

Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅgau Jayataḥ

Acintya-Bhedābheda

“Simultaneous Oneness and Difference”

An essay in refutation of *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* by Śrīyūta Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda

By

Ācārya Keśarī Śrī Śrīmad Bhakti Prajñāna Keśava Gosvāmī Mahārāja

Translated from *Śrī Gauḍīya Patrikā*, Years 9 and 10 (1957–1958)



Foreword

Far be it from ordinary mortals to discuss the disagreements that may exist between higher beings. However, the higher beings themselves may disagree for reasons that are often beyond our ken. There are few as qualified as Śrī Śrīmad Bhakti Prajñāna Keśava Mahārāja to engage in such higher educational purposes, and he does so in this review, clearly enough, for the betterment of all.

Indeed, for the sake of *siddhānta* and *sampradāya*, for their very preservation, His Divine Grace refutes Śrī Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya's covert motives, even though these motives are clothed, externally, in the relishable guise of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava philosophy. Indeed, a subject as profound as *Acintya-bhedābheda*, originally articulated by Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī in his *Paramātmā Sandarbha* 78 (*Sarva-saṁvādinī*), should never have been besmirched with veiled malevolence, dragged, as we see here, through the streets of mundane rationalization, while beaten in the multiple marketplaces of self-interest.

Nonetheless, Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda, in his tripartite work, i.e., *Gauḍīya Darśanera Itihāsa o Vaiśiṣṭya, Gauḍīyāra Tina Ṭhākura*, and, here, too, in *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* — referred to as the three spears of a trident, but which might more effectively be seen as a pitchfork — has done just that, and Śrīla Bhakti Prajñāna Keśava Gosvāmī Mahārāja appropriately takes him to task for it. In doing so, His Divine Grace thoroughly lays out the history of the Gauḍīya Maṭha, the philosophy of *bhakti*, and the importance of fidelity to the Brahma-Mādhva Gauḍīya lineage.

Suffice it to say, there is much to glean, both positive and negative, from Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda's original work, even though it prompted this learned and passionate retaliation from Śrīla Bhakti Prajñāna Keśava Gosvāmī Mahārāja. That said, reading the latter's review will no doubt suffice, giving the essence of the original while carrying what it lacks, preserving what it has, and consolidating the integrity of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism."

—Steven J. Rosen (Satyarāja Dāsa),
disciple of Śrīla A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami
Prabhupāda, author of numerous Vaiṣṇava books,
associate editor of *Back to Godhead*, and founding
editor of the *Journal of Vaiṣṇava Studies*

Contents

Prathama Siddhānta	8
Maṅgalācaraṇa	8
Prabandhera Preraṇā “The Inspiration for This Essay”	15
Dvitiya Siddhānta	17
Ananta, Sundarānanda, and Haridāsa	17
Sundarānanda	17
Ananta Vāsudeva	21
Haridāsa Dāsa	22
Purīdāsa’s Cleverness in Compilation	23
Śrī Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā and Śrī Śrīnātha Cakravartī	26
Tṛtiya Siddhānta	30
Going Against Proper Etiquette	30
The Publisher’s Maṅgalācaraṇa	32
Maṅgalācaraṇa in the Vedas and Upaniṣads	35
Maṅgalācaraṇa of the Sūtrakāras	36
Discernment of Namaskāra in the Kātantra	38
Refutation of Dayānanda’s Conceptions on Maṅgalācaraṇa	38
Sāṅkhya Philosophy on Maṅgalācaraṇa	39
Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam on Śiṣṭācāra (Etiquette)	41
Caturtha Siddhānta	44
Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī’s Adherence to Madhva in his Maṅgalācaraṇa	44
Śrī Jīva’s Loyalty to Śrī Madhva in Tattva-sandarbhā	52
Vidyāvinoda’s Claim of Disparity and the Refutation Thereof	57
“Sva-sampradāya-sahastrādhidaiva” and “Samsārārṇava-taraṇī”	63

Pañcama Siddhānta	69
A Special, Widely Preached Vaiṣṇava doctrine	73
The Use of the Word 'Viśeṣa'	76
Difference of Mata is Not Reason for a Difference of Sampradāya	79
Answering Sundarānanda's Questions about Mādhva-Gauḍīya Sampradāya	95
Śrīman Mahāprabhu's "Sale of His soul"	107
Līlā o Itihāsa "Pastimes and History"	117
Śrī Madhvācārya's Rāma-Sītā	121

Prathama Siddhānta

First Conclusion

Maṅgalācaraṇa¹

*vande 'ham śrī guroḥ śrī-yūta-pada-kamalaṁ śrī-gurun vaiṣṇavāmś ca
 śrī rūpaṁ sāgrajātaṁ saha-gaṇa-raghunāthānviṭaṁ taṁ sa-jīvam
 sādvaitaṁ sāvadhūtaṁ parijana-sahitaṁ kṛṣṇa-caitanya-devaṁ
 śrī-rādhā-kṛṣṇa-pādān saha-gaṇa-lalitā-śrī-viśākhānviṭāmś ca*

(Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Antya 2.1)

I first venerate the *śrīmat-caraṇa-saroja*, or divine and beautiful lotus feet, of the *śrī-mantra-dīkṣā-gurus* and *bhajana-sīkṣā-gurus*, of the *guru-varga*, the lineage of *parama* and *parātpara-gurus* headed by Śrīmat Ānanda-tīrtha and Śrīman Mādhavendra Purī, of the various *bhāgavata* devotees who appeared in the course of the four *yugas*, as well as the lotus feet of Rūpāgraja (Rūpa's elder brother) Śrīmat Sanātana Gosvāmī, of Śrī Rūpa Gosvāmī, of his intimate follower Śrī Raghunātha Dāsa Gosvāmī and of his specially favored Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī, and of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya Mahāprabhu accompanied by His associates, headed by Śrī Advaita

¹ The author, Paramahansa-svāmī Śrī Śrīmad Bhakti Prajñāna Keśava Mahārāja outlines the subject of this 'Acintya-bhedābheda' book by this very *maṅgalācaraṇa* verse and several *upasaṁhāra-māṅgalya* (concluding invocation) verses of his own composition. And alongside that, he is establishing that the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava followers of Śrīman Mahāprabhu are followers of the Śrī Brahma-Mādhva-Gauḍīya Sampradāya.

and the Avadhūta Śrī Nityānanda Prabhu. I then bow before all the Sakhīs and Mañjarīs and the lotus feet of Śrī Śrī Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, accompanied by Lalitā and Viśākhā.²

(Translated in the Bengali from Jagad-guru Śrīla Sarasvatī Ṭhākura's *Anubhāṣya*)

namaḥ om viṣṇupādāya kṛṣṇa-preṣṭhāya bhūtale
śrimate bhaktisiddhānta-sarasvatīti nāmine
śrī vārṣabhānavī-devī-dayitāya kṛpābdhaye
kṛṣṇa-sambandha-vijñāna-dāyine prabhava namaḥ
mādhuryojjala-premāḍhya-śrī-rūpānuga-bhaktida
śrī gaura-karuṇa-śakti-vigrahāya namo'stu te
namaste gaura-vāṇī-śrī-mūrttaye dīna-tāriṇe
rūpānuga-viruddhāpasiddhānta-dhvānta-hāriṇe

(Śrī Gauḍīya Patrikā Year 1, Issue 2)

I bow to He who is the dearly beloved of Kṛṣṇa, Om Viṣṇupāda Śrīmad Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī—who is renowned throughout the world by this name. He is an ocean of mercy, replete with all potency to bestow scientific knowledge of relationship with Kṛṣṇa, and who is very dear to Vārṣabhānavī Śrī Rādhārāṇī. I bow to he who is the bestower of *mādhurya-ujjala-prema-bhakti* in the line of Śrī Rūpa and who is the personified form of Śrī Gaurasundara's energy of compassion (*karuṇā-śakti*). I offer my obeisance to him (that Jagad-guru Śrīla Sarasvatī Prabhupāda) who is the *vāṇī-vigraha*, or personification of Śrī Gaurasundara's holy message, the deliverer of the fallen, and who removes the darkness of the misconceptions that oppose the Rupānuga tradition (the Acintya-bhedābheda *siddhānta*, or conclusive philosophy, approved by the Brahma-Mādhva-Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas)

namo bhaktivinodāya saccidānanda-nāmine
gaura-śakti-svarūpāya rupānuga-varāya te

² The translations of the *maṅgalācaraṇa* verses have been provided by Śrī Śrīmad Bhaktivedānta Vāmana Gosvāmī Mahārāja.

(Śrī Gauḍīya Patrikā 1st Year, 1st Issue)

I offer my obeisance to Saccidānanda Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura, who is the embodied personality of Gaurasundara's potency and is revered by the Vaiṣṇavas who are followers of Śrī Rūpa Gosvāmī.

*nānā śāstra-vicāraṇaika-nipuṇau sad-dharma-saṁsthāpakau
bhūtvā dīna-gaṇeśakau karuṇayā kaupīna-kanthāśritau
ānandāmbudhi-varধানaika-nipunau kaivalya-nistāarakau
vande rūpa-sanātanau raghu-yugau śrī-jīva-gopālakau*

(Śrī Śad-Gosvāmyaṣṭakam 2, 4, 3)

They who are supremely expert in deliberating various scriptures and who are establishers of true dharma ... who mercifully became the protectors of the fallen and destitute, donning *kaupīna* (loincloth) and *kanthā* (simple outer garment) ... who are extremely expert at expanding the ocean of bliss and who are protectors of all *jīvas*, saving them from *kaivalya-mukti* (impersonal liberation)—I offer my obeisance unto those Gosvāmīs, namely Śrī Rūpa, Sanātana, Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, Raghunātha Dāsa, and Śrī Jīva.

*jayo navadvīpa-nava-pradīpah, svabhāva-pāṣaṇḍa-gajaika-simhah
sva-nāma-śikṣā-japa-sūtradhārī, caitanya-candro bhagavān murārīḥ*

(By one *mahājana*)

Glory be to Bhagavān Murāri Śrī Caitanya-candra, who is the fresh *pradīpa*, or sacred flame, of Navadvīpa, who by nature is like a lion subduing the multitudes of heretics and hypocrites. He teaches the performance of loud, limitless (*asaṅkhyāt*) *kīrtana* of the sixteen-name *tāraka-brahma-nāma* and carries a rosary of knotted cloth for the *japa* of *mahā-mantra*.

*yasya prabhā prabhavato jagad-aṇḍa-koṭi,
koṭiṣvaśeṣa-vasudhādi-vibhūti-bhinnam*

tad-brahma-niṣkalam-anantam-aśeṣa-bhūtam
govindam ādi-puruṣam tam aham bhajāmi

(Spoken by Śrī Brahmā himself—*Brahma-saṁhitā* 5.40)

I worship that original Person, Govinda, whose effulgence produces (or suffuses) the indivisible, ceaseless, infinite *brahma*, which is distinct from the infinite splendor (or opulence) of infinite Earthly planets within millions and millions of material universes.

(From Śrī Ṭhākura Bhaktivinoda's *Amṛta-pravāha-bhāṣya*)

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

(By Śrī Vyāsa himself—*Bhāgavata* 1.1.1)

The genesis, stasis and annihilation of this world is effected by that Supreme Lord in direct and indirect ways. That Supreme Lord is fully cognizant in His agency over the world. Within Him exists self-evident knowledge itself, and He has initiated the intelligence of the original poet Brahmā, thereby manifesting *tattva-vastu*, the objects of reality, via his mind. Indra and other demigods are bewildered by the Supreme Lord, just as fire, water, and earth are perceived to truly be one or another of those same elements. Likewise, though the material modes of *sattva*, *rajaḥ*, and *tamo* appear to truly be present within that Supreme Lord, in reality it is impossible for any sort of material function to exist within Him. Never is there any existence of deceit in that Supreme Person. We meditate on that Supreme Lord, who is characterized as the Personality of Absolute Truth (*satya-svarūpa-lakṣaṇa-maya* Parameśvara).

(Translation by Śrīla Sarasvatī Ṭhākura of *Bhāgavata* 1.1.1)

devakī-nandana nanda-kumāra vṛndāvanāñcana gokula-candra
kanda-phalāśana sundara-rūpa nandita-gokula vandita-pāda

(By Śrīla Madhvācārya—*Dvādaśa-stotra* 6.5)

O son of Yaśodā, who is known as Devakī, O son of Nanda Mahārāja, You who play in Vṛndāvana, the moon of Gokula, eater of *kanda* fruit [a large, sweet, nutritious root that grows around Govardhana], whose form is so very beautiful, who delights Gokula, and is venerated by all—I bow to You.

*yasya brahmeti sañjñām kvacid api nigame yāti cinmātra-sattā-
py-amśo yasyāmsakaiḥ svair vibhavati vaśayann eva māyām pumāms ca
ekam yasyaiva rūpaṁ vilasati parama-vyomni nārāyaṇākhyam
sa śrī-kṛṣṇo vidhattām svayam iha bhagavān prema tat-pāda-bhājām*

(By Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī—*Tattva-sandarbha* 8)

In some places in the Vedas, just the existential feature of His *cit* aspect is referred to as *brahma*. His portional expansion as the Puruṣa dominates the illusory energy of *māyā* and manifests a pastime of majesty throughout His expansions. His form known as Nārāyaṇa sports in the spiritual sky, Paravyoma. May that original Supreme Personality of Godhead, Śrī Kṛṣṇa, offer *prema* for Him to those who perform *bhajana* of His sacred feet.

(From Śrī Satyānanda Gosvāmī's *Tattva-sandarbha*, published 1318 [Baṅgāba])

*yad advaitam brahmopaniṣadi tad apy asya tanubhā
ya ātmāntaryāmī puruṣa iti so'syāmśa-vibhavaḥ
ṣaḍ-aiśvaryaḥ pūrṇo ya iha bhagavān sa svayam ayam
na caitanyāt kṛṣṇāj jagati para-tattvaṁ paramiha*

(By Śrīla Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja—*Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, Ādi 1.3)

What the Upaniṣads refer to as *advaita-brahma*, or nondifferentiated divinity, is the bodily splendor of my Prabhu [Lord]. He who is referred to in the Yoga scriptures as the Antaryāmī Puruṣa, or Paramātmā, is the portional expansion of my Prabhu. He who is referred to as

Bhagavān, who is the refuge and source of *brahma* and *Paramātmā* and who is replete with all six opulences of divinity is my Prabhu, *Svayaṁ Bhagavān* [the Supreme Personality of Godhead Himself].

(From Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura's *Amṛta-pravāha-bhāṣya* on *Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta*)

satyānantācintya-śaktyeka-pakṣe, sarvādhyakṣe bhakta-rakṣāti-dakṣe
śrī govinde viśva-sargādi-kande, pūrṇānande nityam āstām matir me

(By Śrīla Baladeva—*Gītā-bhūṣaṇa-bhāṣya* 1.1)

The one truth, the infinite, the possessor of inconceivable potency, the controller of all, most expert in protecting the devotees, the root of *Svarga* and all material universes, and the form of total bliss—may that Śrī Govinda remain forever within my consciousness.

cil-līlā-mithunaṁ tattvaṁ bhedābhedaṁ-acintyakam
śakti-śaktimator-aikyam yuga-padvarttate sadā

tattvaṁ ekam param vidyāl-līlāyā tad-dvidhā sthitam
gauraḥ kṛṣṇaḥ svayaṁ hy etad ubhāv ubhayam āpnutaḥ

saguṇaḥ nirguṇaṁ tattvaṁ ekam evādvitīyakam
sarva-nitya-guṇair-gauraḥ kṛṣṇo rasastu nirguṇaiḥ

śrī-kṛṣṇaṁ mithunaṁ brahma tyaktvā tu nirguṇaṁ hi tat
upāsate mṛṣā vijñāḥ yathā tuṣāvaghātinaḥ

śrī-vinoda-bihārī yo rādhayā milito yadā
tadāhaṁ vandanaṁ kuryāt sarasvatī-prasādataḥ

(By the author—*Śrī Rādhā-Vinoda-bihārī Tattvāṣṭakam* 3, 4, 6, 7, 8)

Śakti and Śaktimān, identical twin principles of divine interplay [*cil-līlā-mithuna-tattva*] are situated together for all eternal time in a way that is inconceivably one and different. In other words, the *para-tattva-vastu*, the reality that comprises the supreme principle, is never deprived of potency; in that *tattva*, Śakti and Śaktimān exist eternally as one. They are fully conscious [*pūrṇa-cetana-maya*], the topmost personality that embodies divine interaction [*Līlā-Puruṣottama*], the Original Divine Pair [*Svayaṁ Mithuna-vigraha*] or, in other words, the ultimate combined form of male and female, or Śakti and Śaktimān. That *mithuna-vigraha* is Śrī Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa, or Śrī Gaura-tattva. Within Them, these contradictory roles are eternally extant in simultaneous difference and nondifference by effect of inconceivable potency. Know that Para-tattva [the Supreme Principle] is one, but that one reality is situated in two variations by the influence of *līlā*; as is the case with Śrī Gaura and Śrī Kṛṣṇa. They are Themselves that *tattva-vastu*, which is to say Śrī Gaura is Kṛṣṇa Himself and both of Them achieve a duality. In other words, Śrī Gaurasundara becomes Śrī Kṛṣṇasundara and Śrī Kṛṣṇasundara also becomes Śrī Gaurasundara. *Saguṇa* and *nirguṇa-tattva* are one and nondual. Śrī Gaurasundara is *rasa-svarūpa*, the embodiment of *rasa*, via the aggregation of all eternal *sad-guṇa*, or transcendental qualities, whereas Śrī Kṛṣṇa, in the *nirguṇa* aspect, in the absence of all *guṇa*, or material designations, is the *rasa-svarūpa*; in other words, that *vastu* is *rasa* itself. *Rasa* is *nirguṇa* and *aprākṛta*, or supramundane; it is never conditioned by material qualities. Śrī Kṛṣṇa, or Gaura, is the *mithuna-brahma*. Discarding Him (or His *bhajana*), the false erudite *jñānīs*, who are actually ignorant persons, worship the *nirguṇa* impersonal *brahma* like people thrashing empty husks. In other words, just as people thrashing empty husks in the hope of reaping grains of rice are engaging in futile toil, the *jñānīs* give up Kṛṣṇa's service and willfully accept the futile worship of *nirguṇa-brahma*. In other words, their strenuous endeavours will never lead to real *mokṣa*. As Śrī Vinoda-bihārī Kṛṣṇa meets with Śrī Rādhā, by the mercy of Śrīla Sarasvatī (by the mercy of the author's Śrī Gurudeva), I propitiate and glorify Them in this manner.

‘ananta’-‘sundarānanda’-‘hari’-guru-virodhinām
daityānām dalanam vande gaura-vāṇī-vinodakam

(By the author)

I venerate *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* and the scriptures that follow its guidance as *vāṇī-vinodakas* (delightful expressions of the holy word) of Śrīman Mahāprabhu, who embodies triumph over the demons who are inimical the infinite [*ananta*], beautiful embodiment of bliss [*sundarānanda*], Śrī Hari and *guru*.

Alternatively: I venerate Śrīla Gaura-kiśora, vāṇī or Śrīla Sarasvatī Ṭhākura, and Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura, who are the personifications of the demolition of Ananta Vāsudeva, and the writer of *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* and other books, Sundarānanda, as well as Haridāsa Bābājī of Navadvīpa’s Haribola Kuṭīra and other *daitya* antagonists of my *gurus*.

Prabandhera Preraṇā “The Inspiration for This Essay”

It is with great sadness that I divulge that some days ago I read a book titled “*Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*”, which I found to be rather heart-rending. The author of this book is Śrīyūta Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda. This writer has written two other books with the same intention. Those two books are titled “*Gauḍīya Darśanera Itihāsa o Vaiśiṣṭya*” (The History and Specialities of Gauḍīya Philosophy) and “*Gauḍīyāra Tina Ṭhākura*” (The Three Masters of the Gauḍīyas)”. The *Gauḍīya Darśana* book is almost 500 pages, and *Gauḍīyāra Tina Ṭhākura* concludes at a little more than 600 pages. The *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* book is almost 400 pages, including the appendix. Though outwardly these three books have three different titles, they are essentially one book. Though they have some rudimentary differences, those are not worthy of mention at present. The purpose and subject of these three books is, at their root, one and the same. Therefore, of the three aforementioned books, I have at present set about a critical review of only *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, because if this book is critiqued, no other lengthy critique of the other two books will be necessary.

Although in some places the author’s efforts in writing and collecting historical information from various places is praiseworthy, when I say “critical review”, I mean I intend to focus on refuting this *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* book. Last year (on the 6th of Pauṣa 1363 Baṅgābda or Friday, 21 December 1956), while delivering a lecture on the occasion of Śrī Śrīmad Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Gosvāmī Ṭhākura’s disappearance day during a special conference of the Śrī Gauḍīya Vedānta Samiti at Chunchura’s Śrī Uddhāraṇa Gauḍīya Maṭha, I presented to those present something of a refutation related to the aforementioned three books. In this book, Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has tried to prove that *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* is *advaya-vādī* [monist] and that *kaivalya* [“ultimate solitude”] is the objective it promotes—which is to say that *acintya-bhedābheda* is not the philosophy of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. Tridaṇḍisvāmī Śrīmad Bhaktivedānta Vāmana Mahārāja has published the aforementioned refutational speech in the

(monthly) *Śrī Gauḍīya Patrikā*, Year 8, Issue 12, pages 462–470, in an article³ titled “Śrīla Ācāryadevera Vaktṛtā.” Pages 465 and 466 therein are especially worth deliberation. Several of my truth-seeking, intellectually keen friends read this article and encouraged me with special delight to deliver an extensive refutation of those books. And they requested that I shed light on what the real *acintya-bhedābheda-tattva* is. I am writing this article to fulfill their wishes, and those of various other devotees, and to shed light on the real philosophical truths of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava world, because I know this to be the best *guru-sevā* I can render. I hope that

³ The article referred to above has been quoted below for the convenience of the readers:

Ananta Vāsudeva and Sundarānanda were not able to grasp even a drop of Śrīla Prabhupāda’s *kathā*. Though they stayed in Śrīla Prabhupāda’s proximity, the extent of their distance from him cannot even be determined. We are seeing that their fate is a much more wretched, detestable, and miserable fate than befell Kālā Kṛṣṇadāsa despite living with Śrīman Mahāprabhu. What more degraded fate can there be for a man than *guru-drohitā*, or treacherous acts toward one’s *guru*. One does not become a *guru-sevaka* just by staying in the proximity of Śrīla Guru-pādapadma. Śrīla Prabhupāda has shown us the example of this through the character of these two *dānavas*.

Sundarānanda has created a world of mess by writing three books entitled ‘*Gauḍīyāra Tina Ṭhākura*’, ‘*Acintya-bhedābheda*’ and ‘*Gauḍīya Darśanera Itihāsa*’. With these three books, shafts have been shot into the chests of Śrīman Mahāprabhu and Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī. These three books are three spears or a trident. With these, the immaculate flow of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava thought has been slain. This trident has been created from the venomous seed of murderous intent directed at Hari, *guru*, and Vaiṣṇavas. We will discuss these three books one by one. Sundarānanda has also written another book entitled *Mahā-mantra* that is full of heresy. Therein he has forbidden the *kīrtana* of the *harināma mahā-mantra*. We had resolved not to judge such *daityas* and *dānavas* during the age of Kali, but as we proceed to discuss the life of Śrīla Prabhupāda on his disappearance day, we are being reminded of just what sort of *daityas* and *dānavas* have been created in this world in his absence.

In the age of Kali, the one path to deliverance is the loud *kīrtana* of *mahā-mantra*. Vāsudeva and Sundarānanda are antagonists of *śrī nāma-kīrtana*. The sixteen-name, thirty-two syllable *mantra* is forever and in every respect *kīrtaniya* [“to be sung”] in a loud voice, maintaining a fixed number of rounds [*saṅkhyāt*] and, beyond that, chanting the holy names innumerable times [*asaṅkhyāt*]. This is the Rūpānuga Bhaktivinoda-dhārā and this is Śrīla Prabhupāda’s teaching. These two *daityas* have joined forces and crafted a trident, wherein they have tried to prove that *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* is *advaya-vādi* and *kaivalya* is its only objective, and that *acintya-bhedābheda* is not the philosophy of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. They have used the statement ‘*yaj-jñānam-advayam*’ not to convey *acintya-bhedābheda*, but rather *advayatva* [nondualism]. With the statement ‘*kaivalyaika-prayojanam*’, they have tried to establish that *kaivalya* is the ultimate goal instead of *kṛṣṇa-prema*. We, under the guidance of Mahāprabhu, know *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* sheds light on *acintya-bhedābheda-tattva* and we accept that *kṛṣṇa-prema* is the only *prayojana*. These two *dānavas*, two fake ascetics that they are, have committed offenses at the feet of the crest-jewel of supremely liberated *ācāryas*, the ocean of mercy, Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, and have thus chosen *dānavatā* [a demoniac nature]. We are witnessing in them a degradation like that of the *prākṛta-sahajiyās*. Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa is the ultimate guardian of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Sampradāya. Even remembering the *pāṣaṇḍa* heretics who commit offenses at his feet will result in total ruin.

the wise readers will read this with steady minds and be able to grasp the true tenets of *acintya-bhedābheda*.

Dvitiya Siddhānta Second Conclusion

Ananta, Sundarānanda, and Haridāsa

Ananta Vāsudeva [Puridāsa Svāmī (?)], Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda, and Haridāsa Bābājī of Navadvīpa have come together and conspired to antagonize the Śrī Mādhva-Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas who are followers of Śrīman Mahāprabhu. It is necessary to briefly say a few words about these conspirators.

Sundarānanda

First of all, I will introduce the author of the “*Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*” book, Śrī Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya. Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya took birth in East Bengal, in the Malakar Tola area of Dhaka city, in a renowned Sāhā *vaiśya* [merchant] family. His father was the late Vrajendra-kumāra Rāya, and his mother the late Yāminī-sundarī Dāsī. The name Sundarānanda’s father gave him was Śrī Subodhacandra Sāhā Rāya. Subodha Bābu’s ancestors led their religious lives in the disciplic succession of a caste Gosvāmī who belonged to one of the thirteen *sahajiyā apasampradāyas* [pseudo-lineages]. Subodha Bābu got married while still a student completing his material education. His wife’s name is Śrīmatī Tilottamā. Śrīmatī Tilottamā is the only daughter of her father Gokulacandra; her mother’s name was Jñānadā-sundarī Dāsī. Gokula Bābu had his residence in the Murshidabad city of West Bengal. Due to a variety of unfortunate events, Subodha Bābu’s father, Vrajena Bābu, was in deep debt and sought the aid of his son’s father-in-law, Gokula Bābu, who paid off a considerable portion of Vrajena Bābu’s debt.

Subodha Bābu, after completing his B.A. at university, was released from the jaws of the *prākṛta-sahajiyā* lineage by the honorable Tridaṇḍisvāmī Śrī Śrīmad Bhakti Pradīpa Tīrtha Mahārāja. Then he made an act of receiving the grace of Jagad-guru Om Viṣṇupāda Paramahansa-svāmī Śrī Śrīmad Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura. Gradually, as he frequented the world-renowned Śrī Gauḍīya Maṭha, he became acquainted with the current of Vaiṣṇava philosophical conclusions, and with its system of logic and reasoning. After some time, he was engaged in the position of editor for Śrī Gauḍīya Maṭha's main publication, the weekly *Gauḍīya* magazine. During the period that he was the editor of this magazine, by the grace of Jagad-guru Śrīla Sarasvatī Ṭhākura, he propagated the *siddhānta* tenets of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas who adhere one-pointedly to the guidance of Śrīman Mahāprabhu. After some time, he gave up his material life and accepted *vānaprastha*, leading a *maṭha*-based life.

Subodha Bābu was also his father's only son. Reminded of his father's lack of wealth and severe debt, and overcome by a weakness of heart, he fled the Gauḍīya Maṭha without informing anyone. Thereafter, taking what he had learnt in the Gauḍīya Maṭha, he accepted a job at the Indian Press in Allahabad for a salary of 75 rupees [per month?]. When the manager of the Gauḍīya Maṭha, Śrīyuta Kuṅjabihārī Vidyābhūṣaṇa, found out about Sundarānanda's dire financial situation, then, because of his natural fondness for someone of the same caste, and to accomplish a distant future purpose of his own, he made an arrangement for Sundarānanda's monthly remuneration and helped him get out of debt after roughly a year. From then onwards, Sundarānanda lived in the *maṭha* and was engaged in Kuṅja Bābu's service.

After Subodha Bābu received *dīkṣā*, he became 'Sundarānanda' and ultimately was decorated with the title 'Vidyāvinoda', becoming known thus as Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda. As time went on, he was inclined to hide his previous name and title, and the fact he was born to a Sāhā merchant family that was in the business of selling liquor, and used the name his *guru* had given him to boost his prestige. That said, it is the duty of the *guru-sevaka* to introduce himself only by the name his *guru* has given. At present Subodha Bābu has in every way completely severed his ties with his world-renowned *jagad-guru*, one who is both dearly beloved to Kṛṣṇa and nondifferent from Him as the *para-tattva* worshipped by hosts of exalted, liberated personalities. But till this today, Subodha Bābu deceives the world by selling the name that exalted personality gave him, refusing to give up the thirst he has for gathering prestige. Though we have witnessed firsthand his malice towards *guru* and Vaiṣṇavas, it is in the text of his *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* that such malice is refulgent and on full display, like

constellations on a dark moon night. We will expose the fact of this in the various *Siddhāntas* (chapters) in the text of this *Acintya-bhedābheda* essay.

Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya is now no longer the Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda of old. Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī has said in *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa*:

*yathā kāñcanatām yāti kāmsyam rasa-vidhānataḥ |
tathā dīkṣā-vidhānena dvijatvaṁ jāyate nṛṇām ||*

[Just as bell metal is turned to gold by the application of mercury, a person can attain the status of a *brāhmaṇa* by the process of *dīkṣā*.]

Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya once carried this quotation from *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* atop his head with utmost regard and, as per the orders of his *guru-pādapaḍma*, underwent the *upanayana-saṁskāra* (sacred thread ceremony) after accepting *dīkṣā*. Now, because he has given that up, he has reverted back to being a Sāhā merchant. Even though he has not started a liquor business like the Sāhā vintners, he has filled himself up with the intoxicant of malice towards his *guru* and thereby he has become deprived of knowledge and forgotten himself. Therefore, we will refer to him just as Subodha Bābu or Sāhā Bābu in certain places. If one studies the teachings of Śrīman Mahāprabhu, one learns the following:

*arccau viṣṇau śiladhīr guruṣu naramatir-vaiṣṇave jāti-
buddhir-viṣṇor vā vaiṣṇavānām kalimala-mathane pāda-tīrthe 'mbu-buddhiḥ |
śrī-viṣṇor-nāmni mantre sakala-kaluṣahe śabda-sāmānya-buddhir-
viṣṇau sarveśvareṣe tad-itara-samadhīr yasya vā nārakī saḥi ||*

(*Padma Purāṇa*)

That person who thinks the worshipful deity is a chunk of stone or wood, who thinks *gurudeva* is an ordinary mortal, who judges pure devotees by their caste, who thinks the nectareous water that has washed the feet of Viṣṇu or the Vaiṣṇavas is ordinary water, who thinks the name and *mantra* of Viṣṇu, who removes all degradation, are ordinary sounds, and who thinks that other demigods are equal to the Supreme Lord Viṣṇu—such a person is a *nārakī*, or someone barreling towards hell. Someone who is a *nārakī* can never be called a Vaiṣṇava. This is especially the case when someone tries to lead a religious life after regarding

their supremely liberated *gurudeva* as a mortal and discarding him. Such a person can never be considered a Vaiṣṇava. Though it is considered an *aparādha* to judge a Vaiṣṇava by their caste, we have been compelled to share what background Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya belonged to because he has abandoned Om Viṣṇupāda Sākṣād Guru-pādapadma Śrīla Prabhupāda and disregarded his conduct and conceptions. We learn from the words of *Padma Purāṇa* quoted in the first *vilāsa* of *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* who a Vaiṣṇava is:

grhīta-viṣṇu-dīkṣāko viṣṇu-pūjā-para narah |
vaiṣṇavo 'bhihito 'bhijñair itaro 'smād avaiṣṇavaḥ ||

In other words: “Those acquainted with scripture deem that only one who has received *dīkṣā* initiation into the practice of a Viṣṇu *mantra* and is inclined to the worship of Viṣṇu via this *mantra* is to be called a Vaiṣṇava. Everyone else, or in other words, anyone who gives up their *guru* and the *mantra* he has given, is deemed an *Avaiṣṇava* [a non-Vaiṣṇava]. Therefore, because Subodha Bābu has given up his *guru*, he is in the category of the *Avaiṣṇavas*. Therefore there is no fault in viewing him in terms of his caste. Rather, it will safeguard the truth to use the proper words to describe what is. Legally and religiously speaking, concealing the truth is a punishable offence.

It is needless to say that if it suits him, Subodha Bābu does not hesitate to give up his *guru* again and again. Initially, he gave up his family Jāti-gosvāmī *guru* and took shelter of the Gauḍīya Maṭha. Later he gave up the practices and conceptions of the Gauḍīya Maṭha and surrendered to Ananta Vāsudeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Mahāśaya. After that, he began following Haridāsa Bābājī of Haribola Kuṭīra. After some time, he also gave him up as well, at least externally. At present he is living in some unknown whereabouts in Navadvīpa, running after his family *guru* again. The *siddhānta* of such a *guru-tyāgī* [*guru* renouncer] can never stay the same. Like a running deer, he roams hither and thither, through various versions of truth and falsity. At one point, out of greed for the money provided him by Kuñjabihārī, who was of the same caste, Sāhā Bābu worshipped and praised him, coming up with many inventive new *siddhāntas*. Then, thinking that the *vaiśya* Sāhā family heritage was comparatively inferior, he became enamoured with the glories of Ananta Vāsudeva, who was from a *kṣatriya-kāyastha* family, and actively concealed Ananta Vāsudeva’s transgressions, resorting to total falsehoods to put profuse praise of him into print. After that, whether it was because of a loss of faith in Ananta Vāsudeva or because he personally lacked genuine *jñāna* and *vijñāna* [knowledge and realization], he established a bond with Haridāsa Bābājī of Navadvīpa’s Haribol Kuṭīra. At

present, there has occurred an unprecedented iteration of the logic expressed in the statement “*yogyam yogyena yujyate* – those who deserve each other find each other.” Haridāsa Bābājī, Ananta Vāsudeva, and Sundarānanda—the three of them are like the three points of the trident in Rudra’s hand, but with the aim of destroying *bhakti-tattva*. These three have come together, consulted with each other, and, in Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s name, compiled three books entitled “*Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*”, “*Gauḍiyāra Tina Ṭhākura*” and “*Gauḍīya Darśanera Itihāsa o Vaiśiṣṭya*”.

Ananta Vāsudeva

Now we will provide some introduction to Sundarānanda’s third *guru*, Ananta Vāsudeva. His previous name was Śrī Anantavāsa Vasu. He lived in the famous village of Vajra-yoginī in the Dhaka district of East Bengal. His father’s name was Śrīyuta Rādhā-Govinda Dāsa Bābājī. Ananta Vāsudeva introduces himself to everyone as the youngest son of this renunciate Bābājī Mahāśaya. Because Bābājī Mahāśaya’s financial situation was rather precarious, he had Ananta-vāsa live at the home of a prominent *sahajiyā* and teacher of the Pali language, Śrīyuta Amūlyacaraṇa Vidyābhūṣaṇa Mahāśaya. It was with this *mahāśaya*’s all-round assistance that he had Ananta-vāsa taught till the IA level [12th grade]. Later, by great fortune, Ananta took shelter at the feet of the founder of the Gauḍīya Maṭha, the crown-jewel of *ācāryas*, the topmost liberated personality, Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura. Śrīla Sarasvatī Ṭhākura took notice of Ananta-vāsa’s powerful memory and facilitated him in earning a B.A. degree. After passing his B.A., with the help of Kuñja Bābu, the impoverished Ananta-vāsa accepted a job at a post office for an ordinary salary. After some months, as per Śrīla Prabhupāda’s wishes, he left his job and became engaged in the service of the *maṭha*. His father, Rādhā-Govinda Bābājī Mahāśaya had been faithful to the *sahajiyā* religion for a long time. It seems it was fate that Ananta-vāsa happened to be in the company of a fullblown *sahajiyā* like Amūlya Bābu during his formative years of education. If, in the early stages of life, the poisonous seeds of the *apasampradāyas* sprout in a person’s heart, it is very difficult to get rid of them. I have heard hundreds of praises of this Amūlya Vidyābhūṣaṇa from Ananta-vāsa’s own mouth. Maybe it was gratitude for having been raised on Amūlya Bābu’s grain, or maybe it was because he received core, formative instruction on religious practice from him, but Ananta-vāsa always had special regard for Amūlya Bābu.

Impacted by Jagad-guru Śrīla Prabhupāda’s limitless scriptural knowledge and powerful language, the sprout of Ananta-vāsa’s poisonous *sahajiyā* seed could not make any growth. However, after the enactment of Śrīla Prabhupāda’s disappearance pastimes, ever so gradually

the smoldering fire inside him became an inferno and burnt up whatever he had assimilated of the current of pure Mādhva-Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava thought. The *sahajiyās* explain that the very act of conversing and relating intimately with a married woman is itself transcendental *pārakīyā-mādhurya-rasa*. Ananta Vāsudeva, inspired by this notion deep down, was attracted to the idea of free, uninhibited amour. When Ananta-vāsa took shelter of Jagad-guru Śrīla Prabhupāda, he became known as Śrī Ananta Vāsudeva Brahmācārī and he became bound by a vow to engage himself in the service of his *guru-pādapadma* and observe resolute celibacy till the end of his life. Impressed by his external renunciation and scholarly brilliance, the devotees of the Gauḍīya Maṭha put him in the position of *ācārya*. It is very difficult for ordinary, conditioned souls to maintain the position of a Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava *ācārya*. And that is exactly what took its toll on Ananta Vāsudeva.

Vāsudeva, taking the opportunity afforded him by the position of *ācārya*, would provide a great deal of *bhajana-śikṣā* to the learned, scholarly ladies Śrīla Prabhupāda had showed some favour to, like Asīmā, Nīlimā, and others. Later, many people began to listen to the various *kathās* Vāsudeva would speak, so he made an act of assuming *sannyāsa* and concealed the name Ananta Vāsudeva Brahmācārī, becoming known everywhere by the name **Śrī Bhakti Prasāda Purī**. By the concerted efforts of Sundarānanda and other excellent writers, Ananta-vāsa began to be popularized everywhere as a very distinguished individual. As a result of this, one very learned young lady of the renowned Nāga family of Dhaka district (who was a B.A. student at the time) became his disciple. He used to give her various types of confidential *bhajana-śikṣā* as well. Needless to say, this lady was a very qualified individual in every way; she came from a distinguished family, had a very noble and reputable character, and was very beautiful and virtuous. After receiving *dīkṣā*, she became known as ‘Garimā’. Over time, as Garimā received special instruction in *bhajana* from her *gurudeva*, her relatives compelled Śrī Śrīmad Bhakti Prasāda Purī Mahārāja to marry Garimā. Once the marriage rituals were conducted in Allahabad, he left his *sannyāsa* garb and accessories, as well as his *sannyāsa* name, etc., and turned back into Ananta-vāsa Basu. Even though Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya saw this spectacle with his own eyes, in order protect the *sahajiyā-dharma*, he continued to preach that this was an exemplary incident in the life of a Vaiṣṇava.

Haridāsa Dāsa

Seeing Ananta and Sundarānanda’s *sāhajika-prīti*, or natural fondness for *sahajiyā* practices, who joined them like a bride in her finery? Haridāsa Bābājī of Navadvīpa. He has published many *sahajiyā* books and created many new, never-before-published books, ascribing them to

the names of various Vaiṣṇavas of bygone ages. And he continues to do so. And through Ananta-vāsa he publishes Vaiṣṇava literatures, concealing all of Anantavāsa’s previous names and calling him ‘Purīdāsa Gosvāmī’. These books have not been printed for some innocent reason. Embedded with a whole series of statements that encourage the *sahajiyā* train of thought and overturn statements that go against said train of thought, this whole new set of editions has been published in a whole new *dhārā* [current], and therefore many people in learned circles eye these editions with deserved suspicion. These editions are distributed free of charge only among the *sahajiyās* themselves. Not one copy has been given to the disciples and grand-disciples of Jagad-guru Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Prabhupāda. And they have pressured the people to whom they have distributed these books to make a pact to the effect that they will not show these books to anyone from the Gauḍīya Maṭha. The fact this is happening will allow the community of learned and intelligent readers to infer just how trustworthy these editions are.

Purīdāsa’s Cleverness in Compilation

Sundarānanda Vidyavinoda Mahāśaya has compiled and wrote the book *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* using these editions. Of all the statements he has borrowed from Purīdāsa Gosvāmī’s editions, we have compared a few of them to the readings in other editions and found many changes. Below I cite an example from the *Tattva-sandarbha* compiled by Purīdāsa:

“*Yat khalu purāṇa-jātamāvirbhāvya, brahma-sūtraṅca praṇīyāpy aparituṣṭena tena bhagavatā nija-sūtrāṇām akṛtrima-bhāṣya-bhūtaṁ samādhi-labdham-āvirbhāvitam; —yasminneva sarva-śāstra-samanvayo dṛṣyate, sarva-vedārtha-lakṣaṇāṁ gāyatrīm-adhikṛtya pravartitatvāt | * * * gāruḍe ca—‘artho’yam brahma-sūtrāṇām bhāratārtha-vinirṇayaḥ | gāyatrī-bhāṣya-rūpo ’sau vedārtha paribr̥mhitah || * * * brahma-sūtrāṇām arthas teṣām akṛtrim-bhāṣya-bhūta ityarthah | pūrvam sūkṣmatvena manasyāvirbhūtam, tadeva samkṣīpya sūtratvena punaḥ prakāṣitam, paścād-vistīrṇatvena sākṣāt śrī-bhāgavatam iti | tasmāt-tad-bhāṣya-bhūte svataḥsiddhe tasmin satya-vācīnam anyad anyeṣām sva-sva-kapola-kalpitaṁ tadanugatamevādarāṇīyam iti gamyate*”⁴

We have compared this excerpt from *Tattva-sandarbha* with a very old edition of *Tattva-sandarbha* printed in Devanāgarī script and with Satyānanda Gosvāmī’s *Tattva-sandarbha*,

⁴ In the introduction to *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, which is titled “*Kayekṭi Prārambhik Kathā* [“A Few Preliminary Topics”] Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya references the Sanskrit citation above in a footnote, writing: “*Tattva-sandarbha*, Anuccheda 10–11 (Śrīmat Purīdāsa Gosvāmī’s edition).”

which was published with a Bengali translation in 1318 [Baṅgāba], and observed that the above excerpt does not match in three places, as we show below. It is needless to say that the Devanāgarī edition and Satyānanda Gosvāmī's editions read the same. Readers, note that the portions that have been left out of Purīdāsa's version have been printed and provided below in clear, bold letters:

*Yat khalu 'sarva' purāṇa-jātamāvirbhāvya, brahma-sūtraṅca praṇīyāpy aparituṣṭena tena bhagavatā nija-sūtrāṇām akṛtrima-bhāṣya-bhūtam samādhi-labdham-āvirbhāvitam; — yasminneva sarva-śāstra-samanvayo dr̥śyate, sarva-vedārtha-'sūtra'-lakṣaṇām gāyatrīm-adhikṛtya pravartitavāt | * * * gāruḍe ca—**pūrṇaḥ so'yam-atiśayaḥ** | 'artho'yam brahma-sūtrāṇām bhāratārtha-vinirṇayaḥ | gāyatrī-bhāṣya-rūpo 'sau vedārtha paribr̥mhitah || * **

—*Tattva-sandarbhā*, Anuccheda 19, 21—(The Satyānanda and Nāgarī editions)

In other words, the word 'sarva' after the words 'yat khalu', the word 'sūtra' after the words 'sarva-vedārtha', and the words 'pūrṇaḥ so 'yam atiśayaḥ' after the words 'gāruḍe ca—' have been left out of Purīdāsa's edition. This gives a clear indication that no book published by Purīdāsa or Ananta Vāsudeva can be accepted as authentic.

As stated previously, Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda, the newly-wedded Bhakti Prasāda Purī (Purīdāsa Gosvāmī or Ananta Vāsudeva), and Haridāsa Dāsa of Navadvīpa are conspiring together, publishing various books under various names, to undermine the *āmnāya* [sacred knowledge] of the Śrī Brahma-Mādhva Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas. Among these publications, there is a newly composed book by the name of "Śrī Caitanya-mata-maṅjuṣā" published by Śrī Haridāsa Dāsa. Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya references the commentary on this book on page 19 of his "Kayekṭi Prārambhik Kathā" introduction, writing as follows:

The 'ārādhyo bhagavān vrajeśa-tanayaḥ' verse at the start of 'Śrī Śrī Caitanya-mata-maṅjuṣā' by Śrī Kavi Karṇapūra Gosvāmī's *śrī gurudeva*, Śrī Śrīnātha Cakravartī, clearly proves that the philosophy of the *tattva-vāda-guru* Śrīman Madhvācārya is different from Śrī Kṛṣṇa-caitanya-candra's philosophy.

To verify the above statement, he made the following citation in a second footnote: "2 | Śrī Caitanya-mata-maṅjuṣā—published by Śrī Haridāsa Dāsa 466 Caitanyābda, Śrīdhāma Navadvīpa." The thing to really pay attention to here is that the aforementioned *tippanī-*

grantha [commentary text] was first printed in Kṛṣṇa-nagara, Nadiyā, by Śrī Śailendra-govardhana Brahmācārī at Śrī Bhāgavata Yantra [press?], which is run under the supervision of Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya. There is no mention of a commentary on *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* called “*Śrī Caitanya-mata-maṅjuṣā*” written by Śrī Śrī Nātha Cakravartī Mahodaya in any of the Gosvāmī’s *granthas*, past or present. This text has appeared from the fertile mind of Śrī Haridāsa Dāsa Bābājī Mahāśaya and has only first seen the light of day on Śrī Śrī Gaura Jayantī 466 Caitanyābda [same as Gaurābda], or the Christian date of 28th February, 1953.

We have previously stated that these three persons—Sundarānanda (Subodha Sāhā), Ananta Vāsudeva (Puridāsa) and Haridāsa Dāsa—have come together and are publishing various book to accomplish some ignoble aim in the distant future. Here we present to the readers some strikingly clear evidence of this. Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s “*Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*” book was published on 30 Govinda, 464 Gaurābda, on Śrī Gaura’s appearance day (9th of Caitra 1358 Baṅgābda; 23rd of March 1951, Christian year). How is it possible that he could reference Śrī Haridāsa Dāsa’s *Śrī Caitanya-mata-maṅjuṣā*, which was first published on Śrī Śrī Gaura Jayantī 466 Śrī Caitanyābda (16th of Phālguna 1357, 28th of February, 1953 Christian era)—a book that was published two years later? We cannot even begin to understand how this is possible.⁵ But we do know from ancient history that Vālmīki Muni wrote *Rāmāyaṇa* even before the birth of Rāma. Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has referenced “*Śrī Caitanya-mata-maṅjuṣā*” as having been finalized two whole years before it was actually written, finalized, and published.

The fact that the book *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* references *Śrī Caitanya-mata-maṅjuṣā* leads us to understand that *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* was published after *Śrī Caitanya-mata-maṅjuṣā*. If that is not the case, then the date of *Maṅjuṣā*’s publication mentioned is a mistake or printing error. Otherwise, *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* was printed later and “464” was printed by mistake, maybe by the printer’s error. Or page 19 of *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*’s introduction was swapped out with a previous version of the page two years later and rebound. Or should we believe that the printing and publication of both books is correct? No matter how one may try to reconcile this, Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya cannot escape the fact of the devious work he has done because this is a punishable offence. Whatever was done, we call it conspiracy, artifice, and suppression of the real truth. But the fact that he published a statement from the future, from 466 Gaurābda, in 464 Gaurābda, and referred to it as

⁵ See page 19, second footnote of *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*’s introduction. The footnote reads as follows: “2] *Śrī Caitanya-mata-maṅjuṣā*—published by Śrī Haridāsa Dāsa, 466 Śrī Caitanyābda, Śrīdhāma Navadvīpa.

something of a past year is a sort of inconceivable feat that goes well with the imaginative accomplishments he has demonstrated in *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* itself. It is by such inconceivable feats that he has published *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, or rather, shall we call it *Acintya-abheda-vāda* [“The Doctrine of Inconceivable Oneness”]?

Śrī Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā and Śrī Śrīnātha Cakravartī

Here we move forward to discuss a few points regarding Śrī Haridāsa Dāsa’s commentary on *Śrīmad-Bhāgavata* called “*Śrī Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā*” and its supposed author Śrī Śrīnātha Cakravartī Mahāśaya:

Śrīnātha Cakravartī was the disciple of Advaita Prabhu and is known to be the *guru* of Kavi Karṇapūra. Therefore, according to disciplic succession and timeline, he is held in high regard by the Six Gosvāmīs, and it can be assumed that his manifest presence was somewhat prior to theirs. If we imagine he had a very long lifespan, then he would have met with Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī. If “*Śrī Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā*” had been written by Śrīla Śrīnātha Cakravartī Ṭhākura, then “*Śrī Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā*” would have been the first *ṭīkā* on *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* in Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava society, and this *ṭīkā* would have been everyone’s go-to text. Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī, Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī, Jīva Gosvāmī, Viśvanātha Cakravartī Ṭhākura, Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, and others do not mention this *ṭīkā* and do not quote any evidence from it. Still, even though there is no mention of this *ṭīkā*, no one has any disagreement about

the fact he was a *paṇḍita-ācārya* of the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya. Kavi Karṇapūra, son of Sena-Śivānanda, describes him as his *guru*⁶ in *Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā*.

Even though Śrīnātha Cakravartī was senior to the Six Gosvāmīs in age, they are all contemporaries in one sense—of this, there is no doubt. Śrīnātha-jī does not mention any of Rūpa and Sanātana’s texts, and also does not quote from any of them—and surely it would not be natural for him to do so, because by age, he is an exalted personality of a somewhat earlier generation. Rūpa and Sanātana also do not quote any evidence from *Śrī Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā*. They do not even mention it anywhere. No Vaiṣṇava *ācārya* makes any mention of it. It is only in the past 10–12 years that its existence has begun to be noticed. Because I have not seen it mentioned in any authoritative *grantha*, I am compelled to state clearly that this text is a new presentation opposed to pristine Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava *dharma* and has been presented in order to firmly establish *sahajiyā-apadharmā*. There is abundant

⁶ *guruṁ naḥ “śrīnāthābhidham-avani-devānvaya-budham
numo bhūṣā-ratnam bhūva iva vibhorasya dayitam |
yadāsyād-unmīlan-niravaka vṛndāvana-rahah-
kathāsvādām labdhvā jagati na janah ko ’pi ramate || 3 ||*

*pitaram śrī-śivānandam sena-vamśa-pradīpakam |
vande ’ham parayā bhaktyā pārśadāgryam mahāprabhoḥ || 4 ||*

*ye vikhyātāḥ parivārāḥ śrī caitanya-mahāprabhoḥ |
nityānandādvaitayoś-ca teṣām api mahīyasām |
gopālānāṅca pūrvāṇi nāmāni yāni kānicit |
sva-sva-granthe svarūpādyari darśitānyādi-sūrabhiḥ |
vilokyānyādi sādḥūnām mathuraudra-nivāsinām |
gauḍīyānām api mukhān niśamya sva-manīṣayā |
vivicyāmrēḍitaḥ kaiścit kaiścittāni likhāmy aham |
nāmnā ’śrī paramānānda-dāsaḥ’ sevita-śāsanah || 5 ||*

I offer my obeisance to that *gurudeva* who is named “Śrīnātha,” who is very dear to Gaurāṅga-deva, who is the moon of the *brāhmaṇa* dynasty, the ornament of the world and its gem. Who in the world does not become utterly delighted by relishing the descriptions of Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s secluded pastimes in sweet Vṛndāvana as they emanate from his lotus-like mouth?

With great devotion, I bow unto he who is foremost among the associates of Mahāprabhu, the radiant flame of the Sena dynasty, my father, Śrī Śivānanda Sena.

The original *paṇḍita*, ‘Svarūpa,’ and other great souls have revealed the names of those in the *parivāras* of Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu, Nityānanda, and Advaita and their correlating names in the exalted *gopa* dynasties of the previous incarnation. Having seen those texts and having heard from the exalted saints of Orissa and Bengal, I have carefully determined the following information and have been repeatedly requested by many saintly persons to reveal it. Therefore, I, Śrī Paramānanda Dāsa (Kavi Karṇapūra’s previous name), am writing this text.

objection to its integrity, provenance, and the acceptance of it as written by Śrīnātha Cakravartī. Below I am providing yet another reason for having such doubts.

Right when the *ṭikā* commentary titled “Śrī Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā” was being stirred and shaken through the imaginations of our conspirators, suddenly another “history” titled “Śrī Śrī Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava Sāhitya” was presented. It had become an absolute necessity to compile this sort of so-called history of Vaiṣṇava literature in order to set the foundation for the aforementioned *Mañjuṣā*. We see that an article entitled “Śrīnātha Cakravartī and Śrī Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā” has been printed in the 10th Pariccheda (titled “Caitanya Yuga-dharma”) of *Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-Sāhitya*, on pages 110–111. Though there is nothing written about Śrīnātha-jī there, what is provided is very specific information about this contrived *Mañjuṣā*. It seems to us they came up with the idea of writing this *Mañjuṣā-ṭikā* and have put into print a brief, introductory description or indication of it in this so-called history book as groundwork for what was to come. This error-ridden historical text was printed in 462 Caitanyābda. And *Acintya-bhedābheda* was published in 464 Caitanyābda, while *Śrī Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā* came out in 466 Caitanyābda. It seems clear that all these books were written around the same time. And the writers accept each other’s authenticity and quote back and forth between these texts.

We are quoting from page 111 of *Śrī Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-Sāhitya*, from the twelfth to the sixteenth line:

He (Śrīnātha Cakravartī) has not explained every verse of every chapter; only where he felt that Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s preeminence could be undermined, he was compelled to establish Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s superiority in those places. However, sadly, in his explanation of the verse “*uvāha kṛṣṇo bhagavān śrīdāmānam parājitaḥ*,” (10.18.24) he has written: “*ity atra śrī kṛṣṇasya parājayāt’ śrīdāma-vahane ’anaucityāc ca bhagavān kṛṣṇaḥ stoka-kṛṣṇa ityarthah,*” and this reading is opposed to the *mata* of Śrī Caitanya,

Having printed this in 462 Caitanyābda, later, in 466 Caitanyābda, when Haridāsa Bābu was writing his commentary, he totally forgot to include the commentary on this verse (10.18.24) of *Bhāgavatam* in “*Śrī Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā*”. It is impossible to keep your head straight when undertaking a new publication of such a large scale. If that was possible, then how would we catch people’s forgeries and slip-ups as they rush their work? Sadly, the *ṭikā* on that portion of verse from *Bhāgavatam*—‘*uvāha kṛṣṇo bhagavān śrīdāmānam parājitaḥ*’ (10.18.24)

—is simply not there in the text of *Śrī Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā* published by Haridāsa Bābu in 466 Caitanyābda. In fact, you can see that there has not been a single commentary written or printed for the entire eighteenth chapter. This and various other discrepancies prove that this creation comes from that colony of conspirators, using Śrīnātha Cakravartī's name, and in actuality, is not written by any reputable *ācārya* of the past.

Śrīla Viśvanātha's verse in Śrī Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā

I am briefly addressing one more point in relation to this commentary and concluding what I have to say on the topic. Where did Haridāsa Bābu draw his inspiration from to write the *Śrī Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā* commentary? This merits some investigation. There is a world-renowned verse about Mahāprabhu's philosophy composed by Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartī Ṭhākura that every person educated in the Vaiṣṇava community knows. Said verse is quoted below:

*ārādhyo bhagavān vrajeśa-tanayas-tad-dhāma vṛndāvanam
ramyā kācid upāsanā vraja-vadhū-vargeṇa yā kalpitā |
śrīmad-bhāgavatam pramāṇam amalāṁ premā pumartho mahān
śrī caitanya-mahāprabhor-matam-idaṁ tatrādaro naḥ paraḥ ||*

Dāsa Bābu relies on this verse to write his *Mañjuṣā*, and he has demonstrated a bit of etiquette by changing its reading slightly in the *maṅgalācarāṇa* verse of said *Mañjuṣā ṭīkā*. The verse he has stolen is printed below in the footnote.⁷ He will possibly say that Jagad-guru Śrīla Viśvanātha was the one who has changed the words slightly and used it. But he [Śrīla Viśvanātha] did not mention that this verse was written by a previous *ācārya*, did he? This sort of argument will never be accepted in scholarly society. Whatever the case may be, Dāsa Bābu has gone to great lengths to ensure his book becomes accepted in the Vaiṣṇava community. If he wrote and published this sort of *sahajiyā* book in his own name, pure Vaiṣṇavas would never accept it. But if he gives another name, that of a Vaiṣṇava of the past, and prints his book, then everyone has to accept it, and thus all the ignoble aims of their group are achieved.

⁷ *ārādhyo bhagavān vrajeśa tanayas tad dhāma vṛndāvanam
ramyā kācid upāsanā vraja-vadhū-vargeṇa yā kalpitā |
śāstram bhāgavatam pramāṇam amalāṁ premā pumartho mahān
ittham gaura-mahāprabhor matamatas-tatrādaro naḥ paraḥ ||*

The portions printed in bold are the portions that differ from the *śloka* composed by Cakravartī Ṭhākura.

Tṛtīya Siddhānta Third Conclusion

Going Against Proper Etiquette

If we consult ancient, religious literature, we see that every example of it has preserved the etiquette of including a *maṅgalācaraṇa* at its commencement. What to speak of *granthas* in Sanskrit, this etiquette has not been done away with in Bengali books of worship either. It is absolutely imperative to have a *maṅgalācaraṇa* for every auspicious undertaking. Śrī *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*'s author—Śrīla Kṛṣṇa-dāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī *Caitanya-bhāgavata*'s author—Śrīla Vṛndāvana-dāsa Ṭhākura, Śrī *Caitanya-maṅgala*'s author—Śrīla Locana-dāsa Ṭhākura, and every other *ācārya* has offered obeisance to their respective *iṣṭadeva* (worshipful deity) and prayed for their mercy or proclaimed their glory and victory. Some poets have, in some places, not composed a *śloka* or *payār* for a *maṅgalācaraṇa*, but they have all demonstrated their honor for their deity or object of worship in one way or another.

We cannot accept that Subodha Bābu has demonstrated any sort of etiquette at the start of his *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* book. Of course, we can see that at the top of the book's first page, “Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅgau Jayataḥ” has been printed in very small letters; but is this Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya's *maṅgalācaraṇa*? What we will show here is that he has not, in fact, maintained proper etiquette with this line and done a *maṅgalācaraṇa*.

The meaning of the words “Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅgau Jayataḥ”

The purport of “Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅgau Jayataḥ” is to convey a manner of prayer, as in: “Śrī Guru and Śrī Gaurāṅga are forever reaping victory,” or “may Śrī Gurudeva and Śrī Gaurāṅga-deva have victory.” There is no way of understanding from Sundarānanda Bābu's book what

he means when he uses that phrase. And I am compelled to say with particular insistence that he has planted that phrase on the heading of his *asiddhānta*-replete book with the express purpose of contradicting it. The deceitful *daityas* and *dānavas*, and the *asuras* who bear malice for the demigods and the rest of the world, conceal their inner, secretive and devious aims as they charm Śiva and other demigods with their austerities, whereafter they try to kill those same demigods they were worshipping. Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya, or Subodhacandra Sāhā Mahāśaya, has adopted just such a propensity in using the phrase “Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅgau Jayataḥ.” As much as he has displayed a less than noble motive with the use of his own name [to acquire prestige], he has displayed similar deviousness with the subject of this book as well. He has written it and titled it *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* with the intention of destroying the *siddhānta* of *acintya-bhedābheda* and establishing “*acintya-advaita-vāda* – the doctrine of inconceivable non-dualism.” We see misrepresentation and artifice in his exploitation of the name his *guru* gave him, and we see he uses a misleading name and similar artifice with the title of this book. He even goes about establishing his *siddhāntas* in a deceptive, artificial way and demonstrates deception and misrepresentation as he lives and moves in society itself.

Now I ask: “Who is Subodha Sāhā’s *guru*? Whose glories is he singing? Śrī Gaurāṅga who? Where did he learn about Śrī Gaurāṅga? From whom? Can we know who that is? From whom has he received *dīkṣā*? Has he received divine knowledge? Or rather, has he made any actual attempt to attain that divine knowledge? Will we find any information about his *gurudeva* in his book? What sort of guidelines has *Śrī Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* provided in regard to how one is to mention one’s *śrī gurudeva*’s name? Does he know these rules? If someone’s name was mentioned according to those standards, then we would be able to understand that Sāhā Bābu’s *gurudeva* is such and such *mahājana*. Does he know that if he mentions his *śrī gurudeva*’s name in the same way one refers to any Rāmā, Śyāmā, Yadu, or Madhu of today that it reduces *gurudeva* to the same level as everyone else? What is a *maṅgalācaraṇa*, or proper etiquette? Did he not learn proper etiquette as taught in the *śāstras*? If he cannot learn this small etiquette, then it would have been better for him not to have the audacity to write books on grave subject matters. The *asuras* and *daityas* do a great many deeds—but we look upon all of it with disdain. Being like a mother and trying to force poison into Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s mouth like Pūtanā did is extremely wicked business. Vaiṣṇavas have no disagreement on that. Only the *asuras* experience boundless bliss and feel pride to see that Pūtanā attained the position of nurse to Kṛṣṇa in Goloka. The pure Sārasvata Vaiṣṇavas consider this the fitting destination of an *asura* and do not give it much regard; but *sahajiyās* are enamoured with that and become engaged in Pūtanā’s service.

We will discuss Sāhā Bābu’s abandonment of his *guru* later on at the appropriate place. Only one who has attained special distinction in the realm of *bhakti* is a truly distinguished *guru-sevaka*. Till this day, no conception has attacked *gurudeva*’s philosophy and been accepted in the religious world. No one in the religious world will approve of serving Haridāsa Bābājī and serving or supporting Vāsudeva’s (Purī Gosvāmī’s) unholy wedding. If such despicable conduct is accepted in the religious realm, then what are we to call wrongdoing, unholy arrangements, and sinful activities? Hirāṇyakaśipu, Rāvaṇa and other *asuras* had no shortage of erudition. You can get a sense of Hirāṇyakaśipu’s erudition if you study his instructions to the wives of Hirāṇyākṣa after Hirāṇyākṣa’s death as described in *Bhāgavatam*. The *advaitavādīs* have become enamoured with the discussions between the ten-headed Rāvaṇa and the Tathāgata Buddha in *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*. Are mental acrobatics devoid of any real character or conduct to be considered *bhakti*? Does working out or exerting the mind to generate dozens of spurious arguments like Cārvaka constitute *bhakti*? The devil can quote scripture too. Does that make his propositions acceptable to *sādhakas*? The authors of scripture give no value to preaching that lacks proper conduct. I beg Sāhā Bābu to follow the instruction of Śrīla Sanātana Gosvāmī in *Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta*:

āpane ācare keha, nā kare pracāra |
pracāra karena keho, nā karena ācāra ||
‘ācāra’, ‘pracāra’,—nāmera karaha ‘dui’ kārya |
tumi—sarva-guru, tumi—jagatera ārya ||

(*Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, Antya 4.102–103)

What is the point of giving up the etiquettes of the *dīkṣā-saṁskāras* and other traditions and becoming a barbarian? “*Guru chāḍi gaurāṅga bhaje, se pāpī narake maje* – One who gives up *guru* and worships Gaurāṅga is a sinner who sinks into hell.” Has Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya forgotten this saying?

The Publisher’s Maṅgalācaraṇa

It is a stubborn fact that Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya did not use the words “Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅgau Jayataḥ” as a *maṅgalācaraṇa*. Though I have proven this already, I am submitting a few more points in this regard. Of the three trident-forming books he has wrought to destroy

guru-sevā-based *bhagavad-bhakti*, the other two⁸ besides *Acintya-bhedābheda* have the phrase “Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅgau Jayataḥ” printed above their titles and a *maṅgalācaraṇa* to start out their text. From this we know that Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has not even taken “Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅgau Jayataḥ” or “Śrī Śrī Gaura-Nityānandau Jayataḥ” and other statements seriously as *maṅgalācaraṇas*. If his heart’s mood had been that this phrase is in and of itself a *maṅgalācaraṇa*, then he would not have added *maṅgalācaraṇas* to the beginnings of the other two books. The authors of scripture and other such *mahājanas* have all maintained a standard practice of composing a *maṅgalācaraṇa*, for the sake of proper etiquette. Even the publishers of *granthas* include a *maṅgalācaraṇa* to alleviate obstacles in the publication process. These sorts of phrases are seen preceding the titles of books. They are accepted everywhere as the *maṅgalācaraṇa* of the *prakāśaka* (publisher), not the author. “Śrī Gaṇeśāya Namaḥ,” “Śrī Sītā-Rāmābhyāṁ Namaḥ,” “Śrī Rādhā-Kṛṣṇābhyāṁ Namaḥ,” “Śrī Hanumate Namaḥ,” “Śrī Śivāya Namaḥ,” “Śrī Sarasvatyai Namaḥ,” “Śrī Nārāyaṇāya Namaḥ,” “Śrī Durgāya Namaḥ,” “Śrī Guru-caraṇāravindābhyāṁ Namaḥ,” and, in the books presently under scrutiny: “Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅgau Jayataḥ” and “Śrī Śrī Gaura-Nityānandau Jayataḥ.” These and other such phrases are generally understood to be the *maṅgalācaraṇas* of the publishers. If any exalted personality accepts these phrases as *maṅgalācaraṇas*, we cannot consider that a mistake. Even if a preacher of atheistic *dharma* does not accept these statements as *maṅgalācaraṇas*, that does not stop them from being classified as *maṅgalācaraṇas*; still, they are the publishers’ *maṅgalācaraṇas*, not the authors’.

Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda is published by Gauḍīya Mission. So if Gauḍīya Mission has inserted the *mantra* “Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅgau Jayataḥ” and published Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s book, then it is the Gauḍīya Mission’s *maṅgalācaraṇa*. However, there is a fair bit of dispute as to whether or not the Gauḍīya Mission (registered) has the right to utter or use said *mantra*, because the current Gauḍīya Mission has no relation with the old Gauḍīya Mission’s founder or with Guru-Gaurāṅga. Publishing this kind of book by Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya, a book that is rooted in malice towards *guru*, is pure antagonism of the statement “Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅga Jayataḥ [Let there be victory for Śrī Guru and Gaurāṅga!].” Whatever the case may be with that, the publisher’s *maṅgalācaraṇa* cannot be accepted as the author’s *maṅgalācaraṇa*.

⁸ ‘Gauḍīya-darśanera Itihāsa o Vaiśiṣṭya’ and ‘Gauḍīyāra Tina Ṭhākura’—published 467 Gaurābda, 1360 Baṅgābda, 1953 Christian era, by Gauḍīya Mission.

In many editions of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*⁹, it is seen that the *mantra* “*om namo bhagavate vāsudevāya*” is printed at the beginning of the text. Then there are other editions where the aforementioned *mantra* is not printed, like the 437 Śrī Caitanyābda edition published by Śrī Ananta-Vāsudeva Brahmācārī with *Śrīmad Gauḍīya-bhāṣya* (the Gauḍīya Maṭha edition), and the 1288 Sāla edition, published 14th of Jyeṣṭha from No. 164 Māṅkatalā Street, Kalikātā, edited by Śrī Upendra-candra Mitra and published by Śrī Bhagavatī-carāṇa Rāya. Of all the editions of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* available at present, the latter, the one edited by Śrī Upendra-candra Mitra Mahāśaya with Śrīdhara Svāmī’s commentary, is the oldest. From these editions it is evident that *mantras* like “Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅgau Jayataḥ” or “Om Namō Bhagavate Vāsudevāya” do not constitute the author’s own *maṅgalācarāṇa*. In the aforementioned oldest version of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, the “*janmādy asya*” verse has been interpreted as Vyāsa’s *maṅgalācarāṇa*. And the editor, Mitra Mahāśaya, has made this clear by titling the verse “*śrī bhāgavata-kr̥to maṅgalācarāṇa*.” He has even excluded it from *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*’s official verse count, designating it as the *maṅgalācarāṇa*. Even though Mitra Mahāśaya is a prominent *advaita-vādī*, he did not hesitate to accept from Vyāsadeva’s “*satyaṁ param dhīmahi*” statement that the aforementioned verse is the *maṅgalācarāṇa* to the text. Moreover, he did not think it necessary to include any atheistic *advaita-vādī* version of a *maṅgalācarāṇa*. He has accepted *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* as a distinguished text that propounds *advaita-vāda* and he believes that Pūjyapāda Śrīdhara Svāmī was also a teacher of *advaita-vāda* and wrote *Bhāvārtha-dīpikā* with that intention. This is Mitra Mahāśaya’s opinion, and Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has, like Mitra Mahāśaya, followed in the footsteps of the *advaita-vādīs*, echoing this belief throughout the text of *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*.

Though the aforementioned edition of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* published by Śrī Gauḍīya Maṭha does not use the *mantra* “Om Namō Bhagavate Vāsudevāya,” it has printed the words “Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅgau Jayataḥ” above the title of the book. This is conclusively not the author’s, but the publisher’s *maṅgalācarāṇa*. Still, in his *Gauḍīya-bhāṣya* on *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, Jagad-guru Om Viṣṇupāda Paramahansa-kula-cūḍāmaṇi Śrī Śrīmad Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Gosvāmī Ṭhākura has maintained the proper etiquette and has first of all performed a

⁹ (1) The edition published from Bhavānīpura, 37 no. Balarama Bose Ghat Road, Kolkata, by Śrī Khagendranātha Śāstrī; (2) the 1960 Samvat edition edited by Śrī Nityasvarūpa Brahmācārī, published by Rājārṣi Vanamālī Rāya Bāhādura; (3) the 1304 Vaiśākha edition of Śrī Rāma Nārāyaṇa Vidyāratna Mahāśaya; (4) the 1334 Sāla edition of Śrī Pañcānana Tarkaratna Mahāśaya.

maṅgalācaraṇa via a *kīrtana* glorifying the entire Śrī Guru-paramparā.¹⁰ Every commentator on *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* and all the Gosvāmīs have accepted the aforementioned verse [*janmādy asya*] as the main *maṅgalācaraṇa* to *Bhāgavatam* by Śrī Vyāsa. Moreover, they have offered *praṇāmas* to and sung the glories of their respective *īṣṭadevas* while writing their individual *ṭīkās* on this verse.

Maṅgalācaraṇa in the Vedas and Upaniṣads

We also see the use of *maṅgalācaraṇa* in all ancient scriptures, both those that are *apauruṣeya* (not of mortal origin) and those that are *pauruṣeya* (of man-made provenance). Of the four Vedas—Ṛk, Yajuh, Sāma, and Atharva—the Ṛg Veda is the oldest, and is considered the original Veda. At the beginning of this Vedic text, we see the etiquette of *maṅgalācaraṇa* embodied and taught in the very first *mantra*:

10

Śrī Guru Vandana

*rukma-varṇa gaurahari, nitya dui tanu dhari, rādhā-kṛṣṇa ānanda-cinmaya
vibhāva sāmāgrī-nāma, viṣaya āśraya dhāma, ālambana nāme paricaya
nitya uddīpana-yoge, upādeya rasa-bhoge, cid-vilāse matta nirantara
aprākṛta rati juṣṭa, sadā nāma-rase puṣṭa, gaura-bhakta-saba parikara
parikara paricaya, sambandha sthāpita haya, tāhā lāgi paramparā gāna
anvaya nirdeśa kari, guru-gaṇa pada dhari, yāhe harijana abhimāna
kṛṣṇa haite caturmukha, haya kṛṣṇa-sevonmukha, brahmā haite nāradera mati
nārada haite vyāsa, madhva kahe vyāsadāsa, pūrṇaprajña padmanābha-gati
nṛhari mādharma-vamśe akṣobhya paramahamse, śiṣya boli aṅgikāra kare
akṣobhyera śiṣya jaya-tīrtha nāme paricaya, tāra dāsye jñānasindhu tare
tāhā ha'te dayānidhi, tāra dāsa vidyānidhi, rājendra haila tāhā ha'te
tāhāra kiṅkara jaya-dharma nāme paricaya, paramparā jāno bhālomate
jaya-dharma dāsye khāti śrī puruṣottama yati, tā hai'te brahmaṇya-tīrtha-sūri
vyāsa-tīrtha tāra dāsa, lakṣmīpati vyāsadāsa, tāhā hate mādhavendra purī
mādhavendra purīvara śiṣya-vara śrī īśvara, nityānanda śrī advaita vibhu
īśvara purīke dhanya, karilena śrī caitanya, jagad-guru gaura mahāprabhu
mahāprabhu śrī caitanya, rādhā-kṛṣṇa nahe anya, rūpānuga-janera jīvana
viśvambhara priyaṅkara, śrī svarūpa dāmodara, śrī gosvāmī rūpa-sanātana
rūpa-priya mahājana, jīva raghunāta hana, tāra pīrya kavi kṛṣṇadāsa
kṛṣṇadāsa priyavara narottama sevāpara, jāra pada viśvanātha āśa
viśvanātha bhaktasātha baladeva jagannātha, tāra pīrya śrī bhaktivinoda
mahābhāgavata-vara śrī gaura-kiśora-vara, hari bhajanete jāra moda
ihārā paramahamśa, gaurāṅgera nija-vamśa, tādera caraṇe mama gati
āmi sevā-udāsīna, nāmete tridaṇḍī dīna, śrī bhaktisiddhānta sarasvatī*

(From the Gauḍīya Maṭha edition of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* published by Śrī Ananta-Vāsudeva)

“*om agnimīle purohitam yajñasya deva-mṛtvijam hotāram ratna-dhātam*¹¹ |” (Rg Veda, 1st Maṇḍala, 1st Sūkta, 1st Ṛk) – I praise the god of fire. He is the family *purohita* priest of the sacrifice as well as the intermediary *ṛtvik* priest and the officiating *hotā*. He is its presiding diety and has full claim to the finest of gems.” (Sāyanācārya has written the following in his commentary to this: “*agni-nāmakam deva-mīle | staumi | īda stauti | ... ḍa-kārasya la-kārah ... prāptaḥ |*”)

From this we can understand that the Rg Veda itself has performed a *maṅgalācaraṇa* by uttering the *omkāra* and praising Agni-devatā. It is not that the Veda is itself trying to dispel any inauspiciousness that might befall it with this *maṅgalācaraṇa*. It must be understood that Bhagavān is uttering these words as a teaching to the *jīvas*. We cannot take this to mean that Bhagavān is dispelling His own inauspiciousness with this Vedic *maṅgalācaraṇa*. If one does not maintain the Vedic standard of etiquette and perform a *maṅgalācaraṇa*, then one’s work will be relegated to the non-Vedic, Buddhist category of texts. We glean this implication from the aforementioned statement of Veda itself. This tradition exists not only in the Vedas, but also in the Upaniṣads. The teachings born from the supramundane contemplations of the Ṛṣis as they studied the Vedas manifested in the form of the Upaniṣads, and there too we find that they all begin with a *maṅgalācaraṇa*. The *Īsopaniṣad* and *Bṛhad Āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* share the same *sānti-pāṭha* [“prayer for peace”] as their *maṅgalācaraṇa*:

“*om pūrṇam adaḥ pūrṇam idam pūrṇāt pūrṇam udacyate |
pūrṇasya pūrṇamādāya pūrṇam evāvaśiṣyate || om sāntiḥ sāntiḥ sāntiḥ ||*”

The *sānti-pāṭha* type of *maṅgalācaraṇa* found in the *Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, *Praśnopaniṣad*, and *Nṛsimha-Tāpanī* is as follows: “*om bhadram karṇebhiḥ śṛṇuyām*” etc. In *Aitareyopaniṣad*, *Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad*, *Mudgalopaniṣad*, and others, we see “*om vāñ me manasīti sāntiḥ.*” The *sānti-pāṭha* invoked in the *Kaṭha* and *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣads* is of the same variety: “*om saha nāvavatu | saha nau bhunaktu | ... om sāntiḥ sāntiḥ sāntiḥ.*”

Maṅgalācaraṇa of the Sūtrakāras

The six *darśanas* (philosophies) of India are recorded in *sūtra* (aphorism) form. I will discuss the topic of Nyāya philosophy later, but for now, a review of the five *darśanas*—Sāṅkhya,

¹¹ From 5th page of *Rg-veda Samhitā*, edited by Śrīyuta Durgācaraṇa Lāhiḍī.

Pātañjala, Vaiśeṣika, Pūrva-mīmāṃsā and Uttara-mīmāṃsā—reveals that each of them has included a *maṅgalācaraṇa* via the word ‘*atha*’. As the Vedas, Upaniṣads, and their corollaries perform *maṅgalācaraṇa* via the word ‘*om*’, the authors of the *sūtras* have done their *maṅgalācaraṇas* simply with the word ‘*atha*’.

The first *sūtra* of Kapila’s Sāṅkhya *darśana* is “*atha trividha-duḥkhātyanta-nivṛttir atyanta-puruṣārthaḥ*.” Here the word ‘*atha*’ is interpreted as a *maṅgalācaraṇa*, as Ācārya Vijñāna Bhikṣu writes in his commentary to this *sūtra*: “‘*atha*’ śabdo ’yam uccāraṇa-mātreṇa maṅgalarūpaḥ.”

In Patañjali’s *Yoga-sūtra*, we see “*atha yoga-śāsanam*.” The fact that the word ‘*atha*’ in this first *sūtra* of the *Yoga darśana* is meant to be a *maṅgalācaraṇa* is clearly proven in the *ṭīkā* of Vācaspati Miśra: “*athaiṣa ’jyotir-ativat’, natvānantaryārthaḥ | ... adhikārarthasya cā ’tha-śabdasyā ’nyārtham nīya-mānoda-kumbha-darśanamiva śravaṇam maṅgalāyopakalpata iti mantavyam*.”

The first *sūtra* of Kaṇāda’s Vaiśeṣika *darśana* is “*athāto dharmam vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*,” and again in the first *sūtra* of Jaiminī’s Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā—“*athāto dharmajijñāsā*”—we see a *maṅgalācaraṇa* via the word ‘*atha*’. In the foremost of these *darśanas*, Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vedavyāsa’s Uttara-mīmāṃsā, we see the first *sūtra* of the Vedānta *darśana* is: “*athāto brahmajijñāsā*.” All the *ācāryas* have accepted the word ‘*atha*’ in Vedānta to be a *maṅgalācaraṇa*. Of all the *sūtra* texts, *Brahma-sūtra* is the one that delivers to us *sambandha-jñāna*. Then, for the perspective of *abhidheya-tattva*, in Śāṅḍilya Ṛṣi’s *sūtras* we see “*athāto bhaktijijñāsā*,” and from the *prayojana-tattva*¹² angle, again we find a *maṅgalācaraṇa* via the word ‘*atha*’ in Nārada’s *bhakti-sūtras*: “*athāto bhaktim vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*.”

Even Pāṇini Ṛṣi has written “*atha śabdānuśāsanam*” in his first *sūtra*. Therefore, we see that as the authors of the *sūtras* proceeded to describe their respective conclusions in extreme brevity, they channeled the depth of sentiment in their hearts into a *maṅgalācaraṇa* via the word ‘*atha*’. In some places in the Vedas, Upaniṣads, and other similar literatures, the

¹² Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas take *bhakti* to exist in both *abhidheya* and *prayojana* forms. Śāṅḍilya’s *bhakti-sūtras* discuss *abhidheya-tattva*, whereas Śrī Nārada’s *bhakti-sūtras* address *prayojana-tattva*. To explain *bhakti*, he has written in the second *sūtra* of the aforementioned text: “*sā tvasmin parama-prema-rūpā*.” In the third *sūtra*, he writes: “*amṛta-svarūpā ca*” etc. From this, we learn the *bhakti* described by Nārada is in the stage of *prema*, the initial state of the *prayojana* level, which is likened to *amṛta*, the nectar of immortality.

*maṅgalācaraṇa*s are performed with the “*om*” *bīja-mantra*. All of these examples indicate that a *maṅgalācaraṇa* is imperative at the start of any *grantha*.

Discernment of Namaskāra in the Kātantra

The author of the *Kātantra* performs his *maṅgalācaraṇa* not with ‘*atha*’, but with the word ‘*siddhi*’. The commentators on the *Kātantra* (otherwise known as *Kalāpa Vyākaraṇa*) have written extensively on the use of this word ‘*siddhi*’. Of them, the *Pañjikā-ṭikā* by Trilocana and the *Kaumudī-ṭikā* by Abrada Tarka-cūḍāmaṇi are notable in this regard. We request Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya to study the critical analysis of *maṅgalācaraṇa* performance these commentators have provided, which includes quotations of all the arguments against performing a *maṅgalācaraṇa*. Though this study of theirs was printed along with the main text of *Kalāpa-vyākaraṇa*, it has been published separately by Īśvaracandra Tarka-vāgīśa in 1306 Baṅgābda, under the title “*Namaskāra Vivekaḥ*”. It states clearly there that if one does not include a *maṅgalācaraṇa*, one’s text is bound to retain many types of flaws. It is evident to us that Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s book is full of many such erroneous conclusions, as outlined in the *Pañjikā-vṛtti-vyākhyā* and *Kaumudī-ṭikā* of *Kātantra*.

Refutation of Dayānanda’s Conceptions on Maṅgalācaraṇa

In reality, it is not acceptable for anyone besides the speakers of the Vedas or Upaniṣads and the authors of the *sūtra* texts to perform a *maṅgalācaraṇa* with the words ‘*om*’ or ‘*atha*’. We see the following claim in a book by Dayānanda Sarasvatī titled *Satyārtha Prakāśa*: “Performing a *maṅgalācaraṇa* by any *śloka*, phrase, or *chanda* other than the words ‘*atha*’ and ‘*om*’ is not endorsed by the Vedas.” We deem this opinion of his to be the embodiment of atheism and a train of thought that is utterly bereft of *tattva-jñāna*. In the *sūtra* style, the verbosity of the mind is restrained and, instead, a profound and expansive truth is fully expressed in few words¹³. Therefore, if putting the full emotion of the heart into verse form and conveying one’s faithful offering to one’s cherished deity cannot be accepted as a *maṅgalācaraṇa*, then what are we to call a *maṅgalācaraṇa*? What else is to be considered an expression of honor and proper etiquette? Svāmī Dayānanda’s opinion is very laughable and wholly rejectable,

¹³ *alpākṣaram analpārtham viśuddham sarvato mukham |*
viśeṣa-kathanopekṣam sūtram sūtra-vido viduḥ ||

This is quoted from the commentary of *sūtra* 42 of *Harināmāmṛta-vyākaraṇa*—Rāma-nārāyaṇa Vidyaratna’s edition, Behrampore; its author is Durgādāsa, commentator on the *Mukha-bodha-vyākaraṇa*.

because the Vedas and Upaniṣads have clearly not performed their *maṅgalācaraṇas* only with the word ‘*om*’. As for the *sūtrakāras*, it is only because their mode of presentation is so constrained that they do their *maṅgalācaraṇas* with the word ‘*atha*’.

Our Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya will possibly say: “Where is the proof that we have to follow the etiquette of performing *maṅgalācaraṇa*?” Even total atheists like Svāmī Dayānanda who are inimical to the deity form of the Lord have been compelled to accept some manner of *maṅgalācaraṇa* etiquette. Subodha Bābu may think that even though this is a long-practiced custom, because there is no hard proof for it, there is nothing wrong with not honoring it. The reason we assume this is because he has already perpetrated atrocities against the *mahā-mantra*, claiming without proof that *mahā-mantra* is not to be sung and chanted aloud. This false statement is like dealing a blow to the form of *śrī nāma* with a mace. By doing so he has become a *nāmāparādhī*. We will, with evidence based on scriptural reasoning, refute the *nāmāparādhā* conceptions disseminated in this *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* book by this stain on our community, Vidyāvinoda. Those who do not engage in loud *kīrtana* of the sixteen-name, thirty-two-syllable *mahā-mantra* are phony *nāmāparādhī* ascetics.

Sāṅkhya Philosophy on Maṅgalācaraṇa

In the Sāṅkhya philosophy of Kapila, we see evidence in support of observing the *maṅgalācaraṇa* etiquette:

“*maṅgalācaraṇam śiṣṭācārāt*” *phala-darśanāt śrutitāś-ceti* ||”

(*Sāṅkhya-darśana* 5.1)

“For the sake of observing etiquette and in order to see proper results, and to honor tradition, it has been determined that it is imperative to perform a *maṅgalācaraṇa*.”

Thus, we see that the author of the aforementioned Sāṅkhya *sūtras* does not disregard the custom of *maṅgalācaraṇa* either. And Vijñāna Bhikṣu also writes: “*maṅgalācaraṇam śiṣṭācārāt iti svayam eva pañcamādhyāye vakṣyati* – the *sūtra* author himself explains in the fifth chapter that *maṅgalācaraṇa* is proper, customary etiquette.” Vijñāna Bhikṣu has pointed this out in his commentary on the word ‘*atha*’ in the first *sūtra*. In other words, it is being clearly established that there is indeed a need to perform a *maṅgalācaraṇa* at the start of any *grantha*.

Perhaps Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya will think, “Kapila’s *Sāṅkhya* is a *yoga-śāstra*; why should we Vaiṣṇavas accept his word?” When it comes to the history of Indian philosophy, everyone unanimously accepts *Sāṅkhya darśana* to be the oldest, and even in Vedānta, Vyāsadeva does not transgress the tenets of *Sāṅkhya* in relation to the creation of the material universe. Even though it is an atheistic school of thought and its theories on *sādhya* and *sādhana* have been totally refuted, its statement “*maṅgalācaraṇam śiṣṭācārāt*” (5.1) has not been transgressed in any way. Who can say that this statement was not made by the Kapila who was the Lord’s *śaktyāveśa-avatāra*, the son of Devahūti? According to Ācārya Vijñāna Bhikṣu¹⁴, Devahūti-nandana Kapila is indeed the author of the *Sāṅkhya sūtras*. These *sūtras* are twenty-two in total. Their extension, or explanation, the *Sāṅkhya-pravacana*, which is comprised of six chapters, was composed by the Kapila who was an incarnation of Agni. It is this *Sāṅkhya-pravacana* that represents *Sāṅkhya* philosophy in the current age. Vijñāna Bhikṣu states that the original twenty-two *Sāṅkhya sūtras* form the basis of *Sāṅkhya-pravacana*. Thus we must conclude that the statement “*maṅgalācaraṇam śiṣṭācārāt*” comes directly from the Kapila who was an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu and the son of Devahūti.

And if one is to disregard the views of Vijñāna Bhikṣu, then one can turn to Gauḍapāda, the ancient *śunyavādī* preceptor of *Sāṅkhya*, who informs us at the start of his *Sāṅkhya-bhāṣya* that Kapiladeva is one of the seven sons of Brahmā¹⁵. If we accept Gauḍapāda’s statement for the sake of argument, then the author of the *Sāṅkhya darśana*, Kapila, the son of Brahmā, is a third Kapila. This Brahma-putra Kapila would have to be different from Vijñāna Bhikṣu’s *agni-avatāra* Kapila and Devahūti’s son Kapila. If he is Brahmā’s son, then those in the Brahma-sampradāya should not object to accepting his statements. Thus, whichever Kapila it was who

¹⁴ “*Śāstra-mukhyārtha-vistāras-tantrākhye ’nukta-pūraṇaiḥ | ṣaṣṭhādhyāye kṛtaḥ paścād-vākyaārthas-copasamhṛtaḥ ||*” *tad-idam sāṅkhya-śāstram kapila-mūrtti-bhagavān viṣṇur-akhila-loka-hitāya prakāśitavān | yat tatra vedānti-bruvaḥ kaścid āhaḥ—sāṅkhya-praṇetā kapilo na viṣṇuḥ | kintv-agnyavatārah kapilāntaram—“agniḥ sas kapilo nāma sāṅkhya-śāstra-pravarttakah |” iti (mahābhārata) smṛter iti | tal-loka-vyāmohana-mātram | “etan-me janma loke ’smin mumukṣuṇām durāśayāt | prasaṅkhyānāya tattvānām sammatāyātma-darśane ||*” *ityādi (bhāgavata 3.24.36) smṛtiṣu viṣṇvavatārasya devahūti-putrasyaiva sāṅkhyopdeṣṭṛtvāvagamāt | kapila-dvaya-kalpanāgauravāc ca | tatra cāgni-śabdo ’gnyākhyā-śaktyāveśād eva prayuktaḥ | yathā—“kālo ’smi loka-kṣaya-kṛt prabuddhaḥ |” iti (gītā 11.32) śrī kṛṣṇa-vākyae kāla-śaktyāveśād eva kāla-śabdaḥ | anyathā viśvarūpa-pradarśaka-kṛṣṇasyāpi viṣṇvavatāra-kṛṣṇād-bhedāpatter iti dik || (sā bhā—6.70)*

¹⁵ “*iha bhagavān brahma-sutaḥ kapilo nāma | tad yathā—sanakaś ca sanandaś ca ṛṭīyaś ca sanātanaḥ | kapilaś cāsuriś caiva bodhūm pañca-sikhas tathā | antya ityete brahmaṇaḥ putroḥ sapta proktā maharṣayaḥ ||*”

made that statement, if it is favorable to *bhagavad-bhajana*, then there is nothing stopping us from accepting it.

Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam on Śiṣṭācāra (Etiquette)

Putting aside all other views, we are bound to accept the decrees of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* with bowed heads. Śrī Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsadeva himself has demonstrated proper etiquette by performing his *maṅgalācaraṇa* in *Vedānta-sūtra* by the word ‘*atha*’ and in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* by the verse “*janmādy asya*”. He demonstrates the etiquette himself and is not remiss in putting clear injunctions on the topic into written word. We see in the First Canto of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, second chapter, fourth verse:

*nārāyaṇam namaskṛtya narañcaiva narottamam |
devīm sarasvatīm vyāsam tato jayam udīrayet ||*

In other words: “The presiding deity of this scripture is Nārāyaṇa, the Supreme Person, and the incarnation of Bhagavān known as Nara Rṣi. After offering obeisance to them as well as to the goddess of divine knowledge, Sarasvatī, and the sage Vyāsadeva, one is to recite this sacred text that allows one to conquer *samsāra*.”

(Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam published in 437 Śrī Caitanyābda by Ananta Vāsudeva)

The aforementioned *śloka* ordains obeisance to one’s worshipful deities before doing anything else. After thus glorifying them in order to conquer this nescient existence, one may compose instructive texts, etc. In this context, we are quoting Śrīdhara Svāmī’s commentary: “*jayatyanena samsāram iti jayo granthas tam udīrayet iti svayam tathodīrayan anyān api paurāṇikān upaśikṣyati*.” Vyāsadeva himself, in order to compose the sacred text of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, which enables the conditioned souls to conquer *samsāra*, has demonstrated the tradition of offering obeisance to one’s worshipful deity. Not only that, but—“*anyān api paurāṇikān upaśikṣayati*.” In other words, we understand from this statement of Śrīdhara Svāmī that Vyāsadeva did this so that other authorities of the Purāṇas would offer their respects to the Supreme Lord and compose other similar literatures that may be referred to by

the word *jaya* (“victory”)¹⁶. Even though Śrīdhara-svāmipāda is not a predecessor *ācārya* of the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya and there are significant differences between his conceptions and those of Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas, everyone has shown him tremendous respect as being the original commentator on *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* in one sense, among all the other commonly read *Bhāgavata* commentators. In his *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has invested considerable effort into trying to prove that Śrīman Mahāprabhu was a follower of Śrīdhara Svāmipāda’s lineage. That is precisely why I have been compelled to quote Śrīdhara Svāmipāda’s statement here and expose Sāhā Bābu’s unwillingness to observe proper etiquette in this regard. If we understand from the aforementioned verse’s statement (“*tato jayam udīrayet*”) that after offering our obeisance we are to utter the word “*jaya*,” then we can see that “Śrī Śrī Guru-Gaurāṅgau Jayataḥ” has not been used in Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s title in a way that follows in Śrīdhara Svāmipāda’s footsteps. And since we know the word *jaya* refers to all *sāmsāra*-conquering scriptures, we can understand that the book *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* has not been written for the purpose of conquering *sāmsāra*.

It is relevant in this context to inform the readers of a certain aspect of Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s nature. In the various books he has written, he has advocated a number of conflicting conclusions and self-contradictory ideas; and if you ask him in person why he has written all these perplexing statements, he responds: “I am not the operator, just an instrument.” So, by his own admission, he is like a paid employee and does not have a problem with publishing completely conflicting views according to the wishes of whoever he is subservient to at any given time. We will lay bare this habit of his as we proceed to critique his book in these articles. For now, our question is: Who is the actual operator behind this *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* book? Has this figure behind the curtain not been able to conquer *sāmsāra* and instead relinquished his *śrī gurudeva* and *sannyāsa* to become a degraded sort of householder? And is Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya becoming a *vāntāśī* as well and spending his whole life in the *grhastha-āśrama*? If so, then how will his writings comprise a book that can help people cross over *sāmsāra*? Instead it will be a tome that fosters states of eternal frog-like entrapment in the well of material existence. Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s book has not upheld the purport of Śrīdhara Svāmipāda’s statement: “*sāmsāram iti jayo grantham udīrayet*”—nor can it.

¹⁶ *jaya-śabdasyāyam artho bhaviṣyottare | viṣṇu-dharmādi-śāstrāṇi śiva-dharmāś ca bhārata | kārṣaṅca pañcamo vedo yan mahābhārataṁ smṛtam || sītā-rāmādi-dharmāś ca mānavoktā mahīpate | jayeti nāma caiteṣāṁ pravadanti manīṣiṇa iti ||*—(footnote on *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* 1.2.4, from the edition of Śrī Khagendranātha Śāstri)

This ‘jaya’ word spoken in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* was referring to books that are full of powerful instructions that afford one the ability to conquer this nescient state of existence. And the word ‘*udīrayet*’ refers to the recitation of such texts, as well as to their composition or compilation. Therefore, this ‘jaya’ refers to all the teachings imparted by the authors of scripture and the various Purāṇic authorities. Svāmipāda’s mention of ‘*anyān api*’ is in reference to anyone else who may write instructive texts. Therefore, it follows that everyone is expected to observe the procedural etiquettes of such writing as prescribed in *śāstra*. This is the purport of Śrīdhara Svāmipāda’s commentary.

In his commentary to the aforementioned *śloka*, Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartī Ṭhākura, following the lead of previous *ācārya* commentators of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*, has provided another very clear instruction to the writers of *granthas*: “*guruṁ natvā devatādīn praṇamati nārāyaṇam iti.*” Viśvanātha Cakravartī Ṭhākura’s instruction is this: “First one must offer obeisance to *gurudeva*, and then one can offer obeisance to one’s *upāśya-tattva* (whichever form of Bhagavān one chooses to worship). In the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya, there is no need to give any separate introduction to Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartī Ṭhākura. He is a *mahā-mahopādhyāya* scholar in all scriptures. Whether you look at his Vaiṣṇava qualities or at his role as a protector of the *sampradāya*, Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartī Ṭhākura’s name commands distinction in every respect. Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s neglect of this “*guruṁ natvā*” instruction of Śrīla Cakravartī Ṭhākura gives us further reason not to accept his book as any sort of helpful, saintly text.

To sum up, we have seen that even Śrī Vyāsadeva himself does not transgress the standard established in Sāṅkhya—“*maṅgalācaraṇam śiṣṭācārāt.*” He has demonstrated that etiquette himself in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* and put into writing the rules for *maṅgalācaraṇa*. If one neglects this standard, no matter what task one sets about, no good will come of it. Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has included *maṅgalācaraṇas* in all the other books he has done, but with this ‘*vāda*’ book of his, this *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, it is as if the gods or fate itself knew he would be publishing conclusions opposed to pure Vaiṣṇava philosophy and so, he was somehow deterred from following the proper etiquette. We will demonstrate in detail how his book has managed to be opposed to *siddhānta*, opposed to *guru* and Vaiṣṇavas, contradictory to history, contradictory to proper presentation of evidence, antithetical to proper conduct, antithetical to civility, antithetical to purity, at odds with Gauḍīya thought, inimical to the Gosvāmīs, inimical to Śrī Caitanya, contrary to the *sampradāya*, opposed to *śrī nāma*, and opposed to everything else of the like.

Caturtha Siddhānta

Fourth Conclusion

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī’s Adherence to Madhva in his Maṅgalācaraṇa

The authors of *granthas* and commentators on such works provide some indication of their intentions and the subject of their *granthas* via their *maṅgalācaraṇas*. Because Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has not done a *maṅgalācaraṇa* for this book, we cannot find any clear declaration of its subject. He has not been able to even slightly establish “*acintya-bhedābheda*” with the *vāda*, or theory, of “*acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*” that he has posited in the very title of his book. Mostly he has gone to great effort to establish that Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s *sampradāya* is an *advaita-vādi* lineage and that Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s *sampradāya* is not the Brahma-Mādhva-Gauḍīya-*sampradāya*. Vidyāvinoda has introduced a discussion in regard to this in a most shameless and audacious manner in the thirteenth *prasaṅga* of this “*Vāda*” text, on page 239. I am quoting a few portions of that here with the aim of demolishing his most ignoble intentions:

“The main arguments against the Śrī Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-*sampradāya*’s inclusion in the Mādhva-*sampradāya* have been presented below as follows:

“1 | (a) There are six categories of differences between the Mādhva-*sampradāya* and Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-*sampradāya*: (1) *sādhyā*, (2) *sādhana*, (3) *śāstra*, (4) *iṣṭa*, (5) *bhāṣya*, and (6) *vāda*;

[We will demonstrate with evidence that in each of these categories, there is no difference between the two *sampradāyas*. —author]

“(b) How can Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanyadeva, who is the lord and master of the founders of the four *sampradāyas*, become subservient to one of them? [We will lay out the refutation to this argument as well later on. —author]

“(c) Śrī Mahāprabhu cannot refute the Mādhva doctrine and then be a part of that lineage. Therefore the Śrī Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya cannot be called the Śrī Brahma-Mādhva-Gauḍīya-sampradāya. It is an independent *sampradāya* founded by Śrī Gauracandra.”¹⁷

Note: The main arguments in this connection, against the Śrī Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya’s inclusion in the Mādhva-sampradāya, are laid out as follows:

There are numerous references in *Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta* (Madhya 8.45, 123; Antya 7.16) and *Śrī Caitanya-candrodaya-nāṭaka* (5.28, 29; Behrampur edition, 401 Śrī Caitanyābda) that tell us Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya-deva was a *sannyāsī* of the *kevalādvaita-sampradāya*, and the *guru* of Śrī Caitanya-deva’s *sannyāsa* pastimes, Śrī Keśava Bhāratī, was also a *kevalādvaita-vādī*. Besides Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya-deva referring to himself as a *māyāvādī-sannyāsī*, the *sannyāsī-guru* of the *māyāvādīs* in Kāśī, Prakāśānanda, addresses Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya-deva as follows: “*keśava bhāratīra śiṣya, tāhe tumi dhanya* – You are blessed to be the disciple of Keśava Bhāratī.” And: “*sāmpradāyika sannyāsī tumi raha ei grāme* – You are a *sannyāsī* of a recognized lineage; you should stay in this village. (Cc. Ādi 7.66–67)” Śrī Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya, after first having Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya-deva’s *darśana* in Purī, said: “*bhāratī sampradāya,—ei hayena madhyama* | – This Bhāratī lineage is second-class. (Cc. Madhya 6.72)” “*Nirantara ihāke vedānta śunāibo | vairāgya-advaita-mārge praveśa karāibo || kahena yadi, punar api yoga-paṭṭa diyā | saṁskāra kariye uttama sampradāye āniyāi ||* – I will recite Vedānta to him ceaselessly and help him enter the path of renunciation and monism. If he wants, I will perform his *sannyāsa* ceremony again and transfer him into the highest order of *sannyāsa*. (Cc. Madhya 6.75–76)” In Purī, Śrī Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya-deva revered Śrī Brahmānanda Bhāratī like a *guru*, and when He saw Bhāratī wearing a deerskin like the *māyāvādī-sannyāsīs*, He asked, “*bhāratī gosāi kene paribena cāma?* – Why would Bhāratī Gosāi wear deerskin?” There are also the statements of Śrī Brahmānanda Bhāratī himself: “*ājanma karinu mui ‘nirākāra’ dhyāna | tomā dekhi’ ‘kṛṣṇa’ haila mora vidyamāna | kṛṣṇa-nāma sphure mukhe mane netre kṛṣṇa | tomāke tad-rūpa dekhi’ hṛdaye—saṭṛṣṇa. bilvamaṅgala kaila yaiche daśā āpanāra |*

¹⁷ [If we follow Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s reasoning that Mahāprabhu became part of the *kevalādvaita-vādī* lineage because He took *sannyāsa* from the *advaita-vādī* Keśava Bhāratī, we can mention that Madhvācārya himself also took *sannyāsa* at the age of twelve from the *kevalādvaita-vādī* Acyuta Prekṣa. In that case, you would have to say that Śrī Madhva is also part of the *kevalādvaita-vādī-sampradāya*! So what then is stopping Mahāprabhu from also being part of the Madhva-sampradāya? Both were part of Śaṅkara’s *advaita-vādī* lineage. On the other hand, it would not be an overstatement to say that since Śrī Madhvācārya adopted an *ekadaṇḍa* as per Śaṅkara lineage traditions, Mahāprabhu Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya-deva followed in Śrī Madhva’s footsteps and accepted *ekadaṇḍa-sannyāsa* from Keśava Bhāratī. This serves only to bolster and confirm the fact that Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas are following in the guidance of Madhvācārya.]

ihā dekhi' sei daśā haila āmāra || 'advaita-vīthī-pathikair-upāsyāḥ, svānanda-simhāsana-labdha-dīkṣā | haṭhena kenāpi vyaṁ śaṭhena, dāsīkṛtā gopa-vadhu-ṁṭena | – From birth I engaged in meditation on the formless *brahman*. Seeing you, however, Kṛṣṇa appeared to me. Kṛṣṇa's name appeared in my mouth and His form before my mind and eyes. Seeing You to be just like Him, my heart is thirsting to serve You. I have become just like Bilvamaṅgala. 'Although revered by monists and initiated to sit upon the throne of self-bliss, I have somehow been made a maidservant of a cunning boy who jokes with the *gopīs*.' (Cc. Madhya 10.175–78)" It is clear from these statements that Śrī Keśava Bhāratī, Śrī Brahmānanda Bhāratī, and Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya-deva all manifested pastimes of accepting *sannyāsa* in the *kevalādvaita-vādī* lineage. (—from pages 246–247 of Vidyāvinoda's *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, 13th chapter)

—author

Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has cited as proof for the above section (c) an official Sanskrit *vyavasthā-patra* ["manifesto"] circulated by Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa Basu Mahāśaya, the *adhyakṣa* (overseer) of Cuttack's Rāsabihārī Maṭha, in Issue 9|4 of their 1926 *Virabhūma Patrikā* (pages 188-89). Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya's text often quotes evidence of this caliber. This Rāsabihārī Maṭha is one of the main hubs of the *prākṛta-sahajiyās* in Orissa. How can the dogma of its overseer, Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa Basu, be accepted as proper *pramāṇa*? It looks rather shameful to us to have to establish a conclusion based on the word of someone of lesser reputability in order to shore up one's own fallacious doctrine. There is a proverb in English: "A drowning man catches at a straw."

If Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa Basu Mahāśaya's Sanskrit document is so authoritative and the object of Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya's adoration, what objection can there be to the *vyavasthā-patra* of Śrī Śrī Gaura-Govindānanda Bhāgavata Svāmī, founder of Navadvīpa Dhāma's Śrī Guru Āśrama.? He is a much more revered and renowned *tyāgī-sannyāsī* and a widely acclaimed scholar. When all the Vaiṣṇavas of Navadvīpa requested this Svāmījī to present a refined analysis in refutation of Cuttack Rāsabihārī Maṭha's manifesto, said Svāmījī composed and circulated the following *vyavasthā-patra*, which establishes that the root of Śrīman Mahāprabhu's Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya is Śrī Madhvācārya and that is where the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya has originated. The *vyavasthā-patra* document written in Sanskrit *śloka* format is quoted here below, with translation:

*mukhyena sampradāyitvaṁ sampradāya-vidyaṁ naye |
sampradāyi-guror-dīkṣā-mantra-grahaṇato bhaveti || 1 ||*

According to those who are authorities on the various *sampradāyas* (spiritual lineages), one's connection to a particular *sampradāya* is established by the acceptance of *dīkṣā-mantra* from a *guru* who is part of a bona fide disciplic succession in that line.

śiṣṭa-paramparācāryaopadiṣṭa-sārga eva hi |
sampradāya iti khyātaḥ sudhībhiḥ sampradāyibhiḥ || 2 ||

The traditionalists (*sampradāyīs*) who are of refined perspective assert that the path taught by the *ācārya* who is a bona fide heir to a *śiṣṭa-paramparā* (a properly taught disciplic succession) is called a “*sampradāya*.”

śiṣṭatvaṁ nāma cāmnāya-prāmāṇyābhyupaganta tā |
vedanām viṣṇu-pāramyāt śiṣṭo vaiṣṇava ucyate || 3 ||

Accepting the evidence of the Vedas is *śiṣṭatva* [“discipline”], and all the Vedas convey the supreme knowledge of Viṣṇu. Therefore, only Vaiṣṇavas who are intent on the worship of Viṣṇu are referred to as *śiṣṭa*.

atat-paramparatvena vaiṣṇavatvaṁ na siddhyati |
avaiṣṇavopadiṣṭenetyādi-śāstra-prakopānāt || 4 ||

Those who do not maintain the sanctity of Vaiṣṇava *paramparā* cannot authenticate their status as Vaiṣṇavas because there are severe spiritual risks associated with hearing *mantra* from those who are not genuine Vaiṣṇavas.

tasmāt śiṣṭānuśiṣṭānām paramparām rirakṣiṣuḥ |
svaniḥśvasita-vedopi gauṛo mādḥva-mataṁ gataḥ || 5 ||

That is why He who is the author of the Vedas, Gaurahari, from whose breath the Vedas have emanated, wanted to maintain the disciplined and taught disciplic succession and therefore accepted the Mādḥva lineage.

sarva-jagad-guruḥ śrīmad-gaurāṅgo loka-śikṣayā |
purīśvaram guruṁ kṛtvā svīcakre sampradāyakam || 6 ||

As *guru* of the whole world, Śrīmad Gaurāṅga-deva chose Īśvara Purī as His *guru* and accepted a *sampradāya* in order to teach the people of the world to do the same.

kaścin-mata-viśeṣo 'pi nirastas-tattva-vādinām |
śrīmad-gaurāṅga-devena sampradāyasya tena kim || 7 ||

Even though Śrīmad Gaurāṅga-deva refuted some specific concepts of the *tattvavādīs* who were following the Mādhva doctrine, how does that affect his position in the *sampradāya*? In other words, having a philosophical difference with members of one's *sampradāya* does not abolish one's position in the *sampradāya*.

sampradāyaika-dikṣāṅām mithaḥ kiñcin-matāntarāt |
śākhā-bhedo bhaven mātram sampradāyo na bhidyate || 8 ||

Even if members of the same *sampradāya* have some disagreement, that does not divide the *sampradāya*; all that happens is different branches form.

rāmānandī yathā rāmānujīyāntargato bhavet |
nimbārka-sampradāye ca hari-vyāsādayo yathā || 9 ||

Even though the Rāmānandīs have their own unique ideas, they are included among the Rāmānujīs; and in the Nimbārka-sampradāya, even though Hari-Vyāsa and others have some philosophical differences, they are considered part of the Nimbārka-sampradāya.

gauḍīyas-tattva-vādī ca tathā mādharma-matam gatau |
na hy atra bādhaḥ kaścit drśyate tattva-vittamaiḥ || 10 ||

In the same way, both the Gauḍīya-sampradāya and the Tattvavādīs are adherents of Madhva's philosophy; scholars cognizant of *tattva* do not see any reason for this not to be so.

tuṣyatv iti matenāpi sampradāya-viniścaye |
svīkṛtam sādhatvena cet sādhyādi-vivecanam |
tathāpy atyanta-bhedo na śrī gaura-mādhvayor mate || 11 ||

But, as per the *nyāya* of “*tuṣyatu-durjana*,” if it pleases the wicked to accept distinctions between the *sampradāyas* based on the *sādhyādi* (ultimate goals, etc.) of the various practitioners, then too there is no significant difference between the *mata* of Gaura and Madhva.

madhva-mate ca yā muktiḥ sādhyatvena prakīrtitāi |
viṣṇvaṅghri-prāpti-rūpā sā bhāṣya-kṛd-bhiḥ pradārītā || 12 ||

The *mukti* that is talked about in Madhva's doctrine as the ultimate *sādhyā* has been explained by commentators to refer strictly to the interpretation of *mukti* as *viṣṇupada-lābhā* “obtaining the feet of Viṣṇu.”

*sādhanaṁ cārpitaṁ karma jīvādhikāra-bhedataḥ |
svīkṛtaṁ api madhvena bhakteḥ śraiṣṭhaṁ bahu-stutaṁ || 13 ||*

Though Madhva accepted that for certain *jīvas*, according to their eligibility, offering the fruits of their *karma* can be a form of *sādhana*, he has praised the superiority of *bhakti* in many places.

*pramāṇaṁ bhārataṁ mātraṁ madhva-mate 'nṛtaṁ vacaḥ |
yat tena trividhaṁ proktaṁ mukhyaṁ śabda-pramāṇakam || 14 ||*

The idea that in Madhva's *mata* only the *pramāṇa* (evidence) of *Mahābhārata* is accepted is a lie, because he accepted three forms of *pramāṇa*, naming *śabda-pramāṇa* as the main source of evidence.

*śrīman-nartaka-gopāla-sevā yena pratiṣṭhitā |
iṣṭatvena kathaṁ tasya nirṇīto dvārakāpatiḥ || 15 ||*

How does one come to decide that the *iṣṭadeva* of someone who has established the service of Śrīman Nṛtya-Gopāla (“The Dancing Cowherd Boy”) is actually Dvārakāpati Śrī Kṛṣṇa?

*niścito dvārakādhiṣo yadyapi vā kṣatiḥ kutaḥ |
yo nanda-nandanaḥ kṛṣṇaḥ sa eva dvārakāpatiḥ |
svarūpayor-dvayor-aikyam kṛṣṇatvamaviśeṣataḥ || 16 ||*

And even if the Lord of Dvārakā is proven to be his *iṣṭadeva*, what is the harm in that? Nanda-nandana Śrī Kṛṣṇa is Dvārakāpati. In other words, these two forms of Kṛṣṇa are nondifferent. Both *sva-rūpas* are one, and both are Kṛṣṇa.

*līlābhīmāna-bhedena pūrṇatamaś ca pūrṇakāḥi |
na tu svarūpato bhedas tayor asti kathaṅcana || 17 ||*

Depending on the sense of self that Kṛṣṇa has in a particular pastime (*līlābhīmāna*), sometimes He is *pūrṇatama* (fullest) and sometimes *pūrṇatara* (more full). That is all. There is no differentiation present in His actual *sva-rūpa*.

*bhedābheda-mataṁ yac cācintyākhyam kīrttyate budhaiḥ |
śrī caitanya-matābhijñaiḥ tac ca madhva-mateṅgitam || 18 ||*

The philosophy of oneness and difference (*bhedābheda*) that is dubbed “*acintya*” (inconceivable) is extolled by those familiar with Śrī Caitanya's *mata*. Indications of the same concept are found in Madhva's *mata*.

*jīvānām brahma-vaijātye guṇāmśatvād-abhinnatā |
pratiyogitva-bhedatve cinmātratvāt-tadekatā || 19 ||*

Because the *jīvas* are different from *brahma* in certain ways, the *jīvas* have been referred to as the *guṇāmśa* of *brahma*, meaning that they are not different from *brahma*, and though there are some qualitative differences between them, because their essence is spiritual, they are nondifferent, as *amśas*, or expansions.

*tad-vyāpyatva-tadāyatta-vṛttikatvādi-hetutaḥ |
sāmānādhikaraṇyaṅca gosvāmi-madhvayoḥ samam || 20 ||*

This is because that which is pervaded by something else and is functionally dependent on that thing is simply nondifferent from it. This is why both the Gosvāmīs and followers of Madhva see the uniformity of the individual soul (*jīva*) and *brahma* in similar ways.

*vicāra-mātra-naipūnyam śakti-śaktimator iha |
gaura-kṛpodbhavo 'cintya-vādo gosvāmibhiḥ smṛtaḥ |
tattva-nirdhāraṇe mukhyaḥ kāraṇavāda ucyate || 21 ||*

The Gosvāmīs have extolled *acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, the idea of inconceivable oneness and difference between energy and its possessor, and this is a concept that has arisen by the grace of Gaura. This is simply the finesse of His reasoning. In reality, He has deemed a form of *kāraṇa-vāda* (causality) to be of primary significance in determining *tattva*.

*parākhya-śaktimad brahma nimitta-kāraṇam bhavet
upādānantu tad-brahma jīva-pradhāna-śakti-yuk |
iti kāraṇavāde 'pi hy ubhayor matayoḥ samam || 22 ||*

As the abode of *parā-śakti* (supreme energy), *brahma* is the efficient cause, and as the embodiment of the *jīvas* and the material energy of *māyā*, *brahma* is also the immediate, material cause. There is similarity between the doctrines (of the Gauḍīyas and the Mādhvas) in regard to this sort of theory of causality as well.

*śrī govindābhidham bhāṣyam pramāṇam yadi manyate |
prameya-ratna-siddhānta-niṣkṛṣṭā tat-samāhṛtiḥ || 23 ||
vakti śrī-gaura-sammatim madhvaḥ prāhetyupakrame |
yadi bopekṣyate kaiścit tar hy arddha-kukuṭṭīnayaḥ || 24 ||*

And if *Śrī Govinda-bhāṣya* is accepted as an authoritative source of evidence, then one can find these essential concepts collected in *Prameya-ratnāvalī*. There, in a single verse, Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa commences with “*śrī madhvaḥ prāha* – thus spake Śrī Madhva” and concludes with “*hariḥ kṛṣṇa-caitanya-candraḥ*,” having explained that the philosophy of Madhva is the philosophy of Gaura. If someone is to neglect this conclusion, then they have succumbed to the fallacy of “*arddha-kukkuṭi* – half a chicken.” In other words, to accept one fact but not another concomitant one is half-a-chicken logic. This is sort of philosophy is antithetical to the reasoning of *śāstra*.

The points presented in the above twenty-four verses are worthy of careful contemplation in a preliminary discussion about the Gauḍīyas’ inclusion in Mādhva’s *sampradāya*. The reputed Haridāsa Dāsa Mahāśaya’s *Śrī Śrī Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava Sāhitya*, which was published in two parts at around 500 pages and furnishes the contents of Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s pages, quotes the abovementioned verses in the context of describing Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu’s *Prameya-ratnāvalī*. Haridāsa Dāsa has accepted the critical analysis of Śrī Gaura-Govindānanda Bhāgavata Svāmī’s *mīmāṃsā-patra* as *pramāṇa* and Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya cites evidence from this same book [of Haridāsa Dāsa] and uses it in various places in his ‘*Vāda*’ book. Even though Haridāsa Bābājī Mahāśaya’s writings contribute to Sundarānanda’s works, in the first *khaṇḍa* of *Śrī Śrī Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava Sāhitya*, page 112, he writes a short article titled: “Why Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda is part of Śrī Madhva’s philosophy.” There he contradicts Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya and has adhered to the conceptions of Śrīla Baladeva.

Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya himself wrote a book called *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva*. Supati-rañjana Nāga, M.A., B.L. Mahodaya has published this book on February 8, 1939 from Puranapaltan, P.O. Ramaṇā (Dhaka). The book is written on the premise that Śrīman Mahāprabhu was part of Śrī Madhvācārya’s *sampradāya*. Vidyāvinoda’s current ‘*Vāda*’ book attempts a total refutation of this *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva* book. I will lay out the various contradictory conclusions in these two books and demonstrate how fully deluded Vidyāvinoda is, how his intellect appears to have become partially malformed. No conclusion or conception stemming from the writings of such a bewildered, deluded person can be even slightly acceptable in educated society. If the Indian legal system had the right sort of law in place for punishment of such crimes, then he could be brought before a court of justice and efforts could be made to reform him. In fact, I am calling on the special insights of expert logicians and legislators to help in this matter.

Śrī Jīva’s Loyalty to Śrī Madhva in Tattva-sandarbhā

In Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmipāda’s *Ṣat-sandarbhā*, the *Tattva-sandarbhā* is the first. Though he delivers a *maṅgalācaraṇa* in each *Sandarbhā*, in the *maṅgalācaraṇa* to *Tattva-sandarbhā*, he outlines the subject of the whole body of work. What is to be discussed here is how Śrīla Jīvapāda has demonstrated his loyalty to the Mādhva-sampradāya. In the thirteenth section of his *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, page 241, 4th Anuccheda, Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya brings up five arguments titled “(ka), (kha), (ga), (gha), and (ṇa),” and wants to claim that the crown jewel of Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-ācāryas, Śrīla Jīvapāda, does not acknowledge any sort of connection between the Mādhva-sampradāya and Gauḍīya-sampradāya in his *maṅgalācaraṇa* to *Tattva-sandarbhā*. Furthermore, he tries to establish that Śrīla Baladeva Prabhu has forced the mention of Madhva and his *sampradāya* in his commentary to *Tattva-sandarbhā*. Of those (ka), (kha), (ga), (gha), and (ṇa) points, first we will discuss (ka) and (kha) here:

“(ka) The difference between Śrī Śrī Jīvapāda’s invocation in the *maṅgalācaraṇa* to *Tattva-sandarbhā* and Śrīla Baladeva’s invocation.

“(kha) The difference between Śrī Jīvapāda’s and Śrīla Baladeva’s interpretations of the word “*vr̥ddha-vaiṣṇavaiḥ*” in *Tattva-sandarbhā* (4th Anu).”

It is very surprising that Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has sought and extracted a difference between Śrīla Jīvapāda’s invocation and that of Śrīla Baladeva! First of all we need to discuss what he means by difference. He keeps belting out nondual *advaitavādī* words like *advayatva*, *abhedaṭva*, *advitīyatva*, etc., everywhere, so it is no meager feat that he has managed to extract this disparity despite being so absorbed in nonduality—especially since he is not even willing to accept that the *jīva* and *prakṛti* are different *tattvas*. Though *para-tattva* (the Absolute Truth) is one undivided substance, the notion of *jīva-tattva* and *prakṛti-tattva* having their own existence within that whole is perfectly in alignment with all *śāstras*. But Vidyāvinoda does not even want to refer to *jīva* and *prakṛti* as *tattvas*. This alone is a matter of great wonder. Do none of the concepts presented by Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī and others enter the caverns of his ears? In his introduction to his *Vāda* book, he prints the following in bold on page V: “If we give *jīva* and *prakṛti* the title of *tattva* like various Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas* have done, then we have to accept more than one *tattva*, which infringes on the concept of *advaita*.” On page IX of his introduction, he writes: “*Vastu* or *tattva* is not dual.” As he concludes his fourteenth chapter on page 271, he writes: “*Tattva* is one; not two.” On the same page he reiterates his previous point: “If we refer to *jīva* and *prakṛti* as *tattvas*, this

infringes on the concept of nonduality.” In this way, in various places he has accepted the oneness of *vastu* in the *advaita-vādi* fashion while rejecting the notion that *jīva* and *prakṛti* can be separate *tattvas*.

Given this obsession with oneness, it is difficult to understand how he has discovered a disparity between Śrīla Jīvapāda’s *vandanā* (prayers) in the *maṅgalācaraṇa* to *Tattva-sandarbhā* and Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu’s own *vandanā*. Where is the difference he sees? Is it in their use of language? Is the difference in typesetting or font size? Or is that Śrīla Jīvapāda writes eight verses for his *vandanā* in *Tattva-sandarbhā* while Śrīla Baladeva Prabhu has commenced his commentary on *Tattva-sandarbhā* with a *vandanā* of just six? Or does he actually mean there is a difference of opinion between these *ācāryas* who are both *pārśada-bhaktas* (devotees who are direct associates of Bhagavān)? We cannot see any difference between Jīvapāda and Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu in any area. “*Maṇimaya-mandira-madhye pipīlikā paśyati chidram* – An ant will see the crack in a temple wrought of jewels.” This claim Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya makes simply highlights his shortcomings. Though the vulture flies high, it only seeks low-lying, foul-smelling, rotting corpses. Hopefully no sophist uses this analogy to assert the existence of cracks in the temple of Śrī Baladeva’s thought and the presence of something spoiled or decayed in his exalted life.

We cannot find the slightest disparity between the *vandanā* of Śrīla Jīvapāda and that of Śrīla Baladeva in their respective *maṅgalācaraṇas* to *Tattva-sandarbhā*. If Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya would kindly provide some example of the disparity he refers to, then we could discuss that in detail. I hope he reads this refutation of ours and backs up his claim with proper citation of the disparity between these two supremely liberated *ācāryas*, specifying what kind of disparity it is that he sees and providing an example of what he means. To just say there is a difference between them will not fly. Those who have studied *Tattva-sandarbhā* will not take his incongruous statement to be the word of Veda. Below I lay out several verses from the aforementioned *vandanās* side-by-side. Readers will be able to understand that there is no difference between Śrī Baladeva and Śrī Jīvapāda’s prayers.

(1) Śrīla Jīvapāda begins his *Tattva-sandarbhā* with the words “*śrī kṛṣṇo jayati* – All glories to Śrī Kṛṣṇa.” This is how he commences his *Sandarbhā* corpus. And the one and only commentator on this work, Śrī Śrīmad Baladeva Prabhupāda, has also borrowed that phrase—“*śrī kṛṣṇo jayati*”—at the very beginning of his *ṭīkā* commentary. So, in these two places at least, there is surely no difference.

(2) Śrīla Jīvapāda quotes *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* (11.5.32) in the first verse of his *maṅgalācaraṇa*: “*kṛṣṇa-varṇam tviṣākṛṣṇam sāṅgopāṅgāstra-pārṣadam | yajnaiḥ saṅkīrtana-prāyair-yajanti hi sumedhasaḥ ||*” And in the second verse of his *maṅgalācaraṇa*, he clearly explains the meaning of this citation. In other words, Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī has demonstrated proper etiquette by delineating the object of his worship, which is Śrīman Mahāprabhu along with His expansions and plenary portions, via the *kṛṣṇa-varṇam tviṣākṛṣṇam* verse. In the very first verse of his *maṅgalācaraṇa*, Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu has followed closely in Śrīla Jīvapāda’s footsteps and prayed for divine love for Śrīman Mahāprabhu Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya and His expansions, the Prabhus “Nityānandādvaitaḥ”:

*bhaktyābhāṣenāpi toṣam dadhāne dharmādhyakṣe viśva-nistāri-nāmni |
nityānandādvaita-caitanya-rūpe tattve tasmin nityam āstām ratir naḥ ||*

(Baladeva’s *ṭīkā* on *Tattva-sandarbha* 1, Satyānanda Gosvāmī’s edition, 1318 Sāla)

Hence, we have not been able to understand what difference there is between Jīva Gosvāmī’s *maṅgalācaraṇa* and Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa’s. Rather, the current of mood flowing through both *vandanās* is one and the same.

(3) What Baladeva has written in his commentary on both of these verses of Śrī Jīvapāda’s invocation shows full loyalty in every respect to the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas*. What Baladeva’s *ṭīkā* expresses is fully in line with what has been revealed by Śrīla Jīvapāda in *Krama-sandarbha*, Śrī Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja in *Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, and Śrī Viśvanātha Cakrvarṭī in *Sārārtha-darśinī*. What Baladeva has written even expresses nuances that were not fully developed or expressed by said previous *ācāryas*. In his explanation of “*sāṅgopāṅgāstra-pārṣadam*,” Baladeva writes: “*aṅge nityānandādvaitau, upāṅgāni śrīvāsādayaḥ, astrānya-vidyāc-chetṛtvād bhagavan-nāmāni, pārṣadā gadādhara-govindādayas-taiḥ sahitam iti mahā-balitvam vyajyate |*”

What Śrīla Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī has written in explanation of the verse under discussion [“*kṛṣṇa-varṇam...*”] is, without alteration, what Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa expresses in his commentary. Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī’s statements are especially worth perusal:

ācārya gosāi—caitanya mukhya aṅga |

āra eka aṅga tāra—prabhu nityānanda ||
 prabhura upāṅga—śrīvāsādi bhakta-gaṇa |
 hasta-mukha-netra-aṅga cakrādy astra sama ||

(Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Ādi, 6.36–37)

advaita-nityānanda—caitanyera dui aṅga |
 aṅgera avayava-gaṇa kahiye upāṅgai ||
 aṅgopāṅga tīkṣṇa-astra prabhura sahite |
 sei saba astra haya pāṣaṇḍa dalite ||
 śrīvāsādi, pāriṣada-sainya saṅge laiya |
 dui senāpati bulena kīrtana kariyā ||

(Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Ādi, 3.71, 72, 74)

Again, what difference is there between Baladeva and Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī and other ācāryas like Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī?

(4) Śrīla Jīvapāda, in the third verse¹⁸ of his *vandanā*, sings the praises of Śrīla Rūpa and Sanātana and expresses how it is upon their instruction that he has written the *Ṣat-sandarbha* headed by *Tattva-sandarbha*, which delineates the subject of *tattva*.

In his commentary on this text, in his third verse of *maṅgalācaraṇa*, Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa also praises Rūpa and Sanātana. Jīva Gosvāmī has referred to Rūpa and Sanātana with the adjective “*tattva-jñāpakau* – conveyers of *tattva*.” Thus he praises them as those who convey knowledge of the *tattva-vastu* [Absolute Truth], which is the core tenet heralded by the *Tattvavādī-sampradāya*. Śrīla Baladeva himself praises Śrī Rūpa and Sanātana with the words: “*tattvaṁ tattva-vid-uttamau tau śrī-rūpa-sanātanau*.¹⁹”

There is no disparity here between the *vandanās* of Śrīla Jīvapāda and Śrī Baladeva. Rather, Baladeva conveys his profound faith and dedication to Śrīla Rūpa and Sanātana in his *maṅgalācaraṇa śloka*.

¹⁸ *jayatām mathurā-bhūmau śrīla-rūpa-sanātanau |*
yau vilekhyatas tattvaṁ jñāpakau pustikām imām || (Tattva-sandarbha 3)

¹⁹ *govindābhidham-indirāśrita-padam hasta-stha-ratnādivat*
tattvaṁ tattva-viduttamau kṣititale yau darśayāñca-kratuḥ |
māyāvāda-mahāndhakāra-pāṭalī sat-puṣpavantau sadā
tau śrī-rūpa-sanātanau viracitāścaryau suvaryau stumah || (Tattva-sandarbha-ṭikā 1.3)

Here, as it is most relevant to the topic at hand, I would like submit a few points regarding Śrīla Jīva-pāda's adherence to the guidance of the *tattvavādī* Madhva. Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya writes in his *Vāda* book that “Jīva Gosvāmī has referred to Madhvācārya as the “*tattva-vāda-guru*” and therefore not accepted him as the predecessor *ācārya* of the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya.²⁰” This is apparently why the Gauḍīyas are being presented as separate from the Madhvas. In reality, Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī held *tattva-vāda-guru* Madhvācārya's *tattva-vāda* [“realistic argumentation”] as the ideal philosophical approach, took inspiration from it to title his own work the *Tattva-sandarbhā*, or *Bhāgavata-sandarbhā*, and invoked verses from *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* like “*vadanti tat-tattva-vidas-tattvam*” (1.2.11) as core sources of evidence supporting *tattva-vāda*. Of the four Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas*, only Śrī Madhva is known as the *tattva-vādī*. The philosophies of the other *ācāryas* contain some elements that are *atāttvika* [“unrealistic”], so Mādhva-Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas are *tattvavādīs*, for Jīva Gosvāmī himself has established *tattva-vāda*. He even refers to his *guru* and *parama-guru*, Śrīla Rūpa and Sanātana, as *tattva-jñāpaka ācāryas* in the third verse of his *maṅgalācaraṇa*. The crest-jewel of the Vaiṣṇava *ācārya* lineage, Śrīla Baladeva, echoes that sentiment and refers to Śrī Rūpa and Sanātana as the topmost among those who are acquainted with *tattva*. This not only reveals that, like Jīva-pāda, Śrīla Baladeva adheres to Madhva's guidance, but also, from the statement “*tattva-vid-uttamau*,” that he has expressed even more faith in Rūpa and Sanātana than in Śrī Madhva. The notion that Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas are also *tattvavādīs* has also been stated by Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya himself in his introduction to his *Vāda* book, on page V: “Śrī Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī-pāda has established *tattva-vāda* as described in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*.²¹”

Here Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya may say that Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī has established *advītiya-tattva-vāda*, or *advaita* or *advaya-tattva-vāda*, through statements like “*ekamevādvītiyam*,” whereas Madhva has established *dvaita-tattva-vāda*. In the next *siddhānta* (chapter), we will demonstrate how there is no difference between Madhva's *dvaita-tattva-vāda* and the *acintya-bhedābheda-tattva* of the Gauḍīyas. What remains to be said here is that Madhva is unanimously accepted as a *tattva-vādī* and Jīva Gosvāmī has also established *tattva-vāda*. This is being propounded in Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya's own book. Thus, as there is no difference of

²⁰ “In his *Ṣaṭ-sandarbhā*, Śrī Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī-pāda has referred to Śrī Madhvācārya more than once as “*tattva-vāda-guru*”; he cannot refer to a *guru* of his own lineage in this manner.” —page 194 of *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*

²¹ Śrī Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī-pāda has, with extremely subtle analysis, established *advaya-tattva-vāda*, a *tattva* that is expressed in *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*'s statements like “*ekamevādvītiyam*.”

doctrine between us, the Madhvas and Gauḍīyas, we consider both to be *tattva-vādīs*. That being the case, to say “*tattva-vāda-guru*” is to say “the *guru* of our *sampradāya*.” Since Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī calls Madhvācārya the *tattva-vāda-guru* more than once, he has referred to him as the *guru* of his [Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī’s] own *sampradāya*. Thus there is no reason to think of the Gauḍīya-sampradāya as separate. This much is settled.

Vidyāvinoda’s Claim of Disparity and the Refutation Thereof

On page 45 of this essay, I have referred to two of the claims Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has made in his *Vāda* book in regard to supposed differences between the *vandanās* of Śrīla Jīvapāda and Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhupāda. In regard to the first claim, we have provided four reasoned rebuttals as to why there is no difference between the prayers of Baladeva and Jīvapāda. Now, we proceed to address the second claim referred to earlier—(*kha*)—which attempts to say that there is a difference between Śrī Jīvapāda’s and Śrīla Baladeva’s interpretations of the word “*vr̥ddha-vaiṣṇavaiḥ*” in *Tattva-sandarbha* (4th Anu). We will show here that in Jīvapāda’s own *Sarva-samvādinī* commentary and Śrīla Baladeva’s commentary, there is absolutely no difference between the explanations of the word “*vr̥ddha-vaiṣṇavaiḥ*”—which Jīvapāda uses in the fourth verse of his *Tattva-sandarbha*. Vidyāvinoda has made a very inappropriate attempt to impose a perception of difference between these two *ācāryas*.

We will be exposing where Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s festering philosophical wounds are. The main purpose of his *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* book is to show that the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas do not have the slightest connection with Madhvācārya. In trying to establish this misguided conception, he does not hesitate to present Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī as an *advaita-vādī* and claim he has no connection to *bheda-vāda*. If even a scent of *bheda-vāda*, or *dvaita-vāda*, is accepted, one will have to first embrace Śrīman Madhvācārya’s lotus feet. The thought of this is utterly intolerable to Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya. His heart does not even quiver in the slightest when he claims that even *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* is a monistic, *advaya-vādī* text. If *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* is *advaya-vādī*, then where does this *acintya-bhedābheda-siddhānta* belong? Why did Vidyāvinoda even title his book *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*? In the introduction to this *Vāda* book (page IV), he has written without hesitation, without the slightest doubt in his heart: “*Advaya-tattva* (monism) is the subject of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*; it does not promote *dvaita* or *bhedavāda*.”

These sorts of ideas have entered his head as a result of his animosity to his own *guru*. In order to solidify this concocted idea, he has tried to define even Śrī Baladeva as a *bheda-vādī*,

or *dvaita-vādi*. He has tried to say that Śrī Baladeva Prabhu is a *bheda-vādi* following Madhva and Śrī Jīvapāda is not a *bheda-vādi*, but an *abheda-vādi*; thus, he tries to establish that Baladeva has no connection to Śrī Jīvapāda. This kind of blasphemy is only possible for antagonists of our spiritual tradition like Kālāpāhāḍa. Kālāpāhāḍa became so enamoured with a woman that he gave up *hindu-dharma* and adopted *yavana-dharma*. Then, to uproot that *hindu-dharma*, he launched a campaign of unspeakably wicked crimes and atrocities, the likes of which India had never seen. There was no evil he did not perpetrate, and the ghastliness of his crimes still makes India’s historians tremble. Vidyāvinoda’s overseer or operator, Vāsudeva, will reap and surely is reaping the venomous results of these kinds of offenses, which are the worst kinds. Even at present these individuals are leading their lives in an utterly detestable fashion, incurring unprecedented derision from the religious community. Just as Kālāpāhāḍa could not bear to hear the word “*hindu*,” Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has, like Kālāpāhāḍa, given up his own tradition, the Mādhva-Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya, and cannot bear to hear the names of these *ācāryas*. He does not even mention the name of his own exalted *gurudeva*, a liberated personality, revered amongst all the *ācāryas* that have appeared to date, the topmost Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava *ācārya*, worshipped by the Gosvāmī lineage—*paramahansa-kula-cūḍāmaṇi om viṣṇupāda Śrī Śrīmad Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Gosvāmī*. What to speak of mentioning the name of his former *guru*, he cannot tolerate even hearing it. So is it at all surprising that hearing the name of Ānanda-tīrtha Madhvācārya is particularly objectionable to him? It is likely that the acidity in his body will be agitated if he hears this name, and that his mind will become utterly disturbed.

The crest-jewel of *ācāryas*, the one protector of the Gauḍīya-sampradāya, Śrī Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhupāda, mentions Śrī Śrīmad Ānanda-tīrtha Madhvācārya’s name in the second verse of invocation to his commentary on *Tattva-sandarbhā*. It is this reference to Madhvācārya that is the root of all the supposed differences between Śrī Baladeva and Śrī Jīvapāda. Madhvācārya’s name is the “wound” afflicting Vidyāvinoda. Below we provide Baladeva Prabhupāda’s second verse of invocation for the readers to peruse:

*māyāvādam yas tamaḥ stomam uccair nāsam ninye veda-vāgamśujālaḥ |
bhaktir-viṣṇor-darśitā yena loke jīyāt so ’yam bhānur ānanda-tīrthaḥ ||*

Translation: “Ānanda-tīrtha, who is a veritable sun, has totally eradicated the darkness of *māyāvāda* with the rays of Vedic knowledge. Thus he manifested *viṣṇu-bhakti* to the world.” Śrī Baladeva has thus glorified Śrī Madhvācārya. It is the mention of the name Ānanda-tīrtha

that Sundarānanda interprets as the reason for the differences he perceives. Can he prove that this reference of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa is unbecoming or a lie? In his third verse of his invocation, Baladeva refers to Śrīla Rūpa and Sanātana as suns destroying the darkness of *māyāvāda* as well. He even refers to Śrīla Jīvapāda in a similar manner of praise. If this sort of fathomless conviction in the previous Gosvāmīs expressed by Baladeva in his description of them as the topmost *ācāryas* and destroyers of the Sāṅkhya *dvaita-vādīs* and *vivarta-vādīs* is considered antithetical to the conceptions of the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya, then what kind of statements are we to take as favorable to the *sampradāya*?

If Ācārya Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa's name were to be struck from the list of Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas*, then whom are we to refer to as *ācārya*? It was Śrī Baladeva who defended the honor of the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya at Galta Gaddi in Jaipur. Baladeva was sent there by Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartī; this is accepted by everyone. No one has the right to undermine the significance of this historical incident. Baladeva was *śikṣita* (taught) by Śrīla Viśvanātha's *śikṣā* and *dīkṣita* (initiated) in his *dīkṣā* (delivery of divine knowledge). That is how and why Baladeva was sent by him to defeat the members of the Śrī-sampradāya in Galta. Does this not prove that Viśvanātha Cakravartī was the one who inspired him to prove that the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas are followers of Madhva? Another disciple initiated by Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartī Ṭhākura, Śrī Kṛṣṇadeva Sārvabhauma, accompanied Baladeva as well. Cakravartī Ṭhākura sent Śrīla Śrī Kṛṣṇadeva to aid and assist Śrī Baladeva Prabhu in the debate. Baladeva Prabhu was the most prominent disciple of Śrīla Cakravartī Ṭhākura; there is no difference of opinion in this regard. And Baladeva studied *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* from him. Śrīla Cakravartī Ṭhākura would have been personally present at this *sāmpradāyika* debate that arose in Galta had he not been extremely elderly and physically incapacitated. Here we have to consider what arguments he would have presented to the Rāmānuja-sampradāya if he had been there himself. Has Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya thought about this? What we mean to say is that Cakravartī Ṭhākura would have established the same conclusions that Baladeva did. Perhaps, in that case, Vidyāvinoda would have booted Cakravartī Ṭhākura out of the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya as well. We find essays by four different exalted personalities of immaculate character regarding Śrīla Baladeva's life history—Śrīla Ṭhākura Bhaktivinoda, Jagad-guru Om Viṣṇupāda Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura, the late Atulacandra Gosvāmī, and Śrīmad Viśvambharānanda Deva Gosvāmī Prabhu, the *ācārya* of the Śyāmānanda Vaiṣṇavas in Gopī-vallabhapura. Ācārya Baladeva was a prominent *ācārya* of the Śyāmānanda branch of Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas. There is no proof that Baladeva was previously an *ācārya* or initiated disciple in the Madhva-sampradāya. No one has provided any proper

evidence in that regard, except for some hearsay and concocted information. The accounts of him being a Mādhva *sannyāsī* have always been eyed with doubt.

In the (*kha*) section of his *Vāda* book, Vidyāvinoda has cast aspersions on what Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu has written in his commentary on Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī’s use of “*vṛddha-vaiṣṇavaiḥ*” in his *vandanā* and thus tried to prove a difference of opinion between the two *ācāryas*. Below we quote Śrīla Jīvapāda’s *vandanā* verse along with Baladeva’s commentary:

ko ’pi tad-bāndhavo bhaṭṭo dakṣiṇa-dvija-vamśajah |
vivicya vyalikhad grantham likhitād vṛddha-vaiṣṇavaiḥ || 4 ||

Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu’s commentary is as follows:

“*granthasya purātanatvaṁ sva-pariṣkṛtatvañcāḥ, ko ’piti | tad-bāndhavas tayo rūpa-sanātanayor-bandhuḥ,—gopāla-bhaṭṭa ity arthaḥ |*”

Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has no qualms with this portion of the commentary. He only takes issue with the explanation of the word “*vṛddha-vaiṣṇavaiḥ*.” That portion is as follows:

“*vṛddha-vaiṣṇavaiḥ’ śrī madhvādibhir likhitāt granthāt taṁ ‘vivicya’ vicārya sāraṁ grhītvā grantham imaṁ vyalikhat |*”

The gist of these two sections of commentary is: “The subject of Śrīla Jīvapāda’s *Sandarbhas* is not a new one, but rather a very ancient one. In other words, it deals with subject of the Vedas and Vedānta. This book called *Ṣat-sandarbha* has been written from a thorough study of a book written by Rūpa and Sanātana’s bosom friend, the South-India-born *brāhamaṇa* Śrī Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, as well as from in-depth examinations of the philosophies presented by ancient, senior Vaiṣṇavas like Śrīman Madhvācārya.”

The cause for objection here is that somehow there has been a grievous impropriety committed by defining the word *vṛddha-vaiṣṇavaiḥ* as a reference to Śrī Madhva among other Vaiṣṇavas of past ages. Apparently, Madhvācārya’s name should have been omitted here. According to Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya, “Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu was a disciple of the Madhva-sampradāya; that is why he has defined this word like this—unjustly trying to force the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas into Madhvācārya’s *sampradāya*. In reality, there is no sign of Śrīla

Jīvapāda having any sort of intention like this in his *Tattva-sandarbha*.” We are very surprised by these assumptions. Has Sundarānanda not seen Jīva Gosvāmī’s *Sarva-samvādinī*? *Sarva-samvādinī* is a most excellent text that serves as a commentary to the *Tattva*, *Bhāgavata*, *Paramātma*, and *Kṛṣṇa-sandarbhas*. In *Sarva-samvādinī*, Śrī Jīvapāda clearly mentions Madhvācārya’s name in his explanation of the word “*vṛddha-vaiṣṇavaiḥ*” as used in the “*ko ’pi tad-bāndhavo*” verse. An exalted personality like Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī could envision the future and had already anticipated that heretical, demoniac individuals would delude the world with various misinterpretations of the word “*vṛddha-vaiṣṇavaiḥ*.” We provide below for the readers the interpretation he himself has given of this word in *Sarva-samvādinī*:

“ ‘*ko ’pīti*’—*vṛddha-vaiṣṇavaiḥ*’ *śrī rāmānuja-madhvācārya-śrīdhara-svāmyādi-bhir yal likhitam tad dṛṣṭvetyarthaḥi | anena sva-kapla-kalpitaṅca nirastam |*”²² – The word ‘*vṛddha-vaiṣṇavaiḥ*’ used in the verse beginning with ‘*ko ’pi*’ refers to Śrī Rāmānujācārya, Śrīman Madhvācārya, Śrī Śrīdhara Svāmī and others. *Tattva-sandarbha* has been written after thoroughly consulting their written works. The implication is that this systematic approach negates any risk of propounding concocted conclusions via this work.”

Here I would like to draw the readers’ full attention to what Jīva says in his commentary. They can understand from this just how deceptive Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya is, how he has misled people and committed a grave offense at the lotus feet of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu. My personal assertion is that there is not even the slightest difference between this commentary of Śrīla Jīvapāda and that of Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. Śrīla Baladeva Prabhupāda has made a brief comment, writing “*śrī-madhvādi*,” whereas Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī has elaborated somewhat on what is meant by the word “*ādi*” and has therefore mentioned the name of Madhvācārya along with that of Śrī Rāmānuja, Śrīdhara Svāmī and others. Are we to assume that Baladeva Prabhu did not intend to indicate Rāmānuja and Śrīdhara Svāmī by adding the suffix ‘*ādi*’ to ‘*madhva*’? Śrīla Jīvapāda gives special deference to Madhvācārya in his explanation of the word *vṛddha-vaiṣṇavaiḥ*, citing his name between the other two, like the central gem of a necklace. Though the names of these three—Rāmānuja, Madhva, Śrīdhara—are mentioned in *Sarva-samvādinī*, Madhvācārya’s name being mentioned in the middle conveys that he is the central gem. ‘*Śrīdhara-svāmyādi*’ means Śrīdhara Svāmī + *ādi*—and here this word *ādi* refers to Rūpa and Sanātana. We have previously mentioned that Śrīla Baladeva has praised Śrīla Rūpa and Sanātana as “*tattva-vid-uttama* – the topmost of those acquainted with *tattva*.” It is highly

²² Page 4 of *Sarva-samvādinī*, edited by Śrīyuta Rasika-mohana Vidyābhūṣaṇa, published by Rāma-kamala Sinha from Baṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣat Mandira, 1327 Sāla.

inappropriate to accuse Śrīla Baladeva of being “overly attached” to Madhvācārya because he only referred to Madhva and used the word *ādi* instead of mentioning Rāmānuja and Śrīdhara’s names. On lines sixteen and seventeen of page 24 in his *Vāda* book, Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has written: “Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Mahodaya’s excessive eagerness to include the Gauḍīya-sampradāya in the Mādhva-sampradāya....” We say, “If Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu is overly eager for anything, it is for the welfare of the living entities of the world. And if Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya is trying to pass off enmity of *guru* and lack of character as Vaiṣṇava-ness and is overly eager to exclude Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu from the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava *guru-paramparā*, then that is highly inauspicious for the world. An exalted personality’s eagerness to establish Caitanya Mahāprabhu’s *prema-dharma* throughout the world and a degenerate’s eagerness to subdue that same *prema-dharma* can never be on the same platform. Even if, for argument’s sake, we accept that Baladeva Prabhu was indeed over-zealous in his mention of Madhvācārya’s name, I will assert that this over-zealousness was an expression of mercy aimed at subduing the heretics like Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda and Ananta-Vāsudeva. The things he implies in his book are highly objectionable; they reveal his baseness, and above all they are rooted in an offensive mentality. I have become compelled to refute his untouchable, unhearable, and unreadable book in order to protect the world from the clutches of this sort of Vaiṣṇava *aparādhī*. It is my fervent prayer at the lotus feet of Śrī Hari, Guru, Vaiṣṇavas that even as I discuss this book with the aim of refuting it I am not inadvertently affected by *duḥsaṅga* (bad association).

If Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya had claimed a difference between Śrīla Jīvapāda’s commentary and that of Śrī Baladeva Prabhupāda and had cited both *ṭīkās* together for comparison in his book, then we would have sensed some moral courage and bravery from him. But because *he* was over-zealous in his devious purpose, he deliberately declined to present both *ṭīkās* side-by-side. If he had done so, his attempts at deception would surely have been caught outright. This is precisely what is referred to as real *jñāna-khalatā* (intellectual villainy) and *pāṣaṇḍatā* (iconoclasm).

The only evident difference between these two commentaries is that Śrīla Jīvapāda’s is more verbose, whereas Śrī Baladeva’s is brief, echoing Jīvapāda’s statement in a more concise fashion with the word “*madhvādi*.” The mere mention of Mādhvācārya’s name is not over-zealousness. Śrīla Jīvapāda refers to three ancient Vaiṣṇavas and gives Madhvācārya’s name the central spot between them, whereas Baladeva mentions only that central gem of Madhvācārya’s name and refers to Rāmānuja and Śrīdhara Svāmī by the word “*ādi*.” We have

not been able to understand what difference this creates between the two commentaries. Whatever the case, here we conclude in brief our discussion of the (*kha*) section of Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s book.

“Sva-sampradāya-sahastrādhidaiva” and “Samsārārṇava-taraṇī”

The objection Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya raises in the next section—(*ga*)—is something that causes us rather uncontrollable laughter. I have quoted his objection below:

“(ga) At the beginning of *Sarva-samvādinī*, Śrī Jīvapāda has referred to Śrī Gaurahari as “*sva-sampradāya-sahastrādhidaiva*.” Śrī Baladeva, in his *Govinda-bhāṣya* commentary and in the *maṅgalācaraṇa* to *Prameya-ratnāvalī*, has referred to Śrī Ānanda-tīrtha as “*samsārārṇava-taraṇī*” and deemed Śrī Gaurahari to be a member of the Mādhva-sampradāya.

(*Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*—page 242)

Here Sundarānanda intends to demonstrate the difference between Śrīla Jīvapāda’s usage of “*sva-sampradāya-sahastrādhidaiva*” and Śrī Baladeva’s “*samsārārṇava-taraṇī*.” If this sort of difference determined the separation of *mata* or *sampradāya*, it would be impossible to establish any sort of similarity or shared identity between *ācāryas* and their disciples and grand-disciples. The scholars of the inimical *advaita-vādī* lineage are even trying to find disparity between the teachings of Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī and Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī. Not only that, members of the *sahajiyā* faction like Haridāsa Bābājī and Ananta-Vāsudeva have found differences between Śrī Rūpa Gosvāmī and Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī. It is among scholars like the author of this *Vāda* book that such heretical notions crop up, like thinking Jīva Gosvāmī, who was Śrī Rūpapāda’s devout disciple, became a *svakīya-vādī* and established a doctrine opposed to that of Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī. Even so, in his *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* book, Sundarānanda has not determined that Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī, Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī, Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī and other *ācāryas* belong to different *sampradāyas*. Even though there are unique specialities (*vaiśiṣṭya*) to their *matas*, or points of view, there is no *bheda*, no substantive or polarizing difference, that separates them. *Bheda* and *vaiśiṣṭya* are not the same thing.

Here the other point to be discussed is Śrīla Jīvapāda’s reference to Śrīman Mahāprabhu Gaurasundara as “*sva-sampradāya-sahastrādhidaiva*” in *Sarva-samvādinī*. Here Śrīla Jīvapāda means to reveal Mahāprabhu’s glories. If Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu had in any way diminished what Jīvapāda has written about Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s glories, then it would have been fitting to say that there is some difference between Jīvapāda and Baladeva. But here

Baladeva chose to glorify *sevaka-tattva*, the *bhagavad-bhakta* Śrī Ānanda-tīrtha with his use of the word “*samsārārṇava-taraṇī*.” There really is no context to bring up the issue of disparity between these two *ācāryas*. We are more than ready to insist with great intensity that nowhere has Śrī Baladeva glorified Mahāprabhu in a way that is less than Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī’s glorifications. Rather, in many places, Baladeva ascribes an even greater degree of glory to Mahāprabhu. We can show this from the *maṅgalācaraṇa* verse of *Govinda-bhāṣya* mentioned by Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya, who has chosen not to bring this to his readers’ attention. In his “*Prārambhika Vākya*,” in the fourth section of his *Vāda* book, on page 241, he says: “If you compare Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Mahodaya’s over-zealousness and Śrī Śrī Jīvapāda’s train of thought side-by-side, you can get a sense of the real history.” Though he says this, he does not actually show any statements made by Jīvapāda next to those of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. If he had shown their actual statements next to each other, he would not have been able to present such a deceptive text to society. Bravo to his audacity, bravo to his cunning style of writing!

Below we have cited the *maṅgalācaraṇa* verse Śrī Baladeva wrote about Śrīman Mahāprabhu in his *Sūkṣmā-ṭīkā* on *Govinda-bhāṣya*:

*gajapatir anukampā-sampadā yasya sadyaḥ
samajani niravadyaḥ sāndramānandamṛcchan |
nivasatu mama tasmin kṛṣṇa-caitanya-rūpe
mati-rati-madhurimnā dīpyamāne murārau ||*

(Second *maṅgalācaraṇa* verse by Śrī Baladeva in his *Govinda-bhāṣya-ṭīkā*)

May my mind dwell upon that Kṛṣṇa Caitanya Murāri who is refulgent with the utmost sweetness. By the wealth of His mercy, Gajapati Śrīla Pratāparudra has obtained the form of profound bliss, Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu Himself, and thus obtained the perfection of life.

Besides *Prameya-ratnāvalī*, Śrīla Baladeva Prabhu has used this *śloka* as the second verse of his *maṅgalācaraṇa* to *Siddhānta-ratna*. Here he has described Śrīman Mahāprabhu as “Kṛṣṇa Caitanya, who is Murāri Śrī Hari Himself and who is refulgent with the utmost sweetness.” If we compare this statement with Śrīla Jīvapāda’s “*sva-sampradāya-sahastrādhidaiva*,” the sweetness of Śrī Baladeva’s statement is evident—even though Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī Prabhu describes Śrīman Mahāprabhu with the following *maṅgalācaraṇa* of *Sarva-samvādinī*:

“*durlabha-prema-pīyūṣa-maya-gaṅgā-pravāha-sahastram sva-sampradāya-sahastrādhidaivam śrī śrī kṛṣṇa-caitanya-deva-nāmānam śrī bhagavantam.*”²³ Here we submit to the readers that there really is no difference between the prayers of Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa and those of Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī. Both have, in the same tone, praised Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu as Śrī Bhagavān Himself. Śrī Jīva-pāda, at the start of *Sarva-samvādinī*, was commencing a discussion of Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s *tattva*. Even though this is not Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa’s topic at the start of *Govinda-bhāṣya*, he sings the praises of Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu and His associates, albeit arguably incidentally.

Rasika Mohana Vidyābhūṣaṇa Mahāśaya has translated “*sva-sampradāya-sahastrādhidaiva*” as “the supreme presiding deity of His own *sampradāya*.”²⁴ The author of this *Vāda* book translates it as: “the eternal presiding deity of thousands and thousands of *sampradāyas* He has founded.”²⁵

Here we need to compare the translation of revered scholar Rasika Vidyābhūṣaṇa and that of Sundarānanda. In any case, without getting into further analysis, if we accept both translations, there is still not the slightest detectable difference between the statements made by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa and Jīva-pāda. Besides, it is difficult to understand what Vidyāvinoda means by saying Śrīman Mahāprabhu is the presiding deity of thousands and thousands of *sampradāyas* that He has founded. There is only one *sampradāya* founded by Mahāprabhu, which we know as the pure Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-*sampradāya*. But if Sundarānanda has himself become part of the *sahajiyā* faction and wants to establish the *sahajiyās* as comprising a lineage that is part of Mahāprabhu’s *sampradāya*, he can do so. We know well that nowadays there are many *apasampradāyas* (bogus lineages) spreading all over India in Mahāprabhu’s name. Of them, we see that the thirteen *apasampradāyas* identified by Siddha Totārāma Bābājī Mahārāja have been around for over two hundred years. The sonnet he composed in this regard is as follows:

āula, bāula, karttābhajā, neḍā, daraveśa, sāi |
sahajiyā, sakhibhekī, smārtta, jāta-gosāi ||

²³ *Sarva-samvādinī*, page 1, published 1327 Sāla by Śrī Rāma-kamala Simha from Baṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣat Mandira

²⁴ For full translation, see *Sarva-samvādinī*, 1327 Sāla, by Śrī Rāma-kamala Simha

²⁵ *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, page 154, 5th line.

atibāḍī, cuḍādhārī, gaurāṅga-nāgarī |
*totā kahe,—ei terar saṅga nāhi kari ||*²⁶

Besides these, there are many new *apasampradāyas* cropping up:

- (1) *kiśorī-bhajā*, (2) *bhajana-khājā, koto boli hāya!*
 (3) *guru-bhogī*, (4) *guru-tyāgī, āra je bāhirāya ||*
 (4) *asīmā-tyajā—praṇati-majā, āra bāsudevī khala |*
 (6) *dārī-sannyāsī*, (7) *śiṣyā-vilāsī*, (8) *guru-prasādi dala ||*
 (9) *upanayana-tyajā*, (10) *paramahansa-sājā*, (11) *sāṅkara-varṇa jata |*
 (12) *asat-saṅga*, (13) *dvipāda-bhaṅga*, (14) *sevāparādhī tata ||*
 (15) *rāmadāsa*, (16) *haridāsa*, (17) *hariboliyā mata |*
 (18) *nitāi rādhā-gaura śyāma, varṇibo vā koto ||*
 (19) *sītā-rāmiyā*, (20) *rādhā-śyāmiyā*, (21) *sāudīra dala āra |*
 (22) *ghara-pāgalā*, (23) *grhī-bāulā, saba cine uṭhā bhāra ||*
 (24) *varṇa-virāgī*, (25) *āśrama-rodhī*, (26) *gairika-virodhī 'ṣaṅḍa |*
 (27) *dhāmāparādhī*, (28) *nāmāparādhī*, (29) *vaiṣṇavāparādhī bhaṅḍa ||*
 (30) *advaya-vādī—madhva-virodhī, e saba pāṣaṅḍa |*
 (31) *kānupriyā*, (32) *nātha-bhāyā, ākāla kuṣmāṅḍa ||*
 (33) *gauḍeśvara*, (34) *vaṁśīdhara*, (35) *ulaicaṅḍī-vāda |*
 (36) *smaraṇa-panthī—adhomanthī*, (37) *yugala-bhajana sādha ||*
 (38) *dādā o mā*, (39) *kṣepā bāmā, āra jata apasampradāya |*
deśa-vidēṣe, sādḥura veṣe, ghureche phirche hāya!!
pūrvakāle tero chila apasampradāya |
tina-tero bāḍala ebe dharmā rākhā dāya!!

At present, with Totā Bābājī's thirteen *apasampradāyas* and thirty-nine new ones, there is a new total of fifty-two *apasampradāyas* that have risen to prominence. Still we cannot find *thousands and thousands* of *sampradāyas*. Some interpret the word *sampradāya* to refer to all the disciples in the *sampradāya* and their respective disciplic successions. This, to us, seems the most fitting interpretation. In that case, Śrīman Mahāprabhu is understood to be the presiding deity only of the *sampradāya* following His direct guidance. Thus, referring to Śrīman Mahāprabhu as “*sva-sampradāya-sahastrādhidaiva*” takes on a somewhat restricted

²⁶ From *Gauḍīya-kaṅṭhahāra* (13th chapter, 111th Anu, page 221) published from Śrī Gauḍīya Maṭha by Śrīyuta Ananta-Vāsudeva Brahmācārī

scope. He is the Supreme Personality of Godhead, the source of all incarnations and Murāri Śrī Kṛṣṇa Himself. “*Keho māne, keho nā māne, saba tāra dāsa* – All are His servants, though some accept the fact and some do not. (Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Ādi-līlā 6.83)” Therefore, to think Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa’s hymn is different Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī’s and present it as inferior is mired in *aparādha*. Still, Subodha Bābu’s objection may be that Baladeva was wrong to describe Śrī Gaurahari as a descendant of the Mādhva-sampradāya. We will present an extensive response to this in sections (*gha*) and (*ṇa*).

Mahāprabhu is Svayaṁ Bhagavān, Kṛṣṇacandra Himself—on this point there is no difference of opinion. To think that Svayaṁ Bhagavān cannot perform a pastime of accepting *dīkṣā* or *śikṣā* from anyone is some newfangled notion. Śrī Rāmacandra sought guidance from Vaśiṣṭha, Kṛṣṇacandra took Sāndipani Muni as *guru*, and Śrīman Mahāprabhu received *dīkṣā* and *śikṣā* from Īśvara Purī. Doing so did not impair Their *bhagavattā* (Godhood) at all. Svayaṁ Bhagavān engages in such pastimes for the benefit of the living entities. Therefore, being part of a certain *sampradāya* does not do anything to Mahāprabhu’s *bhagavattā* or His *tattva*.

Besides this, in his *maṅgalācarāṇa* to his *ṭikā* on his Vedānta *bhāṣya*, Śrī Baladeva outlines the *guru-paramparā*, or *sampradāya*, and writes the following in relation to Śrīman Mahāprabhu: “*śrī kṛṣṇa-prema-dānena yena nistāritam jagat* – He who has delivered the world by bestowing divine love for Śrī Kṛṣṇa.” By this, Baladeva has described Śrīman Mahāprabhu as the bestower of *kṛṣṇa-prema*. And regarding Madhvācārya, he has said:

ānanda-tīrtha-nāmā sukhāmaya-dhāmā yatir-jīyāt |
saṁsārārṇava-taraṇim yam iha janāḥ kīrtayanti budhāḥ ||

This refers to Madhvācārya as the boat to ferry souls across the ocean of material existence. One personality is the bestower of *kṛṣṇa-prema*. The other is the deliverer of souls from *saṁsāra*. Whom will Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya deem as superior? The bestowal of *prema* is infinitely superior to deliverance from *saṁsāra*. This is something every Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava will accept. What Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī has written regarding the difference in the results to be reaped from *mantra* and *mahā-mantra* deserves our careful perusal:

kṛṣṇa-mantra haite haya saṁsāra-mocana |

kṛṣṇa-nāma haite pāya kṛṣṇera caraṇa ||²⁷

Kṛṣṇa's name is the *mahā-mantra*, whereby one attains the lotus feet of Kṛṣṇa and *kṛṣṇa-prema*. Śrīla Baladeva Prabhu has described Śrīman Mahāprabhu as greater than Madhvācārya with his statement “*śrī kṛṣṇa-prema-dānena yena nistāritaṁ jagat.*” Madhvācārya has been entrusted with the responsibility of *samsāra-mocana*, which is the function of *mantra*. This does not convey Madhvācārya as superior to Śrīman Mahāprabhu. Even though Bhagavān Himself has said, “*Mad-bhakta-pūjābhyadhikā* – The worship of My devotee is greater than worship of Me,” that does not hamper His *bhagavattā*; rather, it multiplies His sweetness to infinity. Śrī Kṛṣṇa Himself has said: “The servant of the devotee is a devotee; the servant of Īśvara is not.”

ye me bhakta-janāḥ pārtha na me bhaktāś ca te janāḥ |
mad-bhaktāñca ye bhaktāś te me bhaktatamā matāḥ ||²⁸

(*Ādi Purāna*)

Śrī Kṛṣṇa is saying to Arjuna: “O Pārtha! All those devotees who worship Me directly are not really My devotees. But those who worship My devotees are the topmost of all devotees.”

Bhagavān is subservient to His devotees. This is the foremost conception of Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas. This highlights the glory of Bhagavān more than anything.

²⁷ Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta (Ādi-līlā 7.73) Śrī Gauḍīya Maṭha edition, published 442 Gaurābda

Pañcama Siddhānta

Fifth Conclusion

The reason the Gauḍīyas follow Madhvācārya

Now we proceed to discuss the topics of section (*gha*) and (*ṅa*) together as presented on pages 242 and 243 of the *Vāda* book under review. Addressing the topics in section (*ṅa*) will automatically cover all the topics of section (*gha*). So, here, in this context, we will address that section at length.

Besides *Tattva-sandarbhā*, Śrī Jīvapāda has displayed profuse dedication to Madhva elsewhere as well. He even follows the guidance of Madhva's prominent disciples and grand-disciples like Vijayadhvaja, Brahma-tīrtha, Vyāsa-tīrtha, and others, quoting from their writings and statements in his *Ṣat-sandarbhās*. Though he has quoted Śrī Rāmānujācārya and Śrīla Śrīdhara Svāmipāda in many places, they cannot be seen as previous *ācāryas* of the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya, because they have assimilated elements of Kapila's Sāṅkhya as well as the statements of Pātañjala and many other Ṛṣis where it suited their own doctrines, though that does not mean we can say they became part of those Sāṅkhya or Yoga lineages. Any statement from any scripture or doctrine that is favorable to *bhakti* can be adopted, but it would be ridiculous for an author to introduce himself as being part of those traditions just because he has cited some evidence from them in his books. However, when someone establishes philosophical conclusions based on a doctrine that is developed in disciplic succession from one master to another, then, in that particular case, that person will be accepted as part of that *sampradāya*—otherwise not; this much can be said without hesitation.

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī has mentioned the names of many of Madhvācārya’s disciples, grand-disciples, and other ācāryas in his lineage; and he has collected statements from their works in *Tattva-sandarbha* and other texts, whereby he has ascertained the purport of the *Bhāgavata*, or what we know as Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava *siddhānta*. We have cited below what Śrīla Jīvapāda has personally written in this regard:

“*atra ca sva-darśitārtha-viśeṣa-prāmāṇyāyaiva | na tu śrīmad-bhāgavata-vākya-prāmāṇyāya
pramāṇāni śruti-purāṇādi-vacanāni yathādr̥ṣtam evodāharaṇīyāni | kvacit svayam-adr̥ṣṭākarāṇi
ca tattva-vāda-guruṇām anādhunikānām pracura-pracārita-vaiṣṇava-mata-viśeṣānām dakṣiṇādi-
deśa-vikhyāta-śiṣyopāśiṣyibhūta-vijayadhvaja-vyāsātīrthādi-veda-vedārtha-vid-varāṇām śrī-
madhvācārya-caraṇānām bhāgavata-tātparya-bhārata-tātparya-brahma-sūtra-bhāṣyādibhyaḥ
saṅgrhītāni | taiś caivam uktaṁ bhārata-tātparye:*

“*śāstrāntarāṇi samjānan vedāntasya prasādataḥ |
deśe deśe tathā granthān dr̥ṣtvā caiva pṛthag-vidhān ||
yathā sa bhagavān vyāsaḥ sākṣān nārāyaṇaḥ prabhuh |
jagāda bhāratādyeṣu tathā vakṣye tad-īkṣayā || iti |”*

*tatra tad-uddhṛtā śrutiś caturveda-śikhādyā, purāṇam ca gāruḍādīnām samprati
sarvatrapracarad-rūpam aṁśādīkam | samhitā ca mahā-samhitādīkā tantraṁ ca tantra-
bhāgatādīkam brahma-tarkādīkam iti jñeyam ||”*²⁹

The purport of what Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmīpāda, a Gauḍīya *guru* in the line of Śrī Madhva, has written in the 28th Anuccheda of *Tattva-sandarbha* is as follows:

“All the quotations I have included in these *Ṣaṭ-sandarbha* are to corroborate the various interpretations or nuances of doctrine that I have pointed out. They are not there to substantiate the statements or conclusions of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. (Because *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* is self-authenticating, like the Vedas; it does not need any corroborative evidence.) I have quoted and copied the statements of Śruti, Smṛti, Purāṇa and other original source texts as I have personally seen them. And there are several original texts and compilations that I, the author of *Tattva-sandarbha* (and a *tattva-vādi*), have not seen

²⁹ Source (a): *Tattva-sandarbha*, 28th Anuccheda, published 1289 Śāla from Hari-bhakti-pradāyīnī-sabhā via Rādhā-ramaṇa-yantra by Śrī Rāma-nārāyaṇa Vidyāratna. Source (b) *Tattva-sandarbha*, 28th Anuccheda, pages 69–72, published 1317 Śāla by Śrī Rāmadeva Miśra, from Khāgaḍā, Murshidabad.

personally. The *tattva-vāda-gurus* (our previous *ācāryas* like Śrīla Mādhavendra and others) took initiation (accepted *sannyāsa*) from the present-day Śrīla Śaṅkarācārya, but because they are fully dedicated to the personal form of Bhagavān, they are completely disconnected from Śaṅkara’s doctrine. I have relied on their statements as well as the conclusions of *ācāryas* who have profusely preached the Vaiṣṇava doctrine with nuanced insights—like Vijaya-dhvaja, Brahma-tīrtha, Vyāsa-tīrtha, and other disciples and grand-disciples of the renowned South Indian Ānanda-tīrtha. I have also collected quotes from various texts like *Bhāgavata-tātparya*, *Bhārata-tātparya*, and *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya* by that same Śrīman Madhvācārya, who is foremost among the seers of Veda and Vedic interpretations and purports. Śrīman Madhvācārya-caraṇa himself has written further in this regard in his *Bhārata-tātparya*:

‘I am acquainted with the profound mysteries of all the various scriptures by the grace of the Upaniṣads and Vedānta. I have consulted and deliberated various texts throughout different lands. I will establish conclusions based on what that master who is a direct manifestation of Nārāyaṇa, Śrī Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Veda-vyāsa, has written in *Mahābhārata* and other texts.’

“I have adhered to the statements of Śrīman Madhvācārya because texts like the *Caturveda-śikhādi-śruti* and Purāṇas like the *Garuḍa Purāṇa* are no longer in print anywhere. As I have not personally seen the original manuscripts of various *samhitā* texts, the *mahā-samhitā* texts, various Tantras, the *Tantra-bhāgavata*, *Brahma-tarka*, and many other books, I have relied on Śrīman Madhvācārya’s quotations in the composition of my *Tattva-sandarbha* and other related works.”

It is clearly and flawlessly proven from the words Śrīla Jīvapāda cited above that he had accepted Śrīman Madhvācārya alone as the one predecessor *ācārya* of the Śrī Gauḍīya-sampradāya. Nowhere does he make such statements regarding Śrīla Rāmānujācārya or Śrīla Śrīdhara-svāmipāda. Moreover, he has not adopted the conclusions of the disciples and grand-disciples of any other lineage. Śrīla Rāmānuja had many disciples and grand-disciples, and even though they were world-renowned *ācāryas*, he does not mention any of their names. Śrīdhara Svāmipāda also had many disciples, and Śrīla Jīvapāda does not mention their names either. As for Nimbārka, there is no evidence of his existence in Śrīla Jīvapāda’s books.

Later we will outline how there are many significant differences between the conceptions of Śrīla Rāmānuja and the Śrī Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas and how Śrīman Mahāprabhu did not adopt

the Śrī-sampradāya in any way, nor could He have. Even though Śrīla Jīvapāda quoted many ideas of Śrīdhara Svāmipāda, he never joined his *sampradāya*. Aside from this, my assertion is that the main point of Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s *Vāda* book is that the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya is an entirely separate lineage and it is not part of any other *sampradāya*. Therefore, Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya accepts that Śrīla Jīvapāda did not adopt Śrī Rāmānuja’s Śrī-sampradāya, Śrīdhara Svāmipāda’s Viṣṇusvāmī or Rudra-sampradāya, nor did he accept Nimbāditya’s, or what is known as the Sanakādi-sampradāya, so what is the point in saying more about that? But now we still have to prove whether or not he accepted the Śrī Brahma-Mādhva-sampradāya as the root of his own lineage or not. According to Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya, besides the other three *sampradāyas*, that is Rāmānuja’s, Śrīdhara’s, and Nimbārka’s, even the Śāṅkara-sampradāya is being dropped as an option.³⁰ Thus Śrīman Mahāprabhu did not accept any *sampradāya*—this is the conclusion he has come to. Even we are one twelfth of an *anna* in agreement with him on this point—that Śrīman Mahāprabhu was never part of the Śrī, Rudra, or Sanaka *sampradāyas*. Śrīman Mahāprabhu has only accepted that His own *sampradāya* is included in the Mādhva-sampradāya—this much is a resolute fact. We will refute all of Vidyāvinoda’s arguments against this inclusion in the Mādhva-sampradāya and establish our aforementioned assertion. This has been demonstrated very clearly in the previous four *siddhāntas*, and we will consolidate it even more in this chapter.

Anuccheda 28 of Śrīla Jīvapāda’s *Tattva-sandarbhā* has been printed on pages 64–65 of this section and below it a rendition of its meaning has been provided as well. From this translation, we find the best, most concise evidence for the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya’s inclusion in Madhva’s lineage. But still, a more extensive discussion about this will render the matter fully transparent and arrest Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s error.

One of the “main arguments against the Śrī Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya’s inclusion in the Mādhva-sampradāya”³¹ brought up by Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya in his *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*

³⁰ “(ka) This (the Śrī Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya) is an independent *sampradāya* founded by Śrī Gauracandra.”—*Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, page 240, lines 3 and 4.

(kha) Approving and echoing this statement, Dr. Śrī Hṛṣīkeśa Gosvāmī Vedānta-śāstrī Mahāśaya has praised Vidyāvinoda, writing: “This *sampradāya* (the Śrī Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya) is not part of the Mādhva-sampradāya or any other *sampradāya*. It is an independent lineage.”—“*Manīṣi-vṛnda o saṁvāda-patrera kayekaṭi abhimata* – Opinions from various scholars and newsletters,” published by Gauḍīya Mission, page 15, lines 5 to 7.

³¹ *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, 13th chapter, page 239, lines 9–10

book is that “in *Tattva-sandarbhā*, Śrī Śrī Jīvapāda refers to *tattva-vāda-guru* Śrī Śrīman Madhvācārya’s *mata* as ‘*anādhunika* – old-fashioned, outmoded,’ ‘*pracūra-pracārita-vaiṣṇava-mata-viśeṣa* – a profusely preached and very specific Vaiṣṇava doctrine,’ and ‘*dakṣiṇādi-deśa-vikhyāta* – a belief system popular mostly in South India.’ He has mentioned the names of Śrī Madhvācārya’s disciples and grand-disciples like Vijaya-dhvaja, Vyāsa-tīrtha and others as exceptional scholars versed in the purports of the Vedas. Here, because he refers to Śrī Madhvācārya as the ‘*tattva-vāda-guru*’ and his doctrine as a ‘certain widely preached Vaiṣṇava doctrine,’ he conveys that this *mata* is not of his own *sampradāya*.”³²

Here the objections raised are about the following three statements: (a) “*bahula-pracārita vaiṣṇava-mata-viśeṣa* – a certain or specific widely preached Vaiṣṇava doctrine,” (b) “*dakṣiṇā-deśa-vikhyāta* – a belief system popularized throughout South India,” and (c) “*tattva-vāda-guru*.” Presently we shall discuss the relevance of the “*bahula-pracārita vaiṣṇava-mata-viśeṣa*” statement:

A Special, Widely Preached Vaiṣṇava doctrine

Here, Śrīla Jīvapāda said “*vaiṣṇava-mata-viśeṣa*,” and Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has taken it to have been said in derogatory or aspersion way, because to say “*mata-viśeṣa*” can mean “one of many doctrines of equal caliber.” In other words, it conveys that there is no significance or superiority to this specific *mata*. The *Vāda* book author has taken this statement in this derogatory way, or understood it to mean that the doctrine referred to is just another one of many equal or comparable Vaiṣṇava doctrines. Thus he has written: “The fact that he has said this conveys that this *mata* is not of his [Jīva Gosvāmī’s] own *sampradāya*.” Everyone ascribes *gurutva*, or great importance, to their own *mata*, or ideology. Our assertion here is that if Śrīla Jīvapāda intended to refer to Madhvācārya’s *mata-vāda* as just another ordinary Vaiṣṇava doctrine, he would not have referred to it as a specific ‘*anādhunika* (?) *pracūra-pracārita*’ Vaiṣṇava doctrine; he would never have referred to it with these sorts of adjectives. If this was just an ordinary Vaiṣṇava doctrine like so many other doctrines, then what was the point or purport of ‘*pracūra-pracārita*’? The fact that he has defined *vaiṣṇava-mata-vāda-viśeṣa* with the adjectives ‘*anādhunika pracūra-pracārita*’ proves he did not see it as an ordinary Vaiṣṇava doctrine. He did not just say ‘*pracārita*’ either; he said ‘*pracūra-pracārita* – profusely preached.’

³² ³² *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, 13th chapter, page 243, lines 1–7

It is precisely because Śrīla Jīva-pāda saw the *mata* of the Mādhva-sampradāya with such immense honor that he used the words ‘*pracūra-pracārīta*.’ Not only that, what he was saying was that this *mata-viśeṣa*, this specific ideology or doctrine, is the specific ideology or doctrine of the Gauḍīya-sampradāya.

If Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī-pāda had no relation with Madhvācārya’s *vaiṣṇava-mata-viśeṣa*, or if he was in fact opposed to it, then he would never have used the words ‘*pracūra-pracārīta*.’ Nevertheless, Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya, out of enmity, has gone to great effort to try to prove that Śrīla Jīva-pāda had some highly unbecoming antagonism toward Madhvācārya’s profusely preached *śuddha-dvaita* or *visuddha-bheda-vāda*. We have cited a few of his devious efforts below here:

- (1) *Advaya-tattva* is the subject of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*. *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* is not a scripture that propounds *dvaita* or *bheda-vāda*.
- (2) Śrī Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī-carāṇa established “*ekamevādviṭīyam* – the one without a second” everywhere as the *tattva*. His *tattva* is not two without the one.
- (3) Referring to *jīva* and *prakṛti* as *tattvas* undermines nonduality.
- (4) Śrī Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī Prabhupāda never accepted *atyanta-bheda* (extreme difference) between *jīva* and Bhagavān.
- (5) Śrī Jīva-pāda has, in clear language, refuted Śrī Madhva’s *bheda-vāda* and established his *acintya-bhedābheda-siddhānta*.
- (6) Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī-pāda has not referred to *jīva* and *brahma* as two separate *tattvas* or *vastus*.
- (7) Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī Prabhupāda has not referred to the *jīva* and Īśvara as two eternally perfect and separate *tattvas* as did Śrī Madhva; therefore, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī-pāda has not accepted the distinct difference between the *jīva* and Īśvara the way Śrī Madhva has.³³

In reality, nowhere has Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī displayed any sort of ideology opposed to that of Madhva. None of the seven points above are in any way Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī’s. This will be demonstrated later. Besides these seven oppositional points, Vidyāvinoda has been utterly shameless, having the audacity to try to prove that Śrī Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī-pāda is an *advaita-vādī* opposed to Madhva. Vidyāvinoda is an *advaita-vādī* himself, so he does not hesitate to insist that all Vaiṣṇavas except for Madhva are *advaita-vādīs*. The *advaya-vādī* or *advaita-vādī* Śāṅkarācārya had no qualms about calling his own *guru* “an ignorant fool” in order to bolster

³³ *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, 14th chapter, conclusion—page 274, lines 18–22

his own false, conjured ideology.³⁴ Every *advaita-vādi* regards *śrī gurudeva* as mistaken, as per the teachings given in their tradition. Sundarānanda has also entered the *advaita-vādi* Śaṅkara-sampradāya and adopted this sort of disrespect of *guru*. This suits a misguided individual like him. Because he is an *advaita-vādi*, then just as a lusty person thinks everyone is lusty—“*kāmukāḥ kāmīnī-mayaṁ paśyanti*”—he thinks everyone is an *advaita-vādi*. We are giving some more examples of this from one of the other points of his trident³⁵, from *Gauḍīyāra Tina Ṭhākura*:

- (1) Every *ācārya*, including Śrī Rāmānujācārya (and except for Śrī Madhvācārya), was an *advaita-vādi* or an *advaya-tattva-vādi*.
- (2) Even the servants of Śrī Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya’s lotus feet, the Gosvāmīs, disproved *acintya-dvaita* + *advaita-siddhānta* and ended up establishing *advaita-siddhānta*.

³⁴ *tasmād evācāryād brahmātma-jñānāvyaṅgiḥ kathamācāryo ’jño vā syāt | yadyajño na brahmātmaikatva-jñānam-upadeṣṭum śaknuyāt | atha vijñāḥ tadā brahmātma-jñānena brahmaiva bhavati | tataḥ ajñānam tātkārya-deha-dvaya-nivṛtteḥ | tadā dehādi-sambaddhābhāvāt tu na śiṣyādi-śānam hy upapadyate | ’athānavagata-brahmātma-bhāvaṁ syāt’ | tasmād dehādi-sambaddho ’ngī-karttavyo ’bhyupetavyaḥ |*

(*Ajñāna-bodhinī* (one of Śaṅkara’s *granthāvalī*) 9th Anuccheda, page 149, published by Śrī Śaratcandra Cakravartī from No. 21 Nanda-kumāra Chaudharī’s 2nd Lane, Kalikātā)

Śaṅkara personally wrote the above passage in the book *Ajñāna-bodhinī* in the context of a discussion between him and his students. The translation is as follows: “(Attaining *brahma-jñāna*, or the *śreyopatha*, the higher path, is of utmost importance.) Therefore it is imperative to obtain *brahmātma-jñāna* from an *ācārya*. Now the question is: will the *ācārya* be *ajña* (ignorant) or *vijña* (knowledgeable)? If he is *ajña*, he is incapable of instructing *brahmātma-jñāna*. And if he is *vijña*, then he has become *brahma-kalpa*, or one with *brahma*, due to *brahmātma-jñāna*; therefore, his *ajñāna* (ignorance) has been eradicated. At the same time, the functions of *ajñāna*, the experiences of the gross and subtle bodies, are destroyed. He has no connection with the body, right? Therefore he is not capable of seeing the disciple as covered by ignorance, enveloped in non-knowledge, trapped thus. So he is not able to instruct the disciple. In other words, one person is the *guru*, the other is the disciple, and on top of that duality, the disciple is in the clutches of ignorance—this awareness of duality is never possible for an *advaita-vādi brahmātma-jñānī*. The answer to this, therefore, is that the *guru* or *ācārya* will be bereft of *brahmātma-jñāna*; he will be *anavagata* (unacquainted). Only such an unacquainted ignoramus is capable of instructing disciples, because only an *ācārya* who is bereft of *brahmātma-jñāna* accepts that he has any relationship with his body. He is the only type of *ācārya* who instructs disciples. Therefore, according to Śaṅkara, if the *guru* is not ignorant, or a fool, then it is not possible to even select him as a *guru*.”

³⁵ “Sundarānanda has created a world of mess by writing three books entitled ‘*Gauḍīyāra Tina Ṭhākura*’, ‘*Acintya-bhedābheda*’ and ‘*Gauḍīya Darśanera Itihāsa*’. With these three books, an arrow has been shot into the chests of Śrīman Mahāprabhu and Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī. These three books are three spears or a trident. With these, the immaculate flow of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava thought has been killed. This trident has been created from the venomous seed of killing Hari, *guru*, and Vaiṣṇavas.” (*Śrī Gauḍīya Patrikā*, Year 8, Issue 12, page 465)

- (3) Only the members of the Śāṅkara-sampradāya refer to the aforementioned *advaita-vādi* Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas*³⁶ and their whole *sampradāya* as *dvaita-vādīs*. This seems to be born entirely from misconception and concoction.
- (4) Śrī Śrī Jīva Gosvāmipāda did not propound that the *jīva* and the world are separate principles as did Śrī Madhva.³⁷

Hence, we are stating with great insistence that Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has committed a grave offense at the lotus feet of Śrī Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya’s devout servants, the Śrī Śrī Gosvāmipādagaṇa, especially Śrīla Jīvapāda, by referring to all the Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas* and their *sampradāyas* as *advaita-vādīs*. This is the result of *guru-drohitā* (malicious behavior towards *guru*). When one commits offenses at the feet of Hari, Guru, and Vaiṣṇavas, one enters *advaita-vāda* and consequently obtains a demoniac destination.

Though we were discussing a somewhat separate topic that was something that needed to be conveyed and known. Whatever the case, it is clearly evident from the previously cited 28th Anuccheda of Śrīla Jīvapāda’s *Tattva-sandarbha* that Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmipāda adopted the conclusions of Śrīla Madhvācārya and his disciples and grand-disciples in order to substantiate the *acintya-bhedābheda* interpretation of *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam* that he has elaborated upon.

The word ‘*viśeṣāṇām*’ in the statement “*pracūra-pracārita vaiṣṇava-mata-viśeṣāṇām*” has been used in its plural form. Even though this word is in its plural form, no one, not Satyānanda Gosvāmī, Rāma-nārāyaṇa Vidyāratna or anyone else, has interpreted it as meaning “*bahumata-viśeṣa* – various particular doctrines.” Here Śrīla Jīvapāda has displayed profuse honor for Madhva’s conclusions because he had such regard for this specific *mata* of his. The sense of reverence conveyed by the word ‘*pracūra-pracārita*’ is solidified even further by the pluralized word ‘*viśeṣāṇām*.’

The Use of the Word ‘Viśeṣa’

Śrī Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmipāda has used the word ‘*viśeṣa*’ at the end of his phrase to convey his utmost regard. Only those who have meticulously studied Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī’s *Ṣaṭ-sandarbha*,

³⁶ Śrī Rāmānujācārya, Śrī Viṣṇusvāmī, Śrī Nimbārka, Śrī Vallabhācārya and Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya’s followers, the Gosvāmīs. (*Gauḍiyāra Tina Ṭhākura*, page 443)

³⁷ From page 443 of Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda’s *Gauḍiyāra Tina Ṭhākura*, 9th Mādhurī: (1) 8–9; (2) 12–13; (3) 18–20; (4) 23–24.

*Sarva-samvādinī*³⁸ and other works with careful, painstaking attention and become heartily inspired by him can realize the veracity of this. Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s consciousness has been bewildered by the perusal of too many scriptures. Otherwise he would surely have caught this nuance in Śrīla Jīvapāda’s language. In this context, we call the readers’ attention to the first line of *Tattva-sandarbhā*’s 28th Anuccheda, where he writes: “*atra ca sva-darśitārtha-viśeṣa-prāmānyaiva.*” Here Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī has used a similar phrase: ‘*sva-darśitārtha-viśeṣa.*’ If we go by Sundarānanda’s interpretation of the word *viśeṣa*, then when Jīva Gosvāmī says “*sva-darśitārtha-viśeṣa-prāmānyaiva* – in order to prove the specific (*viśeṣa*) meaning I have demonstrated,” does that mean he is saying that his conclusion is also ordinary and inferior? This Sundarānanda will never accept. We say, “Here, when he uses the words ‘*artha-viśeṣa,*’ he is referring to the most excellent, most unique interpretation, which he himself has provided, and to establish its veracity, he has accepted the conceptions found in Madhvācārya’s distinguished Vaiṣṇava doctrine. In the above-cited Anuccheda, the statements ‘*pracūra-pracārīta-vaiṣṇava-mata-viśeṣa*’ and ‘*sva-darśita artha-viśeṣa*’ are synonymous. If one cannot properly grasp the meaning of this and instead adopts an interpretation conjured from one’s own mind, then the real *siddhānta* will be obscured. If Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya had in this context quoted the entire passage from this Anuccheda of *Tattva-sandarbhā* and analysed it, or even just demonstrated the impartiality of quoting it without analysing it, readers thirsty for philosophical and historical facts would have been able to grasp what Śrī Jīvapāda meant to say and would not have been deceived by Vidyāvinoda’s cunning presentation. We have previously demonstrated this sort of intellectual villainy of his, which is rooted in some devious purpose.

Śrīla Jīvapāda took guidance from the nuanced ideology of Madhvācārya and his *sampradāya*’s lineage of disciples, grand-disciples, and great-grand-disciples in order to establish the veracity of the interpretation he had presented. He has shed light on this by the words “*dakṣiṇādi-deśa-vikhyāta-śiṣyopaśiṣya-bhūt.*” Not only that, but he accepted the guidance of various prominent *ācāryas* who were exclusively devoted to Madhvācārya’s *sampradāya* and gathered evidence from the books they wrote in order to establish his *sva-darśita artha-viśeṣa*. By mentioning the names Vijaya-dhvaja, Brahma-tīrtha, Vyāsa-tīrtha and other exalted personalities, he has revealed with great pride the fact that his ideology derives from the Madhva-sampradāya. The fact that he uses the word ‘*ādi*’ at the end of the aforementioned

³⁸ “*śrī śrī kṛṣṇa-caitanya-deva-nāmānam śrī bhagavantam kali-yuge ’smīn vaiṣṇava-janopāśyāvātāra-tayārtha-viśeṣāṅgītena śrī bhāgavata-padya-samvādena stauti |*” —*Sarva-samvādinī*, page 1, published 1327 Sāla from Baṅgiya Sāhitaya Pariṣada Mandira.

statement, that is, after ‘*vyāsa-tīrtha*,’ indicates he is referring to all the *ācāryas* of the Mādhva-sampradāya’s *guru-paramparā*. On top of that, the words ‘*śiṣyopāśiṣya-bhūt*’ prove that Śrīla Jīvapāda never adopted the ideology of any other *sampradāya*’s *guru-paramparā* besides that of the Madhva-sampradāya to bolster his own conclusions.

Just as the *ācāryas* of any *sampradāya* form their own individual conclusions from the books of their own *guru-varga* predecessors in order to establish their respective *sāmpradāyika* conclusions, as Śrīla Jīvapāda proceeds to explicitly outline *tattva* in his *Tattva-sandarbha*, he has accepted the Madhva-sampradāya as the predecessors of his own Gauḍīya-sampradāya and utilized the books found in their *guru-paramparā*, from various disciples and grand-disciples in that lineage, in order to establish and broadcast Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s *siddhānta*. This is *sāmpradāyika* tradition. Just the Mādhvas have accepted the evidence of various scriptures in order to establish or demonstrate their ideology, Śrīla Jīvapāda has, under their guidance, adopted the same current of thought in order to establish the Mādhva-Gauḍīya-siddhānta, or shed light on what is his own ideology, by collecting evidence from various scriptures. Therefore, the Śrī Mādhva *dhārā*, or current, and the Śrī Gauḍīya *dhārā*, are one and the same. This is why Śrīla Jīvapāda wrote this 28th Anuccheda of *Tattva-sandarbha*. Even though Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya understands this in all clarity, because of the bad association of Ananta-Vāsudeva and other *sahajiyās*, he has been forced in vain to attempt the establishment of a contrary conclusion.

Even though Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī says he has presented his own particular interpretation (*sva-darśita artha-viśeṣa*), he has not presented an ideology conjured from his imagination. Rather, by saying “*sva-mata*,” he has conveyed that the *mata* of Śrīman Mahāprabhu or Śrīla Mādhvendra Purīpāda and their predecessor *ācāryas* is his *sva-mata*, his own ideology. He has even indicated that this is the *mata* of his direct *guru-varga*, of Śrīla Rūpa, Sanātana, Advaita, and other exalted personalities. Accepting this meaning of the two words ‘*sva-mata*’ and ‘*sva-darśitārtha*’ is appropriate and fitting in every respect. Therefore, despite presenting the ideology of the aforementioned *ācāryas* as his own chosen ideology, it is natural for him to express a great deal of reverential sentiment. This “*artha-viśeṣa*” statement Śrīla Jīvapāda makes does not imply any sort of inferiority or deficiency, nor will it. Surely Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya will accept this. Śrīla Jīvapāda did not use the words ‘*artha-viśeṣa*’ or ‘*mata-viśeṣa*’ to convey such an undue lack of faith in his own *siddhānta*, which is that of his *guru-varga*, the Gosvāmīs. If Jīva Gosvāmī is going to accept Śrī Śrīla Madhvācārya’s words and writings as *pramāṇa* for his own thesis, it does not make any sense for Jīva Gosvāmī to regard

Madhva's *mata* as inferior or equal to various other ordinary doctrines and yet still use it to support his thesis, his *sva-mata*. Therefore, what Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda claims, that Jīva Gosvāmī has referred to Madhvācārya's *mata* as "just another Vaiṣṇava doctrine" and shown it some disregard, cannot be established in any way or accepted in the slightest.

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmpāda has referred to Śrīla Madhvācārya's *mata* as a "*vaiṣṇava-mata-viśeṣa* – a specific Vaiṣṇava doctrine" in the same way that he refers to his own "*sva-darśita mata* – self-propounded doctrine" as an "*artha-viśeṣa* – a special or specific interpretation." Therefore, if the Mādhva-sampradāya's *mata-viśeṣa* is not Mahāprabhu's *mata*, but a separate *mata*, then the *artha-viśeṣa* proposed by Śrīla Jīvapāda will have to be considered separate from Mahāprabhu's *mata*. Śrīla Jīva's *artha-viśeṣa* and Śrī Madhva's *mata-viśeṣa*—what is the difference between these two statements? On the other side, Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya would be compelled to accept this sort of reasoning: since Śrī Jīva referred to his own *mata* as an *artha-viśeṣa*, if that is the *mata* accepted by Śrīman Mahāprabhu, then a very similar statement, that Śrī Madhva's *mata-viśeṣa* was accepted by Śrīman Mahāprabhu, would also have to be accepted, without a drop of hesitation. Therefore, in Anuccheda 28, Śrīla Jīvapāda used the words '*pracūra-pracārta vaiṣṇava-mata-viśeṣa*' to refer to Madhva's *mata* as one with Śrīman Mahāprabhu's *mata* and its root ingredient. What Śrīla Jīvapāda has not done is regard it as separate.

Difference of Mata is Not Reason for a Difference of Sampradāya

If Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya's explanation is accepted for the sake of argument—in other words, if saying '*vaiṣṇava-mata-viśeṣa*' referred to another *mata*, even then, the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya cannot be said to be a *sampradāya* that is at root different from the Śrī Madhva-sampradāya. Why? Because a difference of *mata* is not reason for a difference of *sampradāya*. And that is precisely what Sundarānanda has tried to prove, by quoting Baladeva's explanation on Anuccheda 28 and trying to indicate a different *mata* by the words "*mata-viśeṣa*."³⁹ Therefore, though Sundarānanda suggests that 'because of a difference of *mata*, the *sampradāya* is also different,' Baladeva's aforementioned explanation is not premised on demonstrating differences of *sampradāya*, but rather on showing that **even though Śrīman Mahāprabhu had *mata-vaiśiṣṭya* ["speciality or refinement of ideology"] in contrast to Śrīla Madhva's philosophy, there was no separation of *sampradāya*.** This is the purport. In

³⁹ As found in Sundarānanda's *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, page 243, 2nd Anuccheda and its footnote.

support of our reasoning, I want to say that Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s main complaint about Baladeva is that he is “overly-eager to make the Gauḍīya-sampradāya part of the Mādhva-sampradāya.”⁴⁰ Why would someone who wants to introduce the Gauḍīya-sampradāya as Mādhva want to show Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s disagreements with Śrīla Madhva? What this means is that even though there was some *mata-bheda* or *mata-vaiśiṣṭya* with Madhva in certain “*viśeṣa-viśeṣa* – highly specialized” areas, there was no reason for any separation of *sampradāya*.

Here, I will bring up various examples to make the matter more transparent:

- (a) The *advaita-vādīs* say that Śrī Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī has a difference of *mata* with Śrī Jīvapāda because Śrīla Jīvapāda accepts the oneness of Īśvara and the *jīva*, but does not accept *bheda*. He only accepts *acintya-bhedābheda* between Īśvara and Īśvara because of *acintya-śakti* [“inconceivable potency”]. He has not even classified the *jīva* as a *tattva* separate from Īśvara and therefore supported *advaita-vāda*. (The readers should keep in mind that Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has also presented arguments in favor of this statement of *advaita-vādīs*.) But Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī has accepted the existence of *acintya-bhedābheda* between Īśvara and the *jīva* because the *jīva* is the *vibhinnāṁśa* expansion of Īśvara and constituted of His *tatasthā-śakti*. Therefore, there is a difference of *mata* between Śrī Jīvapāda and Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī.⁴¹ Although the *advaita-vādīs* have pointed out in vain a difference of *mata* between Śrīla Jīvapāda and Śrīla Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, they have not determined there to be a difference of *sampradāya* between them.
- (b) Besides the *advaita-vādīs*, the *sahajiyās*, who want to introduce themselves as Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas, also point out differences between Śrī Jīvapāda and Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī. They even point out many types of differences between Śrīla Jīvapāda and his direct *mantra-dīkṣā-guru*, Śrīla Rūpapāda. They point out differences of *mata*, differences of behavior, differences of duties, differences of personal conduct, etc. The *Anubhāṣya* on the 10th Pariccheda of Śrī *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*’s Ādi-līlā sheds light on this.

⁴⁰ *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, page 241, lines 16–17.

⁴¹ This comment is found in Mahā-mahopādhyāya Phanībhūṣaṇa Tarka-vāgīśa Mahāśaya’s article “Jīva o Īśvarer Bheda o Abheda,” published 1332 Baṅgābda, Bhādra-māsa, in the monthly magazine *Bhārata-varṣa*.

anupama-vallabha, śrī rūpa-sanātana |
ei tina śākhā—vr̥kṣera paścime gaṇana || 84 ||
tāra madhye rūpa-sanātana—baḍa śākhā |
anupama, jīva, rājendrādi—upaśākhā || 85 ||

The world-renowned Jagad-guru, he who is venerable to the family of Gosvāmīs, he who is worshipful for the family of Paramahamsas, the peerless Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavācārya, Om Viṣṇupāda Śrī Śrīmad Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Gosvāmī Ṭhākura, has written the following in his *Anubhāṣya* commentary on verse 85:

Among the members of the highly uninformed *prākṛta-sahajiyā* tradition, there are three accusations against Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī that are propagated. All that is sure to happen from this is the exponential increase of their *aparādha* because of their opposition of Hari, *guru*, and Vaiṣṇavas, which is caused by aversion to Kṛṣṇa.

(1) One *digvijayī-panḍita*, who was essentially a beggar of mundane prestige, had the humble and aloof Śrī Rūpa and Sanātana sign an acknowledgement of defeat, thereby conveying to the world that Śrī Jīva's *guru-varga* (Śrī Rūpa and Sanātana) were fools. The conquering scholar told Śrī Jīva to sign the acknowledgement as well. Śrī Jīva Prabhu, however, defeated the *digvijayī*, effectively stunning the tongue of this person who had insulted his *guru-varga*. Demonstrating the glory of the splendor emanating from his *gurudeva*'s toenails, he personified the ideal of a real “*gurudevātātmā*” disciple. All these *sahajiyās* (however) say, ‘Because this behavior of Śrī Jīva Prabhu went against the teaching of being more than a blade of grass and giving honor to others, Śrī Rūpa Gosvāmī Prabhu chastized him severely and rejected him. Later, on urging of Śrī Sanātana Gosvāmī Prabhu, he accepted Śrī Jīva Prabhu again.

The day these antagonists of *guru* and Vaiṣṇavas understand, by Kṛṣṇa's grace, that they are eternal servants of *guru* and Vaiṣṇavas, that day they will obtain the mercy of Śrī Jīva Prabhu and become truly ‘*ṭṛṇād api sunīca*’ and ‘*mānada*’, whereby they will become qualified to perform *harināma-kīrtana*.

(2) Some uninformed individuals say, ‘When Śrī Jīva saw the beauty of Kavirāja Gosvāmī Prabhu's *Caritāmṛta* composition and the glory of the divine *vraja-rasa* expressed therein, he became afraid that his own prestige would be diminished, so he

became malicious and threw the original manuscript of *Caritāmṛta* in a well. When Kavirāja Gosvāmī heard what had happened, he gave up his life. His disciple, a person named Mukunda, had previously made a copy, whereby *Caritāmṛta* was republished. Otherwise, the text of *Caritāmṛta* would have been lost to the world.

This sort of concocted story, which is rooted in enmity of a Vaiṣṇava, is utterly false and impossible. (Here the point to note is that the *sahajiyās* give more regard to Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī’s *Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta* than to Śrī Jīva’s *Ṣat-sandarbha*.)

(3) Other miscreants keen on their own sense gratification say, “Śrī Jīva Prabhu was not a *rasika-bhakta* because he did not accept the *parakīya-rasa* of the Vraja-gopīs as per Śrī Rūpa Gosvāmī’s notions and instead propounded *svakīya-rasa*. Therefore, we are not to follow his example.”

During his manifest presence, Śrī Jīva saw that certain devotees among his followers had a natural inclination (*ruci*) towards *svakīya-rasa*. He was concerned for their spiritual wellbeing and he understood what kind of *adhikāra* (eligibility) they had. And, he anticipated that later on, in the future, unqualified individuals would not be able to understand the beauty and glory of that supramundane, supremely wondrous *pāra-kīya-vraja-rasa* and would try to imitate such conduct and perpetrate adultery. That is why Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Jīva Prabhu accepted *svakīya-vāda*, but that does not mean we must understand him to be inimical to transcendental *pāra-kīya-vraja-rasa*, because he is the best of the followers of Śrī Rūpa—and one of Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī’s own *śikṣā-gurus*.⁴²

Even though the *sahajiyās* claim in vain such disparity between Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī and Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī and Śrīla Rūpa Gosvāmī, they still accept Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī to be a prominent *ācārya* in Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s *sampradāya*. Even if we accept, for argument’s sake, that there is this sort of divergence of *mata* between them, we cannot in any way accept that they would be in different *sampradāyas* because of this *mata-bheda*.

⁴² Page 203–204 of *Śrī Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, 4th Edition with *Amṛta-pravāha-bhāṣya* and *Anubhāṣya*, published from Śrī Gauḍīya Maṭha, 442 Gaurābda, by Śrī Ananta-Vāsudeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa (Sundarānanda’s *śikṣā-guru*).

(c) Just imagine what Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya will say about Śrī Murāri Gupta? Will he cut him out of the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya? If he does excommunicate him from this *sampradāya*, then which *sampradāya* will he put him in? In Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s pastimes, Murāri Gupta is the shining example of someone who has demonstrated the beauty of one-pointed dedication. Despite hearing an abundance of Mahāprabhu’s own reasons and arguments, he could not establish his personal conviction in what Mahāprabhu was saying. Instead of serving Kṛṣṇa in *ujjala-rasa* as demonstrated by Śrīman Mahāprabhu, Murāri Gupta demonstrated the ideal of dedication to the service of Śrī Śrī Rāmacandra (Raghunātha), who is the presiding deity of *karuṇa-rasa*, one of the secondary *rasas*. And even then, Śrīman Mahāprabhu embraced Śrī Murāri Gupta and accepted him as an ideal *sevaka* of the Śrī Gauḍīya-sampradāya. This has been described in Śrīla Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmi’s *Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta* in very clear language and with utmost honor:

murāri guptere prabhu kari’ ālīngana |
tāra bhakti-niṣṭhā kahena, śuna bhakta-gaṇa ||

The Lord embraced Murāri Gupta.

“Listen, devotees,” he said, “I shall tell you of his conviction in devotion.

pūrve āmi ihāre lobhāila bāra bāra |
parama madhura, gupta! brajendra-kumāra ||

“Previously I tried to entice him again and again.

“Gupta! The young son of the King of Vraja is supremely sweet.

svayaṁ bhagavān kṛṣṇa—sarvāmśī, sarvāśraya |
viśuddha-nirmala-prema, sarva-rasa-maya ||

“Kṛṣṇa is the original form of Godhead—He is the source of all other forms, the abode of all that is. His *prema* is so pure; it is immaculate. And it contains all other *rasas*.

sakala sad-guṇa-vṛnda-ratna-ratnākara |
vidagdha, catura, dhīra rasika-śekhara ||

“He is the abode of all good qualities, like a mine of all priceless gems.

He is debonair and suave, calm and composed, and the crown-jewel of connoisseurs.

madhura-caritra kṛṣṇera madhura-vilāsa |
cātura, vaidagdhya kare jāra līlā-rasa ||

“Kṛṣṇa’s character is so sweet, and His loving pastimes are so sweet.
With cleverness and refined charm, He orchestrates the *rasa* of His pastimes

sei kṛṣṇa bhaja tumi, hao kṛṣṇāśraya |
kṛṣṇa-vinā anya-upāsanā mane nāhi laya ||
“You should worship that Kṛṣṇa; take shelter of that Kṛṣṇa.
Do not let any other form of worship into your mind.”

ei-mata bāra-bāra śuniya vacana |
āmāra gaurave kichu phiri’ gela mana ||

“Hearing Me talk like this again and again, his mind was swayed somewhat, due to his honor
for Me.

āmāre kahena—āmi tomāra kiṅkara |
tomāra ājñākārī āmi nahi svatantara ||

“He said to Me: ‘I am Your servant. I follow Your orders. I am not independent.’

eto boli ghare gelo, cinti’ rātrikāle |
raghunātha-tyāga-cintāya haila bikale ||

“Saying this, he went home, fretting all night.
He became overwhelmed at the thought of giving up Raghunātha.

kemone chāḍibo raghunāthera caraṇa!
āji rātrye prabhu mora karāha maraṇa!!
“How will I leave the feet of Raghunātha?!
Just kill me, Lord, this very night!!

*ei-mata sarva-rātri karena krandana |
mane soyāsti nāhi, rātri karena jāgaraṇa ||*

“Like this, he wept the whole night through.
His mind could find no peace, so he stayed up the whole night.

*prātaḥkāle āsi' mora dharila caraṇa |
kāndite kāndite kichu kare nivedana ||*

“In the morning, he came and caught hold of My feet.
Weeping and weeping, he petitioned Me:

*raghunāthera pāya mui beciyāchō māthā |
kāḍhite nā pāri māthā, mane pāi vyathā ||*
“I have sold my head at the feet of Raghunātha.
I cannot cut my head off. My mind is tormented.

*śrī raghunātha-caraṇa chāḍāno nā jāya |
tava ājñā-bhaṅga haya, ki kari upāya!!*

“The feet of Śrī Raghunātha cannot be left.
But then I will be disregarding Your order. What should I do?!”

*tāte more ei kṛpā koro, dayāmaya |
tomāra āge mṛtyu hauka, jāuka saṁśaya ||*

“So, O merciful one, have this mercy on me that I may die in front of You.
Thus I will be rid of these torments.

*eto śuni' āmi boḍo mane sukha pāilū |
ihāre uṭhānā tabe āliṅgana kailū ||*

“Hearing this gave My mind great joy. I lifted him up and embraced him.

sādhu sādhu, gupta, tomāra sudṛḍha bhajana |

āmāra vacaneha tomāra nā ṭelila mana ||

“I said, ‘Bravo, bravo Gupta! Glory to your firm dedication.
My words did not shake your mind.

ei-mata sevakera prīti cāhi prabhu pāya |
prabhu chāḍāileha, pada chāḍāno nā jāya ||

“I want the servant to have such love for his master’s feet.
Even if the master leaves the servant, the servant will not able to give up his master.

ei-mata tomāra niṣṭhā jānibāra tare |
tomāre āgraha āmi kailū bāre bāre ||

“It was to test this conviction of yours that I pressured you again and again.

sākṣāt hanūmān tumi śrī rāma-kiṅkara |
tumi kene chāḍibe tāra caraṇa-kamala ||

“You are Hanumān himself, the servant of Śrī Rāma.
Why would you ever leave His lotus feet?

sei murāri-gupta ei mora prāṇa sama |
ihāra dainya śuni’ mora phāṭaye jīvana ||

“This is that Murāri Gupta. He is like My own life itself.
When I hear his humility, I feel as if I will rip apart at the seams.”

(*Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta* (Gauḍīya Maṭha edition) Madhya-līlā, 15.137–157)

Here the *upāsya* (worshipful deity) of the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas and Śrīla Murāri Gupta are not the same. Besides that, he could not put sixteen *annas* worth of faith in the words of Svayamī Bhagavān Śrīman Mahāprabhu Himself. Nevertheless, even Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has been compelled to accept him as one of the main and authoritative *ācāryas* of the Gauḍīya-

Vaiṣṇavas.⁴³ Murāri Gupta's *kaḍacā* is one of the main sources of *Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta*. Therefore, even though he had a difference of opinion (*mata-bheda*) with Śrīman Mahāprabhu, Śrīla Murāri Gupta cannot be said to be a Vaiṣṇava of another *sampradāya*.

Another thing to note is that some say Madhvācārya appeared as Murāri Gupta. Why? In Śrīla Kavi Karṇapūra's *Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā*, Śrīla Murāri Gupta has been described to be the one-pointed servant of Śrī Rāmacandra, Śrī Śrī Hanūmat-svarūpa.⁴⁴ And Śrīman Madhvācārya is unanimously accepted to have been Hanūmān during Rāma's pastimes. Thus, *tattvataḥ*, or constitutionally, Śrī Madhvācārya and Śrī Murāri Gupta are one. There is no difference between them. The author of this *Vāda* book, Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya, has quoted several verses from the *Vāyu Purāṇa* and described Madhvācārya as "the first *avatāra* of Vāyu renowned by the name Hanumān, who is foremost in the service of Rāma."⁴⁵ Even Sundarānanda's *vidyā-guru*, Ananta-Vāsudeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Mahāśaya, has also written: "In the *maṅgalācaraṇa* to every book in the Śrī Mādhva tradition, we see the following *namaskāra*: 'śrīmad-hanumad-bhīma-madhvāntargata-rāma-kṛṣṇa-veda-vyāsātmaka-lakṣmī-

⁴³ *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* by Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda, page 193–94

⁴⁴ "murāri-gupto hanumān aṅgadah śrī purandara |" (Verse 91, *Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā*, 4th edition, published Āsvina, 1329 Sāla by Rāmadeva Miśra.)

⁴⁵ "vayor divvyāni rūpāni padma-traya-yutāni ca | trikoṭi-mūrṭti-samyuktas-tretāyām rākṣasāntakah || hanumān iti vikhyāto rāma-kārya-dhurandharah | sa vāyur bhīma-seno-bhūd-dvāparānte kurudvahah || kṛṣṇam sampūjayāmāsa hatva duryodhanādikān || dvaipāyanasya sevārtham vadaryyām tu kalau yuge | vāyuś ca yati-rūpeṇa kṛtvā duḥśāstra-khaṇḍanam || tataḥ kali-yuge prāpte tṛtīyo madhva-nāmakah | bhūrekḥā-dakṣiṇe bhāge maṇimad-garva-sāntaye | dhik kurvan tat-prabhām sadyo 'vatīrṇo 'tra dvijānvaye || – The chief Vāyu has three divine forms, which are like three lotus flowers. In Tretā-yuga appears 'the first *avatāra* of Vāyu, renowned by the name Hanumān, who is foremost in the service of Rāma,' and who destroys the leader of the Rākṣasa dynasty, who had three million servants and soldiers at his behest. That same Vāyudeva, at the end of Dvāpara-yuga, appeared in the Kuru dynasty and became known as Bhīmasena. He destroyed Duryodhana and other wicked persons and worshipped Śrī Kṛṣṇa in a very special way. Later, when the age of Kali arrived, Vāyu's third *avatāra* named Madhva appeared in the southern lands in a Śivālli *brāhmaṇa* dynasty and went to Badarikāśrama as a *sannyāsī*. During the age of Kali, he refuted all illegitimate, concocted religious texts and thus served Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Veda-vyāsa. Vāyu's third *avatāra* as Madhva was to crush the pride of the Rākṣasa Maṇimān and promptly curb his influence." (*Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva*, 4th chapter, pages 27–28, written by Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda and published by Supati-rañjana Nāga in 1939.)

It is clear that Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has put into print a complete contradiction of his own book in *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*. Yet he does not hesitate to quote even from this book when he wants to refute the statements of Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. Though he provides references in the footnotes of almost every page of his *Vāda* book, why he refuses to reveal the title of this book of his there is something of a mystery, no?

hayagrīvāya namaḥ – Obeisance unto Śrī Hanumān’s *antaryāmī* Śrī Rāmacandra, Śrī Bhīmasena’s in-dwelling Śrī Kṛṣṇa, and Śrī Madhvācārya’s *antaryāmī* Śrī Veda-vyāsa, who are nondifferent from Hayagrīva Viṣṇu accompanied by Lakṣmī Devī.’ This Hayagrīva Viṣṇu is the protector and explainer of the Vedic scriptures.”⁴⁶

(d) The topic of Śrīla Jīvapāda’s father, Śrīla Anupama Gosvāmī, who is also known to Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava society as Śrī Vallabha, is also worth mentioning here. Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī describes Śrīla Anupama-Vallabha along with Śrīla Jīvapāda as a branch of the Śrī Caitanyatree—“*tāra madhya rūpa-sanātana—baḍa-śākhā | anupama, jīva, rājendrādi—upaśākhā ||* (Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Antya-līlā, 10.85).” Śrīla Anupama was also a one-pointed devotee of Rāma. Even though his two elder brothers, Rūpa and Sanātana, tried profusely to attract him to the service of Kṛṣṇa, their efforts were not successful. There was no argument or reasoning that could compel Śrīla Jīvapāda’s father, Anupama, to accept Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s supremacy. Nevertheless, Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī has described him as a sub-branch among the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas along with Śrīla Jīvapāda. This we have already mentioned earlier. Kavirāja Gosvāmī has detailed a discussion between Anupama and Śrī Śrīla Rūpa-Sanātana in the fourth chapter of Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta’s Antya-līlā, verses 30–43, that closely mirrors the discussion Śrīman Mahāprabhu had with Śrīla Murāri Gupta about the supreme truth (*para-tattva*) as described on pages 79–80 of this article. For fear of this *grantha* being too long, and for it being repetitive, that dialogue has not been put into print here.

(e) The topic of Śrīvāsa Paṇḍita, one of the Pañca-tattva, who are worshipped as the Gauḍīya’s *upāsya*s, or worshipful deities, is especially worth careful contemplation here.

As it is relevant to the context, I would like to call the readers’ attention to sections (2) and (3) of the portion quoted from Sundarānanda’s *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* here in this article on page 69. Therein he has written: “Śrī Śrī Jīvapāda’s *tattva* is one without a second. And referring to the *jīva* and *prakṛti* as *tattvas* threatens nonduality.” And Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī has quoted from the *kaḍacā* notes of Śrīla Svarūpa Gosvāmī, the one master of the Gauḍīyas and Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s eternal companion: “*pañca-tattvātmakam kṛṣṇam bhakta-rūpa-svarūpakam | bhaktāvatāram bhaktākhyam namāmi bhakta-śaktikam ||*” This verse is from Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta’s Ādi-līlā, 1st Pariccheda, and instead of the oneness of *tattva*, he has

⁴⁶ Page 3 of the introduction to the *Anubhāṣya* book of Śrīman Madhvācārya (a commentary on *Brahma-sūtra*) published in 1344 Baṅgābda by Śrī Navīna-kṛṣṇa Vidyālaṅkāra from Śrī Mādhva Gauḍīya Maṭha, Narindra Palli, Dhaka, edited by Ananta-Vāsudeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa.

expressed in very clear language the *kathā* or description of five principle *tattvas*. He does not stop at describing just five *tattvas*; he has, with pride, said:

‘*rasa āsvādite tattva vividha vibheda –*
Tattva is of a wide variety in order to relish rasa.’

He has also said:

eka mahāprabhu, āra prabhu dui-jana |
dui prabhu seve mahāprabhura-caraṇa ||

There is one Mahāprabhu, and there are two other Prabhus. Those two Prabhus serve Mahāprabhu’s feet.

e tina tattva,—sarvārādhya’ kari’ māni ||
caturtha je bhakta-tattva,—‘ārādhaka’ kari’ jāni ||

I regard these three *tattvas* as most worshipful of all. The fourth *bhakta* principle I know to be the *ārādhaka* (worshiper).

śrīvāsādi jata koṭi koṭi bhakta-gaṇa |
‘suddha-bhakta’-tattva-madhya tā’ sabāra gaṇana ||

Śrīvāsa and all the other millions and millions of devotees are counted in the category of the *suddha-bhakta-tattva* (pure devotee principle).

There is no way to prove *ekatva*, or singularity of *tattva*, from these statements of Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī. If Vidyāvinoda’s words are to be believed, it seems that from Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī’s analysis of *tattva*, there is no way of reconciling with Kavirāja Gosvāmī. Will Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya accept that there is a difference between their *mata-viśeṣa*, or unique *matas*? The *sahajiyās* have explicitly concluded that Śrī Jīva and Kavirāja Gosvāmī have a difference of *mata*. We are not prepared to condone even a drop of this conclusion. In actuality, all of the statements made by Sundarānanda that attempt to furnish authority or proof of a singularity of *tattva* and impose it on Śrīla Jīvapāda’s name are wholly rooted utter error and ignorance and yield only that. We will address this at length in the context of discussing *tattva* and *tattva-vāda*.

Śrī Kavi Karṇapūra has described Śrīvāsa Paṇḍita of the Pañca-Tattva as the greatest of devotees, Nārada: “*śrīvāsaḥ paṇḍito dhīmān yaḥ purā nārado muniḥ* | – He who is the spiritually enlightened scholar Śrīvāsa was previously the sage Nārada.” The conversation Śrīman Mahāprabhu had with Śrīvāsa Paṇḍita during Ratha-yātrā, on the day of Herā Pañcamī, is a topic that deserves thorough discussion here:

śrīvāsa hāsiyā kahe, śuna dāmodara |
āmāra lakṣmīra dekho sampatti vistara ||

Śrīvāsa, laughing, said, “Listen, Dāmodara. Just see the vast majesty of my Lakṣmī.

vṛndāvanera sampada dekho,—puṣpa-kisalaya |
giridhātu śikhi-piccha—guñjāphala-maya ||

“Look at the wealth of Vṛndāvana. It is just flowers and blossoms, some minerals, peacock feathers, *guñja* berries.

vṛndāvana dekhibāre gelā jagannātha |
śuni’ lakṣmī-devīra mane haila āsoyātha ||

“Jagannātha went to see Vṛndāvana and Lakṣmī Devī became upset to hear of this.

eto sampatti chāḍi’ kene gelā vṛndāvana |
tāre hāsya karite lakṣmī karilā sājana ||

“Why did He leave all this opulence to go to Vṛndāvana?” To make Him a laughingstock, Lakṣmī decorated herself.

“tomāra ṭhākura, dekho, eto sampatti chāḍi’ |
patra-phala-phula-lobhe gelā puṣpa-bāḍi ||

“Your master, see, left all this luxury. Hankering for leaves, fruits, and flowers, He went to the flower grove.”

ei karma kare kāhā vidagdha-siromaṇi?

lakṣmīra agrete nija prabhura deha' āni' ||

“Why does the crown-jewel of expert lovers do things like this? Now bring your master before Lakṣmī.”

eto boli' lakṣmīra saba dāsī-gaṇe |

kaṭi-vastre bāndhi' āne prabhura nija-gaṇe ||

Saying this, Lakṣmī's maidservants bound all the Lord's servants hands to their waists.

lakṣmīra caraṇe āni' karāya praṇati |

dhana-daṇḍa laya, āra karāya minati ||

They brought them to Lakṣmī's feet and made them bow to her. They fined them and made them plead for mercy.

rathera upare kare daṇḍera tāḍana

cora-prāya kare jagannāthera sevaka-gaṇa ||

They vandalized the Ratha cart and treated Jagannātha's servants like thieves.

saba bhṛtya-gaṇa kahe, joḍa kari' hāta |

kāli āni dibo tomāra āge jagannātha ||

All the servants said, with folded hands, “Tomorrow we will bring Jagannātha before you.”

tabe śānta hañā lakṣmī jāya nija-ghara |

āmāra lakṣmīra sampada—vākya-agocara ||

Lakṣmī was then pacified and returned to her abode. The wealth of my Lakṣmī is beyond words.

dugdha āuṭi' dadhi mathe tomāra gopī-gaṇe |

āmāra ṭhākuraṇī baise ratna simhāsane !!

“Your gopīs boil milk and churn yoghurt, but my mistress sits on a throne of jewels.”

nārada-prakṛti śrīvāsa kare parihāsa |

śuni hāse mahāprabhura jata nija-dāsa ||

Śrīvāsa, who is endowed with nature of Nārada, thus joked. Hearing this, all of Mahāprabhu's servants were laughing.

*prabhu kahe,—śrīvāsa, tomāte nārada-svabhāva |
aiśvarya-bhāve tomāte, īśvara-prabhāva ||*

The Lord said, “Śrīvāsa, you have Nārada’s nature. The influence of the Lord’s opulent state is affecting you.”

*ihō dāmodara-svarūpa—śuddha-vrajavāsī |
aiśvarya nā jāne iho śuddha-preme bhāsi’ ||*

“This Dāmodara Svarūpa is a pure Vrajavāsī. He does not know the Lord’s opulence. He is immersed only in pure love.”

Here, what is worth pondering is: how is it that even though Śrīvāsa Paṇḍita is accepted as a worshipful figure for every Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava, he displayed a mood contrary to Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s promotion of *unnata-ujjala-rasa*? In *Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta* (Ādi, 4.17), Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī has said: “*aiśvarya jñānete saba jagat miśrita | aiśvarya-śithila-preme nāhi mora pṛita ||* – The whole world is mixed with a reverential awareness of opulence, but I am not pleased with *prema* that is made slack by all this opulence.” This concept is one of the main specialities of Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas. But Śrīvāsa Paṇḍita, on the day of Herā Pañcamī, became enamoured with Śrī Śrī Lakṣmī Devī’s opulence and majesty and with his heart overcome with that mood, he experienced great delight as he watched the assault being made on the *gopīs* [sevakas of Jagannātha] in *unnata-ujjala-rasa*. And it is not that he simply felt this internally. He could not contain the feelings welling up inside of him and, brimming with glee, expressed them rather dramatically before Śrīman Mahāprabhu, Gadādhara, and others. This much will be made clear by a study of Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī’s account of this incident. Therefore, it is not at all reasonable to think he or anyone else should be discarded from the *sampradāya* if they have some *mata-bheda*. As long as there is no difference of opinion on the main *tattva*, you cannot assert that there is a difference of *sampradāya*. A difference of *sampradāya* has only ever been accepted on the basis of differing views pertaining to the Para-tattva (Supreme Truth).

(f) Besides, even in the *advaya-vādī*, or *advaita-vādī*, *sampradāya*, many mutual disagreements are observed. Nevertheless, they are all collectively well-known among the philosophical traditions of the world as *bauddha* [Buddhist], *prachanna-bauddha* [“covert Buddhist”], or Śāṅkara traditions. Ācārya Śāṅkara establishes *advaita-vāda*. Astute philosophers give him various titles, such as *kevalādvaita-vādī*, *māyāvādī*, *mithyāvādī*, *brahma-vādī*, *śunya-vādī*, etc. Even though Ācārya Śāṅkara identifies himself as the grand-disciple of the Buddhist Gauḍapāda, he established his own doctrine by finding some common ground between

brahma-vāda and Gauḍapāda's *śunya-vāda*. Even though Śaṅkara established some clear differences of *mata* regarding the authority of the Vedas, both he and his *guru* are known to learned circles as being part of the same *sampradāya*. That is why the *māyāvādīs* are referred to as *bauddha*, or *prachanna-bauddha*.

(g) Because of his intellectual brilliance, Ācārya Śaṅkara made many disciples. Of them, Padmapāda, Sureśvara, Hastāmalaka, and Toṭaka were the most prominent. Of these four, Padmapāda and Sureśvara developed profuse erudition in the current of *advaita-vāda* thought. Sureśvara's previous name was Maṇḍana Miśra. Hastāmalaka and Toṭakācārya's scholarship was not comparable. Padmapāda and Sureśvara were the main heirs to Śaṅkarācārya's *māyāvāda*, but their views were not the same. "From Ācārya Śaṅkara's (aforementioned) two disciples, two branches formed. Padmapādācārya's interpretations and Sureśvarācārya's interpretations were different. For example, Śaṅkara has given *adhyāsa* (illusion) the definition: "*smṛti-rupaḥ paratra pūrva-dṛṣṭāvabhāsaḥ*." Padmapādācārya and Bhāmatikā's Vācaspatī Miśra have numerous differences in their explanations of this.⁴⁷

(h) Here the *advaita-vādīs* themselves have accepted the differing views of Padmapāda, Vācaspati Miśra, Sureśvara and others. Even though they have such differences of opinion, they are all part of the *advaita-vādī* Śaṅkara-sampradāya. No one has any objection in this regard. Below several other examples of their diverging views are being provided:

Prakāśātma Yati and Amalānanda also differ in regard to Śaṅkara's '*adhyāsa*' and '*avabhāsa*'. Ācārya Śaṅkara has defined *adhyāsa* as "*smṛti-rupaḥ paratra pūrva-dṛṣṭāvabhāsaḥ*." However, Amalānanda has established an objection to this definition and said: "*smṛti-rūpatva-viśiṣṭa avabhāsatva*." Even though Padmapāda was Śaṅkara's direct disciple, he has established a difference of opinion with his *gurudeva*. On the first page of his *Pañca-pādikā*, he has defined *adhyāsa* as: "*smṛte rūpam iva rūpamasya, na punaḥ smṛtireva pūrva-pramāṇa-viśaya-viśeṣasya tathā anavabhāsakatvāt* |" Thus, Śaṅkara's definition and Padmapāda's definition are not the same.

(i) Besides this, the aforementioned *ācāryas* disagree about the characteristics of *mithyātva* (falsity). Padmapāda says: "*sadasad bhinnatvam mithyātvam*." But Prakāśātma Yati says: "*jñāna-nivarttyatvam mithyātvam*." In other words, that which is checked or dissuaded by

⁴⁷ Svāmī Prajñānānanda Sarasvatī's *Vedānta-darśana Itihāsa* ("A History of Vedānta Philosophy"), first part, page 236, lines 6–12.

knowledge is false. Madhusūdana Sarasvatīpāda points out five characteristics of *mithyātva* in *Advaita-siddhi*. Thus there are conflicting views all around among prominent *advaita-vādīs*. Nevertheless, none of them end up being excluded from the Śāṅkara-sampradāya.

(j) Actually, not only do the *advaita* preceptors have conflicting opinions, but they are seen engaging in straightforward refutation of each other. Prakāśātma Yati has refuted Vācaspati Mīśra's 'avachinna-vāda'. Vācaspati says: "The *jīva* and *īśvara* are both reflections (*pratibimba*) of Brahman." Prakāśātma objects to that, saying, "It is impossible for such a reality to have reflections. The example of the sky's reflection is illogical. Hence, the personal form of *Īśvara* is the object that is reflected (*bimba*) and the *jīva* is the reflection (*pratibimba*)." According to Vācaspati, both *jīva* and *Īśvara* are reflections. Prakāśātma says only the *jīva* is the *pratibimba*; *Īśvara* is not the *pratibimba*, but the *bimba*.

Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī has refuted all these sorts of arguments and counter-arguments by the *advaita-vādīs* and defined the *jīva* as *brahman's taṭastha-śakti-svarūpa vibhinnāmśa* (variegated portion in the form of *taṭastha-śakti*).

(k) There has been profuse conflict among *māyāvādīs* over the issue of *brahman's kartṛtva* (agency). The Upaniṣads state: "*tad-aikṣata so 'kāmayata tad-ātmānam svayam kuruta iti.*" The agency of Brahman has been accepted via this *śruti-vākya*. If that is so, then how did *brahman* become *niṣkriya* (without activity), *nirviśeṣa* (without speciality), *nirvikāra* (without transformation)? Failing to shrug off Upaniṣadic states like this wherein *brahman* is described as seeing, desiring, personally doing, etc., the *advaita-vādīs* have accepted them as the *pūrvapakṣa* (the unsound interpretation that is to be refuted), thus attempting to have these statements make some sense. Failing to properly reconcile these statements, the *advaita-vādīs* have vehemently refuted each other's doctrines. Amalānanda, exceedingly distinguished among scholars, is foremost of these *advaita-vādīs*, even though many have established differences with his conclusions.

Some have explained *karma* to be the *sādhana* to attain *brahman-jñāna*, while others have refuted that notion, explaining that *nitya-karma* (eternal action) is a limb of *jñāna*. Despite how clearly evident these and many other differences of opinion are, all these scholars are indisputably accepted as *ācāryas* of the same Śāṅkara lineage. This is something the author of the *Vāda* book himself has also accepted. On page 233 of *Gauḍīyāra Tina Ṭhākura's Aṣṭama Mādhurī*, in the essay titled "Śāṅkarācārya's Matavāda," he has written: "Maṇḍana Mīśra was a

pratibimba-vādī in regards to the *jīva*, while Vācaspati Miśra was an *avaccheda-vādī*. And Sureśvarācārya was an *ābhāsa-vādī*.⁴⁸ Thus there were indeed differences of opinion between them. Nevertheless they are all *māyāvādīs*, or *ādvaita-vādīs*, of the Śāṅkara-sampradāya.

As it is not necessary to go into an extensive discussion of *advaita-vāda*, or *māyāvāda*, in this *Pañcama Siddhānta* of this essay, I have simply mentioned their various doctrines. This topic will be discussed at length in the context of *acintya-bhedābheda-siddhānta*'s speciality. It was Pūrṇaprajña Madhvācārya who thoroughly demolished *māyāvāda*, or *advaita-vāda*. And his irrefutable arguments are what Śrī Jīvapāda has adapted to establish the supremacy of *acintya-bhedābheda*. This also is one of the main reasons for the Gauḍīya-sampradāya being part of the Madhva tradition.

Answering Sundarānanda's Questions about Mādhva-Gauḍīya Sampradāya

In his *Vāda* book, on page 243 (*na*), Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has asked a question of Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhupāda. We can see why that question came up from looking at Śrīla Baladeva Prabhu's commentary on *Tattva-sandarbhā*, where he describes Śrī Madhva's '*mata-viśeṣa*' in the aforementioned 28th Anuccheda: "*bhaktānām viprāṇāmeva mokṣaḥ, devā bhakteṣu mukhyāḥ, viriñcasyaiva sāyujyam, lakṣmyā jīva-koṭitvam ity evam mata-viśeṣaḥ* |" (*Tattva-sandarbhā*, 28 Anuccheda, *Baladeva-ṭīkā*) Below I quote the full version of Sundarānanda's question for discussion:

"We learn from Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa's explanation of *tattvavāda-guru* Madhvācārya's *mata-viśeṣa* that among *bhaktas*, only *brāhmaṇas* can attain *mokṣa*, the demigods are the most prominent among the *bhaktas*, only Brahmā can attain *sāyujya* with Viṣṇu, and Lakṣmī is in the *jīva* category. This is his *mata-viśeṣa* (specific doctrine). When this is the sort of *mata-viśeṣa* found in the Mādhva-sampradāya, why did Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya-deva accept it? There is no reason for this given in Śrīpāda Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa's writings."

If we were to answer this question of Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya's in the language of Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī, we would say:

“*uluke nā dekhe yena sūryera kiraṇa* |

⁴⁸ Sureśvara's previous name was Maṇḍana Miśra. Here we could not understand which Sureśvara Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has dubbed as an *ābhāsavādī* because he has mentioned two doctrines, one of Maṇḍana Miśra and one of Sureśvara.

dekhiyā nā dekhe jata abhaktera gaṇa ||"

(*Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, Ādi, 3.85)

Just as the owl does not see the rays of the sun, the non-devotees fail to see despite seeing.

Why indeed would Śrī Baladeva's answer to this be visible to the eyes of a *guru-drohī* and *vaiṣṇava-vidveṣī* like Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda? But after the aforementioned question, he himself has written the following: "In order to accomplish certain timely objectives, Śrīmad Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu revealed a history of the Gauḍīya-sampradāya's inclusion in the Mādhva-sampradāya with the purpose of showing that the Gauḍīya-sampradāya was part of one of the well-established four Sātvata *sampradāyas*."⁴⁹ What Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya means to say is that the history of the Gauḍīya-sampradāya's inclusion in the Mādhva-sampradāya was fabricated by Baladeva Prabhu. In other words, he means to say that there is no authenticity to these notions, that they are baseless, and that Baladeva popularized these ideas because he was compelled to, for some reason. Here, what I wish to say is this: Does 'history' here refer to some imagined incident? Or does it refer to documented historical facts and series of events? Śrī Baladeva Prabhu detailed the historical events from the lives of the previous Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas* and their philosophical conclusions, incorporating them into his commentary on *Tattva-sandarbha*, his *Govinda-bhāṣya*, *Siddhānta-ratna*, *Prameya-ratnāvalī* and his various other books, thereby very clearly communicating this (the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas' inclusion in the Madhva tradition) to all the philosophers of the world. And ancient and modern scholars from East and West have unanimously accepted Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu's conclusions and discernments with bowed heads. Only Subodha Bābu of the Sāhā family, otherwise known as Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya, along with various characters in his camp, has published a book in refutation of this, thereby committing offenses at the lotus feet of Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa and Śrīman Madhvācārya. Prior to this book by Sundarānanda, no such book that is so offensive to Baladeva has ever been printed anywhere.

I cannot control my laughter when I hear Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya's question. But I am not only laughing. I am forced to be both amazed and saddened as well. Twelve years ago, he himself wrote a 350-page book titled *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva*, where he has proven that the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava *sampradāya* is part of Śrīman Madhvācārya's *sampradāya*. At the end of this book, in the twenty-eighth chapter, in an essay entitled "Śrī Brahma-Mādhva-Gauḍīya-

⁴⁹ *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*, page 244, lines 3–6

sampradāya,” he discusses this point for a lengthy thirty-four pages (241–271) and proves it with utmost certainty. Now a long twelve years have gone by; I suppose you can say there is a possibility he forgot the conclusions he came to in that book. Twelve years is a whole *yuga* (era). A lot happens when the *yuga* changes. After Satya (truth), then eventually Kali-yuga dawns; and as the *yuga* changes, by the influence of Kali, truth is covered and the power of falsehood increases. Perhaps that is what happened to Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya; perhaps all the flaws of Kali climbed onto his shoulders. Whatever the case, the *mahājanas* say: “*Gopanete atyācāra gorā dhare curi* – Gaurahari catches the deceit of those who secretly engage in sinful acts.” In his *Vāda* book, Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has not mentioned the title of his *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva* book. Why? Because, if he mentioned the name of this book, there would be no way for him to establish the main purpose of his *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* book, which is to prove that the Gauḍīyas are not ‘Brahma-Mādhva’. If educated society were to place these two books side-by-side, they would catch Vidyāvinoda’s lack of knowledge, his duplicity, ill intentions, malice for his *guru*, enmity for the Vaiṣṇavas, sinful inclinations and so on. Here I can say with special insistence that he wilfully and knowingly concealed the mention of his *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva* book.

When he wrote *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva*, he was under the supervision of pure Vaiṣṇavas and was compiling books while leading a genuinely spiritual life. At present, due to the influence of those inimical to Hari, Guru, and Vaiṣṇavas, his intelligence has become corrupted like this, much like Kālāpāhāḍa. Every page and every line of *Acintya-bhedābheda* is rife with baseless conspiracy theories and philosophical misconceptions rooted in malice toward Vaiṣṇavas, which is why I am here refuting it letter by letter. For fear of this book being too long and the readers losing patience, I have been compelled to adopt brevity in some places.

Does Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya mean to say that the aforementioned *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva* book he wrote is totally erroneous, from start to finish? If that book is to be considered his major blunder and this present *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* book has been written in refutation of it, then he should have been especially confident and eager to clearly reference *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva* and the falsity of its contents. He could have simply said: “The books I wrote previously were mistaken. Readers should adopt the logic of ‘*paravidhi balavān* – the latter statement is stronger’ and only accept my later books.” However, we must insist: “All the articles, essays, and books he wrote previously while under the shelter of Śrī Śrī Gurudeva were good and pure. All his later books and essays are deeply flawed, rooted in

some nefarious purpose, and full malice, enmity, violence and offenses; they are therefore wholly unacceptable and unreadable. I have searched the entirety of his 500-page *Vāda* book and could not find mention of the aforementioned book anywhere. Moreover, he has actually verified the authenticity of the *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva* book by quoting some portions from its twenty-seventh chapter in this *Vāda* book. Surprisingly enough, he has not in fact forgotten the contents of this book, even though it has been a whole *yuga*, or twelve years. He remembers everything so well that when he raises one of the above questions (about Lakṣmī-devī) and cites evidence from *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva*, he wilfully and consciously conceals where he first recorded this evidence. What he quotes in this *Vāda* book (page 243–244), from Chapter 27 of *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva* (pages 206 and 208) to refute Śrī Baladeva’s conclusions has been replicated without alteration for the readers’ benefit:

“As per the renowned conclusions of Śrī Madhva, Śrī Lakṣmī is Viṣṇu’s *priya-mahiṣī* (beloved queen); She possesses an eternal body comprised of *jñāna* and *ānanda*. Like Viṣṇu, She is devoid of the flaws that subject one to dwelling within a mother’s womb. She is situated everywhere with Viṣṇu, pervading all space and dimensions. Along with Viṣṇu’s infinite forms, Śrī Lakṣmī also enjoys pastimes in infinite forms. At the time of Viṣṇu’s incarnation, Lakṣmī also incarnates and presides as the beloved consort of that *avatāra*. Like Viṣṇu, Lakṣmī also has countless eternal names and forms. (Śrī Madhva’s ‘*Bṛhadāraṇyaka-bhāṣya*,’ 3rd Ch., 5th Brāhmaṇa)

“Lakṣmī-devī ... * * * * *
is subservient to Viṣṇu, the embodiment of all knowledge and many times more exalted than Caturmukha Brahmā. She dwells on Bhagavān’s limbs in the form of various types of ornaments. Viṣṇu’s bed, seat, throne, ornaments and everything He enjoys is comprised of Lakṣmī. (*Bhāgavatam* 2.9.13 quoted in the ‘*Anuvyākhyāne*’ of *Brahma-sūtra* 4.2.1)”⁵⁰

Here, from “As per the renowned conclusions of Śrī Madhva” up to “Lakṣmī also has countless eternal names and forms” is printed on page 206 of *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva* at the very beginning of the article entitled “Lakṣmī.” Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya quoted that directly from the *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva* book. Concealing this fact, however, he has referenced it as cited from Śrī Madhva’s ‘*Bṛhadāraṇyaka-bhāṣya*,’ Ch. 3, 5th Brāhmaṇa. I have not been able to find any such statement in the Third Chapter, Fifth Brāhmaṇa, of Madhva’s

⁵⁰ This citation is found in footnotes on pages 243–244 of Sundarānanda’s *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda*. It is borrowed directly from pages 206 and 208 of his *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva* book.

‘*Brhadāranyaka-bhāṣya*’. This statement of Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s is his refutation of Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu’s explanation of Madhva’s ‘*mata-viśeṣa*’ in *Tattva-sandarbhā*’s 28th Anuccheda. He wants to say Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu has deemed Śrī Śrī Lakṣmī-devī to be in the *jīva* category because of his ignorance of Madhva’s teachings; but Śrī Madhva has not made such a statement anywhere. Therefore, this conclusion of Baladeva’s is not real. I am submitting a few points below regarding this false, groundless charge made by the author of this *Vāda* book.

Here I would like to draw readers’ attention to one statement Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has made about Baladeva Prabhu. In the 13th chapter of this *Vāda* book, he has written: “Śrī Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa was previously a disciple of the Tattvavādī-sampradāya. Later, upon entering the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya, he tried to show that Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya-deva and the disciplic succession of His followers and their philosophical conclusions were congruent with Tattvavāda-guru Śrīman Madhvācārya’s *āmnāya* (tradition).” He also mentions: “First he read Śaṅkara’s commentary, before studying Śrīman Madhva’s thoroughly. At this time, he (Baladeva) became a disciple of the Tattvavādīs and became part of Madhva’s lineage. [...] He defeated the scholars in Śrī Puruṣottama-kṣetra and was living in the Tattvavādī *maṭha*.”

What Sundarānanda wants to prove by this is that Śrī Baladeva is not a Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava, but a disciple of Madhvācārya’s Tattvavādī-sampradāya, and that, having studied Madhva’s *bhāṣya* (commentary) thoroughly, he had become enamoured with Madhva’s philosophy. If Baladeva had studied Madhva’s *bhāṣya* so thoroughly and was a disciple of the Madhva-sampradāya living in the Tattvavādī *maṭha*, and if such a statement is to be accepted as true, then how is it that Baladeva would make a mistake in explaining Madhva-sampradāya’s *mata-viśeṣa*? Otherwise, if for argument’s sake, we accept that he really made a mistake, then we would have to believe that he was not a proper disciple of Madhva’s *sampradāya* and not properly acquainted with Tattvavāda’s *mata-viśeṣa* (the specifics of its doctrine). Therefore, would we or would we not be compelled to think that statements like “he lived in the Tattvavādī *maṭha*” and “he became the disciple of one of the Madhva-sampradāya’s *ācāryas*” were false, baseless, and fabricated?

The fact of the matter is that Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu is situated in the immaculate disciplic succession of Śrī Śrī Gaura-Nityānanda and, following them, so is Śrī Śrī Jīva Gosvāmīpāda. According to Bhāgavata-paramparā, he is ninth in descent from Śrī Śrīman

Nityānanda Prabhu, and according Pāñcarātrika-paramparā, he is accepted as eighth in descent from Śrī Nityānanda Prabhu. Historians outline his Pāñcarātrika-paramparā as follows:

Śrīman Nityānanda Prabhu's disciple was Śrīla Gaurīdāsa Paṇḍita, and his disciple was Śrī Hṛdaya Caitanya; Hṛdaya Caitanya Prabhu's disciple was Śrī Śyāmānanda Prabhu, and his disciple was Śrīla Rasikānanda; Rasikānanda Prabhu's disciple was Nayanānanda and his disciple was Rādhā-Dāmodara. He was the foremost *paṇḍita-ācārya* (scholar and preceptor) of Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī's *Ṣat-sandarbhāḥ*. Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu was a *dikṣa* disciple of this Śrīla Rādhā Dāmodara Prabhu and the foremost *śikṣā* disciple of Śrīla Viśvanātha Cakravartī Ṭhākura. This is historical fact accepted by all. There is no mention of such an illustrious *digvijayī-paṇḍita* in any of the branches of the Mādhva *guru-paramparā*. Historians have made a point to mention how Baladeva Prabhu was a more well-versed scholar of scripture than the Madhva-sampradāya scholars of his time. During that era, there was no scholar anywhere in India in any *sampradāya* who was of the same caliber of erudition in Nyāya, Vedānta, the Purāṇas, Itihāsas, and other scriptures. He had taken birth in the province of Utkala [Odisha]. During his time, in Śrī Purī-dhāma, the Mādhva-Gauḍīya-sampradāya was much more prominent than the Madhvācārya-sampradāya. Therefore, it was natural for a world-revered *mahā-mahopādhyāya* scholar like Baladeva to follow the lotus feet of Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas* of the Mādhva-Gauḍīya-sampradāya. And while Śrī Baladeva studied Madhva's *bhāṣya* thoroughly, he also meticulously studied that of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Bhāskarācārya, Nimbārka, Vallabha and others. It is not as if he became part of those *sampradāyas* just because he studied those philosophical texts. He did not become a disciple of any other *sampradāya* because there were no greater Vaiṣṇava scholars anywhere but in the Mādhva-Gauḍīya-sampradāya. Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya has undertaken a futile endeavor to present Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa as part of the Mādhva tradition. In this vein of guesswork and ignoble intent, he has cited a few portions of an article by Śrīla Ṭhākura Bhaktivinoda. But he has not cited the full article. If he had, the nefariousness of his endeavors would have come to light. In the aforementioned article, Śrīla Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura does not accept that Baladeva Prabhu was a Mādhva Tattvavādī initiate. We will discuss this at length in another *Siddhānta* and present the whole article for careful examination.

Previously it was mentioned that Sundarānanda's statement beginning with "the renowned conclusions of Madhva" was borrowed from his *Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Madhva* book. He decided that readers would think he had lost his mind if he revealed this book to be his source, so he

concealed his source and cited it as being from Madhva’s commentary on the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, 3rd chapter, 5th Brāhmaṇa. We say this has been proven to be false evidence. There is no mention of any such statement in Madhva’s commentary on said chapter in the 5th Brāhmaṇa. However, there are several verses quoted by Madhva that favor the purport of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa Prabhu’s commentary:

śrī bhūr durgāmbhraṇī hrīś ca mahā-lakṣmīś ca dakṣiṇā |
sītā-jayantī-satyā ca rukmiṇītyādi-bheditā ||
prakṛtis tena cāviṣṭā tad-vaśā na hariḥ svayam |
tato’nantāmsa-hīnā ca balajñapti-sukhādibhiḥ ||
guṇaiḥ sarvais tathāpy asya prasādād-doṣa-varjjitā |
sarvadā sukha-rūpā ca sarvadā jñāna-rūpiṇī ||

(*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣya*, 3rd Pariccheda, 5th Brāhmaṇa)

In other words, Śrī, Bhū, Durgā, Ambhraṇī, Hrī, Mahā-Lakṣmī, Dakṣiṇā, Sītā, Jayantī, Satyā, Rukmiṇī, and other various *prakṛtis* are all imbued and compelled by Śrī Hari, whereas Śrī Hari Himself is not compelled by them. In all aspects, such as knowledge, strength, happiness, etc., they are infinitely inferior to Śrī Hari. However, by the grace of Bhagavān, they are devoid of all flaws and forever the personifications of happiness and knowledge.

Here the point to deliberate is this: the statement “*prakṛtis tena cāviṣṭā tad vaśā na hariḥ svayam*” asserts that Śrī, Mahā-Lakṣmī, Sītā and others are *vaśya* (submissive) to Hari; in other words, Hari is the Īśa (lord) and Lakṣmī and others are *vaśya* (subservient). Not only that, they are infinitely inferior to Śrī Hari. Baladeva Prabhu is referring to this citation made by Madhva when he describes Madhva’s *mata-viśeṣa* as classifying Śrī Lakṣmī-Devī as a *jīva*. There is no cause or reason for Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya to disapprove of this. The aforementioned commentary on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* does not prove that Madhvācārya does not have this sort of *mata* and that this is simply something that Baladeva Prabhu conjured up. He surely showed Lakṣmī great regard in his *Anuvyākhyāna* to Vedānta, citing *Bhāgavata* 2.9.13, describing her glories to far surpass those of Brahmā and other demigods. That much is true, but we can see an entirely opposite kind of statement in his *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-bhāṣya*. What purpose he had in selecting that bit of scriptural evidence in his *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-bhāṣya* is not what we are discussing here. But we see in the lives of our *ācāryas*: “*eka lilāya karena prabhu*

kārya pāñca-sāta | – With one pastime, the Lord accomplished five or six feats.”⁵¹ Whatever that may be, it is this statement that Baladeva has taken issue with and refuted Madhva’s *mata* in *Vedānta-syamantaka*. There he discusses Parabrahma’s three types of *śakti*—*sandhinī*, *samvit* and *hlādinī*—and describes Śrī Lakṣmī-devī as the main *vṛtti-svarūpa* (personified function) of the *hlādinī* aspect of Parabrahma’s Parāśakti, thereby refuting the idea of Śrī Lakṣmī-devī being a *jīva*.

Now the point to consider is why Śrīman Mahāprabhu accepted the Mādhva-sampradāya despite there being this sort of philosophical difference. This is Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s question. He has written:

“When this is the sort of *mata-viśeṣa* found in the Mādhva-sampradāya, why did Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya-deva accept it? There is no reason for this given in Śrīpāda Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa’s writings.” (*Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* 143–44)

In this context, we request readers to deliberate the topic discussed in this *Acintya-bhedābheda* essay, from page 75 to 89, under the heading “Difference of *mata* is not reason for a difference of *sampradāya*.” Therein we have clearly proven that *mata-bheda* (philosophical differences) alone is not cause for a separation of *sampradāya*. If every little philosophical difference were cause for creating a whole new *sampradāya*, then Kṛṣṇa’s servants in the twelve *rasas* would have twelve different *sampradāyas*. In discussing this issue, we have shown that even though Murāri Gupta, Śrīvāsa Paṇḍita and other *bhagavad-bhaktas* had philosophical differences with Mahāprabhu Himself regarding the main thing Mahāprabhu was preaching—*mādhurya-rasa*—they were still considered Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas. Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya simply does not have the capacity to reject this fact. Moreover, within a single *sampradāya*, various *vaiśiṣṭya* (specialities) are observed between different *ācāryas*. If you refer to this *vaiśiṣṭya* as *mata-bheda* (philosophical differences), then you are denigrating the wondrousness (*camatkāritā*) of *vicāra-vaiśiṣṭya* (speciality of conception).

In this context, it is very necessary to mention a few points made by the crest-jewel of *sahajiyās*, the honorable Śrīyūta Rādhā-govinda-nātha Mahāśaya, because he has tried to present a comparative analysis of various *vicāra-vaiśiṣṭya* between Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya and various other philosophers in a huge 1600-page book published in two parts under the title “*Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Darśana*.” He too, in this book, has

⁵¹ Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Antya-līlā, 3rd Pariccheda, 169—fourth edition by Gauḍīya Maṭha

followed in Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya's footsteps, matching his tune, and quoting from Sundarānanda's *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* to say that the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya is a different *sampradāya* and not part of the Mādhva-sampradāya. Śrīyūta Nātha Mahāśaya, in the 40th Anuccheda of the introduction to the first volume of *Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Darśana*, has written down several points outlining the reasons for forming a different *sampradāya*. No matter what he writes, it is all but an echo or copy of Sundarānanda's *Acintya-bhedābheda-vāda* book. Therefore, this article of mine should be taken to be refutation of the huge *Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Darśana* book Rādhā-govinda-nātha Mahāśaya has gone to such great effort to compile.

While we have previously proven that “every little philosophical difference is not cause for a split in the *sampradāya*,” Śrīyūta Nātha Mahāśaya holds to the completely opposite point of view and wants to say that “having the same *mata* or *bhāva* does not determine oneness of *sampradāya*.” He wants to take it even further, saying that “even if one's *upāsya* (object of worship), *upāsanā* (worship), and the result of one's *upāsanā*, one's *prayojana-tattva*, are the same, this does not necessarily translate to a unity of *sampradāya*. While there are surely differences between the Mādhvas and Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas in terms of *upāsya*, *upāsanā*, and the ultimate goal, even if they were aligned on these three *tattvas*, they could not be referred to as one *sampradāya*.” Śrīyūta Nātha Mahāśaya has invoked all these statements of his in order to show that the unique Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava perspective aligns with the teachings of Śrīpāda Śaṅkarācārya and, in addressing the issue of *sampradāya-bheda*, has written: “According to the Mādhva-sampradāya tenets, Īśvara is the *sevya* (worshipful master) and the *jīva* is His *sevaka*, or servant. The Gauḍīya-sampradāya has the same teaching. However, it is not accurate to call the Gauḍīya-sampradāya a branch of the Mādhva-sampradāya based only on their agreement on this *sevya-sevaka-bhāva*. Why? Because the Rāmānuja, Nimbārka and other *sampradāyas* also have *sevya-sevaka-bhāva*. If similarity of *bhāva* meant being part of the same *sampradāya*, then all the aforementioned *sampradāyas* would be one and the same; but that cannot be said to be so.”⁵²

When addressing a subject like the history of philosophy, one cannot simply say, “It is said to be so,” or “It is not said to be so.” The *sampradāyas* that accept that the relationship of master and servant between Īśvara and the *jīvas* is eternal are all counted as one Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya. And all those throughout the whole field of philosophy who do not accept the

⁵² *Bhūmikā* (introduction) to *Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Darśana* published (1st Volume) Baṅgābda 1363 Sāla, 2nd of Caitra, 40th Anu, page 180 of *bhūmikā*.

eternal distinction between Īśvara and *jīva* as *sevya* and *sevaka* but accept their oneness are non-Vaiṣṇava, or *advaita-vādī*. Amid these two doctrines, Madhva, Rāmānuja, Nimbārka, and the Gauḍīya Gosvāmīs established the mood of *sevya* and *sevaka*, so they are all classified as Vaiṣṇavas. Meanwhile, Śāṅkara and other *ācāryas* are *advaita-vādī* non-Vaiṣṇavas for having accepted the oneness of the *jīva* and Īśvara. This is the difference between the Śāṅkara-sampradāya and Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya. Among the *advaita-vādīs*, due to *mata-vaiśiṣṭya*, or specialization within the doctrine, different *sampradāyas* were formed: Śāṅkara, Bauddha, Jain, etc., and the Hinayāna, Mahāyāna sects, etc. Likewise, though Vaiṣṇavas all accept *sevya-sevaka-bhāva*, *sāmpradāyika* differences were established on the basis of a variety of *vicāra-vaiśiṣṭya* (specialized conceptual approaches). Since time immemorial there have been two *sampradāyas*, the *devatās* and the *asuras*:

“*dvau bhūta-sargau loke ’smin daiva āsura eva ca |*”

(*Gīta* 16.6 and *Padma Purāṇa*)

In other words, in this world, there are two types of people: the *daiva* (godly) and the *asura* (demoniac); among them:

“*viṣṇu-bhaktaḥ smṛto daiva āsuras tad viparyayaḥ*” (*Padma Purāṇa*)

In other words, the devotees of Viṣṇu, the Vaiṣṇavas, are in the *daiva* category, and the proponents of various other doctrines are all in the *asura* category. Therefore, it is seen that since the prehistoric age till the present, there have been two *sampradāyas* developing alongside each other—this is the declaration of *Gītā* and *Padma Purāṇa*. Every Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya is founded on the basis of *bheda*, or *dvaita-vāda* (dualist doctrine). The *āsurika sampradāyas* are founded on *advaita-vāda*. At their roots, one *sampradāya* adheres to *nirguṇa* or *nirviśeṣa-vāda* (the featureless, unvariegated doctrine) and the other adheres to *saguṇa* or *saviśeṣavāda* (the doctrine personal qualities and variety); in other words, the *nirviśeṣa-vādīs* do not accept the eternal difference between *sevya* and *sevaka* while the *saviśeṣa-vādīs* accept that eternal difference. Those who accept that are part of one *sampradāya* and that *sampradāya* is the Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya. Therefore, Nātha Mahāśaya’s statement that “similarity of *mata* or *bhāva* does not determine oneness of *sampradāya*” is not a well-reasoned remark.

In regard to the differences between the Gauḍīyas and the Mādhva-sampradāya, Nātha Mahāśaya says: “The Gauḍīya-sampradāya cannot be said to be part of the Mādhva-

sampradāya even though both traditions share the same *upāsya* (worshipful deity). Because, the *upāsya*, *upāsanā*, and *lakṣya* (goal) of the Rāmānuja-sampradāya is like that of the Mādhva-sampradāya, but neither of these can be said to be part of the other. These two are different *sampradāyas*. Even though the *sādhya* and *sādhana* of these two *sampradāyas* is the same, they have different doctrines pertaining to the relationship between *brahma* and *jīva-jagata* (souls and the world). It seems that differences of *sampradāya* are determined on the basis of philosophical differences concerning the relationship between *brahma* and the *jīva-jagata*. Because, just as these two *sampradāyas* are said to be different based on the doctrinal differences on this matter even though their *sādhya* and *sādhana* are the same, likewise, even though the Gauḍīya-sampradāya and Nimbārka-sampradāya are almost identical in terms of *sādhya* and *sādhana*, they harbor different opinions about this same issue of relationship [between *brahma* and *jīva*] and are therefore recognized as two different *sampradāyas*. If the Mādhva-sampradāya and Gauḍīya-sampradāya are seen to concur on the matter of the relationship between *brahma* and *jīva-jagata*, then would it be accurate to say that the Gauḍīya-sampradāya is part of the Mādhva-sampradāya. However, on this topic, these two *sampradāyas* are seen to have disparate doctrines as well.”⁵³

We say, the Mādhva and Gauḍīya-sampradāyas do not have the slightest difference of opinion regarding the relationship between *brahma* and *jīva-jagata*. However, the huge philosophical difference that Nātha Mahāśaya has detected regarding this relationship, he has discussed with big, hefty arguments in just ten lines of his 1600-page book. Below we present for the readers the general approach, classification, and finer discernments Nātha Bābu has used to demonstrate this philosophical difference, thereby showcasing just how meaningless Nātha Bābu policy of being ‘*mitaṅca sārāṅca* – brief and to the point’ is:

“The Mādhva-sampradāya is *bhedavādī*; and the Gauḍīya-sampradāya is *acintya-bhedābheda-vādī*. There is a huge disparity between these two *sampradāyas* on this matter.” (Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Darśana—*bhūmikā* page 181)

Nātha Mahāśaya refers to one *sampradāya* as *bhedavādī* and the other as *acintya-bhedābheda-vādī*, and with these two statements, falls silent, having determined the vast differences between these two philosophical perspectives regarding the relationship between *brahma*, the *jīva*, and the world. He differentiates between the Gauḍīya and Mādhva *sampradāyas* based on

⁵³ ⁵³ *Bhūmikā* (introduction) to *Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Darśana* published (1st Volume) Baṅgābda 1363 Sāla, 2nd of Caitra, 4th Anu, page 181 of *bhūmikā*.

Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya, and here I am quoting what meaning Vidyāvinoda has determined for the word *acintya-bhedābheda* to show the irrelevance of Nātha Mahāśaya's statement. Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya says:

“Śrī Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya's followers, the Śrī Gosvāmipāda-gaṇa, fabricated the idea of *acintya-dvaitādvaita-siddhānta*, but really only managed to establish *advaita-siddhānta*.”⁵⁴

What needs to be said here is that if the Gauḍīya Gosvāmīs are establishing *advaita-siddhānta* via *acintya-bhedābheda*—if this notion is to be heeded, then one must say that the Gauḍīyas are part of the *advaita-vādī* Śāṅkara-sampradāya—which is something Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas will not accept, nor can they. In another *Siddhānta*, it will be explicitly demonstrated how there is not even the slightest difference between the *bhedavāda* of Madhva and *acintya-bhedābheda* of the Gauḍīyas. Not only that, but the concept of *acintya-bhedābheda* is clearly evident within Madhva's *bhedavāda* in the context of *brahma*'s relationship with *jīva* and *jagata*, and if one is to deliberate upon the conclusions inherent to Jīvapāda's *acintya-bhedābheda*, Madhva's *bhedavāda*, or *advaita-siddhānta*, will come into focus—not any form of *advaita-siddhānta*.

I think Nātha Mahāśaya has not thoroughly studied Madhva's philosophical texts; even if he has, without an impartial standpoint, a proper grasp of the topics would not be revealed. The reason for this is showing itself: In his *Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Darśana*, Madhvācārya's name and his *vicāra*, or *pramāṇa*, is barely used or quoted. In his 1600-page book, the deliberations of Ācārya Śāṅkara and Rāmānuja are clearly visible throughout, and where he presents a comparative analysis of Vaiṣṇava *siddhānta* with that of Śāṅkara, he accepts only Rāmānuja's thought to bolster his own. So little of the writings of Śrī Jīvapāda and Baladeva Prabhu has been included that it is not even worth mentioning, what to speak of Madhva's. Even in the context of refuting Śāṅkara's doctrine, in places where the arguments of Madhva, Jīvapāda and Baladeva have established the most beauty and *camatkāritā* (sense of wonder), there too he has selected Rāmānuja's explanations instead of these *ācāryas*. This is the speciality of Nātha Mahāśaya.

According to Nātha Mahāśaya, the main reason for differentiation between *sampradāyas* is the disparity of conclusions concerning *brahma*, *jīva*, and *jagata*. We really have not been able to agree with him on this topic. In many places, he has even accepted that there is some similarity between the Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas*' views on the relationship between *brahma*, *jīva*, and

jagata. Therefore, we too will, in proper context, demonstrate how there is no difference between Madhva and the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavas on this point. Small philosophical differences are not reason enough to form a different *sampradāya*. The *upāsya* is Viṣṇu, the *upāsanā* is *bhakti*, and the attainable object is *mukti*, or *sevā*. Even though there are small differences between the four Vaiṣṇava *sampradāyas* in regard to these three *tattvas*, at their roots, they cannot be called differences. Rather, they all share a similar *dharma*. Different *sampradāyas* have been created among the Vaiṣṇavas based on differences between the *upāsya-tattvas*, or in regard to the *utkarṣa* (superior excellence) of the *para-tattva*. In some places we see some *tāratamya* (gradational differences) in regard to *sādhya*, *sādhana*, and *sādhaka-tattva*, which causes some gradational differences between *sampradāyas*. This too will be discussed thoroughly in proper context. In all actuality, the root reason for the variegation of *sampradāyas* is the variegation in experience of the *para-tattva*, or *upāsya-tattva*. Whichever deity has demonstrated more excellence as an *upāsya-tattva* has gained that much more superiority. The *jīvas* take shelter of the various *ācāryas* of different *sampradāyas* according to their own individual capacity and proclivity and thus obtain their individual cherished goals.

Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s “Sale of His soul”

Now, to answer Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya’s question “Why did Mahāprabhu accept Śrīman Madhvācārya’s *sampradāya*?” I would tell him to study the fifteenth chapter of *Madhya-līlā*, Śrī *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, very carefully. There he will be able to see that Śrī Śrīman Mahāprabhu addressed the residents of Kulīna-grāma—Satyarāja Khāna, Rāmānanda Vasu, and other Vaiṣṇavas—with special honor:

kulīna-grāma-vāsire kahe sammāna kariyā |
pratyabda āsibe yātrāya paṭṭadorī laiṅyā ||
‘guṇarāja-khāna’ kaila ‘śrī kṛṣṇa-vijay’ |
tāhā eka vākya tāra āche premamaya ||
nanda-nandana kṛṣṇa—“mora prāṇanātha |”
ei vākye bikāinu tāra vaṁśera hāta |
tomāra ki kathā, tomara grāmera kukkura |
se mora priya, anya-jana rahu dūra ||

(*Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, *Madhya-līlā*, 15.98–101)

Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s most confidential moods have been revealed from this description by Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī. One Vaiṣṇava by the name ‘Guṇarāja Khāna’ wrote a book of poetry

called ‘Śrī Kṛṣṇa Vijaya’. Because the words “*nanda-nandana kṛṣṇa*—“*mora prāṇanātha* – Nanda-nandana Kṛṣṇa is the lord of my life” were written in this text, Śrīman Mahāprabhu became overwhelmed and said, “*tāra vaṁśe bikāinu hāta*”—effectively selling His soul. Not only that, He is saying to Guṇarāja Khāna’s son and grandson, Śrīla Satyarāja Khāna and Śrīla Rāmānanda Vasu: “What to speak of you, what to speak of the human beings in your village, even your dogs are very, very dear to Me.”

The aforementioned text of *Śrī Kṛṣṇa Vijaya* was written two years before Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s advent. Śrīla Ṭhākura Bhaktivinoda has written: “This book is the first text of *padya* poetry in the Bengali language.”⁵⁵ As it suits the context, we are presenting some introduction to this book from my Śrī Guru-pādapadma’s *Anubhāṣya* for the readers:

The *ādi-kavi* (pioneer poet) Guṇarāja Khāna Mahāśaya started writing this *grantha* in 1395 [Śakābda year] and completed it in 1402.

The composition of *Śrī Kṛṣṇa Vijaya* is very simple—so simple that even half-educated teenagers and lower caste people who have little knowledge of letters can easily read and understand it. The language of this book is not ornamental. In many places, its couplets are not so sweet. Often, in a couplet that should be fourteen syllables long, one will find a line of sixteen or twelve–thirteen syllables, and many of the words are contemporary to that era. Only people from the Rāḍha region will understand all those words. **No Bengali language library can be said to be complete without this text.**

This *grantha* deserves the greatest honor among spiritually-inclined persons. Foremost of Vaiṣṇavas, the worshipful Śrī Guṇarāja Khāna Mahāśaya wrote this *grantha* for the appreciation of a general audience as a translation of the crest-jewel of scriptures, *Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam*—of its tenth and eleventh cantos. For that reason, this *grantha* is worshipped everywhere in the Vaiṣṇava world. It is needless to say how much honor the book that Mahāprabhu read and praised so much has garnered in Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava society. Therefore, this text is a venerable treasure for Bengalis; more to the point, some say that it is this very book that is the *ādi-kāvya*, or original work of poetry, in the Bengali language.

⁵⁵ “‘*Śrī Kṛṣṇa Vijaya*’ — a book. Many believe that this *grantha* is the original Bengali *padya-kāvya* text.” —(Śrīla Ṭhākura Bhaktivinoda’s *Amṛta-pravāha-bhāṣya*, *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, *Madhya* 15.99)

This book was written by the hands of Śrī Devānanda Vasu in 1405 Śakābda, two years prior to Śrī Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s advent.

Here we present the original abovementioned verse for the readers:

“*eka-bhāve vando hari joḍa kari’ hāta |*
nanda-nandana kṛṣṇa—mora prāṇanātha ||”

Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī, in the second line of his previously cited couplet describing Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s reaction to this verse, quotes Śrīman Mahāprabhu as saying: “*ei vākye bikāinu tāra vaṁśera hāta* – I have sold myself into the hands of his descendants.” Here it seems necessary to provide some introduction to the dynasty of Guṇarāja Khāna (Mālādhara Vasu), especially since it is the dynasty Mahāprabhu has personally said He has sold Himself to.

Along with five high-class *brāhmaṇas* from Kānyakubja, the King Ādiśura of Bengal also brought five *kāyasthas* with the surnames Ghoṣa, Guha, Vasu, Mitra, and Datta. As the *kāyasthas* were upper class in all respects, they were honored by the *brāhmaṇas*. Daśaratha Vasu was one of the *kāyasthas*. Śrī Mālādhara Vasu appeared in the dynasty of this same Daśaratha Vasu. Śrī Mālādhara Vasu was endowed with many virtues, so the king of Bengal gave him the title “Guṇarāja Khāna – the King of Virtues”. Therefore, the family of Mālādhara Vasu, which is the *tilaka* of the Vasu dynasty, is known by the title ‘Khāna’. Guṇarāja Khāna was the thirteenth descendant of the aforementioned Daśaratha Vasu. The world-renowned Guṇarāja Khāna had a son named Satyarāja Khāna, whose previous name was Lakṣmīnātha Vasu; and Śrī Rāmānanda Vasu is Satyarāja Khāna’s son. Therefore, addressing Guṇarāja Khāna’s son and grandson, Śrīman Mahāprabhu has said: “*nanda-nandana kṛṣṇa—mora prāṇanātha | ei vākye bikāinu tāra vaṁśera hāta.*” From Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s time, we find mention of all three individuals, Guṇarāja Khāna and his sons. Here we present for the readers Guṇarāja Khāna’s genealogy from Daśaratha Vasu to Rāmānanda Vasu. The names mentioned below are the descendant sons, one after the other:

- (1) Daśaratha Vasu, (2) Kuśala, (3) Śubhānkara, (4) Hamsa, (5) Muktirāma, (6) Dāmodara,
- (7) Anantarāma, (8) Guṇī-nāyaka, (9) Mādhva, (10) Śrīpati, (11) Yajñeśara, (12) Bhagīratha,

(13) Mālādhara Vasu (title “Guṇarāja Khāna”), (14) Satyarāja Khāna (previously named Lakṣmīnātha Vasu, (15) Rāmānanda Vasu.⁵⁶

Thus, Śrī Rāmānanda Vasu was fifteenth in line of descent from Daśaratha Vasu. Mālādhara Vasu was a very wealthy person. If you see the temples he established and the fortifications around his residence, it is apparent that he was a very prosperous individual who owned a lot of land. Śrīman Mahāprabhu sold Himself to this family. He even considered the animals, birds, and insects of Kulīnagrāma very dear to Him. Everything related to someone you love becomes dear to you. This is the symptom of true love.

In Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s pastimes, we are seeing that He saw one book where ‘Nandanandana Kṛṣṇa’ was being described as *prāṇanātha* (lord of one’s life), and this is the exact message that Mahāprabhu came to preach. Therefore, by selling Himself to the dynasty of this book’s author, He became so very pleased—pleased to the core of His soul. This teaching is the main thread, or clue, we have to understanding how and why one should accept a particular *sampradāya*. More to the point, we see in the description of Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s nature:

īśvara svabhāva—bhaktera nā laya aparādha |
alpa-sevā bahu māne ātma-paryanta prasāda ||

(Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Antya, 1.107)

The Lord’s nature is such that He does not take offense from His devotees. Any small service they render, He considers to be a great service and is pleased enough to give Himself to them.

“All *bhaktas* are one and the same”—no Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya accepts such indiscriminate judgment. There are differences of *adhikāra* (eligibility), differences in the services devotees render according to their *rasa*, differences in the ultimate goal they want, differences in their experience of the *upāśya-tattva*, and more. As He takes into consideration the *rasa* and *adhikāra* of His devotees, Bhagavān does not heed any offenses they may commit. He does not take any offense personally, and instead, He considers even the smallest and ordinary service rendered by His dear, cherished *sevakas* to be a great service. Śrīla Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī has revealed an extremely confidential truth in the words “*ātma-paryanta prasāda*”.

⁵⁶ Collected from the list preserved at the ancestral home in Kulīnagrāma. Mālādhara Vasu had fourteen children; of them, the second was Lakṣmīdhara, who we know as Satyarāja Khāna.

This is one entirely new and majestic quality of Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s *audārya-līlā*. The word ‘*prasāda*’ generally means “favor, mercy”. It has another emotive meaning that is accepted, which is: “submitting or offering any item to one’s *guru* or worshipful object according to the prescribed rituals of scripture”. The crown-jewel of Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas*, Oṃ Viṣṇupāda Śrīla Prabhupāda, has defined the meaning of the “*ātma-paryanta prasāda*” phrase in his *Anubhāṣya* to *Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta* as: “He grants the favor of giving even Himself.” In other words, Śrīman Mahāprabhu gives such great value to even the smallest service rendered by His devotees that He gives them even His very self. If we reflect on this description of the speciality of Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s qualities, we can understand that even if He had philosophical differences with Madhvācārya’s in the field of logical debate, He has forgotten all of that because He agrees with Madhvācārya, or finds a point of reconciliation with him, in regard to the worship of *para-tattva*. Thus He accepted Madhvācārya as the main *ācārya* at the root of His *sampradāya*.

The description of Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s travels in South India as revealed in *Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta* and Śrīla Govinda-dāsa’s ‘*Kaḍacā*’ (which is accepted as authentic by all) shows that even though Viṣṇu’s supremacy was accepted in some places, Mahāprabhu did not see service, worship, and *arcana* being performed anywhere in acceptance of the presiding deity of *ujjala-rasa*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa, as the supreme. He who has incarnated to teach the world the worship of Kṛṣṇa wandered all over South India and could not see a deity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa anywhere. Surely He felt afflicted at heart. But that was completely alleviated when He came to Uḍupi and saw ‘Nartaka Gopāla’ Śrī Kṛṣṇacandra at Śrī Madhvācārya’s place of worship. The author of *Caritāmṛta* has written the following to describe the religious traditions in South India at that time, as well as Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s purpose and preaching:

dakṣiṇa-deśera loka aneka prakāra |
keha jñānī, karmī, pāṣaṇḍī apāra ||
sei saba loka prabhura darśana prabhāve |
nija nija mata chāḍi’ haila vaiṣṇave ||
sabe-i vaisṇava haya, kahe—‘kṛṣṇa’, ‘hari’ |
anya grama nistāraye se vaiṣṇava kari’ ||
mallikārjuna tīrtha jāi maheśa dekhila |
tāhā saba loka kṛṣṇa nāma laoyaila ||

(Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Madhya 9. 9, 19, 8, 15)

[The people of the southern country are of many types. Some are erudites, some fruitive workers, and there are countless heretics. All of them abandoned their various beliefs and became Vaiṣṇavas by the power of the Lord’s audience. Everyone became Vaiṣṇava and began chanting, “Kṛṣṇa, Hari!” These people would deliver other villages and make the people there Vaiṣṇavas. He went to Mallikārjuna-tīrtha and saw Maheśa. There He had everyone chant the name of Kṛṣṇa.]

Herein it is seen that Śrīman Mahāprabhu brought those who were practitioners in the non-Vaiṣṇava category, into His *mata* and taught them to chant the name of Kṛṣṇa. Even among the worshippers of Viṣṇu, who were Vaiṣṇavas, there were no worshippers of Kṛṣṇa. Śrīman Mahāprabhu taught them the supremacy of Kṛṣṇa and had them chant Kṛṣṇa’s name.

In Ahobala-Nṛsimha, Skanda-kṣetra, Siddhavaṭa, Trimāṭha and other places, Mahāprabhu had *darśana* of Nṛsimhadeva, Rāmacandra, Trivikrama and other forms of Viṣṇu and brought the devotees in those places to His *mata* (perspective). And in those places, they realized the supremacy of worshipping Kṛṣṇa and began chanting the name of Kṛṣṇa. When can see in Kavirāja Gosvāmī’s description:

‘ahobala-nṛsimhadeva’re karilā gamana ||
nṛsimha dekhiyā tāre kailā nati-stuti |

‘siddha-vaṭa’ gelā jāhā mūrtti sītāpati ||
raghunātha dekhi’ kaila praṇati stavana |

tāhā eka vipra prabhura kaila nimantraṇa ||
sei vipra ‘rāma’-nāma nirantara laya |
rāma-nāma vinā anya vāṇī nā kahaya ||

‘skanda-kṣetra’-tīrthe kaila skanda darāśana |
‘trimāṭha’ āila tāhā dekhi’ trivikrama ||
sei vipra kṛṣṇa-nāma laya nirantare |

(Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Madhya 9. 16–19, 21–22)

[He went to Ahobala-Nṛsimha, saw Nṛsimha, offered hymns and obeisance to Him. He went to Siddhavāta where there is a deity of the Lord of Sītā. Seeing Raghunātha, He offered obeisance and prayers. There a *brāhmaṇa* invited Him (to eat and rest). That *brāhmaṇa* was chanting the name of Rāma without interruption. He would not utter any word except for Rāma. At the holy site of Skanda-kṣetra, He saw Skanda. He came to Trimaṭha and saw Trivikrama. That *brāhmaṇa* started chanting Kṛṣṇa’s name constantly.]

In Siddhavāta, hearing the name of Kṛṣṇa of emanating from mouth of that *brāhmaṇa*, Śrīman Mahāprabhu inquired of him:

*pūrve tumi nirantara laite ‘rāma’-nāma |
ebe kene nirantara lao ‘kṛṣṇa’-nāma ??*

[Before you were always chanting Rāma’s name. Why do you now take Kṛṣṇa’s name incessantly?]

In reply the *brāhmaṇa* said:

*vipra bole—ei tomāra darśana prabhāve |
tomā dekhi’ gela mora ājanma svabhāva ||
bālyāvadhi rāma-nāma grahaṇa āmāra |
tomā dekhi’ kṛṣṇa-nāma āila ekabāra ||
sei haite kṛṣṇa-nāma jihvāte bosiyā |
kṛṣṇa-nāma sphure, rāma-nāma dūre gelā ||*

(*Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, Madhya 9. 24–27)

[“This is the power of seeing you. Seeing you, my lifelong habit went away. Since childhood I have chanted the name of Rāma. Seeing you, Kṛṣṇa’s name came for the first time and since then Kṛṣṇa’s name has sat on my tongue. Kṛṣṇa’s name manifests and Rāma’s name has gone far away.]

Śrīman Mahāprabhu had many discussions with this *brāhmaṇa* about the difference between Rāma’s *tattva* and Kṛṣṇa’s *tattva*. And therein Mahāprabhu established the supremacy of

Kṛṣṇa's *tattva*. He also initiated the Buddhists of South India into Vaiṣṇava-dharma and had them take shelter of Kṛṣṇa's name:

tomā-sabāra 'guru' tabe pāibe cetana |
saba bauddha mili kare kṛṣṇa-saṅkīrtana ||
guru-karṇe kahe sabe kṛṣṇa, rāma, hari |
cetana pāiyā (bauddha)-ācārya bole 'hari' 'hari' ||

(*Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, Madhya 9. 60–61)

[Your *guru* will come back to consciousness. All the Buddhists came together to perform *kṛṣṇa-saṅkīrtana*. They uttered the names of Kṛṣṇa, Rāma, and Hari into the ears of their *guru*. Coming back to external awareness, the Buddhist teacher began to call out, "Hari! Hari!"

In Viṣṇu-kāñcī, Śrīman Mahāprabhu had *darśana* of Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa and there too He made many people understand the superiority of Kṛṣṇa compared to Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa and turned them into devotees of Kṛṣṇa:

viṣṇu-kāñcī āsī' dekhila lakṣmī-nārāyaṇa |
praṇāma kariyā kaila bahuta stavana ||
premāveśe nṛtya-gīta bahuta karila |
din dui rahi' loke 'kṛṣṇa-bhakta' kaila ||

[Arriving in Viṣṇu-kāñcī, He saw Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa. He offered His obeisance and many prayers. Absorbed in *prema*, He sang and danced profusely. He stayed for a few days and made people devotees of Kṛṣṇa.]

madhvācārya-sthāne āilā yāhā tattvavādī |
uḍupīte kṛṣṇa dekhi' tāhā haila premāsvādī ||
narttaka-gopāla dekhe parama-mohane |
madhvācārye svapna diyā āilā tāra sthāne |
gopī-candana-tale āchila diṅgāte |
madhvācārya-ṭhāi āilā kona-mate ||
madhvācārya āni' tāre karilā sthāpana |
adyāvadhī sevā kare tattvavādī-gaṇa ||

kṛṣṇa-mūrti dekhi' prabhu mahāsukha pāila |
mahā-premāveśa bahuta nṛtya-gīta kaila ||

(*Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, Madhya 9. 245–249)

[He came to Madhvācārya's place, that of the Tattvavādīs. In Uḍupī, He saw Kṛṣṇa and there began to relish the divine ecstasy of *prema*. He saw the supremely charming form of Nartaka Gopāla who had appeared to Madhvācārya in a dream. The deity had been concealed in a chunk of *gopī-candana* that was being transported by boat and came to Madhvācārya in a miraculous manner. Madhvācārya brought the deity (back to Uḍupī) and established a temple for Him there. Till this day, the Tattvavādīs serve that deity. Seeing the deity of Kṛṣṇa, the Lord felt great bliss. Greatly absorbed in *prema*, He sang and danced profusely.]

Here the most important point to note is that Śrīman Mahāprabhu had not been able to see the deity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa anywhere and was thus unable to really find joy in His heart anywhere. With all the various worshippers of Viṣṇu-tattva, He had endured a fair bit of difficulty discussing *tattva* and getting people to understand the supremacy of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's *tattva*—so much so that He even felt great pain in His heart. As soon as Mahāprabhu came to Madhvācārya's Uḍupī and saw the deity of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, He experienced *mahā-sukha* (great joy) —“*kṛṣṇa-mūrti dekhi' prabhu mahāsukha pāila |.*” Elsewhere, upon seeing the deities of Viṣṇu, Mahāprabhu danced and sang with great *prema*, but in this place “He relished *prema*”—the *prema* Mahāprabhu had appeared in Nadiyā, in Śrīdhāma Māyāpura, to relish. It was only when He came to Uḍupī that He found the opportunity to relish *ujjala-rasa*. He saw the presiding deity of *parama ujjala vātsalya-rasa* (supremely refulgent parental love), His cherished form of the *para-tattva* (Supreme Truth), Nartaka-Gopāla (“Dancing Gopāla”), who was holding the churning rod and dancing. He had not seen such a supremely captivating form in all His wanderings of South India. Naturally He found *ātma-prasāda* (soul satisfaction) upon arriving in Madhvācārya's place.

Upon having *darśana* of that supremely captivating form, Śrīman Mahāprabhu became “*mahā-premāsvādī* – a relisher of great divine love” and found “*mahā-sukha* – great joy”. And it is in this place that He found full satisfaction of His soul (*ātma-prasāda*). From this it seems that He did not accept any of the South Indian Nārāyaṇa-worshipping *ācāryas* like Rāmānuja, or

Nṛsiṃha worshippers like Viṣṇusvāmī, etc., as His predecessor *ācāryas*.⁵⁷ The *sampradāya* that accepted Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the supreme *tattva* was the *sampradāya* He accepted, because Śrīman Mahāprabhu is Śrī Kṛṣṇa Himself and *kṛṣṇa-tattva* was the main topic of His preaching. His appearance was expressly dedicated to the purpose of adopting the moods of the *gopīs* and relishing *kṛṣṇa-rasa*. Therefore, where else but *kṛṣṇa-tattva* can Mahāprabhu sell His soul?

Previously we saw that the one reason Mahāprabhu sold His soul to Guṇarāja Khāna was because he had described Nanda-nandana Kṛṣṇa as the sole object of worship. That Nanda-nandana Kṛṣṇa, the *arcāvatāra*, or deity, of *vātsalya-bhāva* was being worshipped in the Mādhva-sampradāya in the form of Śrī Nartaka Gopāla. Śrī Kṛṣṇa personally came to His intimate associate Madhvācārya, in a dream, and then appeared in reality. Having travelled the whole of South India, Śrīman Mahāprabhu had not been able to see the worship and service of Kṛṣṇa as the Supreme in any other *sampradāya*. Thus what doubt can there be that He would sell Himself to Madhva and his lineage, to the line of his disciples and grand-disciples. This right here is Śrīman Mahāprabhu's acceptance of a *sampradāya*. Why can't Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya understand that?

Another question may arise: In the Uttara-rādhī Maṭha established by Madhvācārya, the deities of Śrī Rāma and Sītā are being worshipped. This is not the worship of Kṛṣṇa. But Mahāprabhu Himself, in His Ṣadbhuja form is Rāmacandra, Kṛṣṇacandra, and Gauracandra. This is the form he showed Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya. The amazing thing is that in South India only Śrī Madhvācārya (and his followers) worship both Śrī Kṛṣṇacandra and Śrī Rāmacandra. This is because Śrī Madhvācārya, as an incarnation of Śrī Śrīmat Hanūmat himself, was a one-pointed servant of Śrī Rāmacandra in *dāsya-rasa*. Then, in the form of Śrī Bhīmasena, He served Śrī Kṛṣṇacandra in one-pointed *sakhya-bhāva*. Then, in Kali-yuga, to facilitate the finest service to Śrīman Mahāprabhu, Śrī Śrī Nartaka-Gopāla, who is immersed in *vātsalya-rasa* and holding the churning rod, appeared in Śrī Madhva's heart via a dream and then manifested Himself from the chunk of *gopī-candana*. Śrī Madhva's place of *bhajana* is an unprecedented amalgamation of the worship of both Śrī Rāma and Kṛṣṇa. And Śrīman Mahāprabhu's appearance and revelation as the Ṣadbhuja-mūrti is the unprecedented union of *upāsya*s to be worshipped. Śrīman Mahāprabhu's incarnation like this is the incarnation of

⁵⁷ Vallabhācārya, Nimbārkācārya, and other *ācāryas* were contemporaries of Mahāprabhu. They and the *ācāryas* under their guidance came into contact with Śrīman Mahāprabhu and realized the supremacy of worshipping Kṛṣṇa in *mādhurya-rasa*.

the *acintya-bhedābheda* (inconceivable oneness and difference) present throughout the Viṣṇu-tattva. Śrī Madhva is the main *ācārya* who revealed this *tattva*; and that is why he is the Tattvavādī Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavācārya.

The deities of Śrī Śrī Rāma and Sītā worshipped by Śrīman Madhvācārya were extremely ancient, belonging to a prehistoric time. These deities were being worshipped by the kings of the Sūrya-vaṁśa (solar dynasty) long before Śrī Rāmacandra's appearance. Eventually they came to be worshipped by King Daśaratha. Finally, they came to be served by Śrī Madhva and are there to this day.

Līlā o Itihāsa “Pastimes and History”

Vaiṣṇavas accept the eternality of Bhagavān's pastimes. Because they accept the eternality of *līlā*, they also accept the eternality of the *sevya-sevaka-bhāva* (the mood of master and servant). If Vaiṣṇava-dharma were to reject the eternality of *sevya-sevaka-bhāva*, it would end up being part of the Śāṅkara-sampradāya. In attempting to prove the oneness of *sevya* and *sevaka*, the Śāṅkara-sampradāya has been compelled to give twisted interpretations of the Vedas and Upaniṣads. And by spreading a web of arguments and logic, they have given prominence to the secondary meanings of words (*lakṣaṇā-vṛtti*), rather than their straightforward, actual meaning (*abhidhā-vṛtti*). The *abhidhā-vṛtti* conveys the natural meaning of a word. This is widely accepted throughout the world of philosophy. If the *abhidhā-vṛtti* does not convey meaning, you are left with the burden of having to accept the *lakṣaṇā-vṛtti*. This is something all philosophical thinkers agree unanimously on. The inferiority of *lakṣaṇā* is accepted universally. We will not choose inferiority in the world of philosophy by determining the purport of the Vedas and Upaniṣads via some secondary, metaphorical meaning under the guidance of Ācārya Śrīla Śāṅkara.

Some, with nefarious intention, resort to the secondary meaning even in regard to historical evidence. We are mentioning the names of some individuals, so-called Vaiṣṇavas and authors. Of them, the most prominent are Śrīyūta Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda and his sycophant Śrīyūta Rādhāgovinda Nātha Mahāśaya. It is not as if another two or four members of the so-called hereditary Gosvāmīs do not merit mention, like Kānupriya Gosvāmī, Satyānanda Gosvāmī and others. They all disrespect genuine history and twist simple, straightforward history to create their own newfangled history. This is in all ways rooted in offenses to the lotus feet of the exalted Vaiṣṇavas of the past. They are loath to accept Śrīman Madhvācārya as the main connective fibre of the Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇava-sampradāya. The main weapon their

arguments use is *lakṣaṇā*. Trying so hard in vain to alter the natural course of history and come up with something new is called using *lakṣaṇā-vṛtti* in history.

The famous history writer, Dr. Śrīyūta Bimanbihari Majumdar M.A., Ph.d. Mahāśaya has resorted to this sort of *lakṣaṇā* tactic and tried like no one has ever before to create the impossible in a text titled “*Śrī Caitanya-caritera Upādāna*”. The sad thing is that Calcutta University published this book and created more scandal. We cannot find any reason for such an unheard, unreadable book to be published with the support of a university. The kind of low vision he has cast upon Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu’s transcendental immortal life and activities simply tells us clearly what kind of character and thoughts he has. Should anyone read this book, they will be totally destroyed. Embodying the example of this is another book “*Śrī Caitanya-deva o Tāhāra Pārṣada-gaṇa*”, which was recently published by the aforementioned university by another author, one Śrī Girijā Śaṅkara Rāya Chaudhuri, who has cast similar aspersions upon Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s character and, several years ago, written another book along these lines: “*Bāṅglā Carita Granthe Śrī Caitanya*”. This too was published by the university. These three books are not fit to heard or read by anyone. I am conveying a humble request to the management of Calcutta University to set up a firepit in front of the library, on the main road, and burn these three books.

Whatever the imaginations of the writers of history come up and whatever is printed as a result cannot be considered history. If post-graduate students base their beliefs about Śrīman Mahāprabhu and His *sampradāya* on these sorts of books, they will find nothing but false, unfounded, and inauspicious notions, and thus they will be caught up in the unprecedented damage wrought by these books. Not only that, if the student society will establish regard for these three books, it will amount to an undue, malicious attack on Bengal’s topmost, foremost religious tradition. If the authors of books become compelled by violence and enmity and compose history, they simply signal inauspiciousness for the whole world. These mental proclivities of Bimān Bābu and Girijā Bābu are clearly evident from even a cursory study of their books. I will go into an extensive discussion of their impertinent predilections in another article.

Historians are often atheists and therefore do not accept *līlā*. In their eyes, *līlās* are just the activities of a historical person, or that of a superhuman. Real ‘*līlā*’ is beyond mortal purview, beyond logic and reason, and endowed with inconceivable potency. Philosophical reasoning and discernment cannot get through the heads of these writers of history, so they are

incapable of conceiving of the *līlā*'s inconceivability and transcendence. We are quoting what Girija Rāya has said about Śrīman Mahāprabhu below, wherein he casts aspersions on the writings of Śrīla Kavirāja Gosvāmī.

“The later the successors of a religious founder are, the more they preach of the religious leader’s divine glory. This attracts the general public the most, but the immediate followers of a religious figure do not make much of his divinity. People blind in regard to dharma have more faith in the supernatural than the ordinary.”⁵⁸ This inability of those blind to dharma is not indicative of Bhagavān’s pastimes lacking *acintyatva* (inconceivability) and *atimartyatva* (superhumanness). The *bhajanānandī-dārśanikas* (philosophers who delight in *bhajana*) are capable of explaining this teaching to them via each and every syllable. The Vedas, Vedānta, Upaniṣads, and other scriptures always teach us that there is no place for *yukti* and *tarka* (logic and reasoning) in *bhagavat-tattva*. Only the *pāṣaṇḍas* (offenders, antagonists) who are established in their *āsurika-dharma* (demoniac nature) spread a convoluted web of reasonings over the subject of *īśvara-tattva*. The proliferation of Bhagavān’s pastimes is based on the eternality of the difference between the *jīva* and *Īśvara*. But Vidyāvinoda Mahāśaya wants to say that the oneness of the *jīva* and *Īśvara* is Śrī Jīvapāda’s conclusion on *jīva-tattva*. This is the *advaita-vādīs’* concept of some *nirīśvara-tattva* (Godless principle). If the absence of difference between the *jīva* and *Īśvara*, or their oneness, is accepted, then how are we to account for the existence of *līlā-tattva*? Where the Upaniṣads teach both *bheda* and *abheda*, *bheda* is always more prominent. This is the conclusion of the Gosvāmīs and other *ācāryas*. In *Paramātma Sandarbha*, Śrīla Jīva Gosvāmī has conveyed this very clearly.

The Vaiṣṇavas are Bhagavān’s eternal servants because they accept the eternal existence of Bhagavān’s pastimes. Their bliss lies in service, and since master and servant are eternal, the service, activity, or inclinations that exist between them are also naturally accepted as being eternal. This *sevā-vṛtti* (inclination to serve) is *nityānanda-svarūpā* (the embodiment of eternal bliss). Service is the supreme goal of the Vaiṣṇavas. Those who worship Nārāyaṇa accept the eternality of Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa and develop *parama-prīti* (supreme, divine love) as they become intensely absorbed in their service for all eternity. Those who are worshippers of Sītā-Rāma accept Rāma-Sītā’s eternality and become absorbed in their service for all time. Those who worship Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa experience the eternality of Kṛṣṇa’s pastimes and offer their lives in His service, thus remaining situated in the bliss of service.

⁵⁸ 9th *Vakṛtva*, page 271 of *Bāṅglā Carita Granthe Śrī Caitanya*, published 1949 by Calcutta University

On the path of *upāsanā* (devotional worship), we refer to the worshippers of Kṛṣṇacandra, Rāmacandra, Nārāyaṇa and other figures of Viṣṇu-tattva as Vaiṣṇavas. They are all Vaiṣṇavas and are known by the same title of Vaiṣṇava. Śrīman Mahāprabhu’s servants are among the most exalted of Vaiṣṇavas. The service of Gaura-Viṣṇupriyā, or Gaura-Nityānanda Prabhu, or the Pañca-tattva is eternal and everlasting, and though *para-tattva* is one *vastu*, it is a *tattva* that possesses inconceivable potency (*acintya-śakti*). Because of this *acintya-śakti*, the one *vastu* becomes situated in the *tattvas* of *aiśvaryāmṛta* (the nectar of opulence), *kāruṇyāmṛta* (of mercy), *mādhuryāmṛta* (of sweetness), or *audāryāmṛta* (of magnanimity) and presides for all eternal time as the *sevya* (master) of one category of Vaiṣṇava. *Nirviśeṣa-vastu* (a featureless or indeterminate object) is the so-called face of *sūnya* (the void of nothingness). Therein is an extreme lacking of the speciality of blissfulness. That is why individuals participating in this variety of thought have been classified as non-Vedic atheists. As historians have rejected God’s inconceivable power, they too belong to this grouping. The forces of nature in the form of time have bewildered their minds. They cannot find a way to rise to the understanding that Śrīman Mahāprabhu is Himself Nārāyaṇa, Rāmacandra, Kṛṣṇacandra and Gauracandra—in one.

The atheistic historians cannot reconcile the fact that *Rāmāyaṇa* appeared long before Rāma’s birth. Vaiṣṇavas devoted to Rāma believe this wholeheartedly, that *Rāmāyaṇa* was written before Rāma’s birth. How and why would this enter the minds of historians if they do not accept the eternality of *līlā*? The eternal, everlasting reality assumes a certain pastime and takes shelter of a particular era of time, thus appearing on the earthly plane. The moment *bhagavat-tattva* incarnates, the earthly realm’s mundane course is interrupted. *Māyā*, or the *prākṛta-tattva* (mundane principle) has no constitutional relationship with the *sanātana-vastu* (eternal reality). Rāmacandra appeared in Daśaratha’s home—this is something the historians do accept. All the devotee lineages in Bhārata have accepted this historical fact with bowed heads. But if the historians hear that King Daśaratha was worshipping deities of Rāma and Sītā in his palace before Śrī Rāmacandra took birth, they will be shocked and will doubt: “How is this possible?” We say this real and an immutable truth. There is no reason for doubt. These two deities worshipped by Daśaratha were installed in a temple by Śrī Madhva Muni and are still worshipped today in the Uttarādi Maṭha. This is a historic and true fact. The history collected by the crown-jewel of Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavācāryas, Jagad-guru Gauḍīya-Vaiṣṇavācārya Śrī Śrīmad Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Gosvāmī Prabhupāda, about the story of these deities of Śrī Rāma-Sītā is provided below.

Śrī Madhvācārya's Rāma-Sītā

“The story of the original deities of Śrī Rāma and Sītā is written as follows in the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth chapters of a book called *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa*: A *brāhmaṇa* once vowed not to eat every day without first seeing Rāmacandra. Once Śrī Rāmacandra could not appear before the citizens for a whole week, due to some pressing task. So that *brāhmaṇa* who was so devoted to having *darśana* of Rāma did not take a drop of water for more than a week. Finally, after eight days, on the ninth day, the *brāhmaṇa* came into the presence of Śrī Rāma and Sītā and obtained Their *darśana*. Hearing of the *brāhmaṇa*'s dedication, Śrī Rāmacandra instructed Lakṣmaṇa to give deities of Rāma-Sītā to this *brāhmaṇa* to be kept in his house. The *brāhmaṇa* received the deities from Lakṣmaṇa and served them every day for the rest of his life. Before he died, he gave the deities to Śrī Hanūmān, who wore Them upon his chest and served them for a long time. After a long while, Bhīmasena went to Gandhamādana Mountain and met Hanumān, who gave these deities to Bhīmasena as he was leaving that place. Bhīmasena worshipped these deities in his palace. Till the time of the final king of their dynasty, Kṣemakānta, these two deities were served in that palace. Afterwards, they came into the hands of the Gajapati kings of Orissa and were safely preserved in their royal treasury. Śrī Madhvācārya gave his disciple Śrī Narahari Tīrthapāda permission to acquire those two original Śrī Rāma-Sītā deities from the treasury and serve them. These deities of Rāma-Sītā were served in the palaces of Sūrya-vaṁśī kings since the time of King Ikṣvāku and were worshipped by Daśaratha before Rāmacandra's birth. Later, when Lakṣmaṇa was serving them, the deities were offered to that *brāhmaṇa* on Rāmacandra's order. Śrī Madhva obtained these deities three months and sixteen days before he disappeared and established the main *maṭha* of Uḍupī-grāma, the Uttara Rāḍhī Maṭha, of which the Śrī Mādharmaite *ācāryas* are still proprietors.”⁵⁹

Many types of *līlās* spring forth from the stories of the kings of prehistoric ages. Two dynasties, the Sūrya-vaṁśa and Candra-vaṁśa, have descended through the ages from ancient times. All the kings of these solar and lunar dynasties were devotees of Viṣṇu. There is actually no record in ancient Sanskrit literature of any kings who did not accept Viṣṇu's supremacy. Even though both dynasties accepted the supremacy of Viṣṇu-tattva, they worshipped different forms of that same *upāsya-tattva*. Ikṣvāku and other Sūrya-vaṁśī kings were devotees of Sītā and Rāma long before Śrī Rāmacandra's appearance, while all the Candra-vaṁśī kings were devotees of Kṛṣṇa. In the tender, cool shade of the Candra-vaṁśa,

⁵⁹ Fourth Gauḍīya Maṭha edition of *Śrī Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, Madhya, 9th Pariccheda, *Anubhāṣya* to the eleventh couplet, page 468–469.

the supremely sweet wonder of Śrī Kṛṣṇacandra's pastimes manifested. The Sūrya-vaṁśī kings were bound strongly by the codes of *kṣatrīya* conduct and manifested service of their *upāsya-tattva* in *dāsya-rasa* mixed with *kāruṇya*.

In Śrīman Madhvācārya's place of worship, we find the worshipful deities of both of the dynasties have come together and are being worshipped there together. Madhvācārya was the servant of Śrī Rāma in Tretā-yuga as Śrī Śrīmat Hanūmān. This we have mentioned earlier. The Sūrya-vaṁśī king Daśaratha was a devotee of these Śrī Rāma-Sītā deities which Śrī Madhva acquired towards the end of his life. After Daśaratha, eventually Hanūmān received them. Of the five Pāṇḍavas led by Yudhiṣṭhira, who are kings of the lunar dynasty, Bhīmasena is the direct incarnation of Hanūmān. In Dvāpara-yuga, Madhvācārya is known as Bhīmasena. Bhīmasena retrieved these deities of Rāma and Sītā from Gandhamādana Mountain and worshipped them. Bhīmasena, who was a devotee of Kṛṣṇa, accepted these worshipful deities of the Sūrya-vaṁśī kings and made Them worshipful deities of the Candra-vaṁśa. Śrī Madhvācārya is the form and incarnation of Hanūmān and Bhīma. This is widely known not only in the Mādhva-sampradāya, but other religious lineages as well. Thus the two sets of worshipful deities of the Candra and Sūrya-vaṁśa are present till this day in Śrī Madhva's temple. This too is one of the *tattvas* of Śrīman Mahāprabhu's Ṣadbhuja-mūrti.