

Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa-Premā: The Trinitarian Mystery of Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism

Klaus Klostermaier

In the history of religions strict monotheisms are relatively rare. More common are dual high-deities: World Parents, Heaven and Earth, Divine Couples. Trinitarian, or triadic,¹ conceptions of divinity are also quite frequent; interestingly enough these are often presented in combination with assertions of the Oneness of the Supreme.

Trinitarian theologies reflect the intuitive perception that the triad is the universal basic dynamic reality principle. In the words of C. G. Jung:

Every tension between Two Opposites demands resolution in a process, from which a Third originates. In the Third the One is reappearing, that was lost in the tension of the Two. The absolute One is unknowable.... The Trinity is an explication of the One and makes it thus knowable. The Triad is the knowable Unity, which without the resolution into the opposition between the First and the Second would have remained in an indeterminable condition.

Unity cannot be One, being the Whole which cannot be differentiated from the Two, because in it are re-absorbed all the antagonistic aspects, which are in opposition to each other, such as left and right, high and low, before and behind, round and square, the whole of yang and the whole of yin. All that together, Unity and Pair, if one wants to express it in numbers, is found in all odd numbers and first in the Three (1+2). The series of numbers begins with the Three.²

¹ The term, “Trinitarian,” is used advisedly to allude to some of the conclusions that I herein suggest.

² C. G. Jung, *Symbolik des Geistes*, Zurich: Rascher, 1948, p. 336.

Marie-Louise von Franz adds a comment of her own: ‘Therefore in China Three is the symbol for “unanimity,” and as they also say in the West, the Trinity represents complete harmony, a viewpoint, which is emphasised in the designation of the Holy Spirit as *vinculum amoris*.’³

According to modern genetics the DNA code consists of triplets, made up by four bases (Adenine, Thymine, Guanine and Cytosine). The code structure of the messenger RNA (ribonucleic acid) are also based on triplets. Von Franz, commenting on this amazing pattern, remarks:

This very astonishing congruence appears to support more than any other fact Jung’s hypothesis, that numbers are a common ordering principle of the psyche as well as of matter: the same numerical pattern which underlies the fundamental processes of our memory, its inheritance, and with that the substratum of our entire process of consciousness, has been discovered on the one hand in China through introspection in the unconscious Psyche and on the other hand in the West through genetic research in the living cell.⁴

While genetics has found triplets by looking within the physical cell, the great sages and metaphysicians of the past had found this pattern by also looking within, that is to say, by “introspection.” The ancient Indian traditions, for example, recognised the dynamic of the triad as intrinsic to all processes of spirit and life. *Prakṛti*, the base “substance” of existence, is constituted of three *guṇas* (*sattva*, *rajas*, *tamas*) without whose interaction there would be no creation. In light of our comparison with DNA it is interesting to note that the term *guṇa*, often translated a “tendency,” has the original meaning of “one of the filaments constituting a rope.”⁵

If, as is suggested by the above, the triad is fundamental to life as well as to consciousness, it would not be amazing to discover that it has also been applied to conceptions of the deity, intuited by perceptive seers in all parts of the world. While its translation into ordinary language, and more, its transmission through the minds of ordinary people, often distorted its true and original meaning, the existence of

³ M-L. von Franz, *Zahl und Zeit*, Stuttgart: Klett, 1970, p.100, n.5.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p.103f.

⁵ See A. Daniélou, *The Myths and Gods Of India*, Vermont: Inner Traditions International, 1991, p.24.

many triadic notions of deity testifies to the universality of such an idea. It also stands to reason that the mythological background of each culture would offer the foil in which that triadic pattern is expressed. Not all cultures developed systems of abstract thinking, called philosophy in the pre-modern Western cultural tradition (or more specifically “Theology” in the more restricted context of the Christian Churches), through which conceptual models of that intuitive “seeing” were constructed. Some did: the continuing controversies over the “right” concepts and the “right” understanding of these, shows how difficult it is to come to an agreement.

Bonaventure found in the structures of nature the traces of the Divine Trinity: ‘The created universe is like a book in which is reflected, represented and read the creative Trinity according to a threefold grade of expression, namely by way of vestige, image and similitude.’⁶ More specifically Bonaventure sees the Father reflected in the “vestige,” which, he says is found in all creatures. The Son is reflected in the “image” that is found only in beings “endowed with intellect or spirit.” The Spirit, finally, is reflected in the “similitude” that is found only in “god-likes.” He also asserts that it is a “natural” process by which humans come to know this Trinitarian Deity.

Using quite consciously the language and the ideas of Plato, Bonaventure sees the Divine Unity mirrored in the “primary name” of “being” (*esse*), whereas the Divine Trinity is mirrored in the name “good” (*bonum*)—“goodness” (*bonitas*) being one of the qualities of God as *principium* which is recognised as *vestigium*, i.e. accessible to all and recognisable in all creation.

From the Neo-Platonic notion that the existence of the world is due to an inbuilt necessity that “the good is spreading itself out” (*bonum est diffusivum sui*) Bonaventure concludes that the Godhead has by necessity to be a Trinity and that in that contemplation of pure goodness as existing in the three persons of the blessed Trinity is found ‘the perfect illumination of the mind,’ and the recognition of the human person being made into the image of God.

The high regard in which Bonaventure holds Plato and the Neo-Platonists would make us assume that he credited them with a sufficiently high degree of illumination with regard to the Trinitarian

⁶ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* II, 12, 1.

nature of the deity—indeed his main criticism of Plato does not concern his theology but his devaluation of nature into a shadow-reality.

The Hindu school that offers the closest parallel to Bonaventure’s Exemplarism is Madhva’s *Bimba-pratibimba-vāda*.⁷ According to Madhva, Brahman as *bimba* (original image) determines the existence (*satta*), functioning (*pratīti*) and creativity (*pravṛtti*) of the *pratibimba* (counter image). For Madhva ‘the entire universe is thus an expression of the Divine Will.’⁸ The material universe is the actualisation of the potentialities of primary matter and the finite souls under the influence of the Supreme. Thus the universe is a “souvenir” of God. Human consciousness is mediated through a consciousness of the manifestations of God in the universe. The mirror-image relationship between soul and God is the truest and most beautiful permanent bond with the Supreme Being. It is the purpose of philosophical instruction progressively to make students realise their being a reflection, a mirror image of the Ultimate. The perfection of human beings consists in recognising the Archetype, the *bimba*, and understanding themselves as mirror image or manifestation (*ābhāsa*) of the Supreme. This recognition goes hand in hand with a universalizing: As Brahman is the Whole, so the recognition of oneself as counter image of Brahman entails a realisation of oneself as universal.

In contrast to Śāṅkara, who considered the physical universe a creation of *māyā*—an illusory mimicry of Brahman / Reality—Madhva sees in it the material manifestation of the creative power of Brahman. It exhibits at its most fundamental level a quality, which reflects the nature of Brahman itself: order, symmetry and movement. Especially, it exhibits itself as Unity: in spite of the myriad beings, which constitute it, it is unified at its most subtle as well as on its most extensive levels.

It is probably not accidental that the Bengali monk, Caitanya (1486-1534), took initiation from a Madhva follower, that his movement became associated in the 18th century with the Gauḍīya *sampradāya* (“the Bengali tradition”), and that the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava theology accepts Madhva’s version of Vedānta as its foundation, which it

⁷ Shri Madhvacharya (1238-1317) was the chief proponent of Tattvavāda (True Philosophy), popularly known as *Dvaita* or dualistic school of Hindu philosophy.

⁸ Madhvacharya, *Dvadasa stotram*, tr. Vaisnavacaran, Madras: Dharmaparakash, 1975. (The moniker “Vaisnavacaran” is probably a pen name; it means “one who is following the Vaiṣṇava mode of life”).

developed into what became known as *Acintya Bhedābheda*, and that Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism developed a Trinitarian notion of deity.

Bonaventure would agree that Madhva and genuine philosophers of all cultures at all ages could find intuitively, through a contemplation of the structures of created nature, the Trinitarian nature of the Deity. A Trinitarian understanding of the Deity is neither a Christian invention nor a Christian privilege. Being a baptized Christian does not guarantee an adequate understanding of it; nor does not being a baptized Christian exclude from comprehending it. The terms used for expressing it are in all cases taken from the already existing cultural religious imagery: in the case of Christians from the New Testament, in the case of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas from the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*.

While the authorities of the Catholic Church and probably also of some of the Eastern Churches and of the more conservative older Protestant ones would judge the “orthodoxy” of a Trinitarian theology by its conformity to Trinitarian dogmatic formulations, it is hard to fathom what kind of understanding ordinary Christians and the members of the thousands of more recent Christian sects connect with the Trinitarian formula of baptism and Trinitarian forms of blessings. Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas with many other Hindus would see the criterion of the “rightness” of their understanding of their conception in its fruitfulness as a *sādhana*, or spiritual practice: the active inner participation in the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa *līlā*⁹ and the inner satisfaction, the *ānanda* gained from a *sākṣātkāra* (“direct meeting”) testified by the great representatives of the tradition.

The case I wish to make is (a) the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava conception of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa-Premā¹⁰ as a mystery needs to be understood on the level on which Christian Trinitarian theology is operating; and (b) it is as valid an interpretation of the mystery of the inner-divine dynamics as the Father-Son-Spirit terminology.

Among the divine Trinities in the history of religions some are fairly openly tri-theistic and would as such not be reconcilable with strictly monotheistic religions like Judaism and Islam, who reject them as idolatrous. Hindu-India too knows several such “Trinities”: the best

⁹ Rādhā is the consort of Kṛṣṇa in the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava tradition. Their divine play, *līlā*, is the source of all creation.

¹⁰ The Sanskrit term *premā* means “love”; see *Śrīmad Bhāgavatam* 1.6.17.

known is probably the Trimūrti of Brahmā [creator], Viṣṇu [preserver] and Śiva [destroyer].¹¹ In that form the Trimūrti is a mediaeval Hindu construct designed to bring the three major streams of popular Hinduism together and allow the followers of one to grant equal status to the others. Typically, however, Vaiṣṇava theology speaks of three functions or manifestations of the one deity Hari, who as Brahmā, issuing from Hari's body creates the universe, sustains it as Viṣṇu, whose living body it is, and destroys it as Śiva-Rudra, reabsorbing it into the un-manifest form of Hari.

Christian Trinitarian theology has rejected tri-theism and the Church forbade early representations of the Trinity in the form of three men side by side. (I still saw in the 1950's such a wall-painting in an archaic little cave chapel in the Abruzzi.) The "orthodox" Trinity paintings, which are quite frequent, show a God Father—usually in the form of a seated elderly gentleman with a white beard—holding a junior Christ-Son on the crucifix and a dove, representing the Holy Spirit, hovering above God Father's head. By restricting the representation to symbolic figures (at least in the case of the Holy Spirit) the Church wanted to say that the Trinity is a mystery that cannot be adequately represented in the sphere of the senses. The attempt to conceptually express this mystery, which took centuries to mature, resulted in the most abstract and abstruse of all Christian dogmas, virtually inaccessible to the ordinary Christian.

The erotic sounding language in which the *Kṛṣṇa līlā* is presented in many Hindu texts, such as the Tenth Book of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* or the even better known *Gītāgovinda* by Jayadeva (both texts are used in Vaiṣṇava worship contexts), has brought about on the one hand a distancing of serious Christian theologians from that complex and on the other hand a romanticising of the relationship between Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. The involvement of Kṛṣṇa with the *gopīs* of Vrindāvana and the emphasis on the *parakīya* nature—the "love affair"—of Kṛṣṇa's involvement with Rādhā has further alienated those who expect ordinary human morality not to be violated in a religious context. The Indian intellectual who publishes under the name of Krishna Chaitanya calls this particular Vaiṣṇava tradition a "betrayal of Kṛṣṇa" and wants

¹¹ Also the triad of Jagannātha, Balabhadra and Subhadra worshipped at Jagannathpuri represents a tritheism rather than a Trinity.

his fellow religionists to return to the Kṛṣṇa of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Bhagavadgītā*. Krishna Caitanya had a problem not only with the eroticizing of Kṛṣṇa, the statesman and spiritual teacher, but also with the multiplication of divinity: Rādhā, after all, shares all of Kṛṣṇa's divine attributes.

Serious theologians in all religions (including the openly polytheistic ones like the ancient Greek and the Hindu) have insisted on the unity and uniqueness of the Supreme Being and preferred a “no-god” language to a “many gods” theology. The Jews in Jesus' times were scandalized by his claim of Divine Son-ship and the early Muslims considered the belief in a Divine Trinity one of the greatest aberrations of Christianity. If Christians understood the Trinity the way non-Christians conceive of it that would indeed be the end of Christian Monotheism. Susil Kumar Maitra, a well-known Indian professor of philosophy in his time, once explained in a seminar presentation at the Vrindāvana Institute of Indian Philosophy the Christian Trinity as the result of the amalgamation of the Jewish Jahwe, the Christian Jesus and the Hellenic Nous.

Christian theologians took a long time to develop formulae that resolved to their own satisfaction the contradiction between One God and Three Divine Persons. In spite of the ingenuity with which concepts like nature and person, subsistence and relationship and similar notions were defined and refined by generations of Christian theologians, for the ordinary person also in the West (including Christians) there remains a problem, and Goethe's frivolous quip in his *Faust*, “one is three and three is one,” has become more popular than Athanasius' *perichōrēsis*, the mutual inter-penetration and indwelling of the Father and the Son—“*the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father.*” Let us also remember that the Inter-Christian Trinitarian quarrel over *homo-ousios*, “same substance,” versus *homoi-ousios*, “similar substance,” fought out among a well informed group of professional Christian theologians resulted in a centuries long split of Christianity.

The Christian Trinitarian dogmas are very Greek. It is extremely difficult to explain them in any modern Western language without recourse to Ancient Greek. It would be impossible to translate them into Sanskrit, not to mention a living Indian language. (I remember having seen a Sanskrit translation of the Athanasian Creed by the German Indologist Paul Hacker—it does not make any sense

whatsoever to a Sanskrit trained traditional Indian.) The Trinitarian dogmas are part of a Christian abstract conceptual universe that is *sui generis* and cannot be translated into any other. Not to mention the outsiders' association of such terminology as the love-relationship of Father and Son, resulting in the misconception of the Spirit as an "offspring," and even the perception of an incestuous homo-eroticism.

Typically the Christian Trinity consists of three males: the New Testament term for the Holy Spirit, *parakleitos*, "comforter," is grammatically masculine. While the Greek *pneuma* is grammatically neuter, the Latin *spiritus* is masculine, and in all languages that have gendered nouns "the Holy Spirit" is masculine.¹² The few existing anthropomorphic pictures of the Trinity show three male figures side by side. By the time of the formulation of the Trinitarian teachings misogyny was a widespread "Christian" attitude. Christian theology as a whole and Trinitarian theology in particular is the product of celibate monastic minds—the religious ideal was always that of the unmarried male and the theological ideal a high degree of abstract intellectuality.

By contrast Vaiṣṇavism in general, and Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism in particular was always a family oriented religion and its theology reflects the experience of marriage and of parenthood. Whereas early Christian theology was strongly influenced by abstract, impersonal Greek philosophy, Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism theology lives and moves in an emotional universe of feelings. Which brings us to Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa-Premā, a more natural looking association of Woman and Man united in mutual Love.

If the Father-Son God of Christianity can be made meaningful for believers on a transcendental level, so can the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa union of Vaiṣṇavism be understood as a Divine mystery that opens up only to those, who immerse themselves in its very depth. For the celibate monastic mind the union of male and female is a sheer organic animal-like sensual activity—the very opposite of the spiritual union which a religious person associates with the divine relationships. For a loving couple the union of bodies as an expression of the oneness of minds is a

¹² It is doubtful whether the Hagia Sophia is dedicated to the "Holy Spirit" in the Trinitarian sense or whether "Divine Wisdom" is meant in a more general sense. Feminist theologians tried to see in the *Sophia* of Eastern Christian traditions a feminine element.

profoundly human and spiritual experience! The fact that this act can be misused for the brute satisfaction of animal urges in situations of rape does not take away from the fact, that it is the most intimate exchange of genuine love between two human beings and that no human being exists that does not owe its existence—body, mind and soul—to this act!

If the tradition, which focuses its spirituality on the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa-Premā operated the way outsiders are prone to understand it, its centres would be filled with eroticism and would attract sex maniacs from all over the world. As a matter of fact—as I can attest from my living for two years in Vrindāvana, the holiest place for the devotees of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, and from visiting other centres of pilgrimage in Braja, which are connected with events in the life of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa—they appear far less eroticized than most modern big cities with their giant-size posters of sex-icons selling cars, holidays or jeans. I must admit that I did not feel comfortable at the beginning in Vrindāvana and that I was initially quite critical of the public expressions of religiosity there. But that discomfort had other reasons: I did not like the noise of the loudspeakers that broadcast day and night scriptures like the *Bhāgavatam*, the incessant clanging of bells and the factory-like chanting of hymns by hundreds of paid people, the audacious soliciting of the *pandas* and the beggars, the—in my eyes—demeaning gestures of submission by devotees towards their gurus. It took me a while to get accustomed to all these things and not to pay any undue notice to them. As far as the deeper religiosity of the tradition was concerned and its scholarly exposition I could not find anything objectionable: On the contrary, I found much that I could genuinely appreciate and I really enjoyed the *bhajan* sessions, the *Rasalīlās*, the temple celebrations, the *darśanas* of famous gurus, local figures like Dīna Śaraṇa Dāsa and Bankey Bihari, and regular visitors such as Śrāddhānanda and Ānandamāyī and many others. After a year or so I felt at home in Vrindāvana and I did not entertain any missionary urge to improve upon its religious life. Of course there were crooks and impostors also in religious garb, abuses that needed to be remedied—but all these things had nothing to do with the substance of the theology of Vaiṣṇavism and could easily be found duplicated in any popular Christian place of pilgrimage.

I noticed one thing especially: the focus of religion in Vrindāvana was not on concepts or creeds but on experience and preparatory practices for it. In my two years there and in the many contacts, which I had with local gurus and devotees, I was not once asked what I believed, but was often asked about my *sādhana*, i.e. the practices I used to further my inner life. The *sākṣātkāra*, which constitutes the highest religious aim of the Vaiṣṇava consists in a vivid inner beholding of the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa-Premā which so fills the minds and hearts of those who have achieved it that they have no further desire. Irreligious people ridicule such exercises in gross and offensive terms, revealing more about themselves than about the mysteries, which they desacralize.

The God-realisation teaching of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas does not begin with a description or analysis of the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa relationship but with a process of acquiring *premā* in a quite down to earth fashion. The aspirant initially is to practice *sādhana-bhakti*, whose first stage consist in exercising *vaidhi-bhakti*, a love that is proving itself in works: A lengthy list of do's and don'ts comprising sixty-four injunctions has to be faithfully implemented and followed to show the seriousness of the devotee. As long as these acts are performed out of fear from the injunctions of the *śāstras* it is *vaidhi-bhakti*, a devotion that is based on external command. 'When the same acts are performed out of one's own heartfelt wish to serve the Beloved Prince of Vraja the devotee has *rāgānuga-bhakti*, or a devotion that is based on desire.'¹³ At that stage 'one should joyfully remember Kṛṣṇa and those most dear to him and one should listen with enthusiasm to stories and always dwell in Vraja. In *rāgānuga-bhakti* the most important practice is *smaraṇa*, "remembrance" which consists in 'mentally with one's feelings entering the sports of Kṛṣṇa and his beloved.'

All this has to be accomplished before the applicant is considered worthy of the second stage of *bhakti*: *bhāva-bhakti*. As the *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu* says: 'When *sādhana-bhakti* has become mature, *bhāva-bhakti* (the experience of love) arises through the grace of Kṛṣṇa or of his devotees.' Its signs are the "nine sprouts of love": forbearance, avoidance of waste of time, distaste for sense objects, freedom from conceit, no longer entertaining expectations, eagerness, enthusiasm for

¹³ Viśvanātha Cakravartin, *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu* X. All quotations from my translation in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94/1 Jan.-March 1974, pp. 96-107.

the singing of the name, attachment to the practice of the recitation of His attributes, and a preference for living in His abode. In a person in which these nine qualities are found the “sprout of emotion” has taken root. A person thus equipped is capable of Kṛṣṇa *saksatkara*, a direct corporeal vision of Kṛṣṇa. An important feature of the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa *līlā* is its permanence: it is always going on in the celestial Goloka, the eternal abode of Kṛṣṇa. In imitation of this eternal *līlā* devotees perform *satsaṅga* and *bhajana* round the clock.

The individual soul as a *pratibimba* of Kṛṣṇa, a mirror image of Kṛṣṇa, defined as “embodiment of the nectar of all sublime feelings,” also consists essentially of feeling: *Premā*, God-Love. *Premā* becomes the highest purpose of life (overriding all other *puruṣārthas*). Although *Premā* in its fullness is the result of a long process of maturing of *bhakti*, in its latent form it is present from the very beginning in the *jivatman* and determines like an entelechy the development of the *bhakta*. Only Kṛṣṇa, or his earthly representative, the guru, can rouse the latent *Premā* and bring it to perfection.

Rūpa Goswāmi thus sketches the eightfold path of *bhakti*: ‘In the beginning there is *śraddhā* [faith and trust], then *sādhu-saṅgah* [keeping company with good people], then *bhajana kṛīya* [acts of worship], *anārtha-nivṛtti* [purification from everything worthless], *rucih* [constancy], *āsakti* [attachment], *bhāva* [experience of divine emotions] and finally arises *Premā* [perfect love].’

The relevance of a triune theology lies in its being reflected in nature and the processes of growth and development and in providing a pattern for human aspirations at various levels, as Bonaventure tries to demonstrate. It makes contemplation of God possible—otherwise it would be a simple arresting of all mental activities.

Viṣṇu Purāṇa I, 12, 69 speaks of the three *śaktis* of which the essence of Viṣṇu is composed: *hlādinī sandhinī samvit tvayyeka sarva samsthītau*. Jīva Goswāmi explains this in his *Tattva-Sandarbha* and *Prīti-Sandarbha* in the following way: “*Sandhinī śakti* is the power through which being is established and communicated to others, through which all existence of things in time and space is caused...*Samvit śakti* is the power of cognition through which knowledge is communicated...*Hlādinī śakti* is the power of enjoyment, through which knowledge becomes enjoyment’. According to Walter Eidlitz, the *samvit śakti*, through which God knows himself, is *bhakti*:

‘*Bhakti* is not a human faculty, it originates in God. But it can be obtained through listening to a true *bhakta*’s narration of God’s *līlā*.’¹⁴

Bonaventura attempts to show in his *Itinerarium Mentis in Deum* a practical path to the innermost secret of the Trinity. Compared with the teachers of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava School Bonaventure’s approach looks abstract and academic and I do not know of any other systematic attempt to translate the Trinity into the spiritual life of a Christian. I remember seeing a book-title *The Holy Spirit: The Forgotten Deity*, that pretty much reflects Christian spiritual practice.

By contrast, the *sādhana* of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa-Premā is very practical and fully fleshed out in Rūpa Goswāmi’s *Bhaktirasamṛtasindhu*¹⁵ and similar works that often are abbreviations or popularisations of it. This “Trinitarian” teaching does reach the heart of its practitioners and keeps them entranced and visibly enchanted. It obviously is more than a theological formulation of an impenetrable mystery or an attempt to rationalise philosophically what is beyond the intellect.¹⁶ An ordering of one’s life according to ethical principles and worship tradition is the basis for the more specific practices that entail a systematic sensitizing of the higher faculties of the soul. Eventually a point is reached where God-Love becomes a habit of the soul and transforms the personality in such a way that it becomes one with Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa-Premā.

¹⁴ W. Eidlitz, *Kṛṣṇa Caitanya*, Stockholm: Almquist & Wicksell, 1968, p. 32.

¹⁵ *Bhaktirasamṛtasindhu* by Rūpa Goswāmi, Dilli: Dilli Viśvavidyālaya, 1963.

¹⁶ I have detailed this “education in God-Love” in my essay: ‘Eine indische Wissenschaft der Gefühle: Rūpa Goswāmi’s *Bhaktirasamṛtasindhu* und *Ujjvalanīlamanī* als *Rasāstra*’ in E. Weber ed., *Indien in Deutschland*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1990, pp.137-150.