhārāṇī She thinks 'Hari belongs to Me,' 'Kṛṣṇa belongs to Me.' *Tadīya-madīya*. And this gentleman comes and says: "Then, after that, *tad-aham*, I am His."

And they have created a *śloka* from the mouth of Hanumān-ji, in the name of Hanumān-ji he has created one *śloka*:

*deha buddha ... daso ham (?)*

The *śloka* does not come to me. *Deha buddha ham daso smi*, "When I come to the plane of this body then I am His servant."

*mano buddha tadam sakha (?)*

"When I identify with my mind then I feel that I am His part and parcel."  
*atma buddha tadeva ham (?)*

"And when I go to look to my soul, then I see that I am, He and me, one and the same."

*iti menisti tamati* (?)

"This is desiring of union."

I composed a *śloka* just in the opposite way, I forgot that. Hare Kṛṣṇa.

So Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura has warned that there are many expressions in his writings. Apparently ordinary man will think that he's a great propounder of *bhakti* school. But at the end he has given about pure Māyāvādā so one must be warned against him, tactics.

Some physical strength he had, inconceivable. It is written in some place, 'One stone by a single hand he removed from one place to another, which about thirty people could not do.' Such physical strength he possessed. And he was very fond of eating plantain, about one hundred plantain he could eat and digest. Something like that, one big cluster of plantains. Hanumān is also fond of plantains. About Bhīma we do not find so much. But Madhvācārya's very favourite food was plantain.

[Madhvācārya is said to be the incarnation of Hanumān and Bhīma]

**Devotee:** So what was the origin of this *Tattva-vādī* (?) philosophy then?

**Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara:** *Tattva-vādī sampradāya* (?) from the Madhva *sampradāya*, originates from Brahmā. Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Brahmā, Deva, Devarṣi Nārada, then Vyāsa, and from Vyāsa, Madhva, in this way.

**Devotee:** But the present *Tattva-vādī* is the same thing?

**Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara:** Yes, more or less the same thing. Their seat is Uḍipī, (Mayisore, Kanatak?), *Tattva-vādī*, eight Maṭhs are there. Acyutānanda told he visited them. And one of the *Tattva-vādī* was a little liberal, he came to visit Gauḍīya Maṭh, a little liberal. And when Acyutānanda visited them they were so orthodox that they did not even talk with Acyutānanda. "A beef eater so we should not talk with him."

Then, that gentleman who came to visit Gauḍīya Maṭh, he was a little liberal, through him, Acyutānanda told me. "I asked that gentleman who did not want to speak to me direct, ask him whether beef has got more capacity to make one sinful, or *Kṛṣṇa-Nāma* has got more strength to remove that sin? Which is the stronger? The beef is stronger or the Holy Name of Kṛṣṇa is stronger? One gives us sin and another purifies us. Who is the stronger?"

Then of course he was compelled to say the *Kṛṣṇa-Nāma* is infinitely more stronger than beef can pollute. "Then if we take the Name, if we have faith in the Name of the Lord then that sin may not be removed?" In this way put the argument, Acyutānanda told. At that time he was a little bewildered and did not say much. Whatever he said he did not mention but he was weakened in his

argument. Some question of *aparādha* etc., might have been taken into that position.

*aparādha sunya he raya krsna nama* (?)

Then the Name can purify, comes to purify us. When we commit offence it is not possible to be purified in this? The principle he had to accept that Name can purify from any sort of sin committed. *Tattva-vādi*, very strict.

Mahāprabhu also visited them and discarded them, as mentioned in *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* [*Madhya-līlā*, 1.114 & *Madhya-līlā*, 4.197 purport.] we find that "You give more importance to *mukti*, emancipation and to *varṇāśrama-karma*. But *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* has discarded both of them. Neither *mukti* is our end nor this *karma*, *varṇāśrama-karma* is our desirable thing, can give us the desired end. Both *karma* and *mukti* has been discarded in *Bhāgavatam*. And you try to establish those two."

**Devotee:** Those present *Tattva-vādīs* they say there's three types of *jīva*, *sattvic*, *rajasic* and *tamasic jīvas*.

**Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara:** That may be. That does not matter. It is accepted by all. *Sattvic*, *rajasic*, *tamasic* everywhere, not only in human species, but in animals, in trees, amongst the *devatas*, everywhere this *sattvic*, *rajasic*, *tamasic* classification, sub-classification.

**Devotee:** But they say it is a quality of the *jīva* directly.

**Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara:** But the soul is *nirguṇa*, above *sattya-guṇa*.

**Devotee:** Yes.

**Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara:** And they all accept:

*nichotyā bhavam gathā* (?)

Even amongst the liberated souls there is also gradation, accepted by *nichotyā bhavam gathā*. *Nicāivam gutyā*, gradation amongst, they all do not merge in the same position but there is hierarchy, gradation, *nichotyā*.

*sarotam manca te tam taro tama* (?)

*Bhāgavat tat puja* (?)

Written by Madhvācārya perhaps.

*gītā tat puja, bhāgavat tat puja* (?)

From quotation of Madhva in his *tikā* (commentary) of *Bhāgavatam* it was found that *tri-śakti*, *antaraṅga*, *bahiraṅga* and *taṭasthā*, *tri-śakti*. He quoted

somewhere from some *Purāṇa*. [*antaraṅga-śakti* is the spiritual, internal potency of the Supreme Lord; *bahiraṅga-śakti* is the external potency; *taṭasthā-śakti* is the marginal potency]

*phalam gitam sri tri varnena* (?)

In this way, in *Ekadas-kanda* (?) perhaps, to explain some *śloka* it was found.

*alangitam tri ragenā* (?)

That means three potencies, *taṭasthā*. *Bahiraṅga*, *antaraṅga* and *taṭasthā*. In *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa* also.

*diti asakti visyate* .....(?)

In *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa*. And Madhvācārya's quoting from somewhere.

He went to see Vyāsadeva and it is told that he met Vyāsadeva and got some direct instruction. Then he came home and he converted his *sannyāsa-guru* first, his first conversion was his *sannyāsa-guru*, Acyutāprekṣa, a *Māyāvādī*. And he was given the name [Pūrṇaprajña Tīrtha] Padmanābha. Śrī Madhva, Śrī Padmanābha, Śrī Nṛhari. Mādhava, Akṣobhya, four direct disciples, Śrī Madhva, Śrī Padmanābha, Śrī Nṛhari, Mādhava and Akṣobhya. Four direct disciples are successively *ācārya*. Then gradually their eight Maṭhs grow, eight Deities, Temples with Deities, and eight *ācāryas*. And in each Maṭh there was one preacher. The *ācārya* was there who was busy with the *pañcajña* (?) of the Deity and another representative of him used to preach, to collect disciples for the *ācārya*. But gradually it came that the preachers began to collect disciples of their own. And at first the eight and then became many. Yutavadhi (?) Maṭh, or something like that, they could collect more men in their favour for their Maṭh, we are told.

And I met the *ācārya* of that Maṭh, *ācārya* or preacher, the *guru*, and had a stop-fight (?) Myself, Bon Mahārāja, Hayagrīva Prabhu, that is Mādhav Mahārāja, etc., we were there. Vighraha of Kṛṣṇa.

*deha dehira vibhargo yan yasyari vidyati kachit* (?)

Our point, and he told that not, "Within the *Arcā-Mūrti* there is God and the body is not God, in *Arcā*."

We told, "No, a wholesale. Wholesale is transcendental. We cannot find it or feel it. But according to *śāstra* it is so."

He put objection. Then ultimately he had to submit in the case of Kṛṣṇa *līlā*.

I told: "When Kṛṣṇa showed that He's being killed by Jarāvyad. Do you admit that there was blood oozing?"

"Yes, it is mentioned, the blood oozing from the body."

"Then what is that blood? Is it really blood or a show?"

"No, it is a show."

"And then? The Kṛṣṇa showed that He's dying, blood oozing, and the blood is not material blood, but to our senses it is material blood."

He told that: "The *Śālagrāma* if it is crushed by a hammer then it is reduced to pieces."

I told that: "It is our offensive conception, offensive conception, we find is like that. But we must not believe it, it is not the truth. Our offensive experience of our senses but it is not the truth, it's not the fact. It is a show." But He did not admit. But as when I gave the example of Kṛṣṇa *līlā* then he had to admit that. What we experience with our eyes, that blood oozing, that is not real blood, that is deceiving our senses, for a similar case here in the case of *Śālagrāma* as reduced to dust by the hammer. This is like that. And I gave quotation from *Bhāgavatam*. That was of course very finer one there.

*Sarva-vedānta-sāraṁ yad*, I heard from Prabhupāda to explain in that way as much I could remember. *Līlā-kaivalyam*. *Sarva-vedānta-sāraṁ yad*, in the end of *Bhāgavatam*:

*sarva-vedānta-sāraṁ yad, brahmātmaikatva-lakṣaṇam  
vastu advitīyaṁ tan-niṣṭham, kaivalyaika-prayojanam*

[This *Bhāgavatam* is the essence of all *Vedānta* philosophy because its subject matter is the Absolute Truth, which, while non-different from the spirit soul, is the ultimate reality, one without a second. The goal of this literature is exclusive devotional service unto that Supreme Truth."] [*Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, 12.13.12]

What is the highest necessity in us? To try to remain always in the faith of the Revealed Truth and not to allow ourselves to come down from that level and to think that what we experience through our senses that is true. We won't allow ourselves. We must try to keep our faith always. "That what I see it is false, it is *māyā*, illusion. My mind, my senses, they cannot find truth. An ordinary magician can deceive them, my mind and my senses may be deceived by a skilful magician, so we must not rely on them. We must rely on the cent-per-cent on the Revealed Truth. They're deceiving my mind, my eyes, my ears, deceiving me. And *kaivalyam*, cent-per-cent we must take our position and develop that Revealed Truth and never allow ourselves to come down to the world of experience.

*Sarva-vedānta-sāraṁ yad*, this is the very gist of all the old *Vedānta*, they say this is all *māyā*. *Brahmātmaikatva-lakṣaṇam*, Brahma, Paramātmā and Bhagavān, these three of same level, similar, not same but similar level, *advaya-jñāna* [knowledge of that which has no second], *vastu advitīyaṁ*, *advaya-jñāna*. Somewhere it comes as Paramātmā to some sections, to some sections it comes as Brahma, to another section it is Bhagavān, *bhajanīya*, to be worshipping. The highest section, She's the ultimate cause, the object of their service for dedication, and not all comprehensive consciousness, neither all permeating and regulating principal of the Ultimate Reality. But He's for Himself. We are for Him, we are to serve Him, we are to satisfy Him. For His enjoyment our existence is possible in this way. This is the highest.

*Brahmātmaikatva-lakṣaṇam, vastu advitīyaṁ tan-niṣṭhaṁ, kaivalyaika-prayojanam:* and continued consciousness on this plane, *tan-niṣṭhaṁ, tan-niṣṭhaṁ*, that *vastu advitīyaṁ, advaya-jñāna niṣṭhaṁ, advaya-jñāna Svayaṁ-Bhagavān. Tan-niṣṭhaṁ, kaivalyaika-prayojanam:* to maintain uninterrupted continuity our existence in the plane of service, that we are to worship Him, we are to serve Him, we are to love Him. He's so beautiful, He's so loving. Our end of life is in His satisfaction, *kaivalyaika-prayojanam*. With this *kaivalyaika-prayojanam* we must not allow ourselves to deviate from the faith which is revealed to us by the scripture, and must not allow ourselves to be drawn down by the charm of the world of this mundane sense experience.

He was a big *paṇḍit*, big scholar. We have not scholarship, not so much well-read. That gentleman when he used to come to Benares, he, by beat of drum, he announced to the Māyāvādīs: "Come and discuss with me if you have any right, you want to prove that devotion, *jīva* and *Bhagavān* is both real and both different. Not one and the same as you say, you fools."

In this way that man, but he was silenced by the Grace of Gurudeva. I heard it once when our Guru Mahārāja [Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura] explained this *śloka*. *Kaivalyaika-prayojanam*, in this word *kaivalya*, this misguides everyone, mostly that *kaivalya*, Śaṅkara, *kaivalya-advaita, kaivalyaika-prayojanam*. One gentleman came and began his argument with the help of this *śloka* of *Bhāgavatam* to Prabhupāda [Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī]. I saw Prabhupāda went up to his own room and came back with the edition where Jīva Goswāmī's comment on this *śloka* in *Bhāgavatam* and began to read. And Jīva Goswāmī says: "*Brahmātmaikatva-lakṣaṇam, brahma ātmā, ātmā* means *jīvātmā, eka lakṣaṇam, brahmātmā*."

That man wanted to prove "*Brahmātmaikatva-lakṣaṇam*, that is *jīvātmā* and *brahma* are one and the same. It is mentioned in *Bhāgavatam* in the conclusion *śloka*."

But Prabhupāda refuted and with the argument of Jīva Goswāmī. In the beginning, *tattvaṁ yaj jñānam advayam brahmeti paramātmēti, bhagavān iti śabdyate*,

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

["Learned transcendentalists who know the Absolute Truth call this nondual substance Brahman, Paramātmā or Bhagavān."] [Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam, 1.2.11]

Here in the conclusion that the beginning that real vision is being satisfied. *Sarva-vedānta-sāraṁ yad, brahmātmaikatva, ātmā* means *Paramātmā*, the meaning of *ātmā* is *Paramātmā* also. So here *Paramātmā*, in the sense of *Paramātmā* it is used because there also the *advaya-jñāna, vadanti tat tattva-vidas, tattvaṁ yaj jñānam advayam, brahmeti paramātmēti, bhagavān*. Here that very beginning has been drawn here in conclusion. *Brahmātmaikatva-lakṣaṇam vastu advitīyaṁ, Brahma Paramātmā, lakṣaṇam advitī astu, tan-niṣṭhaṁ, kaivalyam*. That *advaya jñāna niṣṭha*, (*tat sam vandiya* ?) not (*tat ekata kaivalyam* ?) *tat sam vandiya kaivalyam tasmin nistha yukta, kaivalyaika-prayojanam* .....Continuous, no interruption, no falling down from that plane. Continued presence there,

that is *lilā yam pravesha*, *tato lilāyam pravesha* (?) In that plane the *lilā* is going on, to have entrance, admission in that plane and not to come up *vastu-siddhi*, *vastu-siddhi*, not to come back from there. For eternity to have entrance there.

What's the time?

Devotee: Ten to ten Mahārāja.

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: Rāmacandra Vijayotsav is also today, Rāmacandra. Rāvaṇa was killed when Rāmacandra came back. Hare Kṛṣṇa.

In U.P [Uttar Pradesh] amongst the *kṣatriyas*, this Rāmacandra Vijayotsav is celebrated with much grandeur.

Hare Kṛṣṇa. Hare Rāma. Hare Rāma. Nitāi Gaura Hari bol! Nitāi.

*Dhīrodātta*, the hero, of different types, *dhīra-santa*, *dhīrodātta*, *dhīro-udātta*, *dhīra-lalita*. Kṛṣṇa is reckoned among the class of *dhīra-lalita*, continuous pleasure pastimes. Rāmacandra *dhīrodātta*. *Lilā* means playful, *lalita*, playful. And *dhīrodātta* is a firm generosity is found in Rāmacandra ..... more liberal, generosity is made in Rāmacandra ..... *dhīrodātta*, *udātta*, *udātta* means liberal, dedicated form, life dedicated for others, *dhīrodātta*.

A small person in His kingdom amongst His subjects made some remark about Sītā: "She lived a full year in the, under the control of Rāvaṇa and Rāma has taken Her, accepted. But I am not going to do so." One washer-man told to his wife. "Rāma may do but I won't do. 'You lived in another's house, I won't accept.'"

Through the spy this news reached Rāmacandra and Rāmacandra asked: "Lakṣmaṇa, take Sītā to the forest to the *āśrama* of Vālmiki, put Her. I can't accept Her. The subjects, the people, they've got the audacity to remark on My character in such a way. And if I am to sit on the throne then I can't accept this sort of bad name. I shall have to cope successfully in their opinion."

So Sītā was banished, *odātta*, *odātta*.

His father had promised to His stepmother "That I shall give you three boons." But the father he could not utter it, could not command to Rāmacandra that: "She wants to banish You and make her son enthroned here, he could not.

But Rāmacandra when He heard He took it. "It is My duty to carry out the commitment of My father. He may say or may not say, he may order or may not order. But I am his successor not only of the throne but his commitment, debt. I must accept not just the hard cash, this property, but also debt, My father's commitment to My stepmother. I must, it is My duty to do that so My father may not pronounce such harsh words on Me." So He went to banishment, self-banishment, *odātta*, *dhīrodātta*.

And *dhīro-udātta*, Bhīmasena, a little cruel and rough, and that is his continued characteristic with Bhīma. *Dhīra-lalita* is Kṛṣṇa, *dhīrodātta* Rāmacandra, *dhīro-udātta*, Bhīmasena, and *dhīra-santa* is Yudhiṣṭhira, his character is always submissive, not excited, always cool-brained whatever the circumstances unfavourable comes on him he's not excited, very patiently and

that patience not for the time being but continuous. Yudhi, Yudhiṣṭhira, 'who is firm in internal feud.' Yudhi means in fight, ṣṭhira means firm, undisturbed, he's undisturbed in any sort of, to meet any circumstances, never excited. That was his nature, *dhīra-santa*.

And *dhīro-udāta*, Bhīmasena, *dhīrodāta* Rāmacandra, and *dhīra-lalita* Kṛṣṇa, always a playing mood.

End of side A, 25/27.10.82, start of side B

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: ..... beauty, autocrat. Everything is wanting to serve the beautiful. Beauty has so much command over everything that everyone, every (*narth* ?) is moved only for the satisfaction of beauty. Beauty can control external and internal (*narth* ?), everything, everywhere. Everyone's internal demand is to go towards beauty, towards *ānandam*, towards harmony, towards love. At the bottom of everything there is the tendency to go towards beauty, love, harmony. That is Kṛṣṇa. The deepest plane, anywhere and everywhere can be traced, can be found that the current is going towards that, that plane, to meet, connected with that beauty, realisation of beauty. And beauty, *ānandam*, love, harmony, are the same, same section, sweetness. Everyone wants, that is controlling the whole market. Aspiration, aspiring for the *ānandam*, *sukham*, real ecstasy. Every atom everywhere aspires after that sort of realisation and that is *ānandam*, *sukham*. That is beauty, that is love, that is harmony, ecstasy. The internal, innermost current everywhere to be traced, that must be found of that nature. Not power, the next hit will be power, everyone wants power to control. But beauty, to aspire after beauty just the opposite, to give out power, to throw away power and to be humble. Humility is indispensable for the company of beauty, for the company of ecstasy, humility, so opposite to power.

*tṛṇād api sunīcena, taror api sahiṣṇunā*  
[*amāninā mānadena, kīrtanīyaḥ sadā hariḥ*]

["One who is humbler than a blade of grass, more forbearing than a tree, who gives due honour to others without desiring it for himself is qualified to always chant the Holy Name of Kṛṣṇa."] [*Śikṣāṣṭakam*, 3]

Indispensable qualification for the search of beauty, as much as one can so much selfless, self abnegated, he can appreciate so much love and beauty. Sacrifice, *sevā*, can take us to it. And power seeking takes us here to capture everything under our control to this *brahmānda*. And power for rendering service to the beauty, that is in Vaikuṅṭha. *vaisadhya* (?) serving the Mādhav. Sweetness is the end in itself, and sweetness is God, the highest Entity, the deepest foundation, the final goal. That is sweetness. That *Bhāgavatam* says, Mahāprabhu says.

Devotee: If someone appears to be proud, or even arrogant, then his position is not, he cannot enter *līlā* in that position if he's displaying that?



**Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara:** Arrogant may be of two types, arrogance to the higher and arrogance to the lower. With a good will if a mother seems to be arrogant to deal with the child, that arrogance for the good of the child, that apparent arrogance should not be considered with the real arrogance of a passer-by to punish the child. The arrogance will be of two types. In some stages arrogance ...

*bistay sabhava janate baho shaste loshay ?*

A devotee may be seen to be little, for little cause he becomes angry, but that anger, that should not be classified with the ordinary anger. His anger will do good to the person to whom he's angry. For the well-being of the man with whom he's angry, that anger, *krodham bhakta-dvesi jane*, that is a qualification, it may be. So they cannot be judged independently.

Mahāprabhu was angry sometimes. When Mahāprabhu was going on His *kīrtana* and the door closed, a *brahmacārī* who was only drinking milk and nothing else, he wanted to enter. "I must be considered to be purest. I drink only milk, nothing else. So why they have closed the door against me?" Then at last when a door was open and he told: "Why door closed against me?" Mahāprabhu showed two fingers. "That to drink milk that is no qualification for Kṛṣṇa consciousness." Ha, ha.

And this is so many times. When there was some misbehaviour against Śrīvāsa Paṇḍit, some *tantric* ridiculed Śrīvāsa, put some, this wine and other things in the door of Śrīvāsa at night to show that he, to ridicule him. And Śrīvāsa Paṇḍit opened his door, gate, and found all these nasty things, this wine, this meat and other nasty things. Then he went to the good neighbours: "You please see that how *tantric* I am in that every night I with the help of this meat and wine I worship Devī Kali."

Then the gentlemen they were very much felt disturbed. "Who is the rogue who has done all these things?"

And when it was informed to Mahāprabhu, Mahāprabhu was very much enraged. "That man must have to suffer." And he was Cāpāla Gopāla, he had got this leprosy within a few days.

In this way, sometimes in this world some anger is shown by the incarnation Himself, of the God, and some devotees also sometimes. But that is not harmful, for the good of the persons. So the excitement which is found in a devotee in a proper way, that should not be taken as ordinary anger.

*kāma kṛṣṇa-karmārpaṇe krodha bhakta-dveṣi jāne  
lobha sādhu-saṅga hari-kathā  
moha iṣṭa-lābha-bine mada kṛṣṇa-guṇa-gāne  
niyukta kariba yathā tathā*

[Lust I will engage in offering the fruits of my work to Lord Kṛṣṇa. Anger I will direct towards the enemies of the devotees. Greed I will engage by being greedy to hear the topics of Lord Hari in the association of the saintly devotees.

Bewilderment will be manifested because I cannot immediately attain my worshippable Lord. Madness will be there when I madly glorify the transcendental attributes of Lord Kṛṣṇa. In this way I will engage each of these in the service of Lord Kṛṣṇa.]

[Srla Narottama dasa Thakura's *Prema-bhakti-candrikā*, 2.10]

In devotees also sometimes we see:

*dr̥ṣṭaiḥ svabhāva-janitair vapuṣaś ca doṣair  
na prākṛtatvam iha bhakta-janasya paśyet  
gaṅgāmbhasām na khalu budbuda-phena-pankair  
brahma-dravatvam apagacchati nīra-dharmaiḥ*

["Being situated in his original Kṛṣṇa conscious position, a pure devotee does not identify with the body. Such a devotee should not be seen from a materialistic point of view. Indeed, one should overlook a devotee's having a body born in a low family, a body with a bad complexion, a deformed body, or a diseased or infirm body. According to ordinary vision, such imperfections may seem prominent in the body of a pure devotee, but despite such seeming defects, the body of a pure devotee cannot be polluted. It is exactly like the waters of the Ganges, which sometimes during the rainy season are full of bubbles, foam and mud. The Ganges waters do not become polluted. Those who are advanced in spiritual understanding will bathe in the Ganges without considering the condition of the water."] [*Upadeśāmṛta*, 6]

*Upadeśāmṛta*, Rūpa Goswāmī says, according to the teaching of Mahāprabhu, that if we find any defect in a pure devotee we should not be very eager to find fault in him. Because in the water of Ganges it can purify, but if any ...

Devotee: Bubbles.

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: Bubbles or ...

Devotee: Mud.

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: Any mud is found with that water, that also can purify. The bubble and mud, that cannot stand in the way of purification. So in a devotee who are only meant for the good of the universe, if we find some mud or bubbles like things like anger and some other things. In the body also some is blind, some is lame, if we attribute that to their inner self then we are losers, we commit offence.

Devotee: But it is understandable sometimes when anger is used in love, it can be understood in that way.

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: Of course. When a mother or father is abusing their child for their good, one can, it is understandable. And another man he's beating a boy. Both is distinguishable different things. So a man of that

intelligence, that standard of intelligence that can know. The well-wisher is chastising the boy, and the passer-by is chastising the boy, the difference can be understood by an intelligent man. Ordinary people may not make it out.

Hare Kṛṣṇa. Hare Kṛṣṇa. Gaura Hari. Gaura Hari. Gaura Hari.

Some say that Akshayananda Mahārāja is worthless ...

Devotees: [laughter]

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: ...and a symptom of a worthy man to control men and to earn money.

Devotee: Kṛṣṇa. But he can't get any money, he's useless. ha, ha.

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: Money, money and men together, that is the qualification of a substantial, a good man, a *sādhu*, luck, that is the symptom of a worthy man. Hare Kṛṣṇa.

What's the time?

Devotee: Ten to ten.

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: Ten to ten. Gaura Hari. Nitāi Gaura Hari.

Devotee: We might have some worth as an atom of dust at your feet.

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: Eh?

Devotee: If we can be an atom of dust on your feet...

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: Gaura Haribol! Gaura Hari.

Devotee: ...maybe some worth then.

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: Nitāi Gaura Haribol! Mahāprabhu at least says to Kṛṣṇa that "It is worth to become a dust in the feet of Kṛṣṇa." What is that *śloka* ? *kiṅkaraṁ, patitaṁ māṁ viṣame bhavāmbudhau ...*

Devotee: *ayi nanda-tanuja ..... kṛpayā tava pāda-paṅkaja-sthita-dhūli-saḍṣaṁ ...*

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: *sthita-dhūli-saḍṣaṁ vicintaya.*

[*ayi nanda-tanuja kiṅkaraṁ, patitaṁ māṁ viṣame bhavāmbudhau  
kṛpayā tava pāda-paṅkaja-, sthita-dhūli-saḍṣaṁ vicintaya* ]

[ "O son of Nanda Mahārāja, I am Your eternal servant, yet because of my own *karma*, I have fallen into this terrible ocean of birth and death. Accept this fallen soul and consider me a particle of dust at Your holy lotus feet." ] [ *Śikṣāṣṭakam* ]

**Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara:** "Not a part and parcel of Your body, but *vibhinnāmśa*, a different type of substance. I want connection with Your foot, holy foot."

*Vibhinnāmśa jīva - tāñra śaktite gaṇana, taṭastha-śakti:*

[ *svāmśa-vibhinnāmśa-rūpe haiñā vistāra  
ananta vaikuṅṭha-brahmāṇḍe karena vihāra  
svāmśa-vistāra - catur - vyūha, avatāra-gaṇa  
vibhinnāmśa jīva - tāñra śaktite gaṇana* ]

[ "Kṛṣṇa expands Himself in many forms. Some of them are personal expansions, and some are separate expansions. Thus He performs pastimes in both the spiritual and material worlds. The spiritual worlds are the Vaikuṅṭha planets, and the material universes are *brahmāṇḍas*, gigantic globes governed by Lord Brahmā. Expansions of His personal self - like the quadruple manifestations of Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, Aniruddha and Vāsudeva - descend as incarnations from Vaikuṅṭha to this material world. The separated expansions (*vibhinnāmś*) are living entities. Although they are expansions of Kṛṣṇa, they are counted among His different potencies." ] [ *Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Madhya-līlā, 22.8-9* ]

**Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara:** *mamaivāmśo jīva-loke, jīva-bhūtaḥ sanātanaḥ*

[ *manaḥ ṣaṣṭhānīndriyāṇi, prakṛti-sthāni karṣati* ]

[ "The soul is a part of Me, as My separate fragmental particle or potency. Although he is eternal, he acquires the mind and five perceptual senses, which are parts of material nature as creations of *māyā*, My deluding potency." ]

[ *Bhagavad-gītā, 15.7* ]

It is a general word but in particular really it is the part of His potency and not the higher potency but in the marginal potency, that is *jīva*. That is also a part in a general, in a broad sense, everything is a part of Him. He's *advaya-jñāna*, He's everywhere, He's including everything so everything is a part. But among, there is differentiation in calculation about the reckoning of the parts. *Svarūpa-śakti*, He and His *śakti*, potency, and potency higher, lower, and marginal, *jīva* is a part of the marginal potency.

And *Guru* also, apparently Kṛṣṇa, but Kṛṣṇa can give only Himself, so it by His will that anyone can achieve Kṛṣṇa consciousness. A general it is Kṛṣṇa, but when we are particular we find, 'no, it is His potency.' And potency there of different kinds, different kinds.

And His representation different in Vaikuṅṭha, Nārāyaṇa, Nārāyaṇa's paraphernalia, Kṛṣṇa's paraphernalia. The Rāmānuja's, their ultimate goal is in Vaikuṅṭha, Nārāyaṇa. The Nārāyaṇa is coming to recruit them through His potency of different type. Kṛṣṇa comes to require him through His potency of different types, *sākhya*, *vātsalya*, *mādhurya*, etc., *śanta*, *dāsya*. That

differentiation gradually awakens in ones, in the mind of the disciple and can say: "Oh, who went to recruit me in the name of the agent of Kṛṣṇa, now I find he has got such and such function in the *lilā* of Kṛṣṇa. He went to me with the certificate of an agent of Kṛṣṇa in general to recruit me and he has taken me here and given engagement in this particular service.

*mukunda preṣṭhatve guru varam*

In the first sight everything is seen as He, but by nearer approach we find specification, differentiation there. And the potency, and differentiation again in the potency. And in the higher potency also so many departments. In this way *Guru* is at last located in a particular service there, *mukunda preṣṭhatve*, it is he who went to recruit me on behalf of Kṛṣṇa. Rūpānuga. But they're not to be differentiated so tightly, their oneness, one tune they have got. Of one heart, one aim, one object, one interest. In that case not to differentiate. There is specific service, in that sense it may be differentiated.

So *bhedābheda* and that is *acintya*, everywhere to be applied, common and different. Everything, everything has got this common and difference and that is inconceivable to your consciousness. This will apply, this should be applied everywhere.

So I may finish here today. Hare Kṛṣṇa. Gaura Hari bol!

\* \* \* \* \*

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: ... from Mādhavendra Purī, Mādhavendra Purī belonged to Madhva *sampradāya*.

*srimaḥ tat prāha tattvaṁ harim iha paramaṁ sarva-śaktim rasābdhim, tad bhinnāmsāmś ca jīvān prakṛti-kavalitān tad vimuktāmś ca bhāvat, bhedābheda-prakāśaṁ sakalam api hareḥ ... sri vimuktāmś ca bhāvat, sri mantah prāha tattvaṁ harim iha paramaṁ sarva-śaktim rasābdhim, rasābdhim:*

[*āmnāyaḥ prāha tattvaṁ harim iha paramaṁ sarva-śaktim rasābdhim tad bhinnāmsāmś ca jīvān prakṛti-kavalitān tad vimuktāmś ca bhāvat bhedābheda-prakāśaṁ sakalam api hareḥ sādhanam suddha-bhaktim sādhyam tat prītim evety upadiśati harir-gauracandro bhaje tam* ]

(1) - The Vedic scriptures received through the authorised disciplic succession of bona fide spiritual masters state that:

(2) - Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the Supreme Absolute Truth.

(3) - He is the source of all energies.

(4) - He is the ocean of all transcendental mellows.

(5) - The living entities are His separated parts and parcels.

(6) - Due to forgetfulness of their constitutional position, the living entities are illusioned.

(7) - By awakening their transcendental ecstatic affection and attraction for the Lord, all living souls can be liberated from illusion.

(8) - All things are one with and different from Kṛṣṇa; this oneness and difference is *acintya* or inconceivable.

(9) - Pure devotional service (*śuddha-bhakti*) is the only means to attain the supreme goal.

(10) - The supreme goal is divine love of Kṛṣṇa.

[Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura's *Daśa-mūla śloka*, the ten essential principles of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism]

Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara: Ha, ha. It is being confused with Mahāprabhu's Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura. Madhvācārya has got one, from his *sampradāya*, another from Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa.

*sri mana madana te hari pratama satvam jagat satyato  
vedo jiva gana hari rama cara richotya bhavam gatha ?*

Ha, ha, memory failing.

*richotya bhavam gatha, suddha bhakti sadhya he, Daśa-mūla.*

Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura *e* *Daśa-mūla*, Nimbarka *sampradāya* *Daśa-mūla*.

Nimbarka *sampradāya*: *dasye sloka ache tate tare sampradaya katha, balarsh ?*

And Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura: *eka dasam mukeli kori candi ?*

It is a Gauḍīya *sampradāya*

*āmnāyaḥ prāha tattvaṁ harim iha paramaṁ sarva-śaktim rasābdhim  
tad bhinnāmsāṁś ca jīvān prakṛti-kavalitān tad vimuktāṁś ca bhāvat  
bhedābheda-prakāśaṁ sakalam api hareḥ sādhanam śuddha-bhaktim  
sādhyam tat prītim evety upadiśati harir-gauracandro bhaje tam*

*sri mana madana te hari pratama satvam jagat satyato  
vedo jiva gana hari rama cara richotya bhavam gatha ?*

Madhvācārya, he was the strongest oppositionist of the Śāṅkara school. Śāṅkarācārya laid stress on *advaita*, and he laid stress on *dvaita*, not *advaita*, *dvaita*. *Īśvara* and *jīva*. The *Veda*, the difference that is more prominent. So he opposed them very strongly. And not only he stopped there, he tried to prove Śāṅkarācārya as a demon, quoting a narration from *Mahābhārata*. *Maniman dvaita*, he was ordered by Nārāyaṇa to preach in Kali-yuga this Māyāvādā. And our Guru Mahārāja [Bhaktisiddhānta Saraswatī Ṭhākura] also published a booklet, small, *Mani-mañjarī*, from the Madhva school, *Mani-mañjarī*. There it is proved from reference from *Mahābhārata* that Śāṅkarācārya was a demon and his name was Maniman. And he was ordered to do so and he came and did that. That is their contention.

But Mahāprabhu accepted him as incarnation of Śiva and Śiva was ordered, a reference also given from the *śāstra*:

*lokan madvi mokan kuru ?*

With the spirit of harmony, keeping the harmony, that from segregation, from the underlying good meaning who was that, who was hopeless diseased persons, to take them out of the, of the patients that are, that have got slight disease. The serious diseased persons, serious patients, to remove them, to save for the ..... of the less serious patients. So with that idea Śaṅkara, Śaṅkarācārya, Śiva, was ordered:

*lokan madvi mokan kuru ?*

Who are very much atheist, take them out in another group, showing that they are himself God, that ultimate object, *so ham*. *So ham* means not *daso ham*, "I am Him." "I am Him." Generally we see the demons they have got many qualifications, moral qualifications, but only that main difference they're anti Viṣṇu, generally. They even worship Brahmā and Śiva and get boon from them, also do penances and thereby they acquire power. But they are generally anti Viṣṇu, not all, mostly. Only those that are forced to come here by curse, just as Vitrasura (?), he also apparently worshipper of Śiva. This Bodi (?), he was a devotee though come in the lineage of *asura*. Prahlāda, exceptional cases. But generally *asura*, they are devotees of Śiva and Brahmā but anti Viṣṇu. *Dvau bhūta-sargau loke 'smin, daiva āsura eva ca, viṣṇu-bhaktaḥ smṛto daiva, āsuras-tad-viparyayaḥ*:

*dvau bhūta-sargau loke 'smin, daiva āsura eva ca*  
[*daivo vistaraśaḥ prokta, āsuram pārtha me śṛṇu*]

["O Pārtha, the living beings in this world are seen to be of two natures — godly and demoniac. I have already elaborately described the godly nature to you, so now hear from Me about the demoniac nature."] [*Bhagavad-gītā*, 16.6]

*dvau bhūta-sargau loke 'smin, daiva āsura eva ca*  
*viṣṇu-bhaktaḥ smṛto daiva, āsuras-tad-viparyayaḥ*

["There are two classes of men in this created world. One consists of the demonic and the other of the godly. The devotees of Lord Viṣṇu are the godly, whereas those who are just the opposite are called demons." [*Padma-Purāṇa*]

And generally the demigods they are submissive to Viṣṇu. The general nature of things is such, *āsuras-tad-viparyayaḥ* ...

... is thought to be the incarnation of Śiva, Bhīma and Hanumān. During Kṛṣṇa he was Bhīma and during Rāmacandra he was Hanumān, and in connection of Vedavyāsa Nārāyaṇa he became Madhva. That is their contention.

**Devotee:** In connection of Vedavyāsa?

**Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara:** Madhvācārya, the *avatāra* of Vāyu, *mukha-Vāyu*, incarnation of *mukha-Vāyu*. That is the general *guru-tattva*. When Kṛṣṇa came

he came as Bhīma. When Rāmacandra came he came as Hanumān. And Madhva is also called the *avatāra* of Vāyu but connected with Vedavyāsa. He's considered Nārāyaṇa Himself, *vyāso nārāyaṇa svayam*, but He has been taken as *śaktyāveśa* generally, *nārāyaṇa-śaktyāveśa*.

**Devotee:** What is the relationship of Vāyu and Vyāsa?

**Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara:** [*mukhyapra?*] Vyāsa, Vyāsa is supposed as Nārāyaṇa. *Mukhya* Vāyu's position is that of *Guru*. Madhva philosophy is like this, that Kṛṣṇa, then another half of Kṛṣṇa to render service of Kṛṣṇa Balarāma.

*cid lilamrthuna ?*

Five stages. A figure and within Him the *devatara*, or the *sukhya-tattva* (?) That is *mano-mayacor* (?) ..... person. And within His heart there is *mukhya Vāyu*, *prana pradhana guru*. And then superior to that, Baladeva, and within the heart of Baladeva, *cid lilamrthuna* (?) Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. In this way he has explained.

A material figure of a *jīva*, within that, that the person. In their words, *devatar*, *devatar* is the real person and within the heart of the person there is *mukhya Vāyu*, or *Guru*, that is Madhva, or Bhīma, or Hanumān, something of such conception, *Guru* in general. And in the heart of that *Gurudeva* there is Baladeva, Nityanānada, some similar. And there in that heart of Baladeva *cid lilamrthuna* (?), Kṛṣṇa with His *śakti*.

In *Gauḍīya* also it was written. And one gentleman, one professor, by birth he was a Vaiṣṇava, Professor of English in Barampur College, good scholar, he put a question to the Editor of *Gauḍīya*: "Please try to explain this thing more elaborately. Here we may find, *sarva-dharma-samana* (?), the harmony of all the religious conceptions. Try to elaborate." But that was, elaborated means repeated. I did not find that anything more was given there. This was only couched in a new ... new words and expressions. But I do not find that he is the harmony of all the religions in the field.

*Līlāmaya bhagavān* (?) As Sanātana Goswāmī has mentioned in *Bhāgavatam* in *rasa-līlā*. Baladeva also showing His *rasa* with the *gopīs*. There, the Sanātana Goswāmī has given, "He's not." Externally Baladeva is seen to perform *rasa-līlā* but internally in His heart He's showing the *rasa-līlā* of, He's connecting with Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa is in His heart, in His heart He is connecting Kṛṣṇa in the *rasa-līlā* and externally He's found to participate in *rasa-līlā*, in *Bhāgavatam*. But Baladeva's nature is such, intrinsic nature, that He's not the ultimate enjoyer. He's composed of such materials which is all service, all service. It's said every atom of His body only meant to satisfy Kṛṣṇa. So His own enjoyment is not possible. That is, the note is given by Sanātana Goswāmī.

*lilaya krsna kedar lila koram* (?)



Baladeva is such, the highest platform on which the Kṛṣṇa has His *līlā*, and lower to Baladeva there is *Guru-tattva*, in general, the fifth stage. And then that *Guru-tattva* again within the person and person has got his body. So five stages.

This way divided. And the *Upaniṣad* also:

*annamaya kosh, prāṇamaya kosh, manomaya kosh, vijñānamaya kosh, ānandamaya kosh (?)*

Division is this way. Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa says that in *vijñānamaya kosh* there is *jīva*, *annamaya* this physical body, *manomaya* the mental, the subtle body. Then *prāṇamaya* the life, and after that *vijñānamaya* above *prakṛti*, the *jīva, taṭasthā-śakti*. And then *ānandamaya kosh*, whole Vaikuṅṭha and Goloka covered. *Svarūpa-śakti*, the domain Yoga-Māyā.

Ke ? [Who?]

Devotee: ..... ?

**Swāmī B.R. Śrīdhara:** Following Madhvācārya, there was one Jayatīrtha, whose *Suddhar (?) mādhava haite, akṣobhya paramahamse, akṣobhyera śiṣya jaya-tīrtha nāme paricaya*.

[*nṛhari mādhava-baṁse, akṣobhya paramahamse, śiṣya boli' aṅgikāra kore akṣobhyera śiṣya jaya-tīrtha nāme paricaya, taṅra dāsye jñānasindhu tare*]

[The two other principle disciples of Madhvācārya are Nṛhari Tīrtha and Mādhava Tīrtha. Mādhava's disciple was the great *paramahansa* (a devotee of the highest order) Akṣobhya Tīrtha. The principle disciple of Akṣobhya Tīrtha was Jayatīrtha, whose foremost disciple was Jñānasindhu.]

[*The Brahma-Mādhva-Gauḍīya sampradāya*, verse 2, compiled by Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Saraswatī Ṭhākura]

He was a very good scholar and in His *Suddhar (?)* he refuted this *Māyāvādā śāstrically*, wonderfully, so that the Śāṅkara school was bewildered. From Nimbarka section also, that *Parapakya Girivajara (?)* and other books refuting Śāṅkara school. Many big scholars came. But the *Suddhar (?) Daya Suddhar (?)*, that very successfully refuted, has smashed the argument of the Śāṅkara school. Then after that, the Śāṅkara school, came another Paṇḍit, a Bengali gentleman from Paripur (?) District, Madhusudhan Saraswatī. He again, many of them tried to refute him but this gentleman, he, *Advaita-siddhi*, he wrote one book *Advaita-siddhi*, and he, we are told was successful to re-establish the clamour of *Māyāvādā*.

End of recording, 25/27.10.82

\* \* \* \* \*