

Prabodhananda, Hit Harivams and the Radha-rasa-sudha-nidhi

– Jagadananda Das –

Introduction

In the previous article,(fn1) an attempt was made to establish an authoritative biography of Prabodhānanda Sarasvatī, the author of a number of devotional poems and commentaries in Sanskrit. It was shown there that the sannyāsin Prabodhānanda's life can be divided into three parts: the first, about which we know little, in which he was a Śāṅkarite monk living in Benares; a second, in which he came under the influence of Caitanya and his devotees, and a third, in which he associated closely with Hita Harivaṁśa, the founder of the Rādhā_vallabhī sect in Braj.

The purpose of this second article is to examine the Rādhā_rasa_sudhānidhi (RRSN),¹ which is said by the followers of Harivaṁśa to be his work, while the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas are convinced that Prabodhānanda is in fact its author. Before tackling this problem, however, I feel that it may be worthwhile to discuss what is known about Hita Harivaṁśa's life from contemporary sources and to examine the Gauḍīya claim that he was, in fact, a disciple of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, who in turn identified Prabodhānanda as his guru.

Hita Harivaṁśa: his life

The first literary attestation of Harivaṁśa is given by Prabodhānanda himself in his Śrī-Hitaharivaṁśa-candrāṣṭaka where he calls him Kṛṣṇa's flute, paying tribute to his talents as both singer and hymnologist.² Harivaṁśa's devotional qualifications are further lauded in the padas of his junior contemporary, Harirāma Vyāsa.³ Sometime after Harivaṁśa's death, an apotheosis of sorts was effected by his direct disciple Dāmodaradāsa, otherwise known as Sevaka. This devotee gave some details of Harivaṁśa's essential theology and praxis in his Sevaka-vāṇī. The first work envisaging Harivaṁśa's entire career did not appear until after Bhagavat Mudita had written the hagiographical work on his disciples and descendants, Ananya Rasik Māl. The Harivaṁśa Carit or Hit Carit (HC) by Uddhavadāsa was probably written as an appendix to Bhagavat Mudita's "lives of the saints", and due to often being included together in MSS with Ananya Rasik Māl, has at times been attributed to Bhagavat Mudita. Though Uddhavadāsa's short work refers to a number of miraculous events, the dates which he gives for the major milestones of Harivaṁśa's life are generally considered to be historically reliable. Surprisingly, HC has never been published and the brief biography of Harivaṁśa given here is based on the summaries given by

Lalitācaraṇa Gosvāmī (1957:27ff), Vijayendra Snātaka (1968:91ff) and Rupert Snell (1984:1–44), all of whom have, of course, supplemented Uddhavadāsa's account with information from other historical works of the school. Of the miraculous events, only those which are relevant to the discussion are here included; the stories of Harivaṁś's encounters with his many disciples have been omitted.

Hita Harivaṁśa was born on the 11th day of the bright moon of Vaiśākh in the year VS 1559 (AD 1502) in Bād, a village a few miles south of Mathurā. He was the joint form of Hari and vaṁśa (or flute). His father, Vyāsa Mīśra, was a Gauḍa brāhmaṇa of the Kaśyapa gotra from Deoband, an astrologer of some repute. At the age of six months, before the family returned to Deoband, the babe recited the RRSN and it was copied down by his uncle Nṛsimhāśram.⁴

After receiving the sacred thread at the age of seven, Harivaṁśa was given instruction by Rādhā in a dream to seek out a red leaf at the top of a peepul tree. Upon doing so, Harivaṁśa found the yugala-mantra written on it. Thus, his only guru was Rādhā herself.⁵ Similarly, Rādhā further instructed him to look into the well in his father's garden where he would find the deity Raṅgīlāl, a two-armed form of Kṛṣṇa playing a flute.⁶

Harivaṁśa continued to live in peaceful harmony in his Deoband home until he was 32 years old. After the deaths of his mother and father, though married with three children and a daughter, he decided to move to Vrindavan. Because the children were young, his wife Rukmiṇī preferred not to accompany him.

Harivaṁśa's descendants continue to worship Raṅgīlāl in Deoband.

On his way to Braj in 1533, Harivaṁśa had another message from Rādhā who told him in a dream that he would be offered two girls in marriage while en route and that he should not refuse them. This indeed came to take place and Harivaṁśa was married to Kṛṣṇadāsī and Manoharidāsī.

Upon his arrival in Braj he rested at Madan Ṭer where he encountered a rich landowner called Naravāhana who gave him the land between Madan Ṭer and Cīr Ghāṭ to use in the service of Rādhā-vallabha. He consecrated the image of Rādhā-vallabha there in AD 1535. [Other traditions say that Rādhā-vallabha's service was inaugurated in Sevākuñja.] Harivaṁśa soon established a rāsa-maṇḍala in the area which further enhanced his reputation. In a very short time he made many disciples as well as strong friendships with Harirāma Vyāsa, who probably arrived not long after him, and Svāmī Haridāsa, who was probably there before him. Like many of the other spiritual leaders of the time, he played a part in 'discovering' the old sacred spots of Braj. Harivaṁśa has to his credit Vaṁśī Baṭa and Sevā Kuñj, both important places of pilgrimage in Braj even today. He and his abovementioned associates did much to promote the rāsa performances which enjoyed ever-increasing popularity. His death is said to have taken place at midday, the full-moon day of Āśvin, VS 1609 (AD 1553).

A half century after Harivaṁśa's death, Nābhādāsa, in his Bhaktamāla⁷ (c. AD 1609) gives the following synopsis of Harivaṁśa's contributions, a passage which

is often quoted by the Rādhā-vallabhīs as an encapsulation of the essential facts about him and his doctrines.

Keeping Rādhā's feet foremost, he worshipped (them) in his heart with great resolution,
He served the married couple in their dalliances in the grove as a sakhī;
His all in all was mahā-prasāda, he is well-known to be qualified to take it.
He did not care for the rules and restrictions, his strict vow was only to serve exclusively;
Those who follow the path established by the son of Vyāsa can well understand (its principles);
Only some rare souls can understand the ways of Harivaṁśa Gosvāmī's religion.

The importance placed on Hita Harivaṁśa's uninterest in the rules and regulations by the sampradāya is further shown by Dāmodaradāsa's repeated confirmation of the point in his *Sevaka-vāṇī*.⁸ Uttamadāsa similarly summarizes Harivaṁśa's doctrinal contribution in HC with the following statement:

He rejected all orthodox precepts and prohibitions in favour of pure devotion, and renounced fast-days because they denied him the consumption of prasāda. He ignored the ten rites of passage (saṁskāra) and defeated ceremonialists, Śaivas, Śāktas and the followers of other doctrines....⁹

Hita Harivaṁśa and Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī

Harivaṁśa's miraculous initiation by Rādhā herself seems to have been the cause of some doubts even amongst his own followers during his lifetime, for in one of the two letters (Śrī-mukha-patrī) written by him to a disciple Bīṭhaladāsa, he responded to a question which apparently indicated a lack of faith in his direct disciplic relationship to Rādhā. Harivaṁśa wrote:¹⁰

As far as those principles of the scriptures which are true and the glory of the spiritual master which is similarly true, only those who do not have faith in the process of disciplic succession established by Śrī Rādhā, the queen of all the young beauties of Vraja, are ignorant. Therefore you should abide by this principle.

Thus it appears that Hita Harivaṁśa insisted even during his own lifetime that he was the disciple of Rādhā herself. None of the books attributed to Harivaṁśa contain a guru-stuti. Nor do any of the writers of *Bhaktamāla* works such as Nābhādāsa, his commentator Priyādāsa, or the Rādhā-vallabhī historians Uddhavadāsa, Dāmodaradāsa, Bhagavat Mudita, etc., mention the name of any other guru.

Amongst the Gauḍīyas, however, there is a tradition which connects Hita Harivaṁśa to Gopāla Bhaṭṭa. The first version of the story is found in the *Prema-*

vilāsa (PV) of Nityānanda Dāsa. It has often been pointed out that this is a book filled with interpolations and in which too much faith cannot be placed.

Nevertheless, even in its earliest stratum, which may tentatively be dated to pre-1650, Hita Harivaṁśa is stated to be one of the three disciples of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa. To this is added that 'Harivaṁśa disobeyed his spiritual master; thus though he had many good qualities, they were all destroyed.'¹¹

Further editions of PV contain interpolations which expand extensively on this theme, including allegations that Harivaṁśa was assassinated. Kṛṣṇadāsa's Bengali Bhaktamāla, a rather late work (c. AD 1800) (thus again not to be considered extremely reliable), gives the following summary of this Gauḍīya tradition:

The deeds of Śrīmān Harivaṁśa Gosvāmī are known the world over as most pure. He was a disciple of Śrīmān Gopāla Bhaṭṭa; greatly imbued with devotion, he bore the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. One ekādaśī [fast] day he ate the prasāda betel, and because of this his guru pronounced him guilty. Though the Gosvāmī [Gopāla Bhaṭṭa] was not angry in his heart, he outwardly chastized [Harivaṁśa] as an example to others. Rādhā-vallabhī gosvāmīs in the lineage of Harivaṁśa's disciples live even now in the domain of Braj. Śrīmān Gopāla Bhaṭṭa chastized him; there was not the least fault in this — Gopāla Bhaṭṭa was the preceptor, and moreover [this was] the system; I do not know know why he [Harivaṁśa?] turned [against the tradition?]. Since they [the Rādhā-vallabhīs] do not agree with the various other sampradāyas in social intercourse, the partaking of food and in metaphysics, a schism occurred and there is not [now] commensality [with the other sampradāyas]; Rājā [Savāī] Jayasīma closely consulted [the scriptures]. There is no advantage in describing all these incidents now; tens of millions of obeisances to everyone.¹²

There is no reason to believe that this statement was maliciously motivated. Kṛṣṇadāsa seems rather to be faithfully reproducing a tradition which was well known within the sampradāyas but wished to avoid a prolonged discussion of the friction between them, to all intents and purposes apologizing in the last couplet for having raised the issue at all. The later, embellished version of PV also includes a tale of the unsavory death of Harivaṁśa as a result of his 'offences' and Gopāla Bhaṭṭa's miraculous posthumous pardoning of his disciple. It also calls his sons 'the products of sin,' etc. Kṛṣṇadāsa's good faith is confirmed by his avoidance of these obviously unacceptable exaggerations.¹³ The reference to a judgment by Rājā Savāī Jayasīma of Jaipur in this matter, evidently supporting the Gauḍīya contention, has unfortunately not been corroborated.

The only internal evidence in Harivaṁśa's works which can be brought to bear on the matter is the use of the epithet Rādhā-ramaṇa (the name of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa's deity) in the signature verses of no less than seven of the padas in CP. This may in itself not be so startling, were it not that the name of Rādhā-vallabha, more usually associated with Harivaṁśa, is not found once. Signature verses usually contain the name of the author's iṣṭa. To encounter the name of

Gopāla Bhaṭṭa's iṣṭa rather than that of Harivaṁśa himself naturally comes as a surprise. Furthermore, there are certain similarities in the method of worship found in the Rādhā-ramaṇa temple and that in the Rādhā-vallabha, such as the absence of a deity of Rādhā who is represented by a dress (gaddī-sevā). In view of Harivaṁśa's fabled worship of Rādhā as supreme over even Kṛṣṇa, these similarities point to a prior relation between the two personalities.

Rather significantly however, Priyādāsa, even though himself a disciple of the Rādhā-ramaṇa house, made no mention of any such relation of Harivaṁśa to Gopāla Bhaṭṭa in his commentary on Bhakta-māla (AD 1707). Indeed, even though the contentions of the Gauḍīyas have been examined here in some detail, they can be discarded quite quickly on the basis of the Rādhā-ramaṇa temple's own traditions, according to which Gopāla Bhaṭṭa did not found the service to Rādhā-ramaṇa until 1543. (Gopāla Bhaṭṭa's dates are given as 1499_1586.)¹⁴ Since Harivaṁśa came to Braj in 1533 and independently founded the service of Rādhāvallabha in 1535, he could not have been a pūjārī of the deity Rādhāramaṇa as claimed by the Gauḍīyas. Harivaṁśa's use of the epithet Rādhā-ramaṇa does not betray any sectarian affiliation as it was popular throughout the Vaiṣṇava world and can be found in the writings of Sūradāsa as well as those of the Gauḍīyas. It may well be that Harivaṁśa's preference for the epithet Rādhā-ramaṇa reflects an early date for the composition of the songs of CP, some of which may well have been written even before he came to live permanently in Vrindavan. The name of Harivaṁśa's deity, Rādhāvallabha, took on a sectarian significance amongst the followers of Harivaṁśa, and thus later commentators on CP did seem to consider the use of Rādhā-ramaṇa a problem.¹⁵

Furthermore, worship of Rādhā as a consecrated deity in the company of Kṛṣṇa was not known until a later date. It is said that the wife of Nityānanda, Jāhnavā, was the first to bring idols of Rādhā for worship alongside Kṛṣṇa in many of the Vrindavan temples.

Harivaṁśa and Gopāla Bhaṭṭa's doctrinal differences

Despite the above historical data, the primary thrust of the Rādhā-vallabhī apologists' denial of the above contention of the Gauḍīyas, other than to discredit the sources, is to show that Harivaṁśa's doctrines differ from those of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa. Snātaka (1968:97_8), for instance, marshals forth four great differences:

- (1) Hita Harivaṁśa had faith in the primacy of Rādhā, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa did not.
- (2) Hita Harivaṁśa worshipped Rādhā as svakīyā (Kṛṣṇa's own wife), Gopāla Bhaṭṭa parakīyā (the wife of some other gopa).
- (3) Hita Harivaṁśa worshipped Rādhā in nitya-vihāra, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa was a believer in the vipralambha, love in separation.
- (4) The discipline of the Gauḍīyas in terms of the external rites, the deity service and finally ekādaśī fasting etc. are not accepted by Rādhā-vallabhīs.

As in the discussion of Prabodhānanda's doctrinal connexion with Harivaṁśa, the source for these supposed dogmas of the founder of the Rādhā-vallabhī sect

are based on the RRSN and the subsequent commentatorial traditions of the sect rather than anything found in his vernacular works.¹⁶ On the other hand, in view of Prabodhānanda's ideological solidarity with Harivaṁśa, it is to be expected that Prabodhānanda's disciple Gopāla Bhaṭṭa's would also share in that solidarity to some extent. Furthermore, evidence that Harivaṁśa, Rūpa and Sanātana were identified together beyond any sectarian distinctions is provided by Harirāma Vyāsa, who mentions them together in one song.¹⁷

(1) Unfortunately, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa has not left much in the way of written records by which the above contentions can be proved or denied. A commentary on the KKA (Kṛṣṇa-vallabhā) is the only work which shows any rasika credentials, but his authorship of this work is not beyond doubt. His other works (HBV, etc.) show an inclination towards ritual (vaidhī bhakti) rather than to the emotive aspects of devotion more usually connected with the medieval Vaiṣṇava movements. In HBV, the prescribed rituals generally show a bias to Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa, while Rādhā is only mentioned in connection with the rituals for the month of Kārttika, in the Dāmodarāṣṭaka.¹⁸ On the other hand, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa's commentary on the KKA includes arguments for the supremacy of Rādhā amongst the consorts of the deity. Sanātana Gosvāmī, whose contribution to the compilation of the HBV is well attested,¹⁹ also eloquently proclaims Rādhā's glories in his Bṛhad-bhāgavatāmṛta. Neither of these writers, however, explicitly place Rādhā in a position above even Kṛṣṇa.

On the other hand, Rupert Snell has shown that the clear-cut pre-eminence of Rādhā is to some extent a later development and is by no means always obvious in Harivaṁśa's CP other than in the eyes of its commentators (1984: 492-9).

Numerous verses of the Sphuṭa-vāṇī show Kṛṣṇa-niṣṭhā or exclusive devotion to Kṛṣṇa rather than to Rādhā. There are no exhortations to worship, remember or serve Rādhā exclusively as there are to worship, remember or serve Kṛṣṇa. Other statements by Harivaṁśa indicate a feeling for the equality of the two: dampati rasa samatūla 'in the conjugal pleasures the two are equal' (CP, 32), kaun kare jala-taraṅgani nyāre: 'who could separate the waves from a river,' i.e. they are one life in two bodies (1); ... doṁ rasa-laṁpaṭa surata-juddha jayajuta 'the two lovers are victorious in the battle of passion' (CP 3), etc.

Historically, the root of the primacy given to Rādhā is to be found in Gīta-govinda where Kṛṣṇa's anxiety in separation from Rādhā and his supplications at Rādhā's feet indicate his dependance on her (10.8).²⁰ The goal of the Gauḍīyas is kuñja-sevā, to become the handmaiden (mañjarī, dāsī or priya-narma-sakhī) of Rādhā and their traditions (coming through Gopāla Bhaṭṭa's disciple Śrīnivāsa Ācārya) identify Gopāla Bhaṭṭa as Guṇa Mañjarī. It thus does not seem that there was a great difference between the two schools in this area. The Gauḍīyas have, however, built on the previous scriptural traditions of Vaiṣṇavism and thus they arrive at Rādhā's 'supremacy' by first establishing that Kṛṣṇa is the supreme concept of godhead. The Rādhā-vallabhīs, on the other hand, dispense with the theological apparatus considering it irrelevant to the business of kuñja-sevā.²¹

This attitude certainly contributed to the absence of an elaborated Rādhā-vallabha theology until long after Harivaṁśa's death.

(2) Although the Gauḍīya school is generally seen as supporting the unmarried status of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa (parakīyā), it does not necessarily follow that Gopāla Bhaṭṭa similarly supported this doctrine. The helmsmen of the Gauḍīya school in Vrindavan, Rūpa and Sanātana, had a somewhat ambiguous stand on this issue, theologically accepting a de facto married (svakīyā) state while displaying apreference for the parakīyā condition when it came to līlā. In his commentary on the KKA, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa does not discuss the matter other than to identify Rādhā as the supreme Lakṣmī; this is the usual point of departure for the svakīyā apologists' argument.²² Rādhā's relative absence and the prominence of Lakṣmī Nārāyaṇa in HBV have led at least one modern scholar to speculate that the 'minority [svakīyā] viewpoint might have been reflected in the conservative spirit of [that book].'²³

Jīva Gosvāmī introduces his treatise Bhāgavata-sandarbhā with the disclaimer that it was written on the basis of an outline provided him by Gopāla Bhaṭṭa.²⁴ In the fourth volume of that work, Kṛṣṇa-sandarbhā, Jīva outlines the svakīyā position which is later elaborated in the Gopāla-campū (finished AD 1594).²⁵ To this day, the Gosvāmīs of Rādhāramaṇa Gherā in Vrindavan express sympathy for Jīva Gosvāmī's svakīyā-vāda as outlined there.²⁶ It is certainly true that in the period following Jīva Gosvāmī's Gopāla-campū, the Gauḍīyas the Braj area reacted strongly to his acceptance of the svakīyā position, which though in the ascendant in Braj, was not felt to be that of Rūpa Gosvāmī.

The Gauḍīyas wrote a number of treatises defending the parakīyā position, arguing essentially against Jīva Gosvāmī, the only theologian of any school to have formally defended the svakīyā position. In the time of Viśvanātha Cakravartī in the late 17th century, the furore over this question reached its zenith, not only in Braj but throughout the Vaiṣṇava world. Ill-feeling between the Gauḍīyas and the other Vrindavan Vaiṣṇavas probably became high at this point. The original differences of opinion between the Rādhā-vallabhīs and the Gauḍīyas were likely exacerbated by this controversy, but it is improbable that this was a source of antagonism during the lifetimes of Harivaṁśa and Gopāla Bhaṭṭa.

The ambiguity of Harivaṁśa's own position on the svakīyā/parakīyā issue is reflected somewhat in his CP, where despite the use of terms like dampati, etc. some references to the parakīyā situation can still be found. One pada (51) is clearly about the dāna-līlā which only has meaning in the parakīyā situation (despite the best efforts of certain Rādhā-vallabhī commentators to show otherwise). Another pada (63.ī) about the rāsa also mentions that the gopīs 'forgot their homes, husbands, and relatives when they heard the sound of Kṛṣṇa's flute.' This ambiguity is also discernable in the songs of Sūradāsa, as J. S. Hawley has pointed out.²⁷

(3) From the point of view of the devotee, the spirit of separation is reflected in prayers for service and association to the deity. This is one of the main characteristics of RRSN, where two verses are even prayers for separation itself (210, 215), an attitude which is absent from Harivaṁśa's Brajabhāṣā works. Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa's separation has theological implications which are closely related to

the parakīyā/svakīyā question. In the manifest līlā, Kṛṣṇa is separated from all the residents of Vrindavan when he goes to Mathura to kill Kāṁsa; despite Kṛṣṇa's promises, there is no resolution of this separation in BhP. In his Bṛhad-bhāgavatāmṛta, Sanātana Gosvāmī has eulogized the feeling of separation as especially relishable.²⁸ Thus, in his vision of the nitya-līlā, he includes a provision for Kṛṣṇa's departure to Mathura to take place cyclically, with Kṛṣṇa returning after a separation of only two months.²⁹ Most of the Gauḍīya ācāryas, however, seem to have found it necessary to bring Kṛṣṇa back to Vrindavan in the manifest līlā, despite the lack of any such a precedent in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. According to Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, Caitanya instructed Rūpa Gosvāmī 'never to describe Kṛṣṇa outside of Vrindavan.'³⁰ Verses to that effect are found in Rūpa's Laghu-bhāgavatāmṛta, Padyāvalī and Ujjvala-nīlamaṇi, all insisting that there is no viraha.³¹

Viraha is therefore a matter for the prakāṣa-līlā when Kṛṣṇa is incarnate, but has no ultimate ontological status where all devotees are eternally reunited with their Lord. Jīva even uses the same term, nitya-vihāra, as Harivaṁśa.³² Despite this acceptance of the nitya-vihāra by one of their chief theologians, however, the Gauḍīyas in general continued to demonstrate a preference for the prakāṣa-līlā. This predilection can be found in the writings of Jīva's guru, Rūpa Gosvāmī, for whom the activities of Kṛṣṇa during the incarnation have a special value from the point of view of rasa. The very last verses of UN state clearly Rūpa's idea that sexual union itself is not the most joyous state of love:

The happiness felt by the clever lovers in their various dalliances together are not matched by the pleasures of love-making. This is the opinion of the knowers of rasa.³³

Thus, though the Gauḍīyas accepted philosophically the eternal unity of Kṛṣṇa and his devotees, they also felt that separation in its various forms, including the simulation of marriage to other parties, was created by Kṛṣṇa's yogamāyā for the increased pleasure of all. Harivaṁśa's idea of nitya-vihāra, being opposed to this conception of higher pleasure, is distinct from what became the mainstream of the Gauḍīya school. However, Jīva Gosvāmī, by no means a marginal thinker of that school, clearly preferred a type of nitya-vihāra in the final work of his career, Saṅkalpa-kalpa-druma, where he indicates that once Kṛṣṇa and the residents of Vrindavan were reunited in the prakāṣa-līlā, they never suffered separation again.³⁴

Where Gopāla Bhaṭṭa stood in all this is not entirely clear, unless we accept that Jīva was indebted to him for the outline of Kṛṣṇa-sandarbhā in which he developed these ideas. This would make Gopāla Bhaṭṭa a worshipper of a svakīyā nityalīlā in Goloka. If so, he is rather closer to Harivaṁśa than Snātaka would have us believe.

(4) The most clearly attested point of difference between the two personalities is to be found in Snātaka's fourth point. It has already been shown above that Harivaṁśa considered the various scriptural injunctions to have no relevance for

the devotional path. Gopāla Bhaṭṭa's HBV is a monument to his diverging convictions. Thus, even though Rūpa Gosvāmī also states that rāgānuṅā bhakti, being practised in material body, requires that the scriptural injunctions are to be followed externally while internally one performs smaraṇa, etc. (i.2.295_6), no other writer of the Gauḍīya school went to such lengths to enumerate the external practices in a way which seems to contravene the very spirit of the devotional movement to which he belonged. It can be argued that the Gauḍīyas were conscious of their preaching mission and the need to harmonize their teachings with those of the existing Hindu scriptures of the smārtas. Hita Harivaṁśa's main tenets, i.e. the rejection of the need for sources other than those of his own revelation as well as the rules and regulations of the Smṛti including the ekādaśī fast and the worship of tulasī, put him at the opposite end of the spectrum from Gopāla Bhaṭṭa. Thus, though we may not accept the substance of the Gauḍīya traditions about Harivaṁśa and Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, in view of the little that we do know about these two, it seems rather likely that they would have clashed.

It should be remarked, however, that at the end of HBV, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa makes provision for those who are 'single_minded' (ekāntin). The following passage, found of that book seems to match the descriptions we have of Harivaṁśa and Prabodhānanda:

Thus for the single_minded who are engaged with great love in the constant singing and remembering of the Lord, other [religious] duties do not bring pleasure.

Out of some emotion, some of them have a desire to serve the feet of the deity form (śrī-mūrti) with their own mantra. The rules for this service are established according to their own taste.

They engage spontaneously in the enjoined permanent duties (vihiteṣu nityeṣu). The glory of the single_minded appears thus and we have therefore written of it.³⁵

It may well be that Gopāla Bhaṭṭa considered the renounced condition essential to the ekāntin and rāgānuga devotee, as did Rādhā Kṛṣṇa Gosvāmī (Sādhanā-dīpikā). In general, however, the Gauḍīyas of today, renounced or householder, do not take the elaborate prescriptions of HBV very seriously. On the other hand, ekādaśī fasting, respect for tulasī, etc. are considered to be duties incumbent upon everyone. It may be noted here that in the past, claims by representatives of the Gauḍīya school based on PV have been challenged in court by the Rādhāvallabhīs who have won damages and apologies from those who made them.³⁶

Hita Harivaṁśa, the author

Four written works are ascribed to Hita Harivaṁśa: two in Braja_bhāṣā and two in Sanskrit. The two Braja_bhāṣā works, Caurāsī_pada (CP), often named Hita_caurāsī, particularly in modern recensions, and Sphuṭa_vāṇī, are accepted

without debate as the writings of Harivaṁśa. Neither of these works are integral compositions but seem rather to be collections of disparate verses and songs written by Harivaṁśa and compiled after his death. Most of the padas of these two works finish with signature verses containing Harivaṁśa's name. Two padas (11, 12) of CP have the signature (chāpa) of Naravāhana, and six other verses (13, 33, 37, 50, 54, 82) appear in the anthology of Sūradāsa's songs, Sūra-sāgara.³⁷ Harivaṁśa's language is highly Sanskritized and would indicate that the author had been educated in grammar; there is no reason to believe that he was not capable of composition in Sanskrit.

The first of Harivaṁśa's Sanskrit works is Rādhā-rasa-sudhā-nidhi, often called Rādhā-sudhā-nidhi in Rādhā-vallabhī circles. The Yamunāṣṭaka is another work in Sanskrit, containing nine verses written in the pañca-cāmara metre. No historical investigator seems willing to state unequivocally that this is indeed a work coming from the pen of Harivaṁśa.

Caurāsīpada

This is the more important of the two Brajabhāṣā works, both in size and influence. It consists primarily of descriptions of the erotic dalliances of the divine couple of Braj, Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, the nitya-vihāra, the important exception being those padas which describe the rāsa with no Rādhā in sight. Several themes find repetition and can be identified as favoured by the author. Later commentators have divided the padas into chronological categories (samayas) or situations. Though the division is not necessarily true to the original text, it does show roughly in which līlās Harivaṁśa was interested:³⁶

1. erotic activities (sajjā-samaya): 1_3, 5, 10, 16_18; 29, 30, 32, 34, 42, 46, 50, 66, 72, 76, 80, 82, [Total: 20]
2. the circle dance (rāsa-samaya) : 12, 19, 24_26; 36; 61_63, 67_69; 71, 78, 79, 81 [16]
3. Rādhā's bouderie (māna-samaya) 37_41, 43_44, 58; 64_65, 73_75, 83 [15]
4. forest sports (vana-vihāra-samaya): 45, 47_49; 52_56 [9]
5. after lovemaking (suratānta-samaya): 15, 20, 21, 23, 31, 70, 77, 84 [8]
6. descriptions of the beauty of Rādhā, Kṛṣṇa or both (śṛṅgāra-samaya: 9, 13, 22, 60 [4]
7. joking together (hāsa-samaya): 4_6; [3]
8. springtime (vasanta-samaya): 27, 28, [2]
9. bathing (snāna-samaya): 14; [1]
10. on the swing (hiṇḍola-samaya): 35, [1]
11. demanding the toll (dāna-samaya) 51; [1]
12. playing with the colours (horī-samaya): 57 [1]
13. enjoyment of a special taste (rasa-viśeṣa-samaya) 59 [1]

Padas 4_6 could easily be assimilated into the 'after lovemaking' category for there are described the couple in the morning after a night of lovemaking, and the various signs which are the cause of merriment. The swing pastime and Holī

could be assimilated into the springtime pastime as these activities are notably events associated with that season. Indeed these verses do have a certain amount of crossing over of content. The toll pastime is noticeable as it is traditionally a parakīya-līlā, only having meaning if Rādhā and the other gopīs are unmarried or married to other gopas. This and some of the statements about rāsa also indicate that Rādhā is a parakīyā nāyikā. This contrasts with the frequent use of the terms dampati, dulhana, dulhanī, Rādhāpati etc., which support the svakīyā position for which Harivaṁśa is known.

Some features of Harivaṁśa's descriptions of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa's erotic dalliances are worthy of note. There is a great deal of similarity between these padas and Prabodhānanda's Nikuñja-vilāsa-stava (NVS). Kṛṣṇa is pictured on five occasions undoing Rādhā's nīvi-bandha or waist_knot (padas 7, 30, 49, 50, 72); Rādhā on four occasions refuses Kṛṣṇa saying, 'no, no.' These words are said to be 'nectarean' — neti neti vacanāmṛta (7, 72); neti neti madhubola: 30)39 She is also described as pratipada-pratikūla 'uncooperative at every step.' Lalitā and the other sakhīs are described as looking on (7, 30, 35), 'drinking through the chalices (caṣaka) of their eyes' (50), 'looking through the window of the cottage made of vines' (72).

Compare NVS: 'her hands eager to block the arms of her dearest' (priyatama-bhuja-rodha-vyagra-hastau ratotkau 3); 'blindly intoxicated by the broken words "enough, enough" spoken playfully' ('alam alam' iti līlā-gadgadokty-unmadāndhau 3); 'she said the relishable words, "what are you doing?"' ('kim iha kuruṣa?' ity āsvādyā-vāk-kiñcanoktī; 4); 'uncooperative at every step' (pratipada-pratikūla; 5); 'staying the hand of the lover dropped to touch her waist_knot' (namita-dayita-pāṇi-sprṣṭa-nīvi-nibandhau, 5); 'Lalitā and the other tremulous girlfriends looked through their eyes without blinking.' (sulalita_Lalitāder nirṇimesākṣi-randhrāiḥ; 23); 'the love_filled girl friends looked with their eyes against the windows of the copse' (praṇayamaya_vayasyāḥ kuñjarandhrārpitākṣiḥ; 24).

Other less notable features of NVS can be found sprinkled throughout CP, such as viparīta-rati, jingling of the ankle bells during lovemaking, the dishevelled appearance of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa after lovemaking (described as suratānta), etc. Rādhā's playful refusal of Kṛṣṇa's advances is also described in RRSN, 10.

The padas listed as being about māna fit into a pattern identical to the līlā_cycle found in Jayadeva's Gītagovinda.⁴⁰ Harivaṁśa, imagining himself as a sakhī, takes the role of the go_between (14, 15, 20, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 58), goes to Rādhā and describes Kṛṣṇa as deeply disturbed by feelings of separation from her ('devastated by passion' 6, 37, 38, 66).

Having described Kṛṣṇa's love for her, Rādhā is convinced and taken by the sakhī to the kuñja (abhisāra 39, 40, 48, etc.) where she joins the beloved ('the lady went into the bower smiling,' 20). Two padas of Sphuṭa-vāṇī (14, 21) also fit into this pattern. The themes of māna and abhisāra with the sakhī playing a pivotal role as a go_between in these situations is an oft_encountered theme of the prayers of RRSN (21, 23, 32, 43, etc.). However, in CP this is the only type of service to

which the sakhī shows an inclination.

Harivaṁśa's descriptions of the circle-dance (rāsa 12, 19, 36, 79, 82, 24, 61, 64, 65) are particularly effective. Kṛṣṇa attracts the gopīs by playing the flute from under the vaṁśī-vaṭa tree. Harivaṁśa shows a great knowledge of music and musical instruments, listing the different instruments used (11, 12, 24, 26, 27, 36, 48, 57.11, 63.ii, 65), the sounds of the mṛdaṅga tathei tathei; dancing the sudhaṅga dance. Indra is described as an observer of the dance, showing the influence of the BhP version. This evident feeling for the rāsa-līlā is not found in RRSN where it only figures in a few verses (59, 90, 114, 159, 160) where the dancing and music are most often peripheral to the main theme of the verse itself. Commentaries on rāsa verses of CP show the influence of ARP where Kṛṣṇa blows the flute to calm Rādhā's bouderie.

Other than these verses about rāsa, the only other pada (59) which has a clear reference to BhP is that which has been called rasa-viśeṣa 'something special,' perhaps because of the difficulties that commentators have had in explaining it within the context of Harivaṁśa's doctrines. Piṅgalā, the prostitute who lost faith in her way of life, is alluded to (BhP 11.8.22-44). This entire pada seems to be a statement denouncing material life and advising single-minded devotion to Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa rather than one having any direct connection with the nitya-vihāra. In character, it seems somewhat out of place, and would be rather more at home in Sphuṭa-vāṇī. The name of Piṅgalā is mentioned in the Bhāgavata by the gopīs, too, however, in the context of their response to the message sent by Kṛṣṇa through Uddhava (10.47.47). There is thus a slight resonance with the līlā of separation.

Sphuṭavāṇī

This work is of a somewhat different character from CP though it is also evidently a posthumous collection of verses written by Harivaṁśa. The difference in emphasis is quite clear in that the element of devotional practice and spiritual instruction is more clear. The first nine padas of this work are all dedicated to the rejection of material goals in life and devotion to Kṛṣṇa. Pada 20 also fits into this category.⁴¹ Two other songs (18, 19) are āratīs, also dedicated exclusively to Kṛṣṇa, the second one in particular emphasizing devotion to Kṛṣṇa without any mention of Rādhā. One pada describes the birth of Kṛṣṇa (11), another that of Rādhā (16). These are, of course, prakāṣa-līlā events, and therefore, strictly speaking, do not take place in the nitya-vihāra.

Rādhā-rasa-sudhā-nidhi

The Rādhāvallabhīs' claims that Harivaṁśa was the author of RRSN are strongly supported by a solid tradition which contains at least sixteen commentaries on this work, mostly written in Brajabhāṣā. Harivaṁśa's son Kṛṣṇacandra also wrote a rather inferior pastiche of the work called Upa-sudhā-nidhi, in which he does not, however, attest to his father's authorship of the original.⁴³ The tradition is

further confirmed by manuscript evidence which overwhelmingly supports Harivaṁśa's authorship. Of the nine MSS found in the Vrindavan Research Institute collection, seven are ascribed to him, only two to Prabodhānanda. These two have been shown by Snell (1984:52) to bear signs of tampering: dedications to Caitanya have apparently been interpolated at the beginning and end of the work and the numbering of the verses adjusted.⁴⁴ S. K. De earlier came to similar conclusions on the basis of MS descriptions found in the India Office, Bodleian and Asiatic Society of Bengal catalogues.⁴⁵ He states there that 'it is obviously a case of appropriation by the Caitanya sect of a work composed by Hita Harivaṁśa.'

The legend that Harivaṁśa wrote the work when he was only six months old might have been created to counteract Gauḍīya claims for Prabodhānanda's authorship. RRSN 264, a verse which reflects sentiments frequently expressed in VMA⁴⁶ makes it clear that the work was written in Vrindavan.

All those who have come to this sweet Vrindavan
with its wonderful, eternal glories
possess forms which are eternal
and can bestow the concentrated sacred sentiment;
they are easily visible only to
those who are the greatest of the yogīs.
When I saw them as they are --
even though some are cruel or sinners,
and others not worthy to be spoken to or even seen by the pious --
I came to consider them supremely worshipable.⁴⁷

It is curious that Dāmodaradāsa, the first disciple of Harivaṁśa to write in Brajabhāṣā about the glories of his master, though making frequent references to portions of the CP, gives no indication of a knowledge of the themes of RRSN, or even its language or terminology. Though the glories of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, their erotic sports, even the witnessing of the activities by Lalitā and the other sakhīs (i.e., the themes of CP) are mentioned in Sevaka-vāṇī, there is no talk of service to Rādhā in anything resembling the manner of RRSN, or even of VMA. In view of the importance which RRSN had in forming the doctrines of the sect, this absence could not be explained on the basis of Dāmodaradāsa's supposed ignorance of Sanskrit.

Surprisingly, in view of the nature of the Gauḍīyas' arguments based on internal evidence demonstrating Prabodhānanda's probable authorship of the RRSN, Rādhā-vallabhī apologists have rested their case on MS evidence and the support of impartial researchers such as S. K. De. Snātaka, for instance, has only offered a comparison between CP 7 and RRSN 247 to support Harivaṁśa's authorship. In both cases, Rādhā sees her reflection in Kṛṣṇa's chest and in confusion becomes jealous, though the detail of the latter version is far more refined.

The concept itself is not altogether original for there is a verse with a similar theme in Subhāṣita-ratna-koṣa (4.35) in which Lakṣmī becomes jealous upon seeing her own reflection multiplied infinitely in the eyes of the many-headed

serpent Śeṣa, taking them to be other mistresses of Viṣṇu. Numerous other variations on the theme have been brought forth by Vaiṣṇava poets.⁴⁸ The brevity of the CP version itself makes it clear that the audience was expected to be familiar with the conceit. The RRSN refines the incident by adding that Rādhā leaves Kṛṣṇa's side and goes to complain to a sakhī which the author prays to hear. Some other of the lilās found in the RRSN have echoes in CP, such as Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa's exchanging clothes in the heat of passion. In RRSN 76, the author prays for the service of making the adjustment on Rādhā's clothing when she is thus mistakenly dressed. CP (4) contains this theme of cross_dressing, but without the prayer for service.

Of the other distinctive features of RRSN (see next section), Harivaṁśa does occasionally use a few of the terms which are encountered frequently in RRSN: e.g. the word rasa-sindhu appears twice. In one place, he hints at the inaccessibility of the loves of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa to Brahmā and other gods (CP, 18), and in another offers obeisance to Vrindavan (CP, 57), a feature also met with in RRSN 266.

Harivaṁśa's other Sanskrit work, Yamunāṣṭaka (the authorship of which, as we have seen, is not entirely beyond doubt), also contains some of the vocabulary which is found in the RRSN: rasaikasīman (2), mahā-rasābdhi (3). The eighth verse also contains two ideas which are repeatedly found in RRSN as well as the works of Prabodhānanda: the object of worship also being the object of meditation of the great sages including Nārada and that of a supreme goal of life.⁴⁹ Generally Prabodhānanda talks about Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, or service to them, being beyond Nārada and the sages.

These few correlations, however, do not present an overwhelming case for the identity of authorship of the CP, Sphuṭa-vāṇī, and RRSN. Indeed, even though Harivaṁśa's Brajabhāṣā works were collected after his death, the burning question is why did the spirit of RRSN never enter into those writings? The vernacular hymn would have been the perfect vehicle for transmitting the essential aspects of RRSN's message, exclusive devotion to Rādhā and the desire for service in the kuñja, to the Rādhā-vallabhī congregation. The absence of this spirit of RRSN in any of Harivaṁśa's other writings, when contrasted with its presence in those of Prabodhānanda, combined with the preponderance of stylistic, linguistic and other similarities existing between this work and Prabodhānanda's writings, would seem to justify Gauḍīya claims that he was the author of that work. If we add to this the fact that certain pronounced usages in CP, such as Harivaṁśa's favoured epithet for Rādhā, bhāminī, are completely absent from RRSN, the case for Prabodhānanda's authorship becomes quite strong.

Similarities between RRSN and Prabodhānanda's works

We now turn to a comparison of RRSN with Prabodhānanda's writings. In particular we shall look at the three stotra_kāvya works, CCA, VMA and RRSN, which are generically similar. We shall on occasion, however, also look at some of Prabodhānanda's other metrical works, in particular SaṅgM and ARP. None of the three stotra_kāvya conform to any clear structure as a whole, though on occasion certain verse sequences may be found to have some kind of unity, either metrical or semantic. Such sequences are rather more extended in VMA, the longest work, and less so in CCA, the shortest. Each of these works, being panegyrics to their chosen object of worship have a certain stylistic similarity perhaps attributable to the genre itself. There are, to be sure, differences, some of which might be attributable to the content: Caitanya is described in terms of what he had done and the effects that he produced; Vrindavan is a place, and much of the content describes the wonderful flora and fauna of the dhāman and its nature as a place naturally requires that it be treated in terms slightly different from those used for a person. In all of these works, Rādhā is to some degree or another placed in a category by herself, and service to her is the parama-pum-artha spoken of in numerous verses of CCA (compare RRSN 3, 95, 144). With this in mind, if the author of all three works were one and the same individual, it would be expected that he would have reserved the best of his creative energy for a panegyric to the ultimate object of his devotion. Thus, even though stylistic similarities can be pointed out in the three works, it must nevertheless be accepted that RRSN is indeed the superior composition with greater consistency of literary quality throughout.

(a) Content

Scholars adhering to the Gauḍīya school have pointed to certain exact correlations in content between RRSN and the other works of Prabodhānanda. A few examples of the most salient similarities are given here.

(i) The two following verses are almost exactly the same:

gatā dūre gāvo dinam api turīyāṁśam abhajaḍ
vayaṁ kṣutkṣāmāḥ smas tava ca janani vartmanayanā/
akasmāt tūṣṇike sajalayanane dīnavadane
tvayi tyaktvā khelām nahi nahi vayaṁ prāṇiniṣavaḥ// (SaṅgM 4.8)

gatā dūre gāvo dinam api turīyāṁśam abhajaḍ
vayaṁ yātuṁ kṣāntās tava ca janani vartmanayanā/
akasmāt tūṣṇike sajalayanane dīnavadane
luṭhaty asyām bhūmau tvayi nahi vayaṁ prāṇiniṣavaḥ// (RRSN 229)

The cows have gone far away,
the day too has entered its third quarter,
we are waiting to go, [or we are wasting from hunger]

and your mother is watching the path [for you];
now suddenly you have fallen silent,
your eyes have filled with tears
and your face is filled with sadness
and you have fallen to the ground —
[or after giving up playing with us —]
no, we do not wish to go on living.

This verse and the two prior to it in RRSN are somewhat out of context, as they are purely descriptive, containing no prayer, blessing or 'vision' markers. It may well be that it was later adopted in the SaṅgM which does have the semblance of a continuous plot, or that it was borrowed from that work.

(i) The author of RRSN shows a devotion for Rādhā's name, which Kṛṣṇa himself chants. The same image is found in the writings of Prabodhānanda:

yaj-jāpaḥ sakṛd eva gokula-pateḥ...
yan-nāmānkita-mantra-jāpana-paraḥ prītyā svayaṁ mādhaveḥ
śrī-kṛṣṇo 'pi tad adbhutaṁ sphuratu me rādhety varṇa-dvayam. (RRSN 95);
rādhā-keli-nikuñja-vīthiṣu caran Rādhābhīdhāṁ uccaran (RRSN 139);

rādhety evaṁ japa tad anīśaṁ sārtha-saṁsmṛty-ananyaḥ (VMA 15.75);
rādhā rādhety avirata-jāpaḥ prāṭati (ARP 97).

This is paralleled by a devotion for Kṛṣṇa's name:
ati-snehād uccair api ca hari-nāmāni gṛṇataḥ...
parānandaṁ vṛndāvanam anucarantaṁ ca dadhato
mano me rādhāyāḥ pada-mṛdula-padme nivasatu (RRSN 55);

hare kṛṣṇa kṛṣṇeti kṛṣṇeti mukhyān...
kadābhyaṣya vṛndāvane syāṁ kṛtārthaḥ (VMA 17.89);
rādhāvat kṛṣṇa-nāmābhīdhad iha śamī tiṣṭha vṛndāvane 'taḥ (VMA 8.43)

The following verse from RRSN illustrating Rādhā's devotion to Kṛṣṇa's name is similar in spirit to a Prabodhānanda verse describing Caitanya's devotion to it.

śyāma śyāmety anupama-rasā-pūrṇa-varṇair japantī
sthitvā sthitvā madhura-madhurottāram uccārayantī/
muktā-sthūlān nayana-galitān āsru-bindūn vahantī
hṛṣyad-romā pratipada-camat-kurvati pātu rādhā//(RRSN 218)

May Rādhā deliver you, astonishing you at every step,
her bodily hairs horripilating,
teardrops as large as pearls flowing from her eyes,
chanting the words, 'Śyāma, Śyāma',
completely filled with incomparable flavour,
stopping after some time to pronounce them aloud

in a voice sweeter than sweet.

badhnan prema-bhara-prakampita-karo granthīn kaṭi-ḍorakaiḥ
saṅkhyātum nija-loka-maṅgala-hare-kṛṣṇeti-nāmnām japan/
aśru-snāta-mukhaḥ svam eva hi jagannātham didṛkṣur gatā—
yātail gaura-tanur vilocana-mudam tanvan hariḥ pātu vaḥ//(CCA 9)

May the golden-bodied Hari deliver you,
bringing joy to your eyes by his pacing back and forth,
his face bathed in tears from his desire to see Jagannātha.
To count the world-saving Hare Kṛṣṇa names which he chants,
he ties knots in a rope tied around his waist
with a love-filled, shaking hand.

To count the world-saving Hare Kṛṣṇa names which he chants,
he ties knots in a rope tied around his waist
with a love-filled, shaking hand.

(ii) A prayer for the engagement of all the senses in the service of Kṛṣṇa, which appears several times in BhP (e.g. ix.4.18_21 and x.10.38) is another theme found both of Vrindavan as well of Rādhā.

Rādhā-nāma-sudhā-rasam rasayitum jihvāstu me vihvalā
pādaḥ tat-pada-kāṅkitāsu caratām vṛndātavī-vithiṣu/
tat-karmaiva karaḥ karotu hṛdayam tasyāḥ padam dhyāyatām
tad-bhāvotsavataḥ param bhavatu me tat-prāṇa-nāthe ratiḥ//(RRSN 142)

May my tongue become helpless
as it relishes the taste of the nectar of Rādhā's name;
may my feet wander over the paths of Vṛndā's forest
which are marked with her footprints;
may my hands be engaged in her work
and my heart in meditating on her feet --
O that I may become absorbed in her festive mood
and thus have love for the Lord of her life.

śrī-vṛndāvana-vandanāya satatam mūrdhāstu bahv-ādari
jihvā vihvalatām upaitu satatam tat-sad-guṇotkīrtane/
hastau tan nava-kuñja-mārjana-vidhau pādaḥ ca tatrāṭane
śrotre tan-mahima-śrutau dṛṣi dṛśau nityam smṛtau stān manaḥ// (VMA 7.49)

May my head find its purpose
by constantly bowing down to Śrī Vṛndāvana;
may my tongue become helpless
in constantly chanting its wondrous glories;

may my hands be used in cleaning its groves
and my feet in wandering throughout its territory,
may my ears be engaged in always hearing its fame,
my eyes in seeing it
and my mind in meditation on it.

The use of the word *vihvalā* in both verses is striking. The prayer for the service of sweeping the *kuñja* mentioned in VMA 7.49 is found several times in RRSN (8, 164, 180, 202, 243). Other verses written in this style include RRSN 106.

(iv) Numerous examples could be given of prayers for other types of service in the two works; only one or two more shall be given here. Compare the two following prayers for the service of massaging the feet of the couple in the *kuñja* after lovemaking,

mithaḥ-premāveśād ghana-pulaka-dor-valli-racita_
pragādhāsleṣeṇotsava-rasa-bharonmilita-dṛśau/
nikuñja-kṛpte vai nava-kusuma-talpe 'bhiśayitau
kadā pat-saṁvāhādibhir aham adhīśau nu sukhaye// (RRSN 194)

Deeply absorbed in a perfectly reciprocated love
their eyes are wide open from the ecstatic festival of delights
arising from the tight embrace
of their intertwining, vine-like arms
covered with thick horripilation;
lying on a bed of fresh blossoms in the forest bower
are my Lord and Lady --
when will I bring them pleasure by massaging their feet?

kadā vā kālindī-taṭa-nikaṭa-vṛndāvana-latā_
nikuñjāntaṁ suptaṁ tadati-sarasaṁ preṣṭha-mithunam/
mitho gādhāśliṣṭaṁ mṛdu mṛdu mayā lālita-padaṁ
mudā vīkṣye svapne 'py ahaḥ sukha-nidrāṁ gatam aham//VMA 17.114

And when will that day come
when that beloved couple, so filled with sacred rapture,
lay sleeping by the shores of the Kalindī
within the *kuñja* of Vrindavan creepers;
tightly intertwined in each other's arms
I will gently cradle their feet
and watch as they drift off
into peaceful slumber.

Another verse of this type is RRSN 17. Prayers to hear a Vrindavan parrot repeating the lovers' conversation of the previous night are similarly found in

these same two works:

mat-kaṅṭhe kiṁ nakha-śikharayā daitya-rājo'smi nāham
maivam pīḍām kuru kuca-taṭe pūtanā nāham asmi/
ittham kīrair anukṛta-vacaḥ preyasā saṅgatāyāḥ
prātaḥ śroṣye tava sakhi kadā keli-kuñjam mṛjantī// (RRSN 164)

“Why are you scratching my neck with your claws?
I am not Hiraṇyakaśipu!
And why are you tugging on my breasts?
Do you think that I am Pūtanā?”
O Rādhā, beloved friend! When will I hear your words
overheard and recited by a mynah bird
as I clean your love-bower
on the morning after your dalliances.

kiṁ mām khedayase vimuñca vasaṇam talpottame 'smin sukhen—
āgatya svapihi tyaja tyaja bhujam śliṣyāmi kānte sakṛt/
āḥ kiṁ nirdaya muñca muñca na kim apy āpīdaye rādhikā—
kṛṣṇālāpam imam kadā nu śṛṇuyām vṛndāṭavī-kīrataḥ// (VMA 17.106)

“Why are you harrassing me?”
“Drop your clothes on the delicious bed,
come here happily and sleep.”
“Leave me alone, leave my arm alone.”
“O beloved one, let me just embrace you once.”
“Merciless one! Let me go, let me go!”
“I am not hurting you at all.”
When will I hear this conversation
of Rādhā and K.r.ṣṇa as overheard
and recited by a V.rndāvana mynah.

(v) Prabodhānanda's proclivity for using language reminiscent of Advaita philosophy has been emphasized in our previous discussions of both CCA and VMA. This tendency is not absent from the RRSN and references to brahma-vāda are found there in verse 148 which is comparable to CCA 98 and 107. 'Some people are exclusively interested in brahman, etc., but...' The author of RRSN (84) says he is afraid of kaivalyam just as the author of the CCA calls it hellish (95).

(vi) Another conceit recurring again and again in Prabodhānanda's writing is that in which he states that perfection is beyond the great gods, or even Śuka, the speaker of the BhP.

CCA 2 (śrīśa-brahmādy-agamyā), 7 (govinda-prema-bhājām api yan na kalitam),

24 (bhrāntaṃ yatra muniśvaraiḥ), 34 (aparicita-pūrvaṃ muni-varaiḥ), 51 (śiva-brahmādinām api ca su-mahā-vismṛti-bhṛtām), 62 (mṛgyāpi sā śiva-śukoddhavanāradādyaiḥ), 79 (śiva-brahmādy-alabhye), 95 (vidhi-mahendrādiś ca kīṭāyate), 99 (brahmādīṃś ca hasanti nātibahu-manyante mahā-vaiṣṇavān), 132 (brahmeśādi-mahāścarya-mahimāpi).

VMA 1.2 (īso 'pi); 2.36 (śrī-śaṅkara-druhiṇa-mukhya-surendra-vṛnda-durjñeya), 17.15 (śrī-śuka-nāradādy-akalite), 17.60 (śrīśa-śukārjunoddhava-mukhāḥ paśyanti yan na kvacit).

RRSN 2 (yogīndra-durgama-gatiḥ), 3 (brahmeśvarādi-sudurūha-padāravinda), 4, (brahma-rudra-śuka-nārada-bhīṣma-mukhyair alakṣito), 40 (brahmādi-durgama-gateḥ), 73 (nahi prāpur brahma-śivādayo 'pi), 84 (pareśa-bhajanonmadā yadi śukādayaḥ kiṃ tataḥ), 86 (lakṣmī-śuka-nāradādi), 97 (devānām atha bhaktamukta-suhṛdām atyanta-dūraṃ ca yat), 239 (yan nāradājeśa-śukair agamyam), 240 (sambhāvyo 'pi viriñci-nārada-śiva-svāyambhuvādyair na yaḥ).

(vī) Beside simply describing the different types of service to Rādhā, Prabodhānanda likes to describe the appearance of the sakhīs who serve her. Thus VMA's eighth century contains an extended description of their bodily features. SaṅgM 3.40 is a description of the sakhī after receiving the blessing of the divine couple. Compare the following verse to RRSN 53 which is the author's meditation on his own feminine form; both contain the same third ligne:

atha śrī-govinde vikasad-aravindekṣaṇa-lasat-
kṛpā-drṣṭyāpūrva-praṇaya-rasa-vṛṣṭyā snapayati/
sthitā nityaṃ pārśve vividha-paricaryaika-caturā
na keṣāñcid drṣyaṃ rasika-mithunaṃ sā śritavatī//SaṅgM 3.41

And then, after Govinda had bathed her
in a downpour of incomparable affection
falling from the merciful glance
of his blooming lotus eyes,
she took shelter of the Divine Couple,
invisible to the rest of the world,
and remained always by their side,
an expert in a variety of services.

dukūlaṃ bibhrāṇām atha kuca-taṭe kañcuka-paṭaṃ
prasādaṃ svāminyāḥ sva-kara-tala-dattaṃ praṇayataḥ/
sthitāṃ nityaṃ pārśve vividha-paricaryaika-caturāṃ
kiśorīm ātmānaṃ kim iha su-kumārīm nu kalaye//RRSN 53.

When will I envision myself as a beautiful young girl
always standing by my mistress Rādhā's side;

an expert in a variety of services,
I will be affectionately dressed by her personally
in a skirt and blouse that used to be hers.

Similarly, prayers to Kṛṣṇa for service to Rādhā appear in both SaṅgM (3.39_40)
and RRSN (257_260)

(b) metre

In general, the three panegyric works are written in the same few, mostly longer metres: śārdūlavikrīḍita, sragdharā, mandākrāntā, śikhariṇī, vasantatilaka, pṛthvī and mālinī, RRSN containing rather more mandākrāntā and pṛthvī verses, somewhat fewer sragdharās by roughly the same proportion. VMA and RRSN have approximately the same proportion of 11 and 12 syllable metres. The proportion of gaṇa and anuṣṭubh metres is relatively higher in VMA, somewhat lower in CCA and lowest in RRSN. RRSN is written in only 12 metres, VMA, despite its length, adds only two or three more to this repertoire. There is, however, a noticeable contrast in the metrical composition of these three works as a whole when compared with other stotra-kāvya (see table) such as Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta (KKA) or Raghunāthadāsa's Vilāpa-kusumāñjali (VKA), a Sanskrit poem which resembles RRSN closely in spirit, or Caitanya-śataka (CŚ) a work which may have influenced the writing of CCA and also shows many signs of KKA's influence. RRSN begins with a sequence of 41 verses in vasanta-tilaka which indicates that perhaps the author set out to write the work in that metre alone before changing into a mixed work. VMA also seems to have been written in a similarly erratic fashion.

(c) figures

(i) It has already been briefly mentioned that Prabodhānanda took much inspiration from Bilvamaṅgala. Bilvamaṅgala's apparent conversion from the path of māyāvāda to a path of devotion to Kṛṣṇa would have made him the ideal role model for Prabodhānanda, similarly a convert. In all three of Prabodhānanda's stotra-kāvya, the stylistic features of Bilvamaṅgala's work are to be encountered. In particular, the word jyotis frequently appears in RRSN, usually modified by rādhābhidham or some similar adjectives clarifying what is intended by the ambiguous 'effulgence.' Other synonyms of jyotis are found such as mahas, dhāman, etc. Altogether RRSN contains no less than 20 instances of this particular conceit. The same conceit is found repeatedly in the VMA, though mahas is preferred to jyotis in that work. Furthermore, the modifier is more often gaura-nīlam or nīla-pītam or some other adjective indicating both Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. Below is given an example from VMA, (3.30), in which both the words jyotis and mahas are used. It seems that, in general, Prabodhānanda reserved jyotis for the land of Vraja in VMA in order to contrast it more effectively with the spiritual destination of the advaitins, and used mahas for Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa.

brahmānanda-mayasya nirmalatamasyāntar mahā-jyotiṣo

jyotir bhāgavatam cakāsti kim api svānanda-sārojjvalam/
tasyāpy adbhutam antar antar asamorddhvāścarya-mādhurya-bhūr
vṛndāraṇyam iha dvayam bhaja sakhe tad gaura-nīlam mahah//

Within the supremely flawless great light
of spiritual (brahman) ecstasy,
shines the light of the personal god
which is bright with the essence of his own ecstasy;
Wonderfully, deep within that light
is Vṛndā's forest, made of unequalled, wondrous, sweetness;
my friend, worship the pair of luminaries,
gold and blue, that is found there.

This figure plays a part in those stotra-kāvya stanzas which Hardy typifies as 'vision' verses. Such verses contain in their main clause an indefinite pronoun (kim api, ko'pi) with an ambiguous substantive, often kiśora ('a certain youth'), etc., and noticeably in KKA, jyotis, mahas, dhāman, etc., meaning light, a verb meaning 'shine' (bhāti, cakāsti) either in present indicative or optative mood, completed by a locative indicating 'my heart, my mind', etc (mama cetasi, manasi me, etc.). The verse then clarifies the nature of the 'light' or 'youth' by adjectival compounds, or occasionally a subordinate clause. Naturally, this device can be varied in many ways, changing the location, or the type of verb, even including exhortations to remember, etc. Thus, e.g. 'may a certain light (of such and such a nature) shine in my heart.'

This structure is used with such frequency in VMA that only a few examples shall be reproduced from one of its centuries, the sixth śataka. Here Prabodhānanda generally adds a dual word at the end of his compounds (e.g. mithunam, dvayam, dvandvam, etc.): 6.54 (gaura-śyāma-maho-dvayam), 6.55 (dhāma-dvandvam anaṅga-vihvalam), 6.56 (gaura-śyāmam kim api madhuraṁ dhāma-yugmam kiśoram), 6.57 (nitya-kiśora-mohana-maho-dvandvam kim apy adbhutam), 6.59 (gaurāsita-dhāma tad dvayam), 6.60 (kanaka-marakata-śrī-hari-divyāṅgayos tan-madhura-madhura-dhāmnoḥ keli-vṛndaṁ kayościt), 6.63 (nava-suhema-campakendīvara-dala-vṛnda-sugaura-nīla-bhāsoḥ), 6.64 (druta-kanaka-mahendra-nīla-rocir-dvitaya-mahah), 6.65 (gaura-nīlam ātma-dvayam atikāma-vimohitam kiśoram), 6.72 (gaura-śyāmāṅgakam aviraḥam yatra bhāti dvi-dhāma), 6.73 (jyotir-dvandvam), 6.77 (gaura-nīla-śrī-dampatyoḥ), etc. etc.

A few examples of this conceit (restricted to the use of synonyms for 'light') can be found in the following verses of RRSN: 44, 66, 71, 96, 99, 126, 134, 137, 151, 157, 158, 174, 178, 187, 195 (kim api hema-gauram mahah), 205, 221, 227, 237, 250, 269. The following are those which do not necessarily use a 'light' word, but deal with Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa together rather than Rādhā alone: 108 (rasika-mithunam), 133 (mithunam... kim api sundaram nandati), 134 (jyotir-dvandvam kim api paramānanda-kandaṁ cakāsti), 141 (kim api nīla-pīta-cchavi vidagdha-mithunam), 145 (nava-kaiśora-mithunam), 187 (kiśoram jyotir-dvandvam kim api paramānanda-kandaṁ cakāsti), 196 (marakata-druta-svarṇa-cchāyam sphuratu

mithunam), 197 (tan nīla-pītam mithunam cakāsti), 220 (vidagdha-dvandvam), 221 (jyotir-dvandvam madhura-madhuram prema-kandam cakāsti), 222 (vidagdha-mithunam udeti vṛndāvane), 227 (jyotiḥ-puñja-dvayam, as an adjective describing Rādhā's breasts).

The same structure can be found in CCA, though admittedly to a lesser extent: 4 (kañcid īśam), 15 (param jyotir gauram kanaka-ruci-cauram), 18 (caitanya_nāma paramam kalayāma dhāma), 20 (kim api rasarahasyam dhāma gauram namasye), 45 (mūrtiḥ kācana kāñcanadravamayī), 79 (gaure dhāmani). The indefinite adjective ko'pi with devaḥ, candramāḥ etc. (21, 70, 76, 79, etc.)

(i) Prabodhānanda is particularly enamoured of the alliterative effect produced by the repetition of the same word. This is another effect which, though not original to him, is used with inordinate frequency, suggesting his identity with the author of RRSN. There are several instances of this conceit in KKA, one which uses the word sīman, another word which is greatly favoured by Prabodhānanda:

cāpalya-sīma capalānubhavaika-sīma
cāturya-sīma caturānana-śilpa-sīma/
saurabhya-sīma sakalādbhuta-keli-sīma
saubhāgya-sīma tad idaṁ vraja-bhāgya-sīma// (KKA 74)

aiśvarya-sīmā yad api bhagavataḥ sad-guṇāścarya-sīmā
lilā-mādhurya-sīmā praṇaya-samada_svāda-vaivaśya-sīmā/
saundaryāścarya-sīmā nava-lalita-vayaḥ_śrī-camatkāra-sīmā
vṛndāraṇya eva pravilasati yato 'tas tad evāśraye'ham// (VMA 10.73)

premollāsaika-sīmā parama-rasa-camatkāra-vaicitrya-sīmā
saundaryasyaika-sīmā kim api nava-vayo-rūpa-lāvaṇya-sīmā/
lilā-mādhurya-sīmā nija-jana-paramaudārya-vātsalya-sīmā
sā rādhā saukhya-sīmā jayati rati-kalā-keli-mādhurya-sīmā// (RRSN 131)

Similarly, the influence of Mukunda-mālā 2 can be felt in another variety of this figure of repetition. In this case, a number of names of the deity are given in the vocative case, followed by the direct quotation marker iti:

śrī-vallabheti varadeti dayāpareti
bhakti-priyeti bhava-luṅṭhana-kovideti/
nātheti nāga-śayaneti jagannivāsety
ālāpanam pratipadam kuru me mukunda//(Mukundamālā 2)

caitanyeti kṛpāmayeti paramodāreti nānā-vidha_
premāveśita-sarva-bhūta-hṛdayety āścarya-dhāmann iti/
gaurāṅgeti guṇārṇaveti rasarūpeti sva-nāma-priyety
aśrāntam mama jalpato janir iyaṁ yāyād iti prārthaye//(CCA 67)

śyāmeti sundara-vareti manohareti
kandarpa-koṭi-laliteti sunāgareti/
sotkaṅṭham ahni gṛṇatī muhur ākulākṣī
sā rādhikā mayi kadā nu bhavet prasannā//(RRSN 38)

These and other variations on the conceit of repetition appear at least 18 times in RRSN. The key words there are: sindhu (18), sāra (26), iti (26), cāturī (64), _imā (75), chavi (99), sīmā (131), _dhi (136), rādhā (139), kṣaṇa (167, 204), _āvinī, (182), _āsinī (183), koṭi (212), kvacit (220), nidhi (245), sadā (254). In the CCA it appears also 8 times: koṭi (11, 140), mahā (22), kvacit (37), kṣaṇam (93, 94), iti (98), bahavaḥ (107). The following is a sampling taken from the 5th śataka only of the VMA: koṭi (5.1) kiñcit (5.1), nānā (5.2, 93, 94), paraspara (5.6), mahā (5.11, 55), ananta (5.32), mahā-madhura (5.34), śrī-vṛndāvanam (5.85), anyān anyān (5.96).

(ii) Another type of verse found in the KKA, etc. is one which Hardy calls the 'separation' verse and which the Vai.s.navas call āk.sepa. It is characterized simply by the word kadā or kim and contains a prayer for a vision or for service. This type of verse is found only a few times in the CCA, far more frequently in VMA and RRSN where it forms the basis for the great majority of verses. Frequently, kadā will be used at the beginning of the first foot, kadā vā at the beginning of the third, as in CCA 83, RRSN 138, 175, 192; VMA 17.81 etc. Only one example is given here: compare these two verses describing separation, one from CCA (83), the other from RRSN 210:

saiveyaṁ bhuvī dhanya gauḍa-nagarī velāpi saivāmbudheḥ
so 'yaṁ śrī-puruṣottamo madhu-pates tāny eva nāmāni ca/
no kutrāpi nirīkṣyate hari hari premotsavas tāḍṣo
hā caitanya kṛpā-nidhāna tava kiṁ vīkṣe punar vaibhavam?//

This is the same city of Gauḍa, blessed on earth,
this too the very beach of the ocean,
this, the town of Puruṣottama (Puri)
and these, those very names of Kṛṣṇa;
but nowhere, alas! can I see the same festival of love.
Ah, Caitanya, source of all compassion,
will I never again see your glories?

aho te 'mī kuñjās tad-anupama-rāsa-sthālam idaṁ
giri-droṇī saiva sphurati rati-raṅge praṇayinī/
na vīkṣe śrī-rādhāṁ hari hari kuto'pīti śatadhā
vidīryeta prāṇeśvari mama kadā hanta hṛdayam//

Ah, these are the very thickets,
and this the incomparable scene of the circle dance,

this the very same mountain cave, so dear, when the two made love —
alas, alas, nowhere do I see Śrī Rādhā.
O mistress of my being! When will my heart tear
into a hundred pieces as I say these words?

(d) Language

What strikes one immediately about the language of all of Prabodhānanda's works, a characteristic which applies equally to the RRSN, is that it is simple and straightforward. However great a scholar Prabodhānanda may have been, in his works of poetry and praise, he had no intention of going out of his way to demonstrate it in the traditional manner of the Sanskrit poet. There are no elaborate exhibitions of paranomasia. There is no obscure vocabulary. There are no complex allusions to mythology, no poetic fancies or metaphors that are not direct and easy to grasp. The poet's message of enthusiastic devotion to Caitanya in Caitanya-candrāmṛtam, to Rādhā in Rādhā-rasa-sudhā-nidhi, to Vṛndāvana in the Vṛndāvana-mahimāmṛta all show this same quality. Hyperbole, if considered a fault of Sanskrit poets, does show its face, however, and in each of these works the object of devotion stands supreme and is shown to stand supreme often by the same devices. Though he sometimes strings together lengthy compounds, they often consist of familiar formulae, joining frequently combined superlatives. Although there is no real fixed pattern, the elements of a quintessential Prabodhānanda compound can briefly be summarized by the following table:

Table 2

mahā adbhuta prema laharī
parama āścarya anurāga pīyūṣa sindhu
pūrṇa + madhura + praṇaya + rasa+(eka) + sīdhu + ambudhi
sāndra ujjvala mādhyura amṛta nidhi
śuddha camatkāra ānanda mūrti
vapuḥ

The order may be variable, but this vocabulary is so dear to Prabodhānanda, that any cursory examination of his compositions shows many of these favoured word-combinations much in evidence. They are similarly very present in RRSN, the title itself being the first example.

Caitanya-candrāmṛta

- (1) viśuddha-premonmada-madhura-pīyūṣa-laharīm
- (12) parama-rasa-camatkāra-mādhyura-sīmām
- (17) pūrṇa-prema-rasāmṛtābdhi-laharī-lolāṅga-gaura-cchaṭā...
- (20) param apāra-prema-pīyūṣa-sindhoḥ
- (27) prema-mahā-rasojjvala-pade
- (49) pūrṇa-premāmṛta-maya-mahā-jyotir-amalaḥ
- (88) sāndrānandojjvala-nava-rasa-prema-pīyūṣa-sindhoḥ
- (99) caraṇāmbhoja-sravat-projjvala-premānandāmṛtādbhuta-rasān

- (102) mahā-premānandojjvala-rasa-vapuḥ
 (110) premojjvala-rasa-rahasyāmṛta-nidheḥ
 (116) mahāścarya-premojjvala-rasa-sad-āveśa-vivaśīkṛtāṅgāḥ
 (116) premojjvala-rasa-rahasyāmṛta-nidheḥ
 (119) mahā-praṇaya-sīdhu-sudhā-rasaika-pāthonidhau
 (137) prasārīta-mahā-prema-pīyūṣa-rasa-sāgare

Vṛndāvana-mahimāmṛta

- (14.91) premonmāda-rasa-maya-jyotir-ekābdhi-mūrtī
 (14.93) adbhuta-rati-kalā-vāridhī Kṛṣṇa-Rādhe śuddha-premojjvala-rasa-tanū
 (15.3) ati-rati-rasaikābdhi-magnaṁ
 (15.7) praṇaya-rasa-mahāmbodhi-koṭīḥ
 (15.8) śyāmānanda-rasaika-sāgara
 (15.28) hari-rasotsavānām āścaryonmada-rasa-vilāsotsavam idam
 (15.76) premānanda-rasa-camatkāra-sarvasva-dhārā
 (15.96) svānandāmṛta-sindhu
 (15.97) mahā-rasābdhi-varṣam
 (15.104) parama-madhuraḥ prema-pīyūṣa-sāraḥ
 (15.105) kāma-rasaika-sāra-subhagaṁ śyāma-kiśoram
 (16.6) mahādbhuta-camatkṛti-prakaṭa-sarva-sad-vaibhavam
 (16.7) mahojjvala-mahā-maho madana-gopa-rasaṁ bhaja
 (16.10) atyāścaryānanda-sandoha-sāndrā
 (16.14) atisvacchair aṅga-cchavi-nava-sudhāmbhodhi-laharī-parīvāhair
 (16.19) satatodvela-mahā-rasāmbudheḥ
 (16.25) viharat-pūrṇa-rasaika-sāgaram
 (16.59) anaṅga-rasa-mādhurī-bhara-dhurīṇa-lilā-nidhiḥ
 (16.67) mahā-prīti-jyoti-rasa-jala-nidhau
 (16.68) viśuddhādya-premātmakaṁ parama-cij-jyotir-amṛtāmbudhi—
 (16.75) mahā-premānandātmaka-parama-vistīrṇa-jaladhau
 (16.80) rādhā-caraṇa-paricaryā-rasa-mahā-mahodhi-
 (16.83) mahāścaryaṁ jyotir vapuṣi navakaiśoralalite
 (16.95) mahā-premā-veśotpulaka-rasa-ghūrṇāyita-tanuḥ
 (17.5) apāre śrī-vṛndāvana-mahima-pīyūṣa-jaladhau
 (17.8) mahojjvala-rasonmada-praṇaya-sindhu-nisyandinī
 (17.14) viśuddhādvaitaika-praṇaya-rasa-pīyūṣa-jaladhau
 (17.32) śuddhojjvala-prema-rasāmṛtābdheḥ

Rādhā-rasa-sudhā-nidhi

- (11) pūrṇānurāga-rasa-sāgara-sāra-mūrtiḥ
 (13) premāmṛtaika-makaranda-rasaugha-pūrṇam
 (18) anurāga-rasaika-sindhuh
 (22) sat-prema-sindhu-makaranda-rasaugha-dhārā
 (25) svānanda-sīdhu-rasa-sindhu-vivardhanendum
 (28) premāmṛtāmbudhim agādham
 (40) apāra-rasa-sāra-vilāsa-mūrteḥ

- (41) pūrṇānurāga-rasa-mūrtiḥ
 (46) kṣarad-apāra-rasāmṛtābdhim
 (42) adbhuta-rasāmṛta-candrikaughaiḥ
 (51) mahā-premonmīlan-nava-rasa-sudhā-sindhu-laharī
 (73) prema-sudhā-rasāmbu-nidhī
 (92) unmaryāda-pravṛddha-praṇaya-rasa-mahāmbhodhi-gambhīra-līlā
 (93) pratikṣaṇa-camatkṛtādbhuta-rasaika-līlā-nidhe
 (94) sāndrānanda-ghanānurāga-laharī-nisyanda-pādāmbuja-dvandve
 (125) śoṇādhara-śrī-vidhṛta-nava-sudhā-mādhurī-sāra-sindhuḥ
 (129) adbhuta-mādhavādhara-sudhā-mādhvīka-saṁsvādanaiḥ
 (137) sāndra-premāmṛta-rasa-mahā-sindhu-koṭir
 (153) amaryādonmīlat-surata-rasa-pīyūṣa-jaladheḥ
 (173) hari-mahā-prema-pīyūṣa-sindhoḥ
 (242) hari-mahā-prema-pīyūṣa-sindhoḥ
 (212) nava-sudhā-mādhurī-sindhu-koṭi
 (236) madhura-rasa-sudhā-sindhu-sārair agādhām
 (253) sāndrānandāmṛta-rasa-hrade
 (266) yat premāmṛta-sindhu-sāra-rasadam

This selection has been made primarily of lengthier compounds; shorter ones and the same selection of words outside compounds would have lengthened this paper excessively.

A number of other favoured word combinations could be pointed out such as priya-caraṇa-nakha-jyotiḥ (CCA 127) or śrī-rādhā-pada-nakha-jyotiḥ, found in CCA 68, RRSN 137, 148, 269. Although certain compounds, even some including a few of the key words like rasa-sindhu (36.2, 67.3, 82.1) or rasa-sāgara (52.4, 63.3.5), etc. can be found in CP, or for that matter, most Vaiṣṇava works, there is nothing like the abundant repetition of the same favoured vocabulary found, not only in these three works of Prabodhānanda, but in all his writings. This, more than anything else, constitutes his signature. Thus ARP 170:

śuddhojjvala-premarasaika-śakti_tadvat-svarūpau sukha-sāra-rāsī/
 tau naḥ kiśorau gaura-nīlau khelāyatām citra-manoja-līlau//

Encountering possible objections

Although not many medieval Vaiṣṇava authors are noted for multilingual compositions, there is no reason to think it impossible for Harivaṁśa write both a stotra-kāvya of deliberately narrow forms as well as a number of hymns in the vernacular, designed to appeal to a wider audience. It may, however, be objected that it would be improper to expect correlations of vocabulary, etc. with another work written in Sanskrit, even if he were indeed the author. It has, however, already been noted that Harivaṁśa's Brajabhāṣā is comparatively heavy in Sanskrit tat-sama and tad-bhava words, so a certain amount of similarity in vocabulary, the use of figures, favoured epithets, etc., might well be expected if the two works were both his, particularly since the general subject matter is the

same. It has been shown, however, that this is not the case, at least not beyond a minimal degree of coincidence which might well be found with the works of any other Vaiṣṇava of the same period.

RRSN is a work of intense longing for service to Rādhā, whereas CP is more purely descriptive of the loving dalliances of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa without any such emotional relation of the author to the protagonists being directly expressed. If one considers this an unimportant distinction, then one neglects the fact that Harivaṁśa's audience was primarily non-Sanskrit-speaking (which is borne out by the literature of the sect which is overwhelmingly in Brajabhāṣā). One would expect the mood of the RRSN to have penetrated at least one of his many padas, anthologized after his death — even an interpolated verse expressive of the desire to serve Rādhā in a particular way (like the songs of Narottamadāsa) would indicate that his close contemporaries expected such a mood of him. This is, however, not the case.

One may object that stylistic and lexical differences exist between Prabodhānanda's works and RRSN. This may be due to subject-matter: praises of Caitanya will not necessarily be expressed in the same vocabulary as praises of Rādhā. Perhaps a more serious objection is that the similarities pointed out above are due to the conventions of the Sanskrit stotra-kāvya genre which, like all Sanskrit poetry, has its own conceits and vocabulary. Though this is easily admitted, a cursory glance at other works of the genre will show remarkable differences, even within the restrictions imposed on the authors by stylistic conventions. And even though it is possible to accept that there are bound to be a certain number of changes in a writer's mannerisms, even throughout his own career, there is a truly remarkable degree of similarity between the various works of Prabodhānanda Sarasvatī, to which we must now add RRSN.

Could the similarities found between the works in question not be the result of plagiarism or well-intentioned and perhaps even condoned stylistic imitation rather than identity of authorship? If it could be established who imitated whom, the implications (since imitation is the sincerest form of flattery) for our understanding of the relations between these personalities would certainly be great. As Prabodhānanda's compositional style (in CCA) seems to have been established even before encountering Harivaṁśa, one would have to assume the likelihood of his providing the model copied by the founder of the Rādhā-vallabhī sect, rather than RRSN providing inspiration for Prabodhānanda's numerous V.rndāvana compositions. However, it is not likely that either of these strong personalities, who came into contact with each other when they were already in their mature years, could have been influenced to the extent that their language, style of composition, etc. could take on the other's qualities at the expense of their own already well-developed individual traits.

Conclusions

If it is accepted that RRSN was indeed written by Prabodhānanda, then the

implications are clear: Prabodhānanda can no longer be looked upon as a disciple or follower of Harivaṁśa; rather, he is in the position of influence and his influence, already accepted as being extensive by the Vaiṣṇavas of the Rādhā-vallabhī school, must be seen in a rather more significant light. Even if RRSN is to be considered the work of Harivaṁśa, its great similarity to the works of Prabodhānanda would indicate that Harivaṁśa took his inspiration from Prabodhānanda. In such a case, not dissimilar conclusions would have to be drawn. Harivaṁśa's connection to the Gauḍīya school is thus confirmed. Whether this relation was ritually solemnized through initiation to Prabodhānanda's disciple Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, though now considerably more believable, is the conclusion which we are able to state with the least conviction.

Explaining how a work by Prabodhānanda came to be known as the composition of Harivaṁśa remains another problem which is not easily answered. Two poems in the CP have the name of Naravāhana in the signature couplet. Snātaka (1968:103) argues that these were in fact written by Harivaṁśa but given as a gift to his dear disciple. He states that this was not an uncommon practice in those days. Could it not then be possible that the same could hold true for the writing of RRSN, that Prabodhānanda, an experienced author of many Sanskrit works, made a gift of this work in order to enhance the prestige of his junior contemporary? Prabodhānanda lent support to Harivaṁśa's evangelical aspirations by writing an aṣṭaka in his honour. A more comprehensive work would have helped to promote the independent movement in which they both believed, but of which Harivaṁśa was the acknowledged leader, for Prabodhānanda as a strict renunciate would have imposed on him severe limitations in the number of disciples that he could take. Indeed, other than Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, we know of no other disciples.

Whatever the case, Prabodhānanda's close relation with Harivaṁśa and his successors could not have been a matter of great joy to the Gauḍīyas, particularly in the atmosphere of increasing sectarianism following the short period of camaraderie which existed between the early 'discoverers' of Braj, the representatives of the different neo-Vaiṣṇava schools. Harirāma Vyāsa could sing the glories of Haridāsa Svāmī, Hita Harivaṁśa, Rūpa and Sanātana within a single pada. Rūpa and Sanātana are known to have been on friendly terms with Vallabhācārya's son, Viṭṭhala. It is thus altogether possible that originally Prabodhānanda's close relations with both Harivaṁśa and the Gauḍīyas was univerrally accepted. Sectarian feeling appears to have become quite strong by the time of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, however. Kṛṣṇadāsa took pains to show that Keśava Kāśmīrī of the Nimbārka school and Vallabhācārya, as well as leaders of other schools, were all defeated in debate or converted by Caitanya. For the Gauḍīyas, Rādhā was only attainable through Caitanya and Kṛṣṇadāsa made a tremendous effort to prove this in CC. For Prabodhānanda to condone Harivaṁśa's independent spirit must have seemed to him (and others surely) like reneging on the grace he had received at the hands of the avatāra. When compounded with a disregard for vidhi there was likely to have been a general feeling of distaste for

him and his works. As a result, Prabodhānanda's writings other than CCA (which was already known in Bengal) had only limited circulation amongst the Gauḍīyas. Kṛṣṇadāsa would not even quote a single verse from that work in his CC, though it is impossible that he could have been ignorant of it. One version of RRSN with verses dedicated to Caitanya was preserved and eventually gained currency and even great popularity amongst the Gauḍīyas for its devotion to Rādhā. This work may even have exercised a considerable influence on certain Gauḍīya writers such as Raghunāthadāsa, whose Vilāpakusumāñjali, though stylistically different, follows it closely in spirit. By the same token, though Prabodhānanda is accepted by the Rādhā-vallabhīs as one of their own, the extent of his influence in the sampradāya has never been adequately recognized and the mood and teachings which are his contribution have been credited to Harivaṁśa alone.

FOOTNOTES

(Fn1) 'Prabodhānanda Sarasvatī: from Benares to Braj', First appeared in BSOAS, LV, 1, 1992, 52-75. This article also first appeared in BSOAS, LV, 3, 1992, 472-497)

1. Abbreviations of other titles used here are as follows: ARP = Āścarya-rāsa-prabandha; BhP = Bhāgavata-purāṇa; BRK = Bhakti-ratnākara; BRS = Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu; CP = Hita-caurāsī or Caurāsī Pada; CCA = Caitanya-candrāmṛta; CC = Caitanya-caritāmṛta; Gītag = Gīta-govinda; HBV = Hari-bhakti-vilāsa; HC = Harivaṁśa Carita or Hita Carita; KKA = Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta; PV = Prema-vilāsa; SaṅgM = Saṅgīta-mādhava; UN = Ujjvala-nīlamanī; VMA = Vṛndāvana-mahimāmṛta.

I should like to express here my special thanks to Dr. Rupert Snell of SOAS for corrections and suggestions which have been of great help in the writing of this article.

2. Published in Ananya Rasika Māla, ed. Lalitāprasāda Purohit, Vrindavan, 1961:99_100.

3. Bhaktakavi Vyāsajī, Agrawāl Press, Mathurā, 1953: 193_194.

4. RRSN, Introduction by Hitadāsa, 30. This anecdote appears in a rather late work by Mīṭhā Bhāī, Cf. Snātaka 1968:92. It is not in the earlier account of HC. Attention is called to note 20 in the previous article where a colophon from Gopāla Bhaṭṭa's commentary to KKA is quoted. Note that the author of that work, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa claims to be the son of Harivaṁśa, the son of N.rsimha. The coincidence of names is not a little unusual.

5. Nāgarīdāsa's Aṣṭaka, Rūpalāla's Vāṇī, Jatanlāl's Rasika Ananya Sāra, etc. Cited, Snātaka (1968:98). Another version is that Rādhā appeared to Harivaṁśa and told him the mantra outright. kṛpā kari Śrī-Rādhā prakāṣa hoyā darśana diyo/ apāne hita ko jānikai hita soṅ mantra sunāya diyau//; Uttamadāsa, HC: eka divasa sovata sukha lahyau śrīrādhe supane meṅ kahyau/ dvāra tihāre pīpara jo hai ūmcī ḍāra sabana meṅ so hai/ tā meṅ aruna patra ika nyārau jāmai jugala mantra hai

- mārau/ lehu mantra tuma karahu prakāsa rasika hanana kī pujibahu āsa//
6. Bābā Vṛndāvanadāsa's Śrī-Hitaharivaṁśa-sahasra-nāma, p.11 Rasik Māl, cited in Snātaka, 1968: 97. misra bāga meṅ kūpa nihārau tāmai dvibhuja svarūpa hamārau/ sundara śyāma bāṅsurī lie mama gādī sebhahu man diye//
7. (ed.) Sītārām Śaraṇ Bhagavān Prasād, (Lucknow: Tejkumar Press, 1962) chappaya 90.
rādhā-caran pradhān hṛdai ati sudṛḍha upāsī/
kumja keli dāmpati tahāñ kī karata khavāsī//
sarvasu mahā-prasād prasidha tāke adhikārī/
vidhi_niṣedh nahim dās anani utkaṭ vrata-dhārī//
vyāsa-suvan path anusarai soi bhalai pahimcāni hai/
śrī harivaṁśa gusāi bhajan kī rīti sakṛt kou jāni hai//
8. in Śrīhita Caurāsī (i.e., CP), (ed.) Lalitācaraṇa Gosvāmī, (Vrindavan: Veṅu Prakāśana, 2nd edn. 1979), 68_9.
9. Translation by Rupert Snell (1991: 23)
10. Second letter; Jo śāstra maryādā satya hai aur guru mahimā aisā hī satya hai to Braja nava taruṇi kadamba cūṇamaṇi ŚrīRādhē tihāre sthāpe guru mārḡa viṣai aviśvāsa ajñānī ko hota hai. Tāte yaha maryādā rakhanau. Text taken from Snātaka (1968:331).
11. Berhampore edition, 275; Gopāla Bhaṭṭera śiṣya yāra yei nāma/ kona deṣe kāra vāsa śunaha ākhyāna// Śrīnivāsācārya Gauḍe Harivaṁśa Vrajavāsī/ Gopīnātha pūjāri haya baḍa guṇarāśī/ ŚrīRādhāramaṇa sevā yāre samarpila// ei tina śiṣya Bhaṭṭera ākhyāne kahila// guru ajñā nā māniyā gelā Harivaṁśa/ āchila aneka guṇa saba haila dhvaṁsa// This edition has eighteen chapters. The Yaśodālāla Tālukdāra edition of 1913 is the inflated version.
12. Bhaktamāla, 224_5. śrīmān harivaṁśa gosvāmī caritra/ jagate vyāpita haya parama pavitra// śrīmān gopāla bhaṭṭajīra śiṣya teṁha/ mahābhaktivān teṁha rādhā kṛṣṇa premavaha// eka ekādaśī dine tāmbūla prasādi/ khāilā baliyā guru kailā aparādhi// antare gosāñi ruṣṭa nāhi ta hailā/ bāhya lokaśikṣā hetu śāsana karilā// harivaṁśa gosāñira śiṣya anukrame/ ebe rādhāvallabhī gosāñi vrajadhāme// śrīmān gopāla bhaṭṭa tāhāte praṇālī/ phirāilā ki hetuka nā jāni ki bali// ye hetuka anya anya sampradāya sane/ vyavahāra āhāra paramārthe nāhi bane// viccheda haila eka_pataṅga nā haya/ rājā jayasimha bahu vicāra karaya// se saba kahāte ebe phala kichu nāi/ koṭi koṭi daṇḍavat sabhākāra ṭhāi// The translation above is from Snell (1984: 26) who credits it to Tarapada Mukherjee.
13. This reference is not available, even in secondary sources. Snātaka discusses the issue (1968:97_9, 113_7)
14. Guṇamañjaridāsa, Śrī-Gopāla-bhaṭṭa-śataka (Vrindavan, 1908). Birth, p.2: VS. 1555; Death, p.23, VS 1642; establishment of Rādhāramaṇa, Vaiśākha-pūrṇimā VS 1599 (p.7). This author, a Gosvāmī of the Rādhāramaṇa family writing in the late nineteenth century, indicates that the Rādhā-ramaṇa house accepts the tradition that Hita Harivaṁśa was Gopāla Bhaṭṭa's disciple (p.56).
15. See R. Snell's notes on CP 40.6 and 65.4.
16. Snell (1984:492_9) compares a number of commentaries on certain padas of CP and concludes that RRSN is the dogmatic source for the interpretative

tradition. Since the purpose of this article is to ascertain the authorship of this work, we intend to use only CP as the authoritative indicator of Harivamśa's doctrinal position.

17. in Vāsudeva Gosvāmī (1951:193).

18. HBV, 13.

19. See the discussion in S. K. De (1942: 104_7). BRK, 1.800_1; karite vaiṣṇava smṛti haila bhāṭṭa mana/...gopālera nāme śrī gosvāmī sanātana/ karila hari-bhakti-vilāsa varṇana//, etc.

20. The same scene is portrayed in RRSN 5, 112, 201, 209, 233, See also the māna verses of CP.

21. Rūpa Gosvāmī, in his BRS identifies the qualification for rāgānugā bhakti as the 'non-dependance on scriptural injunctions or logical argument' (tat-tad-bhāvādi-mādhurye śrute dhīr yad apekṣate/ nātra śāstraṁ na yuktiṁ ca tal lobhotpatti-lakṣaṇam// i.2.292).

22. Kṛṣṇavallabha commentary on verse 3.

23. Ramakanta Chakravarty, Vaiṣṇavism in Bengal (Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1985), 308.

24. tau santoṣayatā santau śrīla-rūpa-sanātana/ dākṣiṇātyena bhāṭṭena punar etad vivicyate// tasyādyam granthanālekham krānta-vyutkrānta-khaṇḍitam/ paryālocyātha paryāyam kṛtvā likhati jīvakam// These two verses introduce each of the six volumes of this work.

25. See Kṛṣṇa-sandarbha, para.171ff.

26. Viz. Śrīvatsa Gosvāmī, 'Rādhā, the play and perfection of rasa' in The Divine Consort, (ed.) J. S. Hawley and D. M. Wulffe, (New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984), 72_88. For a fuller discussion of Jīva's svakīyā-vāda, see this author's article "Does Kṛṣṇa marry the gopīs in the end?" in The Journal of Vaiṣṇava Studies, 5.4, Fall 1997, 49-110.

27. 'A vernacular portrait: Rādhā in the Sūr Sāgar' in The Divine Consort, (ed.) Hawley and Wulff, 42_56, esp. 53.

28. i.7.126; tathāpi sambhoga-sukhād api stutaḥ sa ko'py anirvācyatamo manoramah/ pramoda-rāśiḥ pariṇāmato dhruvam tatra sphuret tad rasikaika-vedyah//

29. Bṛhad-bhāgavatāmṛta, i.6.352_355.

30. Antya 1.66_67: Kṛṣṇake bāhira nāhi kariha Braja haite/ Braja chāḍi Kṛṣṇa kabhu nā yāya kāhānte// This is followed by a quote from Yamala.

31. Laghu-bhāgavatāmṛta 1.5.461: Kṛṣṇo 'nyo Yadusambhūto yas tu Gopendranandanah/ Vṛndāvanam parityajya sa kvacin naiva gacchati//; UN (Haridāsa Dāsa edition) 15.185_7: atha samyoga-viyoga-sthitiḥ. harer līlā-viśeṣasya prakāṣyānusārataḥ/ varṇitā virahāvasthā goṣṭha-vāma-bhruvām asau// vṛndāraṇye viharatā sadā rāsādi-vibhramaiḥ/ hariṇā vraja-devīnām viraho 'sti na karhicit// tathā ca pādme pātāla-khaṇḍe mathurā-māhātmye: go-gopa-gopikā-saṅge yatra krīḍati kamsahā//; Padyāvalī, (ed.) S. K. De, (Dacca, 1934).

32. The words nitya-vihāra are repeated several times in GC ii.29.111: tad ittham ākhyātam mama vyākhyā. Yat khalvayam daśama-skandhāntarvartī śrī-śuka-siddhāntas tatra cātra ca tasya vicchedam nirasya nitya-vihāram eva vyāharati.

Also, GC ii.29.113, 116.

33. vidagdhanām mitho līlā-vilāsenā yathā sukham/ na tathā samprayogeṇa syād evam rasikā viduḥ// UN, 15.253.

34. See in particular 2.1, 4.1–10.

35. (ed.) Śyāmācaraṇa Kaviratna, (Calcutta, 1911), 1329. evam ekāntinām prāyaḥ kīrtanaṁ smaraṇaṁ prabhoḥ/ kurvatām parama-prītyā kṛtyam anyam na rocayet// bhāvena kenacit preṣṭha-śrī-mūrter aṅghri-sevane/ syād iccaīṣām sva-mantreṇa svarasenaiva tad-vidhiḥ// vihiteṣv eva nityeṣu pravartante svayam hi te/ ity ādy ekāntinām bhāti māhātmyam likhitaṁ hi tat//

36. In 1888, the Rādhāramaṇa sevāyata Rādhācaraṇa Gosvāmī wrote a book called Śrī-Caitanya-carita-sāra in which he wrote that Gopāla Bhaṭṭa was spiritual master of Hita Harivaṁśa. He was taken to court, and on the 5th of October of that year was judged guilty of defamation. He was made to pay a 5 rupee fine and revoke his claims with an apology, saying he had no proof. Snātaka (1968:98–99) has taken this information from a Hindi work by Gopālaprasāda Śarmā called Bhramoccheda about which he gives no further information.

37. Snātaka (1968: 324–30) makes a concerted effort to show that these are Harivaṁśa's own compositions. Snell (1985: 464–69) suggests that they are more likely to come from the body of anonymous literature from which both the compilers of CP and Sūrasāgara drew.

38. Hita-caurāsī aur uskī Premadāsa kṛta Vrajabhāṣā ṭīkā, (ed.) Vijay Pāl Simha and Candrabhān Rāvat, (Kāśī: Nāgarī Pracārīṇī Sabhā, 1971). The list is somewhat arbitrary. Snātaka gives a somewhat different breakdown (1968: 294), significantly omitting dāna (51), even though this song starts with the line, dāna dai rī navala kiśorī...

39. See also CP 11, 18; RRSN 10.

40. Harivaṁśa's affinity for Gītag is pointed out by Harirāma Vyāsa: baḍe rasika jayadeva bakhānī, līlā amṛta cucāta/ vṛndāvana harivaṁsa prasamsita, suni gaurī musikāta//, Vāsudeva Gosvāmī (1951: 195).

41. CP, 20, mere prāṇa-nātha Śrī-Śyāmā sapatha karauṅ tṛṇa chiye etc.

42. CP, 24.4, śrabaṇa phuṭau jo anasunauṅ bina Rādhā yaśa baina.

43. (ed.) Bābā Hitadāsa, Jabalpur: Narmadā Printing Works, 1950. The earlier verses of this work are similar to those found at the beginning of the mañjarī's speech in SaṅgM (2.2).

44. In this article, references to RRSN follow the Gauḍīya recension. Verses in the Rādhā-vallabhī recensions will be one figure lower.

45. 1942:99; the references given by him are vī.1464–5; p.131, 239; vī. p.230; Notices, 2nd series, i. p.384. 46. See for example: 1.12, 1.61, 2.58, etc.

47. sad-yogīndra-sudṛṣya-sāndra-rasadānandaika-san-mūrtayaḥ sarve 'py adbhuta-san-mahimni madhure vṛndāvane saṅgatāḥ/ ye krūrā api pāpino na ca satām sambhāṣya-dṛṣyāś ca ye sarvān vastutayā nirīkṣya paramasvārādhyabuddhir mama//RRSN 265

48. e.g. Kṛṣṇa seeing himself reflected in Rādhā's bright golden skin is also found both in Subhāṣita-ratna-kośa 4.44 and RRSN 246.

49. samasta-veda-mastakair agamya-vaibhavām sadā

mahā-munīndra-nāradādibhiḥ sadaiva bhāvitām/
atulya-pāmarair api śritām pumartha-sāradām
bhaje kalinda-nandinīm duranta-moham añjanīm//, in Bṛhat-stotra-muktāhāra,
vol.2, Ahmedabad: Gujarat Printing Press, 1916: 419_20.