

“ALL VAIṢṆAVAS ARE GURUS”
NARAHARI SARAKĀRA ON VAIṢṆAVAS, GURUS,
AND THE FATE OF THE GAUḌĪYA TRADITION

Rembert Lutjeharms

In the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja visualizes the entire Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava community as a gigantic tree.¹ Rooted in the devotion of his gurus, Śrī Caitanya became the trunk of a magic tree of devotion, and from that trunk sprang innumerable branches. The tree is enormous: its largest branches alone, Kṛṣṇadāsa writes, “shade the entire world.”² Two of these largest branches are so large that they are equivalent to trunks themselves. The first is that of Nityānanda, which was “very heavy,”³ and its many branches, “bearing the fruits and flowers of love, covered the entire earth.”⁴ The second is Advaita’s; nurtured by Caitanya, its branches were innumerable and bore the fruits of his love.⁵ But there are many more branches besides these, growing directly out of the main trunk, “the greatest” of which is that of Gadādhara.⁶ Though this tree of devotion is firmly rooted, it is yet mobile, and its branches extend themselves to various places, where they bear the fruits of love.⁷

Kṛṣṇadāsa’s image is, as Tony K. Stewart notes, “especially powerful,” and it gives “a place for everyone within a single unified community.”⁸ It allows Kṛṣṇadāsa to easily map the entire Gauḍīya community, and trace each prominent devotee’s relation to Caitanya, while also highlighting the uniqueness of each group of Caitanya’s devotees. But it is also an abstraction and a simplification of the rather complex fabric of these early Gauḍīya communities. This becomes immediately obvious when we look from a different angle at the Vaiṣṇavas that constitute these branches. Though Kṛṣṇadāsa writes that the branches and its sub-branches represent “disciples, disciples’ disciples, and groups of their disciples,”⁹ the organization is primarily based on both proximity to Caitanya and on

community belonging, rather than on initiation (*dīkṣā*), which traditionally determines guru-disciple relations (and which would later determine the shape of the tradition).¹⁰ Kṛṣṇadāsa's organization undoubtedly reflects the lived experience of the Vaiṣṇavas he lists, and studying the early Gauḍīya tradition from this perspective has proven insightful, as Stewart's own groundbreaking work particularly demonstrates.¹¹

But when, instead of looking at these Vaiṣṇavas' belonging to a particular (generally geographically determined) community, we trace lineages of gurus and their initiated disciples, the complexity of the early Gauḍīya community quickly becomes apparent. Take for example Acyutānanda, Advaita's eldest son. In Kṛṣṇadāsa's image he is a "great branch" of Advaita's trunk, yet he was an initiated disciple of Gadādhara Paṇḍita.¹² Or consider Raghunāthadāsa Gosvāmī, who is his own branch in Kṛṣṇadāsa's tree of devotion. Throughout the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, Kṛṣṇadāsa stresses Raghunāthadāsa's close relationship with Svarūpa Dāmodara, Caitanya's closest friend,¹³ who indeed became Raghunāthadāsa's "teacher," though he is also listed separately.¹⁴ Yet, as Raghunāthadāsa indicates in some of his works,¹⁵ he was initiated by Yadunandanācārya, who is a prominent sub-branch of Advaita in Kṛṣṇadāsa's image.¹⁶ Similarly, in Kṛṣṇadāsa's tree Kavikarṇapūra belongs to the branch of his father, Śivānanda Sena,¹⁷ though he was a disciple of Śrīnātha Paṇḍita, who forms his own branch,¹⁸ but who was a disciple of Advaita.¹⁹

When initiation becomes the determining factor, we thus arrive at a very different map, and begin to see that many of the branches of this wondrous tree intertwine. This does not contradict Kṛṣṇadāsa's vision, but rather shows that these Vaiṣṇavas had multiple gurus,²⁰ and therefore also had ties to multiple communities (which could also shift over time, as Raghunāthadāsa's case illustrates).²¹ There was in other words a degree of fluidity in these affiliations.

This plurality of gurus—both collectively, for the tradition as a whole, and individually, for a specific disciple—has important repercussions for the way the guru (in the abstract) is viewed. Though the importance, role, and identity of the guru is a much discussed topic in the early literature of the Gauḍīya tradition, and though there is a general agreement that a Vaiṣṇava does indeed have multiple gurus, there is little in that literature that discusses the practical implications of this, from a disciple's point of view. How should a disciple view his own guru in relation to all other Vaiṣṇavas? Should one's guru be the greatest Vaiṣṇava of the community? How should a disciple honor Vaiṣṇavas who are senior to his guru? Should an initiated disciple look for more gurus? How does a disciple acquire a new guru, and, when he has obtained a new guru, how does he then relate to his

first guru? Is the acceptance of a new guru necessarily a dismissal of the disciple's first guru?

These practical issues are rarely addressed in the early literature of the tradition, but there is in fact one early text that does address these: the *Kṛṣṇa-bhajanāmṛta* ("The Nectar of the Worship of Kṛṣṇa"), a brief Sanskrit work ascribed to Narahari Sarakāra.

Narahari Sarakāra

Narahari Sarakāra belonged to a prestigious family, both in the Vaiṣṇava world and the broader society. He became the senior leader of the influential community of Vaiṣṇavas in Śrīkhaṇḍa, and his brother, Mukunda, was for some time the personal physician of Sultān Hussain Shāh at the court in Gauḍa.²² Though also a leader of the Vaiṣṇava community in his own right, Mukunda is overshadowed in importance by his son, Raghunandana,²³ who served the *mūrti* of Gopinātha in the local temple and who with his uncle Narahari shaped the community of Śrīkhaṇḍa.

Narahari was older than Caitanya. He is said to have been born around 1480, which would make him just a few years older than Caitanya,²⁴ but Rāyaśekhara, a disciple of Raghunandana, claims that Narahari was already an accomplished singer before Caitanya's birth, which—if true—would suggest he was significantly older.²⁵

After Caitanya's devotional awakening, Narahari regularly joined him in his nightly *kīrtanas* in Navadvīpa, where he lived at the time, and was thus one of Caitanya's earliest devotees. The various hagiographies of Caitanya mention Narahari but sporadically.²⁶ Even Locanadāsa, Narahari's own disciple, narrates just a handful of episodes in which his guru plays a prominent role.²⁷ This is particularly remarkable since Narahari is given a more prominent place in the vernacular songs written by Caitanya's earliest disciples. These songs describe how shortly after Caitanya's devotional awakening, Narahari danced and sang Kṛṣṇa's names with him and his early devotees, particularly Gadādhara Paṇḍita, Vāsudeva and Govinda Ghoṣa, Mukunda Datta, and Śrīvāsa. They present him as an important devotee, who is especially close to Gadādhara.²⁸ In one song Govinda Ghoṣa sings: "To the right of the Lord danced Naraharidāsa, while to his left danced his beloved Gadādhara."²⁹ Given Narahari's musical expertise, it is no surprise that he is mentioned as leading the community in song, beginning in Navadvīpa and later in Purī. As one poet sings: "with Narahari he sang the *rasa* of Vraja; Mukunda [Datta], Murāri [Gupta], and Vāsu [Ghoṣa] danced with joy."³⁰

Biman Bihari Majumdar argues that the reason Narahari is not mentioned

frequently by the hagiographers is because they disapproved of his teachings.³¹ In many of his compositions, Narahari describes how the women of Navadvīpa were amorously attracted to the young Gaurāṅga, and longed for his love (which yet remains ever unfulfilled). Some early devotees seem to have disliked this idea. Vṛndāvanadāsa, for example, writes that Caitanya never even looked at women, and that describing him as a lover (*nāgara*) is no praise at all³²—a criticism that many scholars have interpreted as a rejection of the teachings of Narahari, whom Vṛndāvanadāsa does not mention once in the *Caitanya-bhāgavata*.³³

But Majumdar’s argument does not hold for most of the other hagiographers. Murāri Gupta, for example, who was part of Caitanya’s entourage when Narahari was in Navadvīpa and who is in some songs mentioned in the same breath as Narahari, mentions Narahari but once in his *Kṛṣṇa-caitanya-caritāmṛta*, and then only as a name in a long list of Vaiṣṇavas. Yet his hagiography broaches similar themes as Narahari’s songs.³⁴ The *Caitanya-caritāmṛta-mahā-kāvya*, Kavikarṇapūra’s early work which is closely based on Murāri’s, also contains such themes, but it also barely mentions Narahari, despite Kavikarṇapūra’s father’s close relationship with the Śrīkhaṇḍa Vaiṣṇavas. Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, the last of the main hagiographers and certainly the most influential, is the only hagiographer to mention Narahari more frequently, though even most of these references are but brief.

Where Narahari is given a lot more significance, however, is in the hagiographies of Śrīnivāsa, the most significant personality of the Gauḍīya tradition in the generation after the Gosvāmīs of Vṛndāvana. Most of the hagiographies of Śrīnivāsa claim that Narahari played an important role in Śrīnivāsa’s mission. Karṇapūra Kavirāja, a direct disciple of Śrīnivāsa, is the first to do so. In the *Guṇa-leśa-sūcaka* (“An Brief Indication of the Virtues [of Śrīnivāsa]”), a long poem in praise of his guru, Karṇapūra Kavirāja writes that Śrīnivāsa passed through Śrīkhaṇḍa on his way to Vṛndāvana and there “bowed down to the dear friend of Caitanyacandra, the exceptional Śrī Sarakāra Ṭhākura. He received his instructions, and then bowed to the feet of Raghunandana.” Remembering them, he then continued his journey to Vraja.³⁵ In subsequent hagiographies, Narahari comes to play an ever more significant role. In the *Prema-vilāsa*, a text that was probably written sometime after the mid-seventeenth century, Nityānandadāsa claims that Śrīnivāsa spent considerable time in Śrīkhaṇḍa in his youth, and that Narahari suggested he travel to Purī to meet Gadādhara and study the *Bhāgavata* with him, and later instructs him to go to Vṛndāvana to study with the Gosvāmīs.³⁶ The eighteenth century *Bhakti-ratnākara* of Narahari Cakravartī similarly writes that Śrīnivāsa knew Narahari from his childhood,³⁷ but whereas Nityānandadāsa writes that Narahari had passed away by the time Śrīnivāsa returned from

Vṛndāvana with the works of the Gosvāmīs,³⁸ Narahari Cakravartī claims that Narahari passed away only later, and continued to advise Śrīnivāsa after his return.³⁹

To what extent the accounts of these later hagiographies are historically accurate is a question that need not concern us here. What is of interest, however, is that these later authors saw it important to give such prominence to Narahari and make him, essentially, a pivotal figure who linked the newly arrived teachings of the Gosvāmīs with the older tradition of Caitanya devotion in Bengal. Whatever the extent of their relationship, Śrīnivāsa did indeed honour Narahari in his own very small *œuvre*: Śrīnivāsa wrote an eight-verse poem of praise (*aṣṭaka*) in Narahari's honor, and it is worth noting that he wrote only one other such poem, in praise of the six Gosvāmīs of Vṛndāvana, under whom he studied.⁴⁰ Narottamadāsa, a close friend of Śrīnivāsa who studied with him in Vṛndāvana and helped him disseminate the Gosvāmīs teachings in Bengal, also praises Narahari, and elevates him to a member of the *pañca-tattva* in one of his songs: "My wealth is Nityānanda, my lord is Caitanya [. . .], Advaita is my strength, Gadādhara is my family, and Narahari is my joy."⁴¹

It is not difficult to see why the later hagiographers want to emphasise or enlarge the role Narahari played in Śrīnivāsa's mission: he was an intimate associate of Caitanya, and likely one of the few who was still alive during Śrīnivāsa's youth,⁴² and someone whom Śrīnivāsa clearly looked to as a teacher. Though Narahari's theology of Caitanya differs considerably from that of the Vṛndāvana Gosvāmīs, it is important to remember that many Vaiṣṇavas in Vṛndāvana were disciples of Gadādhara, so that it is not unlikely that the Vṛndāvana Vaiṣṇavas had a great respect for Narahari.⁴³ Śrīnivāsa was educated by them, and also studied the *Bhāgavata* with Gadādhara in Purī. In other words, Narahari, and by extension the community he led in Śrīkhaṇḍa, formed a natural bridge between the Vaiṣṇava communities in Vraja and Bengal, even if theologically this may not seem like the most logical connection.⁴⁴

The Kṛṣṇa-bhajanāmṛta

Narahari is primarily known as a composer of Bengali songs (*padas*). He wrote over a hundred such songs, mostly in praise of Caitanya and Gadādhara,⁴⁵ and these were popular among the early devotees of the tradition. Indeed, Narahari seems to have been one of the first to compose vernacular songs in praise of Caitanya.⁴⁶ Many of these describe the life of Caitanya in Navadvīpa, in which Narahari participated,⁴⁷ and are therefore of considerable historical importance, as S.K. De has noted, not just for the events they describe, but especially because

they give “an actually witnessed and necessarily vivid picture of certain aspects of Caitanya’s emotional life of devotion as it appeared to the loving eyes of the faithful devotees.”⁴⁸

Though the association of Narahari with the vernacular is very strong,⁴⁹ several Sanskrit works have been ascribed to him, the most important of which is the *Kṛṣṇa-bhajanāmṛta* (hereafter just *Bhajanāmṛta*). This is a brief text—it is just 9 (large) pages long in Purīdāsa’s edition—written in very simple Sanskrit. Narahari does not build his arguments around key Vaiṣṇava texts, and only rarely does he cite any other text. He cites the *Bhagavad-gītā*, the poet Umāpatidhara, and an unknown (most likely Purāṇic) text all once, but quotes the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* five times, and more than half of those passages are from chapter 47 of the tenth canto, the famous “Song of the bee” (*bhramara-gītā*).⁵⁰

S. K. De has doubted the ascription of the *Bhajanāmṛta* to Narahari. He argues that the text “offers nothing new, being obviously influenced (which indication is somewhat strange) by the views of the Vṛndāvana Gosvāmīs” and that the work contains “no trace” of the distinctive theology of Caitanya which Narahari expresses in his vernacular songs (*pada*).⁵¹ I find this claim puzzling. The *Bhajanāmṛta*’s theology of Caitanya is unique, and betrays no influence from the Vṛndāvana Gosvāmīs. One of the main aims of the text is to justify the pride of place given to Gadādhara Paṇḍita in Narahari’s songs, and the amorous tone that permeates his vernacular songs also finds here a justification, as Hiteshranjan Sanyal and Ramakanta Chakravarti have earlier pointed out.⁵² Narahari argues in no uncertain terms that Gadādhara is Rādhā, and that “even Vedāntins, even sensualists gained the *gopīs*’ love when they saw the love of Śrī Gadādhara Paṇḍita and became infatuated with the artful love of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya, and then danced as women—what to speak then of Vaiṣṇavas!”⁵³

Judging by the scarcity of manuscripts,⁵⁴ the *Bhajanāmṛta* was not a very popular work, and is not cited very frequently. The earliest reference to the *Bhajanāmṛta* I have been able to find is in the mid seventeenth century. Rādhākṛṣṇa Gosvāmī, the fifth successor of Rūpa Gosvāmī at the Govindadeva temple in Vṛndāvana, refers to the work several times (specifically on the privileged position of Gadādhara, to whose lineage Rādhākṛṣṇa belongs), and always identifies Narahari as its author.⁵⁵ In the eighteenth century, Narahari Cakravartī also cites the text in his *Bhakti-ratnākara*.⁵⁶

Based on all this, there is little doubt in my mind that the *Bhajanāmṛta* is indeed Narahari’s text. However, given the many variant readings in the various printed editions of the text, the received text is likely not entirely correct, and the work is in need of a good critical edition.⁵⁷

Though the work was not frequently cited in the pre-modern period, it did gain some popularity in the modern period. Since the nineteenth century, the work has been published about half a dozen times.⁵⁸ In 1899 Kedarnātha Datta Bhaktivinoda, an influential Vaiṣṇava theologian and reformer, wrote a Bengali commentary on the text (titled *Āsvāda-vistāriṇī*, “That which increases the relish [of Narahari’s ‘Nectar of the worship of Kṛṣṇa’]”), and his son Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī, the founder of the influential Gauḍīya Mission, is said to have claimed that the *Bhajanāmṛta* was one of four texts that every Vaiṣṇava should read.⁵⁹ Given the profound differences in their theological understanding of Caitanya, the aspect of the *Bhajanāmṛta* which resonated particularly with these modern Vaiṣṇavas are the sections we will turn to in this paper, on the guru and the Vaiṣṇava community.⁶⁰

The *Bhajanāmṛta* is rather unique in the pre-modern history of the Gauḍīya tradition, as it is perhaps the only text written by a Vaiṣṇava of Narahari’s stature that is explicitly critical of the direction he fears the tradition might be heading. As Narahari explains in the introduction, he wrote the *Bhajanāmṛta* to help future generations preserve the purity of Caitanya’s teachings:

In this age of Kali, when Kṛṣṇa Caitanya and Nityānanda will end their divine descent, all Vaiṣṇavas will always be aggrieved, and year after year, day after day—whether they are among the highest, lowest, or intermediate—they will mostly be confused at heart, as various people will present a thousand objections. By meditating on the Lord [Caitanya], I will present to these great souls and *parama-haṁsas* the spotless doctrines that are established by all scriptures, both briefly and at length.⁶¹

However, Narahari does not claim the ideas he propounds here are his own. Befitting characteristic Vaiṣṇava expressions of modesty, he claims he lacks all qualification to talk about such subjects, and asserts his authority by invoking the authority of others, whom he—or at least this work—represents:

‘The servant Narahari is a fool. How will he establish such complex doctrines?’ Wise one, do not vainly think this! Whether one is disreputable or virtuous, an idiot or indeed a scholar—who on earth is qualified to study devotion to Kṛṣṇa?

I will narrate this incident, which occurred unexpectedly when I slept, within a dream. In that dream I reflected on the objections (*pūrvā-pakṣa*) and the doctrines (*siddhānta*). A lucidity arose in my heart, and I seemed to swim in an ocean of nectar. At that time Gauracandra appeared, smiling. He held out a hand to [Vāsudeva] Sārvabhauma. “Well done! Well done!” he said. “It is exactly as you say!” He then said [to me], “Wake up,” and went away. I then got out of bed and meditated on his lotus feet. I reflected on myself, who am unfortunate, deplor-

able, and who have rejected his lotus feet, while I was remembering the Lord's compassionate words to me, who am seemingly fortunate! I do not understand his great power. What happened then? By this compassion, I gained clear ideas to compose this work. Thus, trying to write in simple prose, a fool has composed the fortunate 'Nectar of Worship' (*Bhajanāmṛta*). All the swan-like great souls, who have come here to purify the world, are skilled in composing this pure work of me, who am feasting on their remnants.⁶²

Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma was one of the most renowned intellectuals of Narahari's day. He was one of the first Bengali scholars to study Navya Nyāya in Mithilā, its homeland, and establish it in Navadvīpa, his home town, before becoming a leading scholar at the court of Pratāparudradeva in Orissa, where he taught Navya Nyāya and Advaita Vedānta. According to Gauḍīya hagiographies, Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya—as he is usually known in Gauḍīya texts—met Caitanya when the latter arrived in Puri as a young monk (*sannyāsi*). He quickly became one of Caitanya's staunch supporters and devotees, abandoning his illustrious career when Caitanya revealed to him his own divinity. The incident Narahari refers to in the above cited passage is one told in some hagiographies: shortly after Sārvabhauma's devotional awakening, Caitanya again asked Sārvabhauma to teach him what he had now learned, which he gladly did.⁶³

In invoking the authority of both Sārvabhauma and Caitanya, Narahari associates his work not just with Caitanya, who is God himself to his devotees, but also with one of the greatest intellectuals of his time. Though in these introductory verses he merely claims to have had a dream in which Caitanya conversed with (the converted) Sārvabhauma and by this was inspired to write the *Bhajanāmṛta*, we will see below that later in the text Narahari states more explicitly that the doctrines he defends are not just inspired by the dream, but—at least partially—the actual contents of the dream.

What are those "spotless" doctrines (*siddhānta*) that Narahari fears will be misunderstood? The *Bhajanāmṛta* is, mostly, concerned with five topics (in order): 1) the importance and position of the Vaiṣṇavas and the Vaiṣṇava guru, 2) the nature of Kṛṣṇa, 3) the theological position of Balarāma, 4) the theological position of God's consorts, particularly Rādhā, and 5) the identity of Gadādhara and Caitanya.⁶⁴

The first of these topics, which is what concerns us here, is discussed in about one fifth of the entire work, though, as we will see, Narahari returns to the topic of Vaiṣṇava leadership in a kind of coda, which is slightly longer than this.

“All Vaiṣṇavas are Equal”

Narahari frames his exposition on the “doctrine” (*siddhānta*) of the guru within a broader discussion on Vaiṣṇavas. As we have seen, Narahari claims that future Vaiṣṇavas will be confronted with various contrary views that will lead to doubts, and the first of such views Narahari addresses is about the very nature of the Vaiṣṇava community: “In the age of Kali, by the power of Kṛṣṇa’s name, all Vaiṣṇavas are equal, resembling Kṛṣṇa.”⁶⁵ Narahari responds:

That all Vaiṣṇavas are equal is true. But those who do not recognize strength and weakness—those sensualists, those of meagre intelligence who fear both a beggar and a man in terrifying dress—how can they know strength and weakness, like the specific nature of a small flame and a great fire by its splendor? They will treat them all equally, because they are incapable of understanding and because they lack discrimination. What more? They will perish. Their equality suits them!

But those Vaiṣṇavas who know both the worldly and the absolute reality are aware of the differences, by hearing, by seeing, and by understanding. They can discriminate between the weak and the strong—how much of Kṛṣṇa’s splendor is in which body—and [thus] they know all, whether weak or strong. Aware of this difference, they will act, and if, knowing the relative strength and weakness, they do not act [appropriately], then they are at fault. Therefore, when in the presence of both weak and strong [Vaiṣṇavas], they will worship first the great, and later those of common strength.

In other words, all Vaiṣṇavas are equal, but some are less so than others. They all resemble Kṛṣṇa, but some do so more than others, because they embody more of “Kṛṣṇa’s splendor.” Therefore, Narahari argues, common sense dictates that they should not be treated equally. As he later explains, “one does not treat the weak in the same way as the strong. Just as when one knows that a volcano has erupted, one does not first extinguish the flame of an oil lamp, but once a volcano is extinguished one can easily extinguish the flame of the lamp.”⁶⁶

However, Narahari is quick to emphasize that the special honor given to the great does not result in disrespect for the small, because, after all, all Vaiṣṇavas are indeed equal: “Do not speak ill of the Vaiṣṇavas or disrespect them out of madness,” he writes. “Even when someone dies because of a Vaiṣṇava there is no suffering. Do not find faults with Vaiṣṇavas by scrutinizing their actions and behavior. Who indeed is spotless in his behavior when wounded by Kali?”⁶⁷ Even if “wounded by Kali,” however, Vaiṣṇavas cannot fall into sin, because

they constantly remember Kṛṣṇa. Even if they would commit a sin, that will be consumed by the “fire of Kṛṣṇa” which resides in their bodies.⁶⁸ Therefore, Narahari concludes, all Vaiṣṇavas deserve respect, but “only the ignorant worship all Vaiṣṇavas—strong and weak—equally, like a single wave in the entire Ganges.”⁶⁹

“All Vaiṣṇavas are Gurus”

It is in this context that Narahari then teaches his views on the guru. He writes:

All Vaiṣṇavas are gurus. Among them, we can differentiate between initiating gurus (*dīkṣā-guru*) and instructing guru (*śikṣā-guru*). The strength of both should be examined. Now, the commands of both should be followed. If both are weak one should learn a specific teaching from other great ones and then offer that to [one’s own] guru. This [new teaching] should be studied in the presence of one’s guru. One should not disrespect one’s guru. It is just like when an affectionate son acquires something, he gives it to his father and then first asks for permission before he enjoys it himself. If he were to take it for himself and eat it, then he would be a bad son, a sinner. Therefore, one should always worship the Vaiṣṇavas as gurus, but one serves only one’s own guru with body, mind, and speech. Even when at that time others disrespect one’s own guru, one’s guru remains one’s guru. One should accept only his side.⁷⁰

Look! it is like this: the father is a superior (*guru*), and so are his older and younger brothers, but the father should be offered greater honor, even though they are his siblings. Still, one’s father’s father—the guru of one’s guru—is worshipped doubly. This custom is well established in society.

Now, if at that time they wrongly criticize the father, the father will certainly remain one’s superior (*guru*). One should only take the side of the father and by this alone one should support one’s life. The father, the guru, and the husband should certainly be worshipped, even if they have no virtues. Strengthened by them one can engage in debate with great or knowledgeable persons. Who indeed can live when one’s father is defamed? He is one’s life, whether he is strong or weak. Whether they [heard it] from the mouth of the guru or they used their own intellect, everyone acts to please him [i.e. the guru]; this is the method. To be his servant is considered to be the highest *dharma*.⁷¹

What is particularly remarkable about Narahari’s teachings on the guru as outlined here is something he does *not* say about the guru. It is a widespread belief in Hindu thought that the guru is in some sense divine, and this idea is also expressed in classical Vaiṣṇava texts, including the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, where Kṛṣṇa declares, in an often cited verse: “Know that I am the guru.”⁷² Prominent early Gauḍīya theologians—Rūpa Gosvāmī, Jīva Gosvāmī, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī,

Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja—also teach this, even if this doctrine is necessarily complex in a theology that consistently critiques the Advaitin’s view that all living beings are, essentially, divine. These authors offer a range of ways in which the guru’s divinity should be understood, as Māns Broo has shown: the guru should be respected like God, he resembles God in some ways, he is dear to God, he is a manifestation of God, and so on.⁷³ These nuances do not concern us much here, for, however other early theologians understood the divine nature or aspect of the guru, they did indeed teach this, sometimes with profuse citations from canonical Vaiṣṇava texts.⁷⁴

In light of this, Narahari’s silence on this topic is remarkable. The guru is, for Narahari, essentially like any other Vaiṣṇava, and not necessarily even the greatest Vaiṣṇava. Though Narahari argues that the Vaiṣṇavas’ power comes from Kṛṣṇa—“the fire of Kṛṣṇa resides in the limbs of the Vaiṣṇavas”⁷⁵—and, as we will see later, he also writes that they can embody Caitanya through their love, this is true for all Vaiṣṇavas, not just for the guru. In other words, for Narahari the guru does not have a unique ontological position—being both human and divine—as some Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas argue. Or, to put it in the language of later Gauḍīyas, Narahari does not teach a *guru-tattva*, but just a *vaiṣṇava-tattva*.⁷⁶

As we have seen, Caitanya’s devotees had more than one guru, and the first thing that Narahari has to say about the guru emphasizes this: *all* Vaiṣṇavas are one’s guru. But just as within the equality of all Vaiṣṇavas there is a hierarchy, so some Vaiṣṇavas are more guru than others to a particular disciple. Narahari therefore distinguishes between gurus who offer instructions (*śikṣā*) and gurus who give initiation (*dikṣā*). This division is a common one in early Gauḍīya texts.⁷⁷ Śrīnātha Cakravartī, for example, explains that those who desire to know Kṛṣṇa should have a single guru—the guru who offers them initiation (*dikṣā*)—but that one will also have various other teachers, the instructing gurus (*śikṣā-guru*), who are “great devotees of the Lord whom one has encountered by fortune.”⁷⁸

Jīva Gosvāmī similarly stresses that one should have only one initiating guru,⁷⁹ but that one also requires instructing gurus (*śikṣā-guru*), without whom one cannot attain “specific scriptural knowledge” (*śāstrīya-vijñāna*).⁸⁰ Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī, on the other hand, explains that “the guru merely offers teachings, but the instructing guru (*śikṣā-guru*) explains the way in which one should worship and so on.”⁸¹ Though the division is thus widely accepted, there is some disagreement on what exactly the roles are of these two types of gurus: for Śrīnātha the initiating guru is essential for those who desire to know Kṛṣṇa and the instructing gurus are other great Vaiṣṇavas who one may have met, whereas both Jīva and Gopāla Bhaṭṭa seem to put much more emphasis on the latter. For Jīva, the

instructing gurus are those that actually teach the scriptures whereas the initiating guru gives the disciple the sacred mantras (which is why Jīva always calls him the *mantra-guru*), whereas for Gopāla Bhaṭṭa the instructing gurus actually train the disciple in the practices of devotion.

Narahari does not elaborate on their roles, but he seems to lean more to Śrīnātha's position. In the remainder of the passage, he talks mostly about the guru in the singular with whom the disciple has a very distinct relationship, comparable to that of a father and son. I take this to be the initiating guru (*dīkṣā-guru*), and understand that when he refers to gurus in the plural, he is thinking of other senior Vaiṣṇavas who may also teach his disciple, though they are not the disciple's principal guru, who thus resemble Śrīnātha's instructing gurus (*śikṣā-guru*). Whereas in Jīva's exposition the initiating guru's importance is primarily related to initiation and the giving of the mantras that are necessary for the worship of Kṛṣṇa, Narahari considers him to be the disciple's principal teacher, whose teachings are supplemented by those of other Vaiṣṇavas. If his initiating guru proves to be a "weak" Vaiṣṇava, the disciple can turn to his instructing gurus, the other Vaiṣṇavas in his community, but if they too lack the ability, he can look for instructing gurus elsewhere.

In other words, Narahari considers a disciple to have a single guru who initiates and guides him in his worship of Kṛṣṇa, but urges his readers to understand their guru's place in the broader Vaiṣṇava community to which he belongs. The analogy he draws with the extended family is apt: the guru is part of a larger family, and the disciple has to learn to respect his own guru as well as the senior members of his guru's community, whether they are his (junior *and* senior) "siblings" or indeed his guru. Here Narahari tries to strike a fine balance. Though a disciple's guru is worthy of the greatest respect—because he is his guru—the disciple should nevertheless also recognize that there might be others who are equally worthy of respect, and some who, objectively, are worthy even of greater respect. The disciple should therefore both have a total devotion to his own guru—only he is served "with body, mind, and words"—as well as an openness to the teachings of other gurus, which should nevertheless always be received through one's own guru. Even if all Vaiṣṇavas are equal, and even if, in that equality, his own guru is not at the top of the hierarchy, still, one's own guru is for the disciple the most important of all the Vaiṣṇavas, and he should regard him as his very life, irrespective of his own qualification.

Can the Guru be Rejected?

In the above passage, Narahari stresses that the guru should be honored even

when others disrespect him, and even if he has no virtues. However, the guru is not beyond reproach. Narahari continues:

However, if the guru does something unbecoming, then one should reprimand him in private with doctrines (*siddhānta*) established by reasoning. But one should not renounce him. I disagree with those who argue that the guru should be punished, for it is said: “It is ordained that a disgraced guru who has gone astray and does not know what is to be done and not to be done should be punished with the rod of reason.”⁸²

Narahari seems here more forgiving than some of his contemporaries. In the *Bhakti-sandarbha* (238), Jīva Gosvāmī cites a verse from the *Mahābhārata* that is nearly identical to the verse Narahari cites, but with an opposite purport: such an ignorant and wayward guru should not be “punished with the rod of reason,” as Narahari advocates, but just plainly “rejected.”⁸³ It should be emphasized, though, that for Jīva the guru described here has become “hostile to Vaiṣṇavas” (*vaiṣṇava-vidveṣṭī*),⁸⁴ whereas Narahari seems to apply it rather to a guru who has merely, and perhaps accidentally, strayed from the path. Narahari’s conciliatory tone finds echoes in other early Gauḍīya texts—most notably the *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa*⁸⁵—but is also the logical outcome of his view that the guru is, first and foremost, a Vaiṣṇava. Whatever transgressions there might be, they do not disqualify a Vaiṣṇava from being a guru, and are therefore, ultimately, to be overlooked. The disciple should remain loyal to the guru, and help him—in private—to get back on the right path, by, essentially, offering back to the guru what he has taught the disciple in the past.

However, Narahari does impose limits on this. Not all transgressions should be tolerated, and it is appropriate to reject one’s guru in some circumstances. He writes:

Naturally, the very foundation of a Vaiṣṇava is to seek refuge in Kṛṣṇa. They live to sing his virtues, describe his fame, and narrate the joy of his pastimes and play. To do this, they all either listen to the guru or act in accordance with their own intelligence. This is the method.

If the guru acts contrary to this, because he is confused about the Lord, is averse to Kṛṣṇa’s fame and does not accept his pastimes and play, or if he himself is obnoxiously arrogant and, applauded by the common people, imitates Kṛṣṇa, then he certainly should be rejected. I disagree with those who question how one can reject the guru. One seeks refuge in the guru out of a strong desire for love of Kṛṣṇa, in order to obtain Kṛṣṇa. If later on a demonic mentality manifest in the guru, what is one to do? One should reject the demon guru and wor-

ship another guru who possesses devotion to Śrī Kṛṣṇa. His power, which comes from Kṛṣṇa, will crush the power of this demon guru. This is the deliberation of the worship of the Vaiṣṇavas. This has been witnessed often during the descent of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya. This is the doctrine (*siddhānta*) concerning the guru.⁸⁶

It is in this final section, perhaps, that we see why Narahari does not grant the guru a special position. The disciple approaches a guru for guidance in the practice of devotion, but when the guru ceases to teach devotion—either because he is confused, envious, or desires prestige—there is no reason why the disciple should continue to follow such a guru. The very reason for their relationship no longer exists. Because the guru is a Vaiṣṇava among Vaiṣṇavas minor transgressions should be excused if also rectified, since these would make him a bad Vaiṣṇava, but still a Vaiṣṇava. Major transgressions, however, which make him lose his Vaiṣṇavism, also make him lose his status as guru.

The Fate of the Gauḍīya Tradition

Narahari’s final comment—“This has been witnessed often during the descent of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya”—is striking, and it is somewhat unclear to what he refers. Some of the early hagiographies mention Vaiṣṇavas who departed from common Vaiṣṇava norms. Vṛndāvanadāsa’s *Caitanya-bhāgavata*, for example, briefly mentions some Vaiṣṇava leaders in eastern Bengal who claimed to be divine,⁸⁷ and though later hagiographies, like Nityānandadāsa’s *Prema-vilāsa*, claim that at least some of these were what we could call Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas before they were ostracized from the community (in some cases by Caitanya himself, according to Nityānandadāsa),⁸⁸ nothing in Vṛndāvanadāsa’s account suggests that they were even remotely part of Caitanya’s entourage. Did Narahari have such “outsiders” in mind—other Vaiṣṇava leaders who contended with Caitanya’s divinity—or did he see this primarily as a threat from within Caitanya’s community? It is hard to say, and perhaps the answer is both. At the end of the *Bhajanāmṛta*, however, Narahari returns to the topic of deviant Vaiṣṇava leaders, and in that context he is quite clear about the internal nature of the threat. Having discussed all the theological topics he set out to cover in this work, Narahari writes:

I will describe something else that is somewhat confidential. When Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya and Śrī Nityānanda will end their divine descent, there will be great destruction, as we see that when a god or a king is overthrown, misfortune will befall the citizens. Day after day, truly all the great Vaiṣṇavas will go to meet their Lord. A few will stay, but even they will withdraw their power. Only rarely will they reveal their inner, hidden love (*prema*), but that even the great cannot

understand. The singing of Hari's name will become scarce. Association with saints (*sat-saiṅga*) will become scarce. The service of the Lord will be ever more neglected.⁸⁹

Narahari then predicts how Vaiṣṇavas will be of four kinds: devotees who care about worldly action (*karma*) and *dharma*; those that are not interested in worldly action and *dharma*; perfect *yogīs*; and those that dress like them.⁹⁰ When this will happen, “great Vaiṣṇavas, seeing the spots in the [moon]light of the path of devotion, will faint and be unable to either reprimand or endorse. But I will now state exactly what Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya said on this topic to Sārvabhauma, in answer to his questions in their conversation.”⁹¹ Caitanya's and Sārvabhauma's authority is thus invoked here again, but much more powerfully: what Narahari is about to say is not just inspired by the dream he had, but is the actual content of their conversation!

Of the four types of Vaiṣṇavas that will emerge among Caitanya's followers, two are deplorable. These are those that care about *dharma* and worldly action (*karma*) and those that dress like perfect *yogīs*. Only the perfect *yogīs* are to be followed, but those who do not care for *dharma* and worldly action, though far from perfect, are at least on the right track.

Why are those Vaiṣṇavas who care for *dharma* and worldly action to be shunned? They engage in Vaiṣṇava practices, “like attending Kṛṣṇa's image (*sevā*) and singing (*kīrtana*)” alongside their worldly duties, Narahari explains, but come to value the latter more than the former, and then begin to teach that to other people as well. Thus, Narahari explains, such a Vaiṣṇava

ruins the good sense of the common people. Now, because common people think that the teachings of Vaiṣṇavas who act in accordance with *dharma* are respectable, they become deluded. With their meagre intellect they doubt the disinterested perfect *yogīs*, since one cannot know his heart, and thus they are ruined. Therefore, they consider a Vaiṣṇava great based on worldly conduct, not because he is a great *parama-haṁsa*.

The worldly religiosity (*dharma* and *karma*) are mistaken for devotion, because the common people cannot understand the nature of pure devotion, embodied by the perfect *yogī*. As Narahari explains, “for worldly people one who cares about worldly action is great, but for saintly people one who cares about Kṛṣṇa is great.”⁹² Worldly people have difficulty understanding the perfect *yogīs* because their love (*prema*) is hidden and difficult to understand even for great Vaiṣṇavas, but also because they often act in violation of social norms. It is not that such a perfect *yogī* intentionally disregards worldly action, however. He does not violate

the social norms found in various sacred texts because he has no respect for them, but rather because “he is not aware of *dharmā* or worldly action. Because his heart is deeply immersed in contemplation of the artful emotions of the pleasure of the play of the great glory of the *rasa* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, he seems absolutely drunk on wine, and has therefore, as it were, lost his memory. Such things as worldly action and *dharmā* cannot find room in his heart.”⁹³ Rather, he is fully immersed in devotion, and “constantly talks of Kṛṣṇa’s acts, or sings them, or listens to them, or meditates, or dances.”⁹⁴ Such Vaiṣṇavas faint, and cry, and tremble, and roar, and laugh, and are so absorbed in thought of Kṛṣṇa that they even forget themselves.

Those Vaiṣṇavas who are disinterested in worldly duties, but have not attained the full absorption of the perfect *yogīs* may have a similar devotion, but can only imitate the perfect *yogīs*. Their faith is fixed in Kṛṣṇa, not in worldly duties, but they struggle on the spiritual path. As Narahari explains, “sometimes he thinks himself to be the master and falls into sensual enjoyment, and cannot extract himself from that and thus he becomes attached to such enjoyment. And when he has become attached, he may sometimes slip from the path. This can lead to the imperfect *yogī*’s great ruin; however, devotion will manifest at a later time, even for one who has slipped, either by the greatness of the Lord’s qualities or by seeing a saint.”⁹⁵ Narahari later states that the danger that they will stray from the path and become indifferent if not inimical to devotional practices and desire only sense enjoyment is very real indeed, but they are not beyond hope.

This is not so for the last category, those “who dress like perfect *yogīs*.” Narahari is perhaps harshest on them. Such people, he explains, “only proclaim devotion to Kṛṣṇa,” but “under the pretext of praising Hari” they pursue “the joys of various pleasures” and “resembling that of the perfect *yogīs*, they display their pastimes as they desire, and delude all materialistic people. Moreover,” he continues,

those who dress themselves [like perfect *yogīs*] devour the common people with a variety of pastimes (*vilāsa*)—those very same joys of the pastimes of deceitful pleasures with which they delude these people! With such ceaseless taste for sensual enjoyment, they become sensual enjoyers of sensual enjoyers. Vaiṣṇavas, because of their nobility, will not go near them.⁹⁶ These [pretenders] seek refuge only in wicked and materialistic villagers, and they associate only with materialistic people. Sometimes, their hair bristles and they display love with great passion, but without the greatness of Kṛṣṇa’s excellences—like actors with superficial *rasa*. In this way they will reach ruin, day by day, and they will be reviled by Vaiṣṇavas. Therefore the devotees of Viṣṇu criticize those companies of people that detest discussing or associating with Vaiṣṇavas.⁹⁷

Narahari's depiction of these pretender Vaiṣṇavas is interesting, and to some extent matches the depictions of deviant Vaiṣṇavas found in Gauḍīya hagiographies, who are said to have associated with low-caste village people, and engaged in "depraved" practices. However, as noted earlier, those deviant Vaiṣṇavas all claimed to be divine, whereas the people Narahari condemns here do not do so—rather they claim to be exemplary Vaiṣṇavas. In an insightful article, Lucian Wong has argued that such narratives of deviant Vaiṣṇavas could be taken as "expressive of a polemic against Sahajiyā currents, even if only by implication."⁹⁸ It is hard to determine to what extent there were *sahajiyā* currents within the Gauḍīya tradition at the time of Narahari, or even if there were what shape they would have taken, but it is indeed tempting to read Narahari's denouncement of these pretenders in that light, even if only implicitly—and doubtlessly that is how it has been read by subsequent generations of Gauḍīyas. Though Narahari does not talk of sexual practices—the hallmark of Sahajiyā Vaiṣṇavas—much of what he says about "those that dress like perfect yogīs" can be read as such, particularly his claim that they become "sensual enjoyers of sensual enjoyers."

Whoever these Vaiṣṇava pretenders are in Narahari's mind, they are clearly an internal threat, as are the others he denounces here. Some members of Caitanya's tradition, he fears, will compromise their devotion and become far too concerned with worldly duties, while others will pretend to be immersed in devotional practices and to have attained the highest states of devotional rapture while thirsting for sensual enjoyment and adoration. Both are particularly a threat, in Narahari's mind, because people with little understanding of devotion will be attracted to them and look to them as gurus. Narahari emphasizes in both cases the evil such individuals will inflict upon the common people. The Vaiṣṇavas too preoccupied with worldly religion will "ruin the intelligence of the common people," and the people will be deluded because they think that the teachings of such a dharmic Vaiṣṇava should be honored. Similarly, those who dress like perfect *yogīs* will delude people with their public display of pretended ecstasies, and lead all their followers astray.

As Joseph T. O'Connell has remarked, the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas "by and large have tended to avoid institutions that would rely on centralized or coercive authority within the community of devotees." The lineages of communities that were established by and around prominent Gauḍīya gurus were "voluntary" and "non-coercive."⁹⁹ This was especially so in the early stages, and this is clearly what worries Narahari. Disciples choose their gurus freely, but who is to say they will choose the right person to be their guru? And on what grounds will they base this decision? The pure love of great Vaiṣṇavas is not just hidden, Narahari explains,

but even when revealed it is immensely difficult to understand, even by the great. Moreover, disciples will look to gurus who embody what they care about: sensualists will look to sensualists; worldly people will look to worldly Vaiṣṇavas.

Narahari does not have a naïve, rosy picture of even the early years of Caitanya's movement, as we have seen, but one thing kept the tradition together at that time: the presence of Caitanya, and the turbulent times he describes will occur when Caitanya and Nityānanda are no longer present. As he writes earlier in the text:

Wearing nothing but a loincloth and appearing poor, Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanya, adorned by the lifestyle of a monk, plunged into an ocean of love spiritualists (*adhyātma-vādi*), who are extremely wicked, powerful, and who seem as tameable as mighty bulls, as well as those blinded by sensual enjoyment, wayward *yogīs*, the dull, the perpetually drunk, sinners, *caṇḍālas*, Muslims, idiots, and noble women, and by [immersing them in] bliss he placed them above Vaikuṅṭha. With a flood of love he washed clean the minds of all, and pulverized their demonic mentality.¹⁰⁰

Caitanya's mere person sustained others and guided the community, so what can we expect of those who have never met him? How will they give up their "demonic mentality" and embrace the principles of devotion? The sudden transition from Caitanya's sustaining charisma to a world without it is a shock that cannot but create chaos in Vaiṣṇava circles, and this chaos will only increase as the presence of great Vaiṣṇavas who knew Caitanya personally also declines.

"The Lord's only Weapon is His Love"

Narahari's vision for the future of the Gauḍīya tradition is not all gloom. After giving his dire prediction, he ends the *Bhajanāmṛta* on a more positive note. If many future Vaiṣṇavas will lead the world to spiritual ruin, there will always be some "experienced and deep devotees" as well as "those people that strive for such love" who can act as proper gurus and "enlighten everyone." They will reveal what Caitanya taught, and therefore, "one should give up the listlessness [that arises from the thought] that the divine descent is over, since Śrī Kṛṣṇa Caitanyacandra is the embodiment of love and affection. If love and affection are here offered, then there will certainly also be devotion to the Lord of all divine descents."¹⁰¹

In other words, even after his departure from this world, Caitanya will continue to be present in the love of these devotees, since he is the very embodiment of that love. These great Vaiṣṇavas will teach people to "sing Hari's names, serve

Hari, associate with the saints, worship great souls, and show love and affection to all.” As time goes on, they will spread the “artful play of the pastimes of the fame of their own Lord” throughout the earth.¹⁰² Though they will barely be able to bear the pain of Caitanya’s absence and they will thus appear “dead though still breathing,” they will deliver all living beings, for “by their own suffering, the saints destroy the sufferings of others.” “The opulence, life, and joy of the saints is the well-being of others.”¹⁰³

Narahari concludes:

Therefore, pay attention everyone: wherever there is the longing for love (*prīti*), wherever there is an inclination to talk of Kṛṣṇa, wherever Hari is praised, wherever there is a desire to hear the descriptions of Hari’s fame, wherever people applaud Kṛṣṇa and the Vaiṣṇavas—in all those places may they become devoted to him! May they show love to all! Therefore, day by day, everyone will become entirely perfect. The Lord’s only weapon is his love and affection. If that arises, then all—even the unhappy—will be happy. One should not despair.¹⁰⁴

Thus, gurus alone cannot be the guardians of the tradition. As Narahari teaches here, only sustained and sincere dedication to devotional practices will be able to preserve Caitanya’s teachings, because they will lead to the love (*prīti*) that Caitanya embodied. In O’Connell’s words, it is these “soft institutions,” the “symbolic means of articulating loving devotion to Kṛṣṇa” that are “bound up with the production and utilization of religious literature (*sāhitya* and *sāstra*) and with a complex repertoire of recommended devotional practices (*sādhana*)”¹⁰⁵ that have acquired a greater authority in Narahari’s teachings. Though these are closely tied to and disseminated by the traditional forms of authority—gurus and their lineages—O’Connell argues that in the case of the Gauḍīya tradition these lineages only had authority in combination with those soft institutions. He writes:

What is especially significant [. . .] is that those traditional institutions that acquired some share of the authority radiating from Caitanya and his associates also managed to retain something of the charismatic quality of that authority. This perpetuation of charismatic authority in combination with traditional institutions of authority was fostered systematically by the development of a dense repertoire of soft institutions. Such charismatic-cum-traditional institutions provided a familiar and stable, yet flexible, framework within which to celebrate and perpetuate the charismatic experience of Caitanya and his entourage in the collective devotional life of the Vaiṣṇavas.¹⁰⁶

As we have seen, Narahari is skeptical of the survival of the tradition if it relies merely on the authority of gurus, and though he does advocate for a continuation

through charismatic authority (the perfect *yogīs* and true Vaiṣṇavas), he is equally emphatic about the need for authority that arises from devotional practice. Not only is the charismatic authority sustained by such practice, but it will also give rise to it. Indeed, a guru's authority is entirely derived from it; when he ceases to practice Vaiṣṇava devotion, he ceases to be a guru and loses his authority. The two types of leaders Narahari fears will become prominent in the future—worldly Vaiṣṇavas and pretenders—fail precisely because they fail in this regard: the former because they care more about worldly religious practices, the latter because they have not internalized those practices.

According to Narahari, Caitanya's charisma, which sustained the tradition during his presence, is thus not to be "routinized" through any form of institution or tradition, but is to be attained by individuals through sincere and continuous devotional practice by which they can attain Caitanya's love and thereby embody him. However one may judge Narahari's views themselves, I suggest that they are important in understanding the dynamics of the post-Caitanya Gauḍīya tradition, because what Narahari advocates here is precisely how several Vaiṣṇavas of subsequent generations saw the development of the tradition.

For example, Kavikarṇapūra, whose father Śivānanda Sena seems to have had an affinity for Narahari and the other Śrīkhaṇḍa Vaiṣṇavas, does precisely this in the *Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā*. This work, written in 1576, records how the early Gauḍīya communities saw Caitanya and his associates, and is therefore primarily concerned with the past, but Kavikarṇapūra also indicates how they looked at the prominent Vaiṣṇavas who led the various communities in Caitanya's absence at the time when the work was written. Thus he writes that the body of Virabhadra, Nityānanda's son and an important leader in his own right, is "non-different from Caitanya,"¹⁰⁷ and he describes Advaitācārya in the exact same terms;¹⁰⁸ Raghunandana, who as we have seen became the leader of the Vaiṣṇavas of Śrīkhaṇḍa, has "a body that is non-dual (*advaita*) from Caitanya";¹⁰⁹ and Sanātana Gosvāmī, the leader of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas in Vraja, he sees in the same way, as one "whose body is non-different from Gaura."¹¹⁰

In the *Caitanya-candrodaya* Kavikarṇapūra also elaborates on how Caitanya manifests himself through his devotees through "possession" (*āveśa*). Kavikarṇapūra tells how his father, Śivānanda Sena—himself a prominent devotee of Caitanya—heard that people worshipped Nakula Brahmācārī—a rather unknown Vaiṣṇava from a small village—as the embodiment of Caitanya. People flocked to see Nakula, but Śivānanda was skeptical: "What is the point of seeing him? I can see the Lord directly. Will the joy I'll get from seeing this person be anything like the joy of beholding him? Certainly not!"¹¹¹ But when Śivānanda finally meets

Nakula his misgivings are quickly removed, and he realizes that his Lord can indeed reveal himself through other Vaiṣṇavas. The story is instructive, because it suggests that already during Caitanya's time his devotees saw other Vaiṣṇavas as embodying him, even if there might have been also some skepticism about this. Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, writing in far away Vraja, retells the story a few decades after Kavikarṇapūra, but also generalizes it. Caitanya delivered all whom he met, Kṛṣṇadāsa explains, but many could not meet him. "To save all of them and those in all countries, the Lord possessed the body of living beings who are worthy devotees. In those living beings he revealed his own devotion, and by seeing them, people in all countries became Vaiṣṇavas."¹¹²

We see the same in Kṛṣṇadāsa's image of the tree. "By his inconceivable potency," Kṛṣṇadāsa writes, Caitanya is the trunk of the tree, as well as the gardener, as well as "the immortal tree of love for Kṛṣṇa" itself.¹¹³ Caitanya connects the various branches of the Vaiṣṇava community, through himself, with each other; he nourishes and cares for every branch; and all of the branches represent him. The tree's fruits are the fruits of Caitanya's love, yet Caitanya himself urges all the branches and sub-branches to perform his task of giving them to the world. Later on, Kṛṣṇadāsa also illustrates this negatively. One group of Advaita's sons, he writes, deviated from their father's teachings, and "fabricated their own ideas."¹¹⁴ As a result, that branch became "sapless" (*asāra*); the branch withered and fell from the tree.¹¹⁵ As long as the branch represents Caitanya, it belongs to the tree and is able to grant the fruits of love. But when it only represents itself, it dies.

Conclusion

In the beginning of the *Bhajanāmṛta*, Narahari expresses concern for the future generations of Vaiṣṇavas who he fears will be haunted by doubts and, as becomes clear by the end of the *Bhajanāmṛta*, will be surrounded by misguided or deviant leaders. It is for their sake, he writes, that he decided to set out some theological ideas that he considers prone to misunderstanding (including the position of the guru), but as we have seen he advocates more than just these doctrines. The only way to preserve these, according to Narahari, is by exemplary Vaiṣṇavas who through committed spiritual practice have internalized the tradition's essence: Caitanya and his boundless love.

Narahari's teachings on the guru have to be seen in this light. The guru should, ideally, become one of those "deep devotees" who embody love, but even if he doesn't, he is not necessarily disqualified, as we have seen, as long as he is a Vaiṣṇava who strives for such love. What is remarkable about Narahari's exposition on the guru is that he constantly urges the disciple to be faithful to the guru

yet to simultaneously to also look beyond him. The disciple should have faith in his guru, but should also broaden that faith to include the wider Vaiṣṇava community to which his guru belongs, and should ground that faith also in the devotional practices taught by Caitanya and his devotees. It is these practices that will lead him to Caitanya's love, and where that love manifests true devotion to Caitanya, "the Lord of divine descents," will naturally follow. Caitanya's tradition is thus kept alive in this love, and that love is Caitanya's only weapon. As Narahari states at the end of the *Bhajanāmṛta*: "Kṛṣṇa is the wealth of the world, and the Vaiṣṇavas are this even more so. Better even than them are love and affection (*prīti-prema*). There is nothing higher than love."¹¹⁶

Endnotes

1. See *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.9-12. This image is derived from Kavikarṇapūra's *Caitanya-candrodaya* (p. 3).
2. *mahā-mahā-sākhā chāila brahmāṇḍa sakala* (*Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.9.18).
3. *śrī-nityānanda-vṛkṣera skandha gurutara* (*Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.11.5).
4. *prema-phula-phale bhari chāila bhuvana* (*Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.11.6).
5. *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.12.4-6.
6. *śrī-gadādhara-panḍita śākhāte mahottama* (*Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.12.79).
7. *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.9.32-33.
8. Stewart, *The Final Word*, p. 242.
9. *śiṣya, praśiṣya, āra upaśiṣya-gaṇa* (*Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.9.24). See also *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.10.16, 1.10.160.
10. See Broo, *As Good as God*, pp. 60ff.
11. See, especially, Tony K. Stewart's *The Final Word: The Caitanya Caritāmṛta and the Grammar of Religious Tradition* (Oxford University Press, 2010).
12. See *Gaura-gaṇodeśa-dīpikā* 87. Acyutānanda is also listed as one of Caitanya's direct branches (see *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.10.150), since he met Caitanya several times and is said to have had staunch devotion to him (see *Caitanya-bhāgavata* 3.1.213-220, 3.4.135-208).
13. *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.10.125
14. See *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 3.6.233; see also *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.5.202, 1.10.92-93, and 3.6.189ff. Raghunāthadāsa himself acknowledges this in his own writings; see *Mukta-caritra* 4, *Manah-śikṣā* 3, *Gaurāṅga-stava-kalpa-vṛkṣa* 11, *Vilāpa-kusumāñjali* 5, and *Sva-niyama-daśaka* 1.
15. See *Vilāpa-kusumāñjali* 4; in several of his works he also offers his respects to his (unnamed) guru, presumably Yadunandana: see *Manah-śikṣā* 1 and *Mukta-caritra* 4. See also Kavikarṇapūra's description of Raghunāthadāsa in the *Caitanya-candrodaya* (10.3): *ācārya yadunandanaḥ su-madhuraḥ śrī-vāsudeva-priyas, tac-chiṣyo raghunātha ity adhiguṇaḥ prāñadhiko māḍṣām*.
16. See *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.12.56. To complicate this even more, Yadunandana was a disciple of Vāsudeva Datta (see 1.12.57), who is listed as an independent branch of the tree (see

1.10.42), and Svarūpa Dāmodara's (*sannyāsa*-)guru was Caitanyānanda, who was likely an Advaitin from Vārāṇasi (see *Caitanya-candrodaya* p. 92 and *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 2.10.103-105).

17. *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.10.61-62.

18. *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.10.107

19. See *Caitanya-candrodaya* pp. 121-22, *Prema-vilāsa* p. 233, *Advaita-maṅgala* p. 97, 144.

20. As indeed Kṛṣṇadāsa acknowledges earlier in the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*: see 1.1.32ff.

21. Yadunandana was Raghunāthadāsa's guru already before he ran away from home to join Caitanya in Purī, when Svarūpa Dāmodara became his mentor.

22. See *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 2.15.120-127.

23. Indeed, though Mukunda is praised as a great devotee himself, he is said to have regarded Raghunandana as his guru: see *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 2.15.113-127. Rāmagopālādāsa, a late seventeenth century Vaiṣṇava in Raghunandana's line and author of the *Śākhā-nirṇaya*, which lists the most prominent Vaiṣṇavas of the community, claims that Mukunda had many disciples of his own (*mukundadāsa rāja-vaidyera yata śākhā haya, kāyāra śaka tāhā vivariyā kaya*, p. 205), but he lists only Narahari's and Raghunandana's disciples.

24. Haridāsa Dāsa claims he was born in either 1401 or 1402 *śaka*; see *Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Abhidhāna*, p. 1267. See also Ṭhākura, *Śrīkhaṇḍera Pracīna Vaiṣṇava*, p. 3.

25. *gaurāṅga janmera āge, vividha rāgini rāge, vraja-rasa karilena gāna* (*Gaura-pada-taraṅgini* 6.3.12).

26. See Murāri Gupta's *Kṛṣṇa-caitanya-caritāmṛta* 4.17.9-13, Kavikarṇapūra's *Caitanya-caritāmṛta-mahā-kāvya* 13.148, *Caitanya-candrodaya* 9.1, and *Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā* 177 & 209. Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja mentions Narahari more often than all the hagiographers together, though most of these are just brief mentions: *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.10.78-79, 2.1.132, 2.10.90, 2.11.92, 2.13.46, 2.15.112ff, 2.16.18, 3.10.60.

27. See *Caitanya-maṅgala* p. 157, 165-67, 195, 202, 217, 266. Locanadāsa also offers obeisance to Narahari at the beginning and end of nearly each section.

28. There are several Sanskrit verses cited in the *Sādhana-dīpikā* that suggest their intimate relationship. One is ascribed to none other than Svarūpa Dāmodara: *avani-sura-varaḥ śrī-pañḍitākhyo yatindraḥ, sa khalu bhavati rādā śrīla-gaurāvatāre / narahari-sarakārasyaṅgī dāmodarasya, prabhu-nija-dayitānām tac ca sāraṅ mataṅ me* (p. 129); and there is this anonymous verse: *gadādhara-prāṇa-tulyo naraharis tasya so'dyataḥ, ubhayoḥ prāṇanāthaḥ śrī-kṛṣṇa-caitanya īsvaraḥ* (p. 155). This last verse echoes the invocation to each section of Locanadāsa's *Caitanya-maṅgala*: *jaya narahari-gadādhara-prāṇa-nātha / kṛpā kari kara prabhu śubha dṛṣṭi-pāta* (p. 153, 291; cf. p. 59).

29. *prabhura dakṣiṇa pāśe, nāce narahari dāse, vāme nāce priya gadādhara* (*Gaura-pada-taraṅgini* 5.1.7); for the same image, see also *Gaura-pada-taraṅgini* 4.2.22 (*vāme rahu paṇḍita, priya gadādhara, dakṣiṇe naraharidāsa*), 5.1.48 and 4.2.80 (*gadādhara vāme dāhine narahari*). See also Locanadāsa's *Caitanya-maṅgala* p. 195: *gadādhara narahari dui dike rahe*; p. 202: *gadādhara narahari vaise dui pāśe*.

30. *vraja-rasa gāyata narahari saṅge, mukunda murāri vāsu nācata raṅge* (*Gaura-pada-taraṅgini* 5.1.61). The song has the signature Śivānanda, which can refer to either Śivānanda

Sena or Śivānanda Cakravartī (a disciple of Gadādhara who lived in Vraja).

31. Majumdar, *Śrī-caitanya-caritera Upādāna*, p. 53.

32. See *Caitanya-bhāgavata* 1.15.28-31. However, a song attributed to Vṛndāvanadāsa (and already cited in Rādhākṛṣṇa's *Sādhana-dīpikā*, p. 150) mentions Narahari alongside Gadādhara (*Gaura-pada-taraṅginī* 4.2.22, cited above), and another mentions Raghunandana (*Gaura-pada-taraṅginī* 4.2.23).

33. It is important to keep in mind, however, that the term *gaura-nāgara* has come to cover a wide range of views. The scenes depicted in Narahari's songs of Navadvīpa's women falling in love with Caitanya upon mere sight, are quite different from the erotic tone found in some of the writings of later, nineteenth century *gaura-nāgaris*, such as Siddha Caitanyadāsa, in which the entire amorous world of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa and their attendant *gopīs* is projected onto Caitanya (see, for example, *Pratyaiṅga-varṇana-bhāvāmṛta*, p. 16).

34. There are also several vernacular *gaura-nāgara* songs ascribed to Murāri Gupta: see *Gaura-pada-taraṅginī* 3.2.47-48. Though Narahari is named only once, Murāri does include a reference to the "residents of Khaṇḍa, headed by Raghunandana" (*khaṇḍa-sthitāḥ śrī-raghunandanādayaḥ...*, 4.5.1).

35. *gacchan yaḥ pathi khaṇḍa-saṁjñā-nagare caitanya-candra-priyaṁ, natvā śrī-sarakāra-ṭhākura-varaṁ nītvā tad-ājñāṁ tathā / tat-paścād raghunandanasya caraṇaṁ natvā gato yaḥ smaran, so'yaṁ me karuṇā-nidhir vijayate śrī-śrīnivāsaḥ prabhuh* (*Guṇa-leśa-sūcaka* 10). Cf. *Bhakti-ratnākara* 4.149-155 and *Narottama-vilāsa* p. 12.

36. See *Prema-vilāsa* pp. 19ff. By contrast, neither Mahoharadāsa's *Anurāga-vallī* nor Yadunandanadāsa's *Karṇānanda* (two other hagiographies of Śrīnivāsa) give much prominence to Narahari.

37. See *Bhakti-ratnākara* 2.215-226, 3.32-49, 3.298-304.

38. See *Prema-vilāsa* p. 104, where Śrīnivāsa says upon hearing the sad news: *śrī-mukhera ājñā haila vṛndāvana yāite, āsī adarśana haila hena daśā mora*.

39. See *Bhakti-ratnākara* 7.551-594.

40. See *Śrīnivāsācārya-grantha-mālā* pp. 12-14. There are also several Sanskrit verses ascribed to Śrīnivāsa in praise of Raghunandana cited in various texts; see *Śrīnivāsācārya-grantha-mālā* pp. 17-18.

41. *dhana mora nityānanda, pati mora gauracandra, prāṇa mora yugala-kīśora / advaita ācārya bala, gadādhara mora kula, narahari vilāsai mora* (*Gaura-pada-taraṅginī* 6.4.17). This substitution is not so uncommon; see Stewart, *The Final Word*, pp. 136-137, 162. In the *Bhakti-ratnākara*, Narottama is also said to have met Narahari after his return to Bengal: see *Bhakti-ratnākara* 8.419-433.

42. It is unclear when Śrīnivāsa was born. Haridāsa Dāsa claims he was born in 1519 (*Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Abhidhāna*, p. 1392), while, on the other extreme, Rādhāmādhava Tarkatīrtha argues for the year 1585 as the year of his birth ("Śrīnivāsa Ācārya", pp. 194-198). Nityānandadāsa's claim that Śrīnivāsa was born shortly after Caitanya's passing (in 1533) does not seem unreasonable (see *Prema-vilāsa* p. 212).

43. See Lutjeharms, *The Gosvāmīs of Vṛndāvana and Caitanya*. Narahari is also praised in

some songs composed by Vaiṣṇavas residing in Vṛndāvana, like Paramānanda Bhaṭṭācārya, a disciple of Rūpa and Sanātana: see, for example, *Gaura-pada-taraṅginī* 6.4.24. In the *Sādhana-dīpikā* (p. 155) Rādhākṛṣṇa also cites a verse in praise of Narahari which he attributes to Rūpa himself: *śrī-vṛndāvana-vāsini rasavatī rādhā-ghana-śyāmayoḥ, rāsollāsa-rasātmikā madhumatī siddhānuḡā yā purā / so'yaṃ śrī-sarakāra-thakkura iha pramārtithaḥ premadaḥ, premānanda-mahodadhir vijayate śrīkhaṇḍa-bhū-khaṇḍake*. Rādhākṛṣṇa cites several more verses in praise of Narahari, which demonstrate that he was revered in Vṛndāvana by the mid-seventeenth century; see *Sādhana-dīpikā* p. 155.

44. I should perhaps state that Narahari is not the only senior Vaiṣṇava in Bengal to whom Śrīnivāsa turned. For example, Jahnavādevī and Viracandra, Nityānanda's wife and son, also played a significant role according to the hagiographies. But in Śrīnivāsa's own writings, no other Bengali Vaiṣṇava occupies such a prominent place as do Narahari and Raghunandana (they are the only ones to have played a significant role in Caitanya's life).

45. There are many more songs with the signature "Narahari" or "Naraharidāsa," but many of these are likely by Narahari Cakravartī, an eighteenth-century poet who composed several hagiographies of Śrīnivāsa and Narottama (like the *Bhakti-ratnākara* and *Narottama-vilāsa*). For more on the authorship of these songs, see Sen, *History of Brajabuli Literature*, pp. 32-35.

46. Vāsudeva Ghoṣa, another early poet, claims that he only began writing his songs after hearing Narahari's: *śrī-sarakāra-ṭhākurera padāmṛta pāne, padya prakāśiba bali icchā kaila mane* (cited in Majumdar, *Śrī-caitanya-carītera Upādāna*, p. 52).

47. Many of Narahari's songs describe the (unrequited) amorous attraction of the women of Navadvīpa for the young and handsome Gaurāṅga, that is similar to the *gopīs'* reaction to Kṛṣṇa. See, for example, *Gaura-pada-taraṅginī* 3.2.39-46, 86-110, 119-180.

48. De, *Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement*, p. 64.

49. In one song, Narahari even emphasizes the importance of the vernacular for Caitanya's devotees (*Gaura-pada-taraṅginī* 1.1.27). I give here Sukumar Sen's translation (Sen, *History of Brajabuli Literature*, p. 33): "On seeing the activities of Gaura there comes over a great desire to put them in vernacular writing. But I am extremely dull, and I do not know the proper order of writing. How can I then write it out? The person who will write this book is yet to be born, and he will be born in a much later time. If written in vernacular it will be intelligible to all. When will the Master fulfil this desire? [. . .] I write a few poems, so that some one on reading them might publish the life of the Master. Then Narahari will be immensely delighted, and all his sorrows will vanish. Even stone will melt when the book will be sung."

50. *Bhāgavata* 1.3.28 (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 4), 4.20.28 (p. 4), 10.47.60 (p. 5), 10.47.58 (p. 6), 10.47.30 (p. 9); *Bhāgavad-gītā* 2.56 (p. 8); Umāpatidhara (p. 6, cited merely as "an old one verse", *ślokaḥ ko'pi paurāṇikah*; also cited by name in Rūpa's *Padyāvalī* 371). We will discuss the unknown verse (cited on p. 3) below.

51. De, *Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement*, p. 231. This view is echoed by Māns Broo (*As Good as God*, p. 139).

52. See Sanyal, *Bāṅgalā Kīrtanera Itihāsa*, p. 132, and Chakravarti, *Vaiṣṇavism in Bengal*, pp. 196-197.

53. *śrī-kṛṣṇa-caitanya-bhāva-kalā-vimohitāḥ śrī-gadādhara-pañḍita-bhāva-darśana-samudita-gopi-gaṇa-bhāvā vedāntino'pi viśayaṇo'pi prakṛti-bhāvair nanṛtuḥ, vaiṣṇavānāṃ kā kathā* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 7). See also just before this: *puruṣān eva prakṛti-bhāvaṃ nināya*.

54. The *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (p. 334) lists but two manuscripts of the text.

55. See *Sādhana-dīpikā* p. 129, chapter 9 pp. 55-56; see also pp. 134-35, 154.

56. See *Bhakti-ratnākara* 13.175-176. It is a moving reference: just before Raghunandana passes away, he cites the opening verses of the *Bhajanāmṛta* to console Śrīnivāsa and help him see past the difficulties that the tradition may have to face in the years to come.

57. All references to the text, unless otherwise noted, are to Purīdāsa's edition. Though not a critical edition, Purīdāsa used 3 manuscripts and 3 printed texts for his edition, and records variant readings. In checking his edition with the others I have been able to find (including some Purīdāsa used for his own edition), I have found significant differences, most of which are not recorded by Purīdāsa. (I will refer to a few of these variant readings below, in footnotes.) Rādhākṛṣṇa also cites a passage from the *Bhajanāmṛta* that is not found in the printed editions of the text that I consulted, though the gist of the passage corresponds to what is found in those editions: *śrī-sarakāra-ṭhakkureṇa bhajanāmṛte—iha mataṃ me, yathā kali-yuga-pāvanāvātāra-karuṇāmaya-śrī-śrī-caitanya-candraḥ vrajārājakumāras tata-hiva niḥsīma-śuddha-praṇaya-sāra-ghanibhūta-mahābhāva-svarūpa-rasamaya-parama-dayitaḥ śrī-gadādhara eva rādhā* (*Sādhana-dīpikā* p. 129). Cf. *Bhajanāmṛta* pp. 6-7.

58. Bibliographic details of all editions known to me are given in the bibliography. Purīdāsa mentions one additional printed edition, published by the Śrī Raghunandana Samiti of Śrīkhaṇḍa in 1903 (1309 *vaṅgābda*), which I have not been able to find.

59. This view is often presented in the literature of his followers, both in print and online. See, for example, Bhaktisharan Damodar's introduction to his translation of the *Bhajanāmṛta* (p. 1), and <http://harmonist.us/2016/12/srila-bhaktisiddhanta-sarasvati-thakura/> (last accessed 22 April 2017). The other three books he is said to have recommended are Vṛndāvanadāsa's *Caitanya-bhāgavata*, Narottamadāsa's *Prema-bhakti-candrikā*, and Bhaktivinoda's *Daśa-mūla-śikṣā*.

60. That part of the text was also translated into English by Jayapatka Swami, a guru of the International Society for Krishna Consciousness, and published by The Bhaktivedanta Swami Charity Trust in the late 1980s, when ISKCON was going through a tumultuous "guru reform" after several scandals with the leading gurus in the movement. Only the first section of the *Bhajanāmṛta*, dealing with the guru, was translated, "since ISKCON, at present, specifically needs sastric direction in regard to some aspects of guru-tattva" (p. 3).

61. *kṛṣṇa-caitanya-candraṇa nityānandena saṃhṛte, avatāre kalāv asmin vaiṣṇavāḥ sarva eva hi / bhaviṣyanti sadodvignāḥ kāle kāle dine dine, prāthaḥ sandigdha-hṛdayā uttametara-madhyamāḥ / pūrva-pakṣa-sahasrāṇi kariṣyanti jane jane, teṣāṃ prabhor dhyāna-balāt siddhāntān ati-nirmalān / pravakṣyāmi samāseṇa vyāseṇa ca mahātmanāṃ, prītyai parama-haṃsānāṃ sarva-śāstra-vicāritān* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 1, verses 3-6).

62. *dāso naraharir mūrkhah siddhāntān ati-duṣkarān, katham kuryād iti mṛṣā vitarkaṃ mā kṛthā budhah / nirguṇah saḡuṇo vāpi mūrkhah paṇḍita eva vā, kṛṣṇa-bhakti-vicāre'smin kaḥ samaryo'sti bhūtale / akasmān nidritaḥ svapne kathayāmi kathām imām, pūrva-pakṣāṃś ca siddhāntāṃś tatraiva vimṛśāmy aham / hṛdi prasannatā jātā sudhā-sindhūm ivāśritaḥ, samaye'smin gauracandraḥ prādur āsīt smitānanaḥ / sārva-bhauma-karālabhī sādhu sādhu iti sammukhe, evam eva yad bravīṣi jāgrhīti bruvan yayau / tata utthāya śayyāyā dhyātvā tac-caraṇāmbujam, ātmānaṃ durgataṃ śocyamī tyakta-tac-caraṇāmbujam / mene dhanyam ivātmānaṃ prabhoḥ sa-karuṇaṃ vacaḥ, smṛtvā ca mahad-aīśvaryaṃ na jāne kim abhūt tadā* (*Bhajanāmṛta* pp. 1-2, verses 7-15).

63. See, for example, Kavikarṇapūra's *Caitanya-candrodaya* pp. 77-79.

64. It is tempting to see in this a precursor to the doctrine of the "five truths" (*pañca-tattva*), first fully articulated by Kavikarṇapūra in the *Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā* in 1576, but already hinted at in earlier texts (see *Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā* 6-12, *Kṛṣṇa-caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.4.1-33; Kavikarṇapūra claims that the doctrine was first taught by Svarūpa Dāmodara). This doctrine establishes that when Kṛṣṇa descends into the world as Caitanya, he does so in five different forms: with the appearance of his devotee (*bhakta-rūpa*, i.e. Caitanya/Kṛṣṇa), his essential form of a devotee (*svarūpa*, i.e. Nityānanda/Balarāma), a divine descent of a devotee (*bhaktāvātāra*, i.e. Advaita/Sadāśiva), the potency of his devotee (*bhakta-śakti*, i.e. Gadādhara/Rādhā), and his devotee proper (*bhakta*, exemplified by Śrīvāsa and others). All these are in a way treated in the *Bhajanāmṛta*, perhaps with the exception of Advaita/Sadāśiva.

65. *śrī-kṛṣṇa-nāma-balāt kalau sarva eva vaiṣṇavāḥ samāḥ kṛṣṇopamāḥ* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 2). It is difficult to determine how popular this view was in Narahari's time. Though Narahari claims this is the view of "a very well established tradition" (*iti smṛtiḥ prasiddhaiva*, *Bhajanāmṛta* p. 2), I have not encountered the view in any other (Bengali) text of this period, apart from the fairly common requests for forgiveness when listing various Vaiṣṇavas, such as this one from Kṛṣṇadāsa at the beginning of his description of the tree of devotion: "No one can distinguish degrees of higher or lower. Therefore, I offer my obeisance to all of them, so that in listing their names, I do not cause offense." (*keha karibāre nāre jyeṣṭha-laghu-krama / ataeva tān-sabāre kari namaskāra, nāma-mātra kari doṣa nā labe āmāra*, *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.10.5-6). See also *Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā* 212.

66. *na hi yathā vāḍavāgnau jvalati pradīpāgniṃ jñānavanta ādau nirvāpayanti, vāḍavāgnau nirvāpīte pradīpāgniṃ sukheṇa nirvāpayanti* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 2).

67. *na nindā vaiṣṇave kāryā nāvahelā pramādataḥ, na duḥkhaṃ maraṇe'pi syād yadi vaiṣṇava-kāraṇāt / na doṣā vaiṣṇave dṛśyāḥ karmācāraḥ vilokanāt, karmācāra-viśuddhā vā ke santi kalim arditāḥ* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 2). I follow here Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda's reading of the first verse; the second half of the first verse in Purīdāsa's edition reads (unmetrically) *na duḥkhaṃ maraṇaṃ vāpi syād yadi vaiṣṇava-kāraṇāt*; Bhaktivinoda reads *na duḥkhaṃ maraṇe'pi vā yadi vaiṣṇava-kāraṇāt*.

68. *yato vaiṣṇavāṅge kṛṣṇāgnir vartate, śrī-kṛṣṇa-dhyāna-balāt pātakāni patituṃ na samarthāni, patitāny api kṛṣṇāgnau daḡdhānīti* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 3).

69. *ajānatām tu sakala-gaṅgāyām ekaivaurmir iti sabalābala-vaiṣṇave samataiva pūjety upasāṅhārah (Bhajanāmṛta p. 3).*

70. Bhaktivinoda has a slightly different reading: *guror eva guruḥ* (instead of *gurur eva guruḥ*). In his translation he renders it as (p. 53/13): [. . .] *takhana parama-gurur pakṣai grāhya*. This reading connects with the next passage, where Narahari mentions the *parama-guru* (i.e. one's guru's guru), though it makes the passage in question less grammatically sound.

71. *sakala-vaiṣṇavā eva guravaḥ. tatra dikṣā-guravaḥ śikṣā-guravaś ca viśeṣataḥ santi, etayor eva balam ācaraṇīyam, athājñāpālanam tu tayor eva kāryam. yadi tāv alpa-balau tathāpy anyamahatām mukhāc chikṣā viśeṣam jñātvāpi gurave deyam. tad eva guruṣu paṭhanīyam na tu gurau helā kartavyā, yathā sneha-bhājana-putro'rthopārjanam pitre dattvā prārthya ca svayaṁ bhunkte. yadi svayaṁ ānīya khādati, tataḥ kuputraḥ pāpi syāt. tasmāt sarvatra vaiṣṇavānām guruḥ samādhikārā pūjā kāryā. tathāpi kāya-mano-vākyair guror eva sevanaṁ kuryāt. kārya-kāle parair guror avahelāyām guror eva gurus tat-pakṣa eva grāhyaḥ. paśya paśya, yathā pitā gurus tathā tasya bhrātā grajō'nujah, pitur adhika-pūjyo vā pituś cedātmiya eva vā, tathāpi pituḥ pitā-gurur api gurur, tasya pūjā dvi-guṇiteti śaili loka-prasiddhā, atra yadi pitarāṁ kārya-kāle ete vrthaiva garhayanti, tarhi pitaiva guruḥ, pituḥ pakṣa eva āśrayaṇīyas tad-balenaiva jīvāvalambanaṁ kāryam. pitā gurur vā patir vā nirguṇo'pi pūjya eva. eteṣāṁ balān mahadbhir jñānibhir vā saha vivaditavyaṁ ke nāma-janāḥ pituḥ kalanke jīvanti? balābalaṁ khalu-jīvanam. sarve tad-anumatam eva guru-mukhād vā sva-buddhyā vā vyavaharantīti kramah, ātmānam tad-dāsyē tadā gaṇayanti. eṣa eva paro dharmah. (Bhajanāmṛta p. 3)*

72. *ācāryaṁ māṁ vijānīyān (Bhāgavata Purāṇa 11.17.27, cited in Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu 1.2.99, Hari-bhakti-vilāsa 4.347, and Bhakti-sandarbhā 211, Caitanya-caritāmṛta 1.1.46).*

73. See Broo, *As Good as God*, pp. 76-82; see also pp. 245-256.

74. See, especially, *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* 4.346-365.

75. *vaiṣṇavāṅge kṛṣṇāgnir vartate (Bhajanāmṛta p. 3).*

76. See Broo, *As Good as God*, pp. 81-82. The expression *guru-tattva* is often used by modern Gauḍīyas to refer to the guru's ontological position (*tattva*). I am not aware of this expression being used in this sense in early Gauḍīya texts. Kṛṣṇadāsa uses the expression once in *Caitanya-caritāmṛta (guru-tattva kahiyāchi, 1.7.3)*, but the term does not seem to have that technical connotation there. Rather, it just seems to mean, "the nature of the guru."

77. I have not seen this distinction in texts of other Vaiṣṇava traditions and therefore do not know how common this was. The distinction seems to be found in some earlier Vaiṣṇava texts that were popular among Gauḍīyas, like Bilvamaṅgala's *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta (cintāmaṇir jayati somagirir gurur me śikṣā-guruś ca bhagavān śikhi-piñcha-mauliḥ, verse 1)*. See also *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.1.35-37, 58 and *Caitanya-bhāgavata* 1.14.161, 1.17.107, 3.4.322.

78. See *Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā* 10.87.35: *guravaś ca dvedhā dikṣā-guruś ca śikṣā-guruś ca. ādyās tu [Bhāgavata 11.10.5] "mad-abhijñam gurum" ity ādinā vakṣyamāṅḥ, dvitiye tu mahad-rūpāḥ yadṛcchayā upasannā bhagavad-bhaktā ye kecit. teṣāṁ upāsanaiva kāryeti*

sad-ācāraṃ pramāṇayanti. See also *Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā* 11.10.5.

79. *mantra-gurus tv eka eva* (*Bhakti-sandarbha* 207).

80. See *Bhakti-sandarbha* 208-209.

81. *gurur hy upadeśa-mātram karoti, śikṣā-gurus tūpāsanādi-prakāraṃ jñāpayati* (Gopāla Bhaṭṭa on *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta* 1).

82. *kintu yadi gurur asamañjasaṃ karoti, tarhi yukti-siddhaiḥ siddhāntais tasya rahasi daṇḍaḥ karaṇīyaḥ, na tu tyājyaḥ*. Gurur daṇḍya iti cen na, tatrāpi: ‘guror apy avaliptasya kāryākāryam ajānataḥ, utpatha-pratipannasya nyāyo daṇḍo vidhīyate’ iti (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 3). As noted above, the verse Narahari cites here is very similar—but very different in purport!—to a *Mahābhārata* verse cited in *Bhakti-sandarbha* 238.

83. The verse Narahari cites parallels a verse from the *Mahābhārata* (12.57.7; cf. 5.178.24 & 12.138.48), which Jīva cites in *Bhakti-sandarbha* 238. The only difference between the *Mahābhārata* verse and Narahari’s citation is the final *pada*: Narahari’s has *nyāyo daṇḍo vidhīyate*, whereas the *Mahābhārata* reads *parityāgo vidhīyate*. Purīdāsa notes one variant reading of this passage in the *Bhajanāmṛta* that follows the *Mahābhārata* reading, but this is clearly wrong, as Narahari cites the verse precisely to support his argument that the ignorant guru should not be rejected!

84. For a brief discussion of this term, see Broo, *As Good as God*, pp. 138-139.

85. See, for example, *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa* 4.359-365.

86. *svabhāvata eva vaiṣṇavānāṃ kṛṣṇāśraya eva mūlam. tad-guṇa-gāna-yaśo-varṇana-vilāsa-vinoda-prakhyāpanam eva jīvanam. sarve tad-artham eva guru-mukhād vā śṛṇvanti sva-buddhyā vā vyavaharantīti kramah. tatra gurur yadi visadṛśakāri, īśvare bhrāntaḥ, kṛṣṇa-yaśo-vimukhas tad-vilāsa-vinodaṃ nāṅgikaroti svayaṃ vā durabhimāni loka-svastavaīḥ kṛṣṇam anukaroti, tarhi tyājya eva. katham eva gurus tyājyaḥ iti cen na, kṛṣṇa-bhāva-lobhāt kṛṣṇa-prāptaye guror āśrayanaṃ kṛtaṃ, tad-anantaraṃ yadi tasmin gurau āsura-bhāvas tarhi kiṃ kartavyam? asura-guruṃ tyaktvā śrī-kṛṣṇa-bhaktimantaṃ gurum anyam bhajet. asya kṛṣṇa-balād asurasya guror balaṃ mardaniyam iti vaiṣṇava-bhajana-vicārah. evaṃ tu dṛṣṭā bahavaḥ śrī-kṛṣṇa-caitanya-āvatāre iti guru-nirūpana-siddhāntaḥ.* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 3).

87. See *Caitanya-bhāgavata* 1.14.82-88.

88. See *Prema-vilāsa* pp. 246-248, where the *Caitanya-bhāgavata* passage is also cited.

89. *evam anyac ca rahasyaṃ kiñcid varṇayāmi. śrī-kṛṣṇa-caitanya-prabhuṇā śrī-nityānanda-nāvatāre samhr̥te mahān pralayo bhaviṣyati. deva-nigrahair āja-nigrahais ca prajā durgatā bhaviṣyantīti. vaiṣṇavāḥ sarva eva mahānto dine dine īśvara-saṅgame calitāḥ. kecit kecid eva sthāsyanti, te’pi nija-prabhāvaṃ samharisyanti. kevalam antaḥ prītim eva nigūḍha-prema kadācit kadācid eva bodhayisyanti. tat tu mahadbhir api boddhuṃ na śakyate hari-kīrtanaṃ ca vilasa-pracāra bhaviṣyati sat-saṅgaṃś ca viralāḥ. īśvara-sevā ca mandaṃ mandaṃ syāt* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 7).

90. *tathā ca karma-dharma-sāpekṣa-bhaktaḥ, karma-dharma-nirapekṣaḥ, pakva-yogī tad-veṣa-dhārī ca, etena caturdhā bhedena grahaṇaṃ syāt* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 7). I follow here Purīdāsa’s reading. The reading in Kedarnātha Datta Bhaktivinoda’s edition (followed by Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda) is somewhat different: *tathā ca karma-dharma-sāpekṣa-bhaktaḥ, karma-dharma-nirapekṣaḥ pakva-yogī, tathāpakva-yogī, tat-tad-veṣa-dhārī ca* (p. 72). Later Nara-

hari does talk about the “non-perfect yogi” (*apakva-yogi*), but only briefly, but he also does seem to make a distinction between the two classes that Bhaktivinoda’s edition conflates: those that disregard ritual action and *dharma* (*karma-dharma-nirapekṣa*) and the *pakva-yogi*. See *Bhajanāmṛta* p. 8.

91. *tadaitena bhakti-vartmani [candra-]prakāṣe kalaṅkaṃ dṛṣṭvā mahāntaḥ kevalaṃ kiñcid api nigrāhānugrahaṃ kartum asamarthā murcchitā bhaviṣyanti. kintu atra sārva-bhaumaṃ prati kathā-praśnottare yat prabhūṇā śrī-kṛṣṇa-caitanyaena kathitam āste, tad eva kathayisyāmi* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 7).

92. *tasmāt karma-sāpekṣaḥ prākṛteṣu mahān, kṛṣṇa-sāpekṣaḥ sādhuṣu mahān iti* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 8).

93. *dharma-karmādikaṃ na jānāti, śrī-kṛṣṇa-rasa-yaśo rāśi-vilāsa-vinoda-bhāva-kalā-bhāvanātīmagna-hṛdayaḥ kevalaṃ madhu-pāna-matta iva vismṛta iva. karma-dharmādikaṃ hṛdaye tasya na praviśati* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 8).

94. *nirantaraṃ kṛṣṇa-caritaṃ kathayati, gāyati, śṛṇoti, dhyāyati, nṛtyati* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 8).

95. *kadācid dampati-bhāvāviṣṭa-matir viṣaye patati, tām ākarṣituṃ na śaknoti, atas tadāsaktiṃ ca labhate. āśaktasya ca kadācit pathaḥ skhalanaṃ syāt. etad evāpakva-yogināṃ mahatī kṣatīḥ syāt. kintu, skhalitasyāpi kālāntare saiva bhaktiḥ samudeti. tac ca prabhor guṇa-vaibhavāt syān mahatāṃ darśanāt* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 8).

96. This sentence (*vaiṣṇavābhijātyena teṣāṃ antikaṃ na gacchanti*) is difficult to construe. Following a suggestion by Dr. Kiyokazu Okita, I have read this as if *sandhi* was doubly applied (*vaiṣṇavā bhijātyena*).

97. *tathā ca pakva-yogi-dṛṣṭāntena kecid veśa-dhāriṇaḥ kṛṣṇa-bhakti-nidarśana-mātram, hari-kīrtana-kapaṭena nānā-sukha-vilāsam, pakva-yogi-prāyaṃ svecchā-vihārāṃ ca prakāṣayantaḥ sarvān prākṛta-janān bhrāmayanti. tenaiva vilāsādi-viśeṣeṇa tān eva veśa-dhāriṇo grasanti. nirantaraṃ tenaiva viṣaya-rasena viṣayinām api viṣayīṇo bhavanti; vaiṣṇavābhijātyena teṣāṃ antikaṃ na gacchanti; ku-grāma-vāsināṃ prakṛtānām evāśrayaṃ bhajante, prākṛta-janānām eva saṅgaṃ kurvanti. kadācit kṛṣṇa-guṇa-mahimnā vinaivānūrāgeṇa pulaka-premādikaṃ bāhyar-asena nartakānām iva jāyate. tad api dine dine vināśaṃ yāsyati. vaiṣṇavānām ca te garhitā bhaviṣyanti. tasmād vaiṣṇava-saṅgālapādi-vimukhānām yaṇi saṅgāntarāṇi tāni viṣṇu-bhaktā-dūṣāṇi.* (*Bhajanāmṛta* pp. 8-9)

98. Wong, “Colonial Morals, Vaiṣṇava Quarrels”.

99. O’Connell, *Caitanya Vaiṣṇava Studies*, chapter 2.

100. *śrī-kṛṣṇa-caityanyas tu kaupīna-dhārī dīna-veśaḥ sanmyāsāśramālakṛto ’tyanta-durdāntaṃ balavantaṃ mahā-vṛṣabha-durdūruḍham adhyātma-vādināṃ viṣayāndhaṃ kuyogināṃ jaḍam aśra-madyapaṃ pāpaṃ caṇḍālāṃ yavanaṃ mūrkhāṃ kula-striyaṃ ca prema-sindhau pātayām āsa, ānandena vaikuṇṭhopari sthāpayām āsa. kevalaṃ prema-dhārayaiva sarveṣāṃ āśayaṃ śodhitavān, āsura-bhāvaṃ ca cūrṇitavān.* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 7)

101. *etena tu kevalaṃ ye caturā gabhira-bhāgavatās te tām eva pṛitim anveṣayanti loka ca sarvaṃ bodhayiṣyanti. tasyā eva premārambhaḥ sphuṭaṃ asty eva. tasmād avatāre saṃhṛta iti citta-daurbalyaṃ tyaktum arhanti. yataḥ śrī-kṛṣṇa-caitanya-candraḥ pṛīti-prema-vigrahāḥ. yadi pṛīti-premā iharpitas tarhi avatāreśa-bhaktir apy asty eva* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 9).

102. *Bhajanāmṛta* p. 9

103. *sva-duḥkhaiḥ para-duḥkhāni nāśayanti mahājanāḥ* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 9).

104. *tasmāt sarve sāvadhānā yatra yatra prīti-lālasāḥ yatra yatra kṛṣṇa-kāthā-prasaṅgaḥ yatra yatra hari-kīrtanam, yatra yatra hari-yaśo-varṇane śúśrūṣā, yatra yatra kṛṣṇasya vaiṣṇavasya ca prasaṅge sādhu-vādaḥ, tatra tatraiva tat parā bhavantu, sarvatra prītiṃ kurvantu. tad eva dine dine sarva-susampannaṃ bhaviṣyanti. kevalaṃ prītiḥ premaiḥ prabhor astram. tad yadi samudeti, tadā sarve'sukhino'pi sukhino bhavanti, śocituṃ nārhanti* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 9)

105. O'Connell, *Caitanya Vaiṣṇava Studies*, chapter 2.

106. O'Connell, *Caitanya Vaiṣṇava Studies*, chapter 2.

107. *sa eva vīracandro'bhūc caitanyābhinna-vigrahaḥ* (*Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā* 67).

108. *sa evādvaita-gosvāmī caitanyābhinna-vigrahaḥ* (*Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā* 76).

109. *śrī-caitanyādvaita-tanuḥ sa eva raghunandanaḥ* (*Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā* 70).

110. *gaurābhinna-tanuḥ sarvārādhyāḥ sanātanaḥ* (*Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā* 182).

111. *aho kim etasya darśanena sāksād eva mayā dr̥ṣṭo'sti bhagavān. tam āloka-sukha-sadr̥ṣaṃ kim asya darśanena bhaviṣyati sukham? naiva* (*Caitanya-candrodaya* p. 106).

112. *tā-sabā tārīte prabhu sei saba deśe, yogya-bhakta jīva-dehe karena āveśe / sei jīve nija-bhakti karena prakāśe, tāhāra darśane vaiṣṇava haya sarva-deśe* (*Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 3.2.13-14). Later hagiographies also see Śrīnivāsa as the embodiment of Caitanya; see Stewart, *The Final Word*, pp. 320-324.

113. See *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.9.6ff.

114. *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* 1.12.9.

115. This image of the withering branches is perhaps an allusion to a famous *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* passage (6.11), where the branch is said to wither because the living essence of the tree—Caitanya, in Kṛṣṇadāsa's image—withdraws itself from the branch.

116. *jagad-dhanaṃ kṛṣṇa eva vaiṣṇavāḥ tad upādḥikāḥ, prema-prītiḥ tato'py agryā paraṃ prīter na kiñcana* (*Bhajanāmṛta* p. 9).

Bibliography

Primary texts

Bhāgavata-purāṇa, with Śrīdhara Svāmī's *Bhāvārtha-bodhinī*. Edited by J.L. Shastri, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1999.

Bilvamaṅgala Līlāśuka. *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta*, with the *Kṛṣṇa-vallabhā* commentary of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, the *Subodhinī* of Caitanyadāsa, and the *Sāraṅga-raṅgadā* of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja. Critically edited by Sushil Kumar De. Dacca: The University of Dacca, 1938.

Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmī. *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa*, with Sanātana Gosvāmī's *Dig-darśinī* commentary. Edited by Swami Bhakti Vilāsa Tirtha. Māyāpura: Śrī Caitanya Maṭha, 1971.

Haricarṇadāsa. *Advaita-maṅgala*. Edited by Ravīndranātha Māiti. Bardhaman:

- Bardhamāna Viśvavidyālaya, 1966.
- Jagadbandhu. *Gaura-pada-taraṅginī*. Edited by Mṛṅṅalakānti Ghoṣa. Second edition. Calcutta: Rāmakamala Siṃha, 1935.
- Jīva Gosvāmī. *Bhakti-sandarbhā*. Edited by Haridāsa Śāstrī. Vṛndāvana: Śrī Gadādhara-gaurahari Press, 1986.
- Karṇapūra Kavirāja. *Guṇa-leśa-sūcaka*. In: *Śrī Śrīnivāsācārya-grantha-mālā*, edited with a Bengali translation by Haridāsa Dāsa, pp. 25-40. Navadīpa: Haribola Kuṭīra, n.d.
- Kavikarṇapūra. *Caitanya-candrodayam*. Edited by Puridāsa Mahāśaya. Vṛndāvana: Haridāsa Śarmā, 1954.
- Kavikarṇapūra. *Gaura-gaṇoddeśa-dīpikā*. In *Grantha-ratna-pañcakam*, edited with a Hindi translation by Kṛṣṇadāsa Bābā, pp. 1-40. Kusumasarovara: Kṛṣṇadāsa Bābā, 1953.
- Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja. *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*. Edited by Bhakti Kevala Auḍulomi Mahārāja, with the *Amṛta-pravāha-bhāṣya* of Saccidānanda Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura, and the *Anubhāṣya* of Vārṣabhānavīdayitadāsa. Calcutta: Gauḍīya Mission, 1957.
- Locanadāsa. *Caitanya-maṅgala*. Edited by Rāmanārayaṇa Vidyāratna. Murshidabad: Rādhārāmaṇa Press, 1892.
- Mahābhārata*. Critically edited by V. S. Sukthankar et al. 4 Volumes. Poona: The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1971-1975.
- Murāri Gupta. *Kṛṣṇa-caitanya-caritāmṛta*. Edited with a Bengali translation by Haridāsa Dāsa. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 2009.
- Narahari Cakravartī. *Bhakti-ratnākara*. Edited by Nandalāla Vidyāsāgara. Second edition. Calcutta: Gauḍīya Mission, 1960.
- Narahari Cakravartī. *Narottama-vilāsa*. Edited by Rākhāladāsa Kaviratna. Second edition. Calcutta: Adharacandra Cakravartī, 1924.
- Narahari Sarakāra. *Kṛṣṇa-bhajanāmṛta*, with the *Āsvāda-vistāriṇī* commentary. Edited by Kedāranātha Datta Bhaktivinoda. *Saj-jana-toṣaṇī* Vol. 11, No. 2 (1898), pp. 21-84.
- Narahari Sarakāra. *Kṛṣṇa-bhajanāmṛta*. Edited with a Bengali translation by Sundarānanda Vidyāvinoda. Dhaka: Rāmakṛṣṇa Pālā, 1942.
- Narahari Sarakāra. *Kṛṣṇa-bhajanāmṛta*. Edited by Puridāsa Mahāśaya. Vṛndāvana: Haridāsa Śarmā, 1954.
- Narahari Sarakāra. *Kṛṣṇa-bhajanāmṛta*. Edited with a Hindi translation by Haridāsa Śāstrī. Vṛndāvana: Śrī Gadādhara-gaurahari Press, 1978.
- Narahari Sarakāra. *Srikrishna Bhajanamritam: The Essence of Devotions to Krishna*. Translated by Bhaktisharan Damodar. Mayapur: Sri Gopinath Gaudiya Math, n.d.

- Narahari Sarakāra. *Sri Krishna Bhajanamṛta*. Translated by Jayapataka Swami. N.p.: The Bhaktivedanta Swami Charity Trust, n.d.
- Nityānandadāsa. *Prema-vilāsa*. Edited by Yaśodālāla Tālukdāra. Calcutta: Yaśodālāla Tālukdāra, 1913.
- Rādhākṛṣṇa Gosvāmī. *Sādhana-dīpikā*. Edited by Haridāsa Śāstrī. Vṛndāvana: Śrī Gadādhara-Gaurahari Press, n.d.
- Raghunāthadāsa. *Mukta-caritra*. Edited by Nityasvarūpa Brahmācārī. Vṛndāvana: Nityasvarūpa Brahmācārī, 1908.
- Raghunāthadāsa. *Stavāvalī*. Edited by Purīdāsa Mahāśaya. Vṛndāvana: Śācināth-arāya Caturdhurī, 1947.
- Rāmagopāladāsa. *Śākhā-nirṇaya*. In *Rāmagopāladāsa-viracita Rasa-kaḷpa-vallī o Ananya Nibandha*. Edited by Harekṛṣṇa Mukhopādhyāya, Sukumāra Sena, Praphullacandra Pāla, pp. 205-214. Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1963.
- Rūpa Gosvāmī. *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu*, with commentaries of Jīva Gosvāmin, Mukundadāsa and Viśvanātha Cakravartī. Edited by Haridāsa Dāsa. Navadvīpa: Haribola Kuṭīra 1961.
- Rūpa Gosvāmī. *Paḍyāvalī*. ed., Sushil Kumar De. Dacca: University of Dacca, 1934.
- Siddha Caitanyadāsa. *Pratyāṅga-varṇana-bhāvāmṛta*. Edited by Jīvasāraṇadāsa et al. Vīracandrapūra: Satyanārāyaṇa Maṇḍala, 1984.
- Śrīnātha Cakravartī. *Caitanya-mata-maṅjuṣā*. Edited by Purīdāsa Mahāśaya. Vṛndāvana: Haridāsa Śarmā, 1955.
- Śrīnivāsa. *Śrīnivāsa-grantha-mālā*. Edited by Haridāsa Dāsa. Navadvīpa: Haribola Kuṭīra, n.d.
- Vṛndāvanadāsa. *Caitanya-bhāgavata*, with the *Gauḍīya-bhāṣya* of Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Gosvāmī. Edited by Bhakti Kevala Auḍulomi Mahārāja. Calcutta: Gauḍīya Mission, 1961.

Secondary texts

- Broo, Måns. *As Good as God: The Guru in Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press, 2003.
- Chakravartī, Ramakanta. *Vaiṣṇavism in Bengal: 1486-1900*. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1985.
- Dāsa, Haridāsa. *Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Abhidhāna*. 2 Volumes. Navadvīpa: Haribola Kuṭīra, 1987.
- De, Sushil Kumar. *Early History of the Vaishnava Faith and Movement in Bengal, from Sanskrit and Bengali sources*. Second edition. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1961.
- Lutjeharms, Rembert. *The Gosvāmīs of Vṛndāvana and Caitanya* (forthcoming).

- Majumdar, Biman Bihari. *Śrī Caitanya-carītera Upādāna*. Second edition. Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1959.
- O'Connell, Joseph T. *Caitanya Vaiṣṇava Studies*. (forthcoming)
- Raghavan, V. (ed). *New Catalogus Catalogorum Vol. 4*. Madras: Madras University Press, 1968.
- Sanyal, Hiteshranjan. *Bāṅgalā Kīrtanera Itihāsa*. Calcutta: P. K. Bagchi, 1989.
- Sen, Sukumar. *A History of Brajabuli Literature, being a study of the Vaiṣṇava lyric poetry of the poets of Bengal*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1935.
- Stewart, Tony K. *The Final Word: The Caitanya Caritāmṛta and the Grammar of Religious Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Tarkatīrtha, Rādhāmādhava. "Śrīnivāsa Ācārya." *Our Heritage* Vol. 2, Part 1 (1954), pp. 191-202.
- Ṭhākura, Gauraguṇānanda. *Śrīkhaṇḍera Pracīna Vaiṣṇava*. 3rd edition. Śrīkhaṇḍa: Śrīkhaṇḍa Madhumati Samiti, n.d.
- Wong, Lucian. "Colonial Morals, Vaiṣṇava Quarrels: Sources of Nineteenth-century Anti-sahajiyā Polemics." In *Hinduism Beyond the Renaissance: Vaiṣṇavism in Colonial Bengal*. Edited by Ferdinando Sardella and Lucian Wong. Abingdon: Routledge (forthcoming).