

The Queens in Dvaraka

Bha.X.83.42–44 ff.

Letter from Sadananda 3 July 1954

Into English and © Kid Samuelsson 2013

Last modified 13.1.20

Noble friends,

Bha.X.83.42–43: “We¹ do not covet majestic rulership, the heaven of Indra, great enjoyment, the position of Brahma, or the anantya or moksha or even Vaikuntha (the padam Hari’s), but we covet the “*Shri*”-combined dust of His feet, embellished by the saffron of the bosom of *Shri* (that *Shri* here means Radha is evident from verse 44), the feet of the Bearer of the gada (He vanquished Naraka asura and freed them [the queens] from his custody by using the gada as weapon),

44: *that* very dust of the lotusfeet of the liberally minded One (maha-atma), *Who was tending the cows*, the dust, the touch of, is coveted by 1) the women of Vraja 2) the aboriginal jungle tribe women 3) the grasses 4) the creepers and 5) the gopa-s. (This sequence means *decreasing* degree of desire of these five groups).

Please notice:

1) The other queens in Dvaraka² don’t pray for gopi-anugatya³; only the queens He freed from the hands of Naraka asura.

2) What did this prayer lead to, this prayer for this dust, in subordination to the gopi-s, disregarding the fact that they are Krishnas legitimate wives? In Bha.I.15.20 Arjuna describes that Krishna has given him the task of guarding these wives; gopa-s came and before the eyes of the powerless Arjuna they were taken away – by Krishna, Who assumed 16 100 gopa forms and brought

¹ The 16 100 queens.

² The eight main queens: Rukmini, Satyabhama, Jambavati, Kalindi, Bhadra, Satyavati, Mitravinda, and Lakshmana.

³ Seva, subordinated to the gopis.

them to Gokula!!! They are the *only* queens who *really* subordinated themselves to Radha and the gopi-s and attained Vraja already in the *prakata-prakasha*⁴. Thus you can see that it is obvious also here in Kurukshetra: the *highest* stage – Radha and the gopi-s – and that is why it is said:

In X.84.1 also “*svagopis*”, ”those gopi-s, who in the deepest sense of the word really are *His Own*”.

In X.84.59–69: When everyone else had left, vrajavasi-s stayed there – *for three months*. [...]

Please give Brinda Manjari my warmest regards. Everything needs time to be rooted, to grow and to spread. [...]

Always with you both, Sada

Bhagavata-Mahatmyam

[...] These [16 100] queens are the same as those who the helpless Arjuna, after the conclusion of the Dvaraka-lila, could not bring to Mathura, because Krishna, in the shape of a robbing herdsman, took them away. (Bha.I.15.20)

These are the 16 100 queens who during the meeting in Kurukshetra and at the sight of the greatness of the gopi-s’ prema did not really consider themselves as queens, but longed for the speck of dust of the lotus feet of the cowherdsman Krishna (literally: Krishna, Who grazes the cows), (those lotus feet) which are fragrant with saffron from (the touch of) Shri’s (Radha’s) bosom, the lotus feet of Whom everyone in Vraja long for.

Bha.X.83.42–43: “We do not covet ... Hari’s eternal abode, but the pollen of the lotus feet of Krishna, the pollen which is saturated with the fragrance of the saffron that comes from the breast of Shri. Krishna, the Magnanimous One; He Who grazes the cows and Whose lotus feet the women of Vraja, the aboriginal jungle tribe women, the grass, the bushes, and the gopa-s desire to touch.”

⁴ The manifest lila.

The word “gavashcharyato” is in the genitive and belongs to “mahatmanah” and not to the word in nom. pl. “gopah”. Note: the well thought-out order regarding the strength of longing for this speck of dust: the gopi-s, the “wild” women of the jungle, the grass, the bushes, the gopa-s [the priyanarmanasakha-s], (and they are just a few, like Subala, Ujjvala and other close friends of Krishna, far from the general gopa-s, who almost all of them are unaware of the gopi-lila and do not know anything of Radha and Her relationship with Krishna). One of the queens is called Rohini; not to mistake for Balarama’s mother. [...]

The Corrections

[...] Moreover, in the Bhagavatam you have the many statements where it is said that Lakshmi, in spite of all her endeavour, never was allowed to attain Vraja, never could serve Vraja-Krishna and never will be able to, because she eternally serves Narayana, who is the fullness of majesty and omnipotence. Because she is Lakshmi, the eternal shakti form of the Almighty God for eternity, and because she is aware of that, she cannot even think of praying for the dust of the gopi-s’ feet.

She does so just as little as the eight queens pray for this when they tell about Krishna when they meet in Kurukshetra. But the 16 100 queens pray: “We do not covet ... Hari’s eternal abode, but the pollen of the lotus feet of Krishna, the pollen which is saturated with the fragrance of the saffron that comes from the breast of Shri. Krishna, the Magnanimous One; He Who grazes the cows and Whose lotus feet the women of Vraja, the aboriginal jungle tribe women, the grass, the bushes, and the gopa-s desire to touch.” (Bhagavatam X.83.42–43)

When Rao in his translation separates the two clauses which are connected with the relative pronoun “yat”, and doesn’t know that “trinavirudhah” is in the

ablative and not in the nominative plural, you can see how hastily and recklessly this man, here as almost everywhere, scrawls down his text.

Last year I sent you the Bhagavata-Mahatmyam from the Skanda-Puranam, fully translated and with explanations. Moreover, you have this at the end of your Sanskrit edition of the Bhagavatam. There you can see how these [16 100] queens (see above) by the end of their lila in Dvaraka, do not go to the eternal Dvaraka, but come to Vraja, and from there, through Uddhava's mercy, attain the eternal Goloka-Vraja – as they are as cit forms – and how they, before the eyes of the observers, disappear, simply become invisible on the spot.

There you also have the allusions to the meaning of Krishna's message to the gopi-s, which Uddhava did not understand when he delivered it. The meaning of a message, "sandeha", which is conveyed by a messenger, is to word it in such a way that it – in the eyes of the deliverer – seems to be something else than it actually is. [...]