

About the style of Kāśikā, E. Krishnamacariara says that among the three commentaries, Tātparya, Kāśikā and Nyāyaratnākara, the Kāśikā is matured and elaborate in style; it is full of such words which have profound and multifarious meanings, it is specially engaged in repudiating the opponents' views. Hence it in comparison with the other commentaries, occupies a unique place.⁴⁴

4. Nyāyaratnākara :

Nyāyaratnākara is regarded as an important commentary. It gives in several places a resumé of the topics discussed in the vārttika and refers to many acknowledged Ācāryas, viz, Dīnnāga, Dharmakīrti, Bhikṣu and Bhartṛmitra. The views of these thinkers have been refuted by Kumāṛila. This work is precise and clear in its exposition. In fact it is of great help in the elucidation of the difficult Kārikās of the Ślokavārttika. It was first published under CSS in 1898 in three volumes, under the editorship of Pt. Tailunga Rama Sastri.

44. cf. Skt. Intro. to Kāśikā, pp. 8-9.

RĀGAVARTMACANDRIKĀ OF VIŚVANĀTHA CAKRAVARTIN

(translated with introduction)

Joseph T. O'Connell

Introductory remarks

The Rāgavartmacandrikā (Moonbeam on the Way of Passion) is a short theological treatise on *rāgānugāsādhana* *bhakti*, passionate devotion as exercise, or simply, *rāgānugā*, passion (in a precisely defined theological sense, of course). Passion, together with ritual devotion as exercise (*vaidhī* *sādhana* *bhakti*), devotion as feeling (*bhāva* *bhakti*) and devotion as love (*prema* *bhakti*), is one of four major types or ways of devotion to Kṛṣṇa developed by the Gauḍiṣa (i.e., Bengali) Vaiṣṇava tradition, of which Śrī Caitanya (1486-1533) is the great exemplar and Śrī Rūpa Gosvāmin and Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja the two most penetrating and effective theological and literary expositors of the early and late sixteenth century respectively. Viśvanātha Cakravartin, born probably around 1660, wrote numerous commentaries and independent texts in Sanskrit on various Vaiṣṇava topics. He had already (perhaps in 1704) composed a short treatise, the *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhubindu* (Drop from the Ocean of Nectar of the Mood of Devotion), or simply the *Bindu* (Drop), summarizing in capsule fashion the lengthy and influential *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu* (variously called the *Bhaktisudhāmbhodi* and the *Bhaktirasāmṛtārṇava* in the present text) by Śrī Rūpa. The purpose of the Candrikā is to complement the *Bindu* by elaborating upon the category of *rāgānugā* through distinctions and definitions intended to remove ambiguities and to resolve points of dispute, much of which, one presumes, had not been foreseen or seen as problematic at the time of Rūpa Gosvāmin's writing.

Editorial constraints prevent any extended discussion of the

issues raised by Viśvanātha's text, but it may be appropriate to mention at the outset a few salient features of the Rāgavartmacandrikā. In the first place it would seem to be significant that Viśvanātha chose to write about *rāgānugā*, and in the way that he did, in his historical situation at the beginning of the eighteenth century. At that time Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas were feeling criticism from other Vaiṣṇavas in Mathurā-Vṛndāvana and elsewhere in north and west India both for their emphasis upon cultivating amorous devotional feelings in general and for their specific insistence that the divine love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa which they celebrate in *parakīyā*, of another's, i.e., extramarital, love. This was also a time when in Bengal itself there was mounting prominence of a somewhat counter-cultural phenomenon known as *sahajiyā* Vaiṣṇava piety. The *sahajiyā* way endorsed close association of a man and a woman, preferably not spouses, under the guidance of a guru and according to rigorous but unorthodox rules, in order to experience the blissful unification of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa within themselves, a way or program of spiritual exercise quite inconsistent with that practiced and propagated by orthodox Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas, including Śrī Caitanya, Rūpa Gosvāmin, and Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja.

In the face of these two very different and even threatening alternate interpretations of the meaning of devotion to Kṛṣṇa, Viśvanātha Cakravartin basically reasserted Rūpa Gosvāmin's position on the authenticity and desirability, for those so favored by divine mercy, of *rāgānugā*, properly understood, as a way of devotion in accordance with Vaiṣṇava scriptures. He says that for those who experience an inner longing (*lobha*) for the feelings (*bhāva*) of Kṛṣṇa and his intimates in the idyllic divine cowherd realm, called Vraja, that very longing should serve as the criterion of which spiritual exercises enjoined in Vaiṣṇava scriptures should be undertaken and which ones avoided (even though endorsed in such spiritual texts). He does insist, however, that in the way of *rāgānugā* some recourse to traditional spiritual exercises enjoined in Vaiṣṇava scriptures is necessary; idiosyncratic following of one's urges would be destructive. He further curtails the possibility for antinomian

developments within *rāgānugā* by setting out a classification of Vaiṣṇava practices, or spiritual exercises, ranging from those which are regular and obligatory for all down to those which must be avoided by any Vaiṣṇava on the way of passion.

On the question of Rādhā's relationship to Kṛṣṇa, Viśvanātha acknowledged that Rādhā, being the essential joy-giving potency (*hlādinīśakti*) of Kṛṣṇa, is indeed in an ultimate sense clearly his "own," *svakīyā*; but for the purposes of worship and meditation, i.e., at the heart of devotional life, Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa are to be approached only as they are manifested in sport (*līlā*); and in the sport where Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa appear as lovers, Vṛndāvana *līlā*, there is no evidence anywhere in Vaiṣṇava scriptures, says Viśvanātha, that they are anything but *parakīyā* lovers.

While there is no direct reference to the *sahajiyās* (with the possible exception of the prohibition of such practices as self-worship, *aḥaṃgrahopāśanā*), it is evident that in the list of required, recommended, or neutral practices none is distinctively *sahajiyā*. Furthermore, the fundamental distinction between the spiritual capacities of a soul having a body of an aspirant (*sādhakadeha*), such as the historical Śrī Rūpa possessed, and of a soul inhabiting an accomplished or perfected body (*siddhadeha*), such as the transcendent Śrī Rūpamañjarī possesses, seems to preclude such aspiration as a *sahajiyā* couple might harbor to realize in themselves in this lifetime the union of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. According to Viśvanātha, it is only after one is reborn as a cowherd girl from the womb of a cowherd woman in an unveiled manifestation (*prakaṭaparakāśa*) of Vṛndāvana that one may attain the longed for devout feelings appropriate to Kṛṣṇa and his intimates. Even then it does not appear that one is expected to become Kṛṣṇa or Rādhā, though one may attain the great feeling (*mahābhāva*), i.e., Rādhā's essential love for Kṛṣṇa. In sum, Viśvanātha's detailed explanation of *rāgānugā* is that of the orthodox Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava tradition theretofore articulated by Rūpa Gosvāmin and Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, and is quite distinct from what has been called *rāgānugā* in *sahajiyā* contexts.

Among other salient features of the *Rāgavartmacandrikā* are the author's efforts to show how great majesty of the divine Kṛṣṇa can be maintained without doing violence to the limits of human sport (*naralīlā*) and his explanation of the simultaneous actuality of Kṛṣṇa's omniscience and his simplicity, such that he can both be enthralled by his transcendent loving associates, oblivious to all cares etc., and yet be attentive to devotees' prayers throughout the universes. Of special interest in this context is Viśvanātha's comparison of the working of nescience (*avidyā*), which covers over the knowledge of a living soul so that it may experience merited pain, with the working of love (*preman*) which covers over Kṛṣṇa's omniscience so that he may enjoy even greater bliss.

Throughout the text Viśvanātha makes less use the categories of Sanskrit poetics, *rasaśāstra*, than he does of the categories of logic and of ritual obligations, an interesting departure from the usual style of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava analysis of the realm of religious feelings. He comments, however, that the application of any such terms, be they from poetics or from logic etc., is done because of the difficulty of analyzing the matter and is merely for the sake of suggestion. For, he says, the subject about which all these distinctions and developments are postulated, namely devotion (*bhakti*), is itself changeless; it is being, consciousness and bliss (*saccidānanda*).

I have benefited from the translation and introduction of the *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhubindu* by Klaus Klostermaier, of the University of Manitoba, Canada, and suggest that the *Candrikā* be read in conjunction with the *Bindu*, and both of these, if possible, in conjunction with the *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu*, the first part of which is available in English translation with an introduction by Swami B. H. Bon Maharaj of Vṛndāvana, to whom I am indebted not only for his published works, but for individual instruction and other courtesies at his Āśrama at Vṛndāvana. I have in most cases adopted Klostermaier's English rendering of Sanskrit technical terms occurring in both texts (though preferring to use feeling rather than emotion for *bhāva*, mood rather than sentiment for *rasa*, and great feeling

rather than essential love of Rādhā for *mahābhāva*). His introduction contains additional relevant information on Viśvanātha Cakravartin and his times, though on two points I disagree. I prefer to follow Biman Behari Majumdar and Sukumar Sen in setting the date of Viśvanātha's death in the first or second decade of the eighteenth century. Also, I find puzzling the assertion that Viśvanātha was the chief theologian of the Nimbarkī movement at Vṛndāvana. That Viśvanātha might have been "adopted" (posthumously ?) by Nimbarkī or others at Vṛndāvana is not out of the question, but his copious theological writings, and in particular the *Bindu* and the *Candrikā* would seem to place him squarely within the main stream of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava tradition.

In conclusion I would like to acknowledge with affection and respect certain major debts of gratitude: to Prabhupad Pran Kishore Gosvamin, whose edition of the text I have followed and whose patient instruction first encouraged me to translate the *Rāgavartmacandrikā* into English; to Dr. Gopikamohan Bhattacharya, who offered assistance in reading portions of the text while he was guest Professor at the University of Toronto; to that truly great scholar and teacher, Dr. Radha-govinda Basak, who at an advanced age generously and graciously helped me to read and to begin to appreciate something of the poetry and thought of Rūpa Gosvāmin; and especially to the distinguished scholar under whom I was privileged to study for two years at the Government Sanskrit College in Calcutta, the then principal, Dr. Gaurinath Sastri.

Select Bibliography

- Rūpa Gosvāmin. *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhuḥ*. Edited by Haridas Das. 2nd ed. Navadvipa : Haribol Kutī, G.A. 475 (1961).
- . *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhuḥ*. Edited and translated by Bhakti Hridaya Bon Maharaj. Vol. 1 ("eastern" division only). Vrindaban : Institute of Oriental Philosophy, 1965.
- . *Ujjvalanilamaṇi*. Edited by Kanai Lal Adhikari. 2nd ed. Navadvipa : Haribol Kutī, G.A. 478 (1964).
- Sen, Sukumar. *A History of Brajabuli Literature*. Calcutta : University of Calcutta, 1935. See pp. 258-59.
- Viśvanātha Cakravartin. *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhubindu*. Translated with introduction by Klaus Klostermaier. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 94, No. 1 (January-March 1974), pp. 96-107.
- . *Kṣṇadāgitacintāmaṇi*. Edited with introduction by Biman Behari Majumdar. Calcutta : General Library, B.A. 1369 (1962). See pp. 25-28.
- . *Rāgavartmacandrikā*. Edited with Bengali translation and introduction by Prabhupad Pran Kishore Gosvamin. Howrah : Vinod Kishore Gosvamin, B.A. 1372 (1965).

Rāgavartmacandrikā

I

1. Praise, praise to those who like *cakora* birds savor the nectarous words of Śrī Rūpa, by the droplets of whose mercy I shall utter this 'Moonbeam on the Way of Passion.'

2. Passionate devotion (*rāgānugābhakti*), mentioned in brief in the previously issued Drop (*bindu*) from the Blessed Ocean of Nectar of Devotion (*bhaktisudhāmbhodhi*, i.e., *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu*) is discussed herein at length.

3. Let it be (defined as) ritualistic devotion (*vaidhībhakti*) if the stimulus (*pravarttaka*) to devotion is scripture (*śāstra*); let it be (defined as) passionate (*rāgānugā*) if indeed longing (*lobha*) is the stimulus to devotion.

4. Let commitment (*pravṛtti*) to devotion be (defined as) very firm desire (*sunīścayacikīrṣā*); let two kinds (of persons) qualified for that (devotion) (*tadadhikārināu*) be (defined as) those desirous due to scripture and (those desirous) due to longing.

5. In that context longing (*lobha*) is characterized (*lakṣita*) by the feet of Śrī Rūpa Gosvāmin himself: "When the mind (*dhi*) pays heed (*apekṣate*) upon hearing of the sweetness of their (i.e. Kṛṣṇa's and his beloveds') feelings (*bhāva*) etc. and (does) not in this context (pay heed) to scripture nor to logical argument, that is characteristic of the onset of longing (*lobhotpatīlakṣaṇa*)."

6. And it (i.e., *lobha*) is two-fold: that caused by the mercy of Bhagvān and that caused by the mercy of a passionate devotee. Among them that due to the mercy of a devotee is twofold: antecedent and current. Antecedent (*prāktana*) is that arising from the mercy of such a devotee living in the past; contemporary (*ādhunika*) is that arising from the mercy of such a devotee living in this present lifetime. In the former case one takes refuge at the feet of such a *guru* subsequently to longing; in the latter case commitment to longing (*lobha-pravṛtti*) comes subsequently to taking refuge at the feet of the

guru. As is said : “This passionate (*rāgānugā*) (devotion) which has as its sole cause longing (*lobha*) due simply to the compassion (*kāruṇya*) of Kṛṣṇa and his devotees is spoken of by some as the way of nourishment (*puṣṭimārga*).”

7. And then, when inquiry occurs as to the means for attaining those longed for feelings, there should be heed for scripture and logical argument on the part of a devotee having such longing. This is so because they (i.e., such means) are made known in no other way than by the injunctions of scripture and by logical argument based upon scripture. Similarly, if there be longing for milk etc. there should be heed for the words of advice of a worthy person experienced in the matter once the question of the means for it—“How may I have milk” ? etc.—occurs. Then from words of advice such as, “The gentleman must buy a cow,” etc. he should learn the procedures for driving a cow, feeding it grass, milking it etc., but not on his own. As is said in the eighth book (of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*) : “As humans through disciplined efforts attain the fire within wood, the milk in cows, food and water in the earth and sustenance in hard work, so do they attain you within the elements (*guṇeṣu*) by means of intellect ; so say the wise.”

8. And this longing becomes greater and greater every day in proportion to the purity of the mind (*antaḥkaraṇa*) due to devotion, beginning with the characteristic (*lakṣaṇa*) taking of refuge at the feet of a *guru* on the part of devotees faring on the way of passion, continuing up to the moment of gaining immediate contact (*sākṣātprāpti*) with one’s most desired reality (*svābhīṣṭavastu*), as stated by Bhagavān : “The more the self is purified by meritorious recitation, hearing and talking about me the more it sees, like an eye treated with ointment, the subtler reality.”

9. When such longing has arisen there should be enthusiastic and exceeding commitment to the scripturally enunciated means of attaining those respective feelings, which (means) in some cases are disclosed by the mouth of a *guru* and in some

cases by the mouth of an experienced magnanimous passionate devotee and which in some cases are manifested spontaneously by the operations of a mind purified by devotion ; as in the saying of Uddhava : “In the form of teacher or of individual consciousness (*caitya*) he shows the way to himself.” It is similar with the means of attaining pleasure in the case of those whose objective is pleasure.

10. And that scripture—which constitutes the essence of all Upaniṣads—is precisely the Śrī Bhāgavata, the great Purāṇa the mine of collections of such sayings as ; “Of whom I am the beloved, the self, or the son, the friend, the guru, the confident, the deity, the desired one...” And similar are the Śrī Bhaktirasāmṛtārṇava (Ocean of Nectar of the Mood of Devotion) etc., which excel in elaborating upon the devotion presented in above. In that (*Bhaktirasāmṛtārṇava*) are these three verses :

(a) “Remembering Kṛṣṇa and his folk, the beloved, desired for oneself (*nijasamihita*), and delighted by talk about them, that one should dwell always in Vraja.”

(b) “In this context service in the form of an aspirant (*sādhakarūpeṇa*) as well as in an accomplished form (*siddharūpeṇa*) is to be done in emulation of the folk of Vraja by one desirous of their feelings (*tadbhāvalipsunā*).”

(c) “Hearing, chanting of praise, etc., spoken of as ritualistic devotion, are to be understood by the wise as constituent parts here (i.e., in passionate devotion).” In this context the three are to be explained from the standpoint of the emulation of amorous pleasure (*kāmānugāpakṣe*).

11. “Remembering Kṛṣṇa” is stated first. The priority accorded to remembering in passionate devotion is due to the mental nature (*manodharmatvāt*) of passion. The “beloved” is Kṛṣṇa, the supreme lord of Vṛndāvana, who displays himself in sports (*līlāvilāsin*) appropriate to one’s own feelings (*nijabhāvocita*). And his, Kṛṣṇa’s, folk, of what sort are they ? “Desired for oneself,” i.e., fit to be longed for by oneself (*svābhīlaṣaṇīya*) : the blessed queen of Vṛndāvana, Lalitā,

Viśākhā, Śrī Rūpamañjarī *et al.* Even though Kṛṣṇa is desired for oneself, his folk are even more to be desired for oneself because they are exclusively situated within amorous (*ujjvala*, lit., flaming) feelings. "Dwell in Vraja": if not possible (physically), then mentally. That such dwelling is to be done even while having the body of an aspirant is evident from the verse that follows.

"In the form of an aspirant": in whatever (ordinary) body one occupies (*yathāvasthitadehena*). "In an accomplished form": in a body suitable for serving face to face the most desired one meditated upon within. "By one desirous of their feelings": by one desiring to attain that feeling called amorous (*ujjvala*) which has as its objects (*viśaya*) Kṛṣṇa, who is one's own beloved, and as its subject (*āśraya*) the folk of Kṛṣṇa, who are desired for oneself. "Service" (*sevā*): serving (*paricaryā*) that is to be done with proper materials etc., both those presented mentally and those presented face to face. He indicated there the manner: "in emulation of the folk of Vraja"; in emulation of such Vraja folk as Śrī Rūpamañjarī and others who are to be limited in an accomplished form and such Vraja folk as Śrī Rūpa Gosvāmin and others who are to be imitated in an aspirant's form. And also to be considered as Vraja folk to be imitated as far as possible in the form of an aspirant are those persons who have attained a relationship with Kṛṣṇa (*prāptakṛṣṇasambandhin*), i.e., Candrakānti and others and the sages of the Daṇḍaka forest and the scriptures (*śrutayas*) known from the *Bṛhadvāmana Purāṇa*. "In emulation of them": with an eye to their respective worshipful services (*tattadācārādṛṣṭyā*).

Having spoken in two verses in this way about remembering and dwelling at Vraja he then spoke of hearing etc.: "Hearing, chanting of praises etc..." Also included by implication (*ākṣepalabdhāni*) are taking refuge at the feet of the *guru* etc. Without these (means) emulating the folk of Vraja etc. would in no way be possible. Then "by the wise": with wisdom, with discrimination; those (means) are to be done which are

appropriate to one's own feelings, but not those which are obstructive of them.

12. And among devotional practices these are not to be done even though enjoined in the Āgama scriptures: self-worship (*ahamgrahopāsana*), hand gestures (*mudrā*), installing gods in the body (*nyāsa*), meditating upon Dvārakā, worshipping Rukmiṇī *et al.* and other (such practices). The reason is that in this way of devotion, it is heard, there is no fault even if there be omission of some of the constituent parts (*aṅgavai-kalya*). As is said, "Having established himself upon which, o king, a man never falters, as one running here does not stumble, does not fall, even though he blink his eyes." There is fault, however, if there is omission of that which possesses the constituent parts (i.e., of passionate devotion as exercise, *rāgānugāsādhana*), as in the statement, "Having taken refuge in which forms of Bhāgavata dharma—hearing, chanting praises, etc.—..." and according to the *smṛti* statement, "Single minded devotion to Hari certainly would be tantamount to destruction if apart from the injunctions of *śruti*, *smṛti*, *purāṇa* and *pañcarātra*." If someone because of the idea that it is not right to neglect what is declared in scripture performs everything that is declared (including that) which is incompatible with one's own feelings even though the stimulus (*pravartakatva*) is longing, then he attains the status of being a follower (*parijanatva*) of one of the queens in Dvārakā city. As is said: "One who, experiencing intense desire for sexual union (*riramsāṃ suṣṭhu kurvan*), serves according to the entire (*kevalena*) way of injunctions attains the status of queen in the city." "Entire" (*kevala*): complete (*kṛtsna*), not omitting any constituent parts at all, not even those incompatible with one's own feelings, like worship of the queens, etc. *Kevala* is "an adjective meaning unique or complete" (*ekakṛtsnayoh*) according to Amara.

The interpretation (*vyākhyā*) does not follow that there is (attained) the status of a queen in the city (i.e., Dvārakā) via the entire way of injunctions and (some status) at Mathurā via

a combined (*miśreṇa*) (way). What form is there at Mathurā analogous to the status of queen in the city (*Dvārakā*)? If one should suggest being a follower of the hunchbacked woman then there would be an improper denigration of the results of combined enjoined devotion as compared with the results of entire enjoined devotion. If, on the strength of the text from the *Gopāla Tāpanī*—"The Lord together with Rāma, Aniruddha, Pradyumna and Rukmiṇī..."—it be concluded that the marriage with Rukmiṇī was at Mathurā and hence that there may be the status of attendant upon Rukmiṇī, such (an interpretation) would not be universally accepted. A second impropriety is: why should a worshipper of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa attain either the hunchback or Rukmiṇī? In fact service in the way of injunctions (*vidhimārgeṇa*) (when) stimulated by longing is called the way of passion (*rāgamārga*) and service in the way of injunctions (when) stimulated by injunctions is called the way of injunctions (*vidhimārga*, i.e., ritualistic devotion, *vaidhībhakti*). But service not related at all to injunctions is conducive to ruin according to the declarations of *śruti*, *smṛti* etc.

13. Next there is addressed the concern over which of the acts of worship (*bhajanāni*) are constituent parts of passionate devotion, of what character they are (*kīrtiśīlī*), what their essential forms (*svarūpāni*) are, how they are to be performed, or not performed. Acts of worship of five kinds are seen in scripture: those composed of one's most desired feelings (*svābhīṣṭabhāvamayāni*), those having a relationship with one's most desired feelings (*svābhīṣṭabhāvasambandhīni*), those harmonious with one's most desired feelings (*svābhīṣṭabhāvānu-kūlāni*), those not obstructive of one's most desired feelings (*svābhīṣṭabhāvaviruddhāni*), those obstructive of one's most desired feelings (*svābhīṣṭabhāvaviruddhāni*). Among them some have the form of accomplishing what is to be accomplished (*sādhyasāadhanarūpāni*), some are material causes (*upādāna-kāraṇāni*) of that which is to be accomplished (*sādhyā*), namely love (*preman*), some are instrumental causes (*nimittakāraṇāni*), some are signs of worship (*bhajanacihnāni*), some are helpful

factors (*upakāraṇāni*), some are harmful factors (*apakāraṇāni*), some are neutral (*taṭasthāni*). These will be presented as classified.

14. Among those the dutiful, the friendly, etc. are composed of one's most desired feelings, have the form of accomplishing what is to be accomplished; starting from taking refuge at the feet of a *guru*, (practices like) recitation of the mantra, meditation (*dhyāna*), etc. have a relationship with feelings because of being material causes of that which is to be accomplished; according to the statement, "Let him recite continuously with an undistracted mind," they are regular and necessary acts (*nityakṛtyāni*); they have a relationship with feelings by being material causes since one notices recitation of the mantra even by those who are to be emulated in an accomplished form (*siddharūpeṇānugamyamānām*), as in the statement of the *Gaṇodeśadīpikā*: "The great prayer, the name of Kṛṣṇa, which is in contact with what one most desires (*svābhīṣṭasamsargi*), is to be recited." "He, ruling all my senses, is the darling of the cowherd women." The name of Kṛṣṇa, in contact with what one most desires, is indeed the great prayer, the best of all mantras. According to the sense it is the mantra of eighteen or of ten syllables that is spoken of. Thus is the meaning of the statement from the *Gaṇodeśadīpikā* to be understood.

Remembering, hearing about, etc. the sports, qualities, forms and names that are appropriate to one's own feelings (*svīyabhāvocita*-) have relationship to feelings by virtue of being material causes. Accordingly: "Let one wander about without attachment and without embarrassment singing the names and forms that refer to him (i.e., to Kṛṣṇa)." According to such statements as, "Persons incessantly hear, sing, praise, remember and rejoice in what is beloved of you," these are to be done incessantly (*abhikṣṇakṛtyāni*). Here the subordination to chanting of praise (*kīrtana*) even of remembering, the chief (constituent part) in passionate devotion, must be affirmed as certain because of the authority of chanting of praise in this

(i.e., Kali) age and because it is propounded (*pratipādanāt*) as the very best by all scriptures in all paths of devotion.

The eleventh day fast, the eighth day birth festival and other observances (*vrata*) have the form of austerities (*taporūpāṇi*) because austerities are understood as cause of love according to the *śruti* texts being followed in the passage of the Ujjvala-nilamaṇi that goes : "Having performed austerities with faith (*śraddhā*), full of love, they were born in Vraja"; and because of the condemnation (*vigītatvāt*) of other austerity in this Kali (age) (implicit) in the statement of Bhagavān : "Whatever observance (*vrata*) is directed at me is austerity (*tapas*)." These are instrumental causes (*nimittakāraṇāṇi*) ; because it is heard that there is sin in their non-performance they are regular and necessary (*nitya*). In that context there is relationship with feelings in the performance of the eleventh day fast and there is the contracting of sin against the (divine) names (*nāmā-parādhā*) in its omission, since one hears of the (sin of) killing the guru etc. from statements of the Skanda etc., such as : "Killing of a mother, killing of a father, and likewise killing of a guru..." and (one hears of) contracting an indestructible kind of sin from the statement of the Viṣṇudharmottara : "Of the killer of a Brahman, of the drinker of liquor, of the thief, or of one who violates his guru's wife..." In view of all this condemnation it is (seen to be) extremely compulsory. What is more, it is seen from statements of the Skanda that the eleventh day fast is the characteristic mark (*lakṣaṇa*) of a Vaiṣṇava : "Of him who though having encountered the greatest peril or having arrived at the greatest bliss does not forgo the eleventh day fast is initiation (*dīkṣā*) (truly) Vaiṣṇavaite"; "He is truly called a Vaiṣṇava who has dedicated all his practices (*ācāra*) to Viṣṇu." But in view of the prohibition for Vaiṣṇavas against food not offered to Bhagavān, the statement, "If a Vaiṣṇava should eat on the eleventh day due to carelessness (*pramādataḥ*)..." is to be understood here as a prohibition even against food offered to Bhagavān.

There is instrumental causality in the *kārttika* observance to the extent that it is austerity, material causality to the extent

that it is hearing, chanting of praise etc. And especially from what is heard repeatedly in the remarks of Śrī Rūpa Gosvāmin, "Kārttikadevatā,...Kārttikadevī,...Ūrjjadevī,...Ūrjjeśvarī,..." it may be understood to be capable of attaining the blessed queens of Vṛndāvana.

According to the *smṛti* texts : "O Ambariṣa, always listen to the Bhāgavata recited by Śuka," it is declared that listening to the Śrī Bhāgavata is a regular and necessary duty. According to the statement in the twelfth book (of the Bhāgavata) which follows the words, "These remarks of the great ones have been spoken to you,"—namely, "One who much desires faultless devotion to Kṛṣṇa should always and incessantly listen to that fault-destroying recital of the virtues of the superlative one, which is recited always,"—hearing etc. of the deeds of Kṛṣṇa, one's beloved, who is related to the tenth book (of the Bhāgavata), are, as is applicable : required to be done always, required to be done incessantly, and related to feelings (of devotion).

Such symbolic supports (*dhāraṇāṇi*) as consecrated offerings (*nirmālya*), basil plant (*tulasī*), incense, sandal paste, garlands, clothing, etc. have a relationship to feelings. Symbolic supports such as garlands of *tulasī* wood, markings on the forehead with *gopīcandana* clay etc., names, hand gestures, ritualistic insignia (*ācaraṇacihna*) etc. are harmonious (*anukūlāṇi*) signs of being Vaiṣṇava. Service to, circumambulation about and prostration before the basil plant also are harmonious.

Acts of respect to cows, the sacred fig tree (*aśvattha*), the earth and Brāhmaṇas etc. are not obstructive of that feeling, are helpful factors. Service to Vaiṣṇavas is to be understood as having all the above mentioned characteristics. All these that have been enumerated are to be done.

Just as on the part of the queen of Vraja (Yasodā) there may be a higher priority of attention to the churned milk, curds, butter etc., which nourish him than to Kṛṣṇa in person, the one to be nourished, as (is evident) from (her) having gone in order to bring the milk for him after having set him aside though hungry and sucking milk from her breast ; so likewise

on the part of devotees experienced in the mood (*rasa*) (of devotion) who are progressing on the way of passion it is not improper for there to be greater attention paid to all those things which nourish than to the hearing, praising, etc. which are to be nourished.

Self-worship, installing deities in the body, hand gestures, meditation upon Dvārakā, rituals for the queens (*mahīśyarccana*) (of Dvārakā) etc. are harmful factors and are not to be done. Talk about, hearing of etc. other purāṇas are neutral.

The (mention of) material cause etc. in this context—even though there is no modification in devotion, its form being existence-consciousness-bliss—is due simply to the difficulty of analyzing (*durvitarkatvāt*). In devotional texts like, “In that context there are six feelings (*bhāva*), namely affectionate love (*sneha*) etc. which are expressions (*vilāsa*) of love (*preman*),” suggestion is effected (*vyāñjitam*) by means of the word “expression” (*vilāsa*), just as in treatises on mood (*rasaśāstra*) by means of words like “stimulant” (*vibhāva*). Here indeed it is purely to facilitate understanding that words like “material cause” have been used. May this be pardoned by the virtuous !

II

1. From this and other texts :—“He knows no loss, no exhaustion, no attachment to duties of his household, no cause for fear nor any anxiety at any time in any way ; surrounded by fine bodied girls who have made of the god of love their confidant (*svāṅgikṛtasuhṛdanaṅgābhīr*), Hari sports far into the night loudly in the woods of Vṛndā,”—it may be objected that it is not possible for the blessed son of the village chief, charmed by expressions (*vilāsamugdha*), of love (*preman*) by the blessed queens of Vṛndāvana, to be attentive anywhere else. And if this be the case, then by whom is serving (*paricaryā*), etc. being done by countless passionate devotees in sundry regions, to be accepted ? and by whom would entreaties, praises and recitations be heard ? If it be proposed : by a portion of him, by the supreme self (*paramātmān*), because of the unity of part and whole, such a resolution would be utter pain for such

passionate devotees of Kṛṣṇa. So what is the solution ? The statement of Śrīmad Uddhava is directly to the point (*sākṣāt*) : “O god, it indeed (*iva*) baffles my mind that you who always have self-awareness (*sadātmabodha*) which is neither dulled nor incomplete (*akumñhitākhaṇḍa*), the lord who is not inattentive should, as though simple, summon and inquire of me for advice.”

The meaning is this : having definitely summoned me for advice, for deliberations undertaken with regard to going forth for the killing of Jarāsandha and the royal consecration etc. that you should ask, “Uddhava, you must tell me what is to be done here” ; “you ask” (*prccheḥ*), i.e., you asked (*apṛcchaḥ*) ; “not dulled”, i.e., by time etc. ; “nor incomplete”, i.e., completely full ; “always”. i.e. in every respect ; just such awareness of self. He who possesses the all-knowing divine power (*samvicchakti*) asks as though simple, like any simple person. This is the meaning. This your simultaneous simplicity (*maugdhya*) and omniscience (*sārvajñya*) indeed (*eva*) baffles. Here the interpretation, “You are as though simple, but are not really simple ; it seems to baffle, but does not really,” is not the right interpretation because it contains a lack of meaning (*saṅgatyabhāvāt*) that would call for a pointless classification of it with such meaningless statements as “the works of one who is inactive,” “the birth of the unborn,” etc. And so, like simplicity amid the omniscience that prevails in the Dvārakā sport, omniscience amid the simplicity that prevails in the Vṛndāvana sport is to be understood as the accomplishment of his thought-transcending power. Thus it is described by Śrī Lilāśuka : “In omniscience and in simplicity this great sovereignty...”

2. In this context it is the imperceptive who say that omniscience is great majesty (*mahaiśvarya*), not sweetness (*mādhurya*) ; that the latter is the simplicity (*maugdhya*) of completely human sport, devoid of majesty.

3. Sweetness etc. are to be explained. Sweetness is the non-transgressing by great majesty of the limits of human sport both in its manifestation and in its non-manifestation. For

example : (when manifested) the sport of a human child with characteristic of sucking at the breast, even during the killing of Pūtanā ; the sport of a three month old child with very soft feet lying on his back, even while shattering a very hard wagon ; the despondency due to fear of the mother, even as very long ropes were proving insufficient to bind him ; the sport of tending cows, even while baffling Brahmā, Baladeva, *et al.*, even in the presence of omniscience. Likewise when majesty is present, but not manifested : the theft of milk and curds ; naughtiness with wives of cowherds, etc. According to the statement that sweetness is the simplicity of completely human sport devoid of majesty, the simplicity of ordinary human children boisterous at play would be sweetness ; but it is not to be so understood.

4. But majesty (*aiśvarya*) becomes a display of dominance (*iśvaratvāviṣkāra*) when there is disregard for (the limits of) human sport, as was said in showing majesty to (his) mother and father : "This form has been shown to you to mind former births ; otherwise knowledge of my being does not arise for one in mortal form," and as majesty was shown to Arjuna while saying, "See this my majestic form." And even in Vraja (by showing) more than a thousand four armed forms to Brahmā in the vision of "Lovely greatness" (*mañjumahimā*).

5. Awareness of majesty (*aiśvarya-jñāna*) is that which provokes extreme slackening of one's own feelings due to heart-palpating fear in the realization that this is the sovereign. Thus there is awareness of majesty lodged in a devotee, as indeed indicated by such statements of Vasudeva as, "You are not our sons, (but) the two primordial sovereign persons face to face," and the statement of Arjuna, "Whatever was said rashly with the idea that this is a friend..."

Awareness of sweetness (*mādhuryajñāna*) is that which promotes greater firmness of one's own feelings due to the absence of even a trace of heart-palpating fear even amid the discovery that this one is the sovereign. As, for instance, we learn of the absence of any slacking of the feeling of friendship (*sakhya-*

bhāva-) on the part of Śrīdāma, Subala, *et al.*, even at the sight of Brahmā, Indra, Nārada *et al.*, saluting Kṛṣṇa's feet, with praises, singing, instrumental music, worship, offering of presents at the time for leading the cattle toward the cow pen, according to the words of the Yugalagitā : "Which godlings, saluting with song, music and offerings, surrounded him..." and, "With feet being worshipped by the venerable on the road." Likewise there is not even a trace of slackening of parental devotion (*vātsalya*) by the queen of Vraja on account of the words of consolation from the lord of Vraja ; on the contrary, there is amid heartfelt rejoicing a firming up of feelings for the son : "Fortunate am I that this my son is the supreme sovereign" ! Similarly the affection of an ordinary (*prākṛta*) mother for her son grows ever more brilliant when her son becomes the sovereign of the earth. Thus there is to be understood a firming of the respective feelings of friends and of lovers : "Fortunate are we whose very friend is the supreme sovereign ;...whose beloved is the supreme sovereign."

However, awareness of majesty does not shine so fully when there is union (between friends, lovers, etc.), because of the cooling quality of union, which may be compared with moonlight ; but in separation the awareness of majesty shines fully because of the heating effect of separation, which is comparable to sunlight.

Because of the absence of heart-palpating fear, respect, etc. there is no awareness of majesty in this statement : "Enough of friendships with this black fellow who, though hunting was not his *dharma*, killed the monkey king like a hunter, though docile before his own wife, mutilated a lusting woman, (who) like a crow ensnared Bali and ate the offerings ; it is hard to put aside the import of his tales." Here there was no awareness on the part of the residents of Vraja prior to the lifting of Govardhana (hill) that Kṛṣṇa is sovereign. But even with the realization that this Kṛṣṇa is the sovereign, after the lifting of Govardhana and the journey to the realm of Varuṇa, it is pure awareness of sweetness, in the sense spoken of, that is full. And one does not hear on the part of the lord of Vraja (Nanda)

even when he was aware—thanks to the statements of Varuṇa and Uddhava—that the sovereign was immediately present, even slightly, even in the heart, any statement like, “Kṛṣṇa is not my son,” which would be comparable to Vasudeva’s statement, “You two are not our sons.” Thus it is that for those situated at Vraja it is in all respects pure awareness of sweetness that is full: for those situated in the city (Dvārakā) it is awareness of sweetness mixed with awareness of majesty that is full.

6. But, it may be objected, is it the case that Kṛṣṇa the son of Nanda in Vraja is aware of himself as sovereign, or not, in the way that Kṛṣṇa the son of Vasudeva in the city, even within human sport, is aware: “I am the sovereign”? If he is aware (the objection continues), then during the sport of tying with ropes etc, weeping due to fear of the mother etc. should not occur. To say that this and like behaviour is simply pretending would be an explanation of the dim witted, not of experienced devotees. If the experienced were to agree to such an interpretation then according to the statement, “It amazes me, this condition of you, whom fear itself fears, paralyzed by fear and worry, your face hidden, with eyes having mascara mixed with tears, when the cowherd woman placed ropes upon you who had been naughty,” certainly awareness of majesty is attested to here by Kuntī and the authenticity of the fear, as in “paralyzed by fear and worry,” is also certainly affirmed by her. If she knew that it was only pretending then amazement on her part would not occur; this is how it is to be understood.

If, however, he is not aware of his own sovereignty, then how is the eternal knowledge of him who is full of eternal knowledge and bliss covered over? To this it is said that just as nescience (*avidyā*), an operation of illusory power (*māyāvṛtti*), covers over the knowledge of living souls (*jīva*) in order to cause them to experience suffering after having cast them into the bondage of rebirths; and just as providential illusion (*yogamāyā*), an operation of the conscious power

(*cicchaktivṛtti*), covers over even the knowledge of Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s retinue, the queen of Vraja *et al.*, who are beyond the material elements (*guṇātīta*), in order to enable them to experience the joys of the most sweet sports of Śrī Kṛṣṇa; so likewise to enable Śrī Kṛṣṇa, even though his essential form is bliss, to experience even more bliss the essential operation of the conscious power (*cicchaktisāravṛtti*), i.e., love (*preman*), covers over his knowledge. There is no failing in its (i.e., Kṛṣṇa’s knowledge) omnipresence (*vyāpti*) since love pertains to his essential power (*tatsvarūpaśaktitvāt*). Similarly nescience binds the living soul by its own operation, egoness (*māmatā*), in order to make it suffer; similarly the binding of the body of a blameworthy person is by means of ropes, chains etc. and the binding of the body of an honorable person is with articles of worship (*argha*), scents, fine clothes, turban, etc. In sum, the living soul under the influence of nescience is sorrowful; Kṛṣṇa under the influence of love is most happy. Kṛṣṇa’s love-enveloped form is to be understood as a special enjoyment of pleasure (*sukhaviśeṣabhoga*) as is the form of a honey bee enveloped by the corolla of a lotus. Thus it is said, “O Lord, do not depart from the lotus heart of your people,” and “Lotus foot (*aṅghripadma*) held by the cords of love...”

Moreover, just as there is ordained a five-fold gradation of pain on the part of a living soul corresponding to the gradation of coverings of knowledge due to nescience’s own gradation (*tāratamya*), so likewise there is ordained an unlimited gradation of pleasure for one’s object (*viśaya*) and subject (*āśraya*) (i.e., Kṛṣṇa and the *Gopīs*) according to the gradations of coverings of knowledge, majesty, etc. by love with its gradations. In that sense love combined with knowledge and majesty situated in Devakī *et al.* does not give joy so exceedingly as does complete love situated in Śrī Yaśodā *et al.* which covers over knowledge and majesty and, binding by the cords of mineness its object and subject, renders each under the influence of the other. Therefore, Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the presence of the queen of Vraja *et al.*, charmed by their parental and other love, is not even aware of his own sovereignty.

That omniscience of his, however, that is seen at the time of arrival of various demons, forest fires and such calamities is to be understood as manifested precisely by that power of sport (*līlāśakti*) which does what is needed for protecting the various loving followers. But even at times of simplicity omniscience in respect of accepting worshipful service etc. of aspiring devotees is accomplished through thought-transcending power (*acintyaśaktisiddha*); this has been explained before. Thus indeed have the distinction between the way of ritual and the way of passion, the distinction between majesty and sweetness, and the distinction between awareness of majesty and awareness of sweetness been made clear. And even the distinction between love of one's own (*svakīyā*, i.e., marital love) and love of another's (*parakīyā*, i.e., extra-marital love) has been elaborated in the explanations of the Ujjvalanīlamanī. In that context one attains awareness of majesty and the undifferentiated feelings of love of one's own and love of another's in Goloka in the great Vaikuṇṭha (heaven) through worship of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa in the way of rituals (*vidhimārga*). When there is longing for the sweet feelings (*madhurabhāvalobhitva*) one attains awareness of sweetness mixed with awareness of majesty and the feelings of love of one's own by virtue of being a follower of Satyabhāmā—due to the identity of Śrī Rādhā and Satyabhāmā—in the realm of Dvārakā through worship in the way of injunctions (rituals). One attains pure awareness of sweetness and the feelings of love of another's by virtue of being a follower of Śrī Rādhā (*śrīrādhāparikaratva*) in the realm of Vraja through worshipping in the way of passion.

Even though Śrī Rādhā is the joy-giving power (*hlādinīśakti*) born of the essential form (*svarūpabhūtā*) of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, and Śrī Kṛṣṇa is her very own (husband), still they are to be worshipped in conjunction with sport (*līlāsahita*) and not apart from sport; but nowhere in scripture composed by the seers (*ārṣa-śāstra*) has there been mentioned any marriage for them in the realm of Vraja. Rādhā indeed is another's (wife) in both unveiled and veiled manifestations (*prakaṭāprakaṭaprakāśa*); this in brief is the conclusion of all exegesis.

7. Next is presented the procedure for attaining face to face what is most desired by a person of passionate devotion who has ascended to the stage of love (*preman*) after (having reached) aversion from the worthless (*anarthanivṛtti*), devotedness (*nīṣṭhā*), relish (*ruci*), and attachment (*āśakti*). As is said in the Ujjvalanīlamanī: "Those persons who are passionately bound by that feeling are attentive in spiritual exercises (*sādhana*); having acquired through eagerness an intensity of passion adequate for it, they were born from time to time alone or in two's or three's in Vraja." "Intensity of passion" (*anurāgaugha*) (means) eagerness for passionate worship (*rāgānugābhajanautkaṇṭhya*), not the permanent emotion (*sthāyin*) of constant passion (*anurāga*), because it is impossible that constant passion should arise in the body of an aspirant. "They were born in Vraja" means that just as at the time of a descent (of Kṛṣṇa) the eternally beloved ones *et al.* take birth, so likewise those whose exercises have achieved accomplishment take birth in the wombs of cowherd women. And then, thanks to the greatness of association with the eternally accomplished and other cowherd women who possess the great feeling ("essential love of Rādhā," Klostermaier) (*mahābhāva*) and by means of seeing, hearing, chanting of praise etc., there are produced in that body of a cowherd woman even affectionate love (*sneha*), jealous love (*māna*), unhesitating love (*praṇaya*), passion (*rāga*), constant passion (*anurāga*) and the great feeling (*mahābhāva*); this is because it is impossible for these to arise in the body of an aspirant in a prior birth.

Then there are the unusual characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) of Kṛṣṇa's beloved ones in Vraja, as is said: "There was extreme delight at the sight of Govinda, for the cowherd women, for whom a moment without whom (Kṛṣṇa) was like an aeon," and, "Absence becomes an aeon for those not seeing you." Considering a moment to be as long as a hundred aeons is a characteristic of the great feeling (*mahābhāva*). It may be objected: in a veiled manifestation one may attain the feelings of affectionate love etc. from association with eternally

accomplished cowherd women upon attaining the body of a cowherd woman even without being born from the womb of a cowherd woman after the dissolution of the body of an aspirant who has ascended to the plane of love ; what do you say ? is this so or not ? (response) Not at all. Without birth from the womb of a cowherd woman there would be no customary relationships (*vyavahāra*) of human sport defined in such terms as : whose daughter is this female friend ? whose daughter-in-law ? whose wife ? If it be stressed that the birth is in a veiled manifestation ? By no means. Because it (i.e., a veiled manifestation of Vṛndāvana) is a realm exclusively for the accomplished (*kevalasiddhabhūmi*)—as is known from there being seen no entry by aspirants and materialistic persons (*prāpañcikaloka*) into any manifestation of Vṛndāvana which is invisible to the material world (*prapañcagocara*), there being seen entrance only by the accomplished—affectionate love (*sneha*) etc. feelings do not come to fruition there quickly by one's respective exercises (*svasvasādhana*). Therefore devotees in whom love has taken birth are brought by providential illusion (*yogamāyā*) into a manifestation of Vṛndāvana that is visible to the material world at the time of a descent of Śrī Kṛṣṇa for the sake of bringing to accomplishment those feelings after birth there, but before making contact with the limbs of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. From the sight of entrance therein by aspiring devotees, by persons caught up in work etc. (*karmiprabhṛti*), and also by accomplished devotees it may be realized that it has the qualities of a realm for aspirants and of a realm for the accomplished.

It may be objected : then where would extremely eager devotees stay for so long a time ? To this it may be said : at the time of dissolving of the aspirant body there is at once (*sakṛt*) granted by the mercy of Bhagavān to that loving devotee, who is greatly eager with the long held desire for face to face service, a view of himself with his retinue and that desirable service, even though he has not attained affectionate love (*sneha*) and the other levels of love ; as, for instance, (was granted) to Nārada. And a body of a cowherdess, made of

consciousness and bliss, is given. And that very body is born by the agency of providential illusion (*yogamāyā*) from the womb of a cowherd woman in an unveiled manifestation of Vṛndāvana at the time of appearance of Kṛṣṇa's entourage. There is not a trace of delay in this because there is no interruption even of unveiled sport. Thus there is always an appearing of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his entourage, even at the time of dissolution of the body of an aspiring loving devotee, in the respective Vraja realm in whatever universe (*brahmāṇḍa*) there is the unveiling of Vṛndāvana sports at that time.

Hail, hail, greatly impassioned eager devotees ! do not fear ! be steadfast ! it is well with you.

8. "O delighter in sport, O bee lusting after the buds of devotion, O treasure house of simplicity and omniscience, O darling of the cattle village, obeisance to thee.' You said, O Lord, "I give that mental discipline (*buddhiyoga*) by means of which they come to me." Thus I ask for this : "O son of the chief of the cowherds, give me the mental discipline whereby there may be servitude to you who are adorned with the breasts of cowherd women."

Those who say that passionate devotion is in all respects and at all times beyond the injunctions of scripture are worthy of reproach and repeatedly are experiencing, have experienced and will experience disaster, according to such statements from the Gītā as, "Those who having rejected the injunctions of scripture make sacrifices with faith..." and without injunction, unoffered food..." Enough of this over-elaboration.

Ah ! may devotees of clear intellect discover by means of this Moonbeam the way of passion which is difficult even for the gods to see.

Thus is completed the 'Moonbeam on the Way of Passion' (Rāgavartmacandrikā) by the great scholar, the gentleman, Śrī Viśvanātha Cakravartin.