

Introduction

Overview of the Six Sandarbhas

PRĪTI SANDARBHA is the last of the *Six Sandarbhas*, which are collectively known as the *Bhāgavata-sandarbha* or *Ṣaṭ-sandarbha*. The first five in order are the *Tattva*, *Bhagavat*, *Paramātmā*, *Kṛṣṇa*, and *Bhakti Sandarbha*. In the first *Sandarbha*, namely *Tattva Sandarbha* (*Anuccheda* 50), Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī provided a succinct overview of the complete anthology, pointing out that in these *Six Sandarbhas*, the three primary topics of *sambandha*, *abhidheya*, and *prayojana*, as propounded in the authoritative text of *Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, are delineated in sequential order.

The first four *Sandarbhas* — *Tattva*, *Bhagavat*, *Paramātmā*, and *Kṛṣṇa Sandarbha* — treat the first primary topic of *sambandha-tattva*, which Jīva Gosvāmī specifies as “the truth regarding the dynamic relation between the referring text (*vācaka*) and the Subjective Reality to which it refers (*vācya*).” This relation is not merely propositional, involving a set of tenets to be intellectually grasped and accepted on faith as metaphysical truth. Rather, the relation is direct and participatory. As the reader’s attention is drawn into moment-to-moment involvement with the ideational truths disclosed through the self-revealing words of the *Bhāgavata*, the direct experience of one’s own authentic self, the world, Ultimate Reality, and the interwoven relation between them is radically disclosed and transformed. Thus, the first four *Sandarbhas* firmly ground the practitioner in a core view of life that is progressively

refined, enhanced, and accentuated, and which serves as the existential metaview¹ through which the practice can then be enacted in earnest.

In the *Tattva Sandarbha*, the Absolute Reality (*tattva*) is first defined in a quintessential statement of the *Bhāgavata* (1.2.11) as “nondual consciousness” (*advaya-jñāna*), which is self-disclosed in three distinct features as Brahman, Paramātmā, and Bhagavān, in direct correspondence with the existential metaview held by the practitioner. The first three *Sandarbhas* discuss these three features in detail. Among them, Bhagavān is shown to be the most complete disclosure of the nondual *tattva* from a comparative analysis of the ontological status of each of these three features and the existential domains of Being over which they preside. Although Bhagavān manifests in innumerable divine forms, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the original form, Svayaṁ Bhagavān. This is the subject matter of *Kṛṣṇa Sandarbha*, the fourth volume, which reexamines all the core truths regarding Bhagavān in the light of this original, utterly complete disclosure.

The fifth book, *Bhakti Sandarbha*, treats the second of the three primary topics — namely, *abhidheya*, “the effective means prescribed by the *Bhāgavata* to enable the direct disclosure of Bhagavān.” As with the shaping of the practitioner’s relational metaview (*sambandha-jñāna*), the practice (*sādhana*) is to be taken up in a participatory fashion involving the physiological, cognitive, affective, and volitional aspects of the self — in short, the totality of the self. This consummate involvement (*sādhana*) is neatly summed up by Jīva Gosvāmī in the single term *sāmmukhya*, “the turning of one’s intentful regard toward Reality,” which forms the essence of all spiritual practice. If this turning of attention is richly informed by the relational metaview disclosed in the first four *Sandarbhas*, then the practice becomes correspondingly self-revealing of the

¹ The word “metaview” here refers to the profound internalized recognition of fundamental truths that serves to regulate and transform both cognitive and affective processes in an overarching manner to optimally fit the practitioner to the practice and the Ultimate Reality that is thereby disclosed.

very same Reality. This is the true nature of the interwadded relation that exists between *jñāna* and *bhakti* on the path of devotion. In *bhakti*, *jñāna* is not mere theoretical or propositional knowledge but existential metaframing of the practitioner’s cognitive-affective apparatus that directly bears upon and is reciprocally impacted by the involvement in *sādhana*.

This brings us to the third of the three primary topics — namely, *prayojana*, “the completion state to be attained through realization of the means,” which is elaborated in the final volume of the series, *Prīti Sandarbha*. Because of the integral relation that exists between the three core principles of *sambandha*, *abhidheya*, and *prayojana*, the completion state to be attained is determined both by the practitioner’s relational metaview (*sambandha-jñāna*) and by the direct participatory involvement (*sādhana*), or turning of one’s intentful regard (*sāmmukhya*), that is correspondingly informed. Thus, in regard to the complete disclosure of the nondual *tattva* as Bhagavān, Jīva Gosvāmī argues that the end state to be attained (*prayojana*) cannot be simple liberation (*mukti*), for the liberated state is merely the existential ground in which the play of divine love (*prīti*) is made possible in the highest sense. From this starting point, in which *prīti*’s radical encompassment and transcendence of *mukti* is clearly shown, Jīva Gosvāmī goes on in this volume to illuminate the intrinsic nature, dynamic effectivity, and transcendental aesthetics of divine love with astonishing detail and insight.

Profound Well-being Devoid of Misery Is the Foundational Goal

In Jīva Gosvāmī’s investigation into the ultimate goal attainable by human beings (*prayojana*), he first defines this goal in the most basic and universal terms as the state of happiness or “profound well-being” (*sukha*) uninterrupted by misery (*duḥkha*). By beginning the investigation here, he frames the discussion in pragmatic terms, addressing the crisis of meaning faced by all human beings,

irrespective of the temporal or cultural settings. Had the discussion begun by immediately professing an abstract or otherworldly goal, its relevance would not have been perceived to be universal or efficacious in nature. Starting from the implicit embodied disposition to seek a state of profound well-being divorced from misery, Jīva Gosvāmī systematically builds his case, demonstrating that this state culminates exclusively in divine love (*prīti*).

In this vein, it is abundantly evident that life is full of both pains and pleasures. Everyone — rich or poor, young or old, male, female, or eunuch — experiences both of these conditions without exception. The natural instinct of every living being is to seek a state of sustained well-being and to become free from all dangers and miseries (*sukha-prāpti-duḥkha-nivṛttiś ca*). This instinct is most developed in human beings. All our efforts, conscious or unconscious, are directed toward that end. Thus, everyone's most pressing aim in life (*puruṣārtha*), on which all philosophers, theologians, and even common people can agree, is the attainment of sustained well-being bereft of the experience of suffering. If we experience pain, we naturally endeavor to become relieved of it. And when relieved of the pain, we then yearn for happiness. Thus, attaining freedom from pain is our first concern.

According to Vedānta philosophy, the sufferings faced by human beings are of three categories, namely, *adhyātmika*, or those that derive from our own body and mind, such as physical ailments and mental distress; *adhibhautika*, or those that are caused by other living beings, such as ferocious animals, bugs, mosquitoes, and enemies; and *adhidaivika*, or those that result from natural calamities, such as earthquakes, tsunamis, hurricanes, floods, famine, cloudbursts, and lightning. Human beings have always striven to cope with these problems and endeavored to become free from or reduce their sufferings. With the advancement of science and technology, much success has been achieved in counteracting disease, defending ourselves against natural enemies, and providing protection from natural calamities. Yet, the overall condition of humanity is far from satisfactory. Scientific advancement has not yet accorded a complete solution to human suffering. Even if a

particular type of problem or suffering is dealt with successfully, others emerge to the surface.

Correspondingly, there is no permanent source of happiness. Undoubtedly, technology has provided a better standard of life and varied ways of enjoying it. Yet, the level of happiness in general has not increased. Rather, with the complexification and depersonalization of life brought by scientific advancement, the levels of stress, mental anxiety, and existential angst have only increased. Moreover, the material pleasures awarded by various gadgets are temporary and do not address the true crisis of meaning faced by human beings. People, in general, are still left with a sense of emptiness within. Thus the technological solution to the acquisition of happiness and dispelling of suffering is seen to be deficient at the very root, reducing the state of existential well-being to the condition of having many temporary pleasurable items.

Next to be considered is the solution offered by conventional religion. Most major religions of the world advocate a system of belief along with an accompanying set of rituals and practices that are meant to ensure the attainment of heaven, where life is full of happiness and without any suffering. Some philosophers prescribe the path of self-abnegation in this life. They advocate the shunning of sensual pleasures and promise a life of eternal bliss after death. The fact is, however, that no material undertaking can award an unending result. If the cause is temporary and limited, the effect cannot be permanent and unlimited. Moreover, the entire material creation itself is subject to cyclical periods of manifestation and dissolution, and thus the heaven being promised, which is merely the highest plane of the cosmos, cannot be a permanent place.

On this note, Śrī Kṛṣṇa affirms that when a living being's stock of pious credits is exhausted through enjoyment in heaven, he or she returns to the mortal world (GĪTĀ 9.21). Furthermore, heaven is not completely free from suffering. Scriptures such as the Purāṇas inform us that sometimes even heaven is attacked and captured by a class of ungodly beings called *asuras*. At such times, even Indra, the lord of heaven, is compelled to run away to a safe haven.

Besides, inequality in the standard of luxury and pleasure exists even in heaven, which leads to pride among those more privileged and envy among those less advantaged. This too is the basis of suffering. Consequently, even the attainment of heaven is shown to be an inadequate and impermanent solution to the problem of suffering.

Inquiry into Life's Ultimate Goal

Taking the above discussion into consideration, we must look for a solution that is not fraught with these deficiencies. That solution is systematically elaborated by Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī in *Prīti Sandarbha*. He first analyzes that the root cause of suffering is the beginningless prior absence of direct knowing of the Absolute (*anādi-tattva-jñāna-abhāva*). This absence in the cognitive framework defines the basic psychological constraint of the *jīvas* in the conditioned state. This constraint, however, can be removed through the inculcation of wisdom, or immediate knowing of the Absolute. Thus, to address the problem of suffering at its root, the solution lies in the immediate cognition of the Absolute (*tattva-sākṣātkāra*), which frees the agents from all identification with misery and situates them in a state of perpetual, unconditional well-being. Consequently, at the most fundamental level, direct realization of the Absolute (*tattva-sākṣātkāra*) is the most pressing need and thus the real goal of human life (*puruṣārtha*), coessential with *mukti*. This is the foundation of Jīva Gosvāmī's argument on which he erects the edifice of *prīti*.

The next step in the procedural analysis is to examine more precisely exactly what is implied by the term *tattva*, since this is the very object that is meant to be realized. It was explained in *Bhagavat Sandarbha* (Anucchedas 2–4) that one Absolute Nondual Reality (*parama-advaya-tattva*) is self-disclosed in three features as Brahman, Paramātmā, and Bhagavān. So the question naturally arises, what are the distinguishing features that define these three disclosures while still preserving their essential unity as one Nondual Absolute? Associated with this consideration is the question as to

whether a hierarchical order of Being pertains between these three disclosures.

The traditional approach of the impersonal nondual wisdom schools, which argue on the basis of formal logic, is to deny all qualification (*viśeṣaṇa*) in the Absolute. At first glance, this *a priori* constraint seems necessary to avoid the dualism that would otherwise pertain between the Absolute as essential substance (*vastu*) and the various qualities (*guṇas*) by which It would thereby be delimited (*upādhita*). From this perspective, Brahman, the unqualified Absolute, would be the highest disclosure of the nondual *tattva*. Jīva Gosvāmī, however, reframes the question from the very root, demonstrating that this argument is subject to the error of mistaking the Absolute's transcendental qualification (*aprākṛta-viśeṣaṇa*) for the qualifications that pertain to the realm of formal logic and worldly experience (*prākṛta-viśeṣaṇa*). In other words, this argument itself imposes a limitation on the Absolute in the very attempt to ensure Its freedom from limitation. By categorically depriving the Absolute of all qualification, Its transcendental qualification, which sustains and discloses Its nondual essentiality, is thereby also denied.

Employing the terms *viśeṣaṇa*, *viśeṣya*, and *viśiṣṭa*, Jīva Gosvāmī turns the traditional view on its head, arguing that Brahman is nothing other than the one nondual *tattva* stripped of the disclosure of Its intrinsic transcendental qualification. Consequently, as the unqualified Absolute, Brahman is merely the *viśeṣya*, or that feature of the Absolute that awaits (and conceals) the disclosure of Its qualification. Thus, although Brahman, as the Absolute, is certainly complete (*pūrṇa*), It is embedded in a yet higher existential order of completion. On the other hand, Bhagavān is the *viśiṣṭa*, the same nondual *tattva* intrinsically self-endowed with Its own transcendental qualification and thus self-disclosed in Its own original state of utter completion (*pūrṇatama*). From this perspective, Bhagavān is clearly the highest and most complete disclosure of the nondual *tattva*. Connecting this argument to his original point, Jīva Gosvāmī shows that the immediate intuition of Bhagavān (*bhagavat-sākṣātkāra*) is superior to and inclusive of the

sākṣātkāra of Brahman and Paramātmā. Consequently, after first establishing *tattva-sākṣātkāra* as the *puruṣārtha*, he then specifies the direct realization of Bhagavān (*bhagavat-sākṣātkāra*) as the real goal to be attained.

Taking the argument a step further, Jīva Gosvāmī next makes the point that the immediate intuition of Bhagavān (*bhagavat-sākṣātkāra*) is made possible only by endowment with *prīti*, which discloses Bhagavān's essential nature (*svabhāva*) as the supreme ground and object (*āspada*) of unconditional love (*nirupādhi-prīti*). Without *prīti*, even the direct vision of Bhagavān amounts to no more than a semblance of true seeing (*sākṣātkāra-ābhāsa*), as in the case of those of impure hearts such as Duryodhana and Jarāsandha, who saw Kṛṣṇa directly but remained inimical toward Him. Their seeing was as good as not seeing at all. Consequently, by way of this systematic investigation, the ultimate goal to be attained (*parama-puruṣārtha*) is established as *prīti* for Bhagavān.

To summarize the conclusion in mathematical terms, Jīva Gosvāmī sets forth the following formula: *parama-tattva-sākṣātkāra* = *paramānanda* = *parama-puruṣārtha*. In this regard, he undertakes a comparative analysis of the various grades of bliss, beginning from the bliss of material prosperity (*martyānanda*) to that of the realization of the self (*ātmānanda*), the apperception of the unqualified Absolute (*brahmānanda*), and culminating in the bliss of the immediate intuition of Bhagavān (*bhagavat-sākṣātkāra*), which is shown to be all-exceeding both in magnitude and aesthetic quality. Bhagavān's very own essential constitution (*svarūpa*) is that of supreme unadulterated bliss (*paramānanda* or *kevalānanda*), and He can be attained only by *prīti*, which is devoid of all ulterior motive. Thus, *prīti* is not only the means of attainment but also the very end to be attained. Since, however, *prīti* is not commonly understood, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī writes the last of the Six *Sandarbhās* to elucidate its true nature.

Prīti Is Superior to Mukti

In India, liberation (*mokṣa* or *mukti*) is traditionally considered the highest *puruṣārtha*. Strictly speaking, however, *mukti*, literally meaning “freedom, deliverance, or release,” is a purely negative term, signifying the cessation of the experience of misery. It does not directly denote a positive state of bliss, here meaning a transegoic state of beatitude beyond the mere eradication of suffering. This negative type of *mukti* is specified as the goal by those who adhere to the philosophical schools of Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Sāṅkhya, Yoga, and Advaita Vedānta. Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī argues, however, that in order to be complete, the end state to be attained (*parama-puruṣārtha*) must be of the nature of bliss and not merely the cessation of misery. To validate his point, he specifies the following five divisions of *mukti* based on the evidence of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*: the transpersonal liberation of conscious identity or unity with the Absolute (*sāyujya*), the attainment of Bhagavān’s own divine abode (*sālokyā*), endowment with divine opulence comparable to that of Bhagavān (*sārṣṭi*), attainment of a divine form similar in constitution to that of Bhagavān (*sārūpya*), and perpetual abidance in the proximity of Bhagavān (*sāmīpya*).

Among these five, the first, namely *sāyujya*, is the type of impersonal liberation that is most commonly referred to by the word *mukti*. *Sāyujya* has two divisions — absorption of one’s conscious identity in Brahman (*brahma-sāyujya*) and absorption of one’s conscious identity in Bhagavān (*bhagavat-sāyujya*). Neither of these is recommended by Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī because the merging of conscious identity in either manifestation of the *tattva* imposes a categorical limitation on the range of direct participatory involvement with the *tattva* in its utter completion as Bhagavān. Being grounded in the state of radical nondistinction (*kevala-abheda*), this type of *mukti* denies all possibility of *prīti*. In both types of *sāyujya*, the liberated individual is freed from all material suffering. In *brahma-sāyujya*, there is no explicit experience of bliss. In *bhagavat-sāyujya*, however, there is a faint experience of bliss by virtue of the identification with Bhagavān. But this too is abhorred

by devotees, who long only to please Bhagavān through ever newly unfolding loving reciprocation and not to appropriate His bliss.

Among the four types of personal liberation, *sāmīpya* is considered preeminent because the external direct manifestation of Bhagavān (*bahih-sākṣātkāra*) is predominant therein. True devotees, however, do not hanker for any of these types of liberation because they are intent only on rendering loving service to Bhagavān. Moreover, *mukti* is naturally included in *prīti*. A devotee may sometimes accept one or more of the four types of *mukti* if they assist in one's service to Bhagavān. Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī affirms that *mukti* is attained only by the *sākṣātkāra* of Bhagavān, and this is possible only by means of *prīti*. Thus, he rightly concludes that *prīti* is superior to *mukti*.

Prīti Defined

A subject is substantiated by specifying its definition and the pragmatic means for its significance and scope to be “real-ized” — both in the sense of “comprehended” and “made real.” Consequently, after establishing *prīti* as the ultimate goal of human life (*parama-puruṣārtha*) — the sole truly significant object that supplies meaning to all other pursuits — Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī sets forth the formal definition of *prīti*. It is crucial to grasp this definition in order to understand the elucidation of *prīti* that follows in the remainder of the book. First, however, we must consider the problem posed by the conventional view of love, an indispensable reference frame that nonetheless tends to obscure genuine discernment of what is meant by *prīti*.

In general reference, the word *prīti* simply means “love,” which is a very common word used by all people. Yet the commonly held notion of love is not the same as what is implied by the word *prīti* in its technical sense as defined by Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī. Indeed, his definition of the term is a very subtle and difficult concept to grasp. There are a few reasons for this. First, love is quite possibly the most popular word in any language, universal in its application. When a word is overused, it tends to lose its original sense. It is

comparable to repeatedly eating the same dish of food. Eaten every day, even a favorite dish loses its charm and appeal. On account of this overfamiliarity, almost everyone uses the word “love” without paying attention to its meaning. Although people use it regularly or hear it being used, they normally never reflect on its true import. Every word has one or more meanings. According to the *Nyāya-siddhānta-muktāvalī*, the meaning of a word is generally understood through the following methods:

1. From grammar (*vyākaraṇa*). For example, we know the meaning of the word “went” as the past perfect form of the verb “to go.”
2. From analogy (*upamāna*). We may learn the meaning of the word “lime” by hearing that it is similar to a lemon.
3. From a dictionary (*koṣa*), such as the Oxford Student Dictionary.
4. By hearing the authoritative statements of others (*āpta-vākyā*), as when parents teach their children about the various bodily parts, such as the nose and eyes.
5. Through social interactions (*vyavahāra*). For example, a person may not know what an iPad is, but when visiting a friend, he hears the friend ask his wife, “Please bring my iPad.” When she hands him the instrument, the person sees it directly and understands the meaning of the word.
6. By the elucidation of the meaning of a word (*vivṛteḥ*). For example, a person reads or hears that a planet is a heavenly body that orbits the sun.

Surprisingly, however, we use many words in our daily lives without knowing the precise definition or meaning. We may not have understood the meaning by any of the above methods. Rather, we may hold only a vague idea of the meaning of many words regularly employed. “Love,” indeed, is such a word.

Another reason for our difficulty in understanding love is that we think we already know what it is. As a result, we make no effort to examine it more critically. Or, if it is being elaborated, we do not pay attention to it. Everyone claims to have some experience of love. The status of love that Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī explains here, however, is categorically distinct from whatever we may have experienced. In fact, we have never experienced anything like what he

describes. Thus, we have absolutely no idea about it. But we can easily misunderstand it by projecting upon it our material notion of love.

For these reasons, Jīva Gosvāmī endeavors to elucidate the true nature of *prīti*. To provide a basis for discussing his formal definition of *prīti*, he first cites the following verse from *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*. In spite of the complication involved, it is seen even here that *prīti*'s unique status can be effectively demonstrated only in contradistinction to worldly love: "May unceasing love (*anapāyini prītiḥ*), such as those bereft of discernment have for the objects of worldly experience, never slip from my heart, engaged as I am in constant remembrance of You" (*Viṣṇu Purāṇa* 1.20.19).²

This is a verse spoken by the great devotee Prahāda to Śrī Nṛsiṃhadeva. He provides an example by way of reference to the worldly affection (*prīti*) that ordinary people have for sense objects. An example is linguistically defined as an ideational structure that is intelligible both to the instructor as well as the uninformed audience. Examples aid in understanding an unknown object or phenomenon by way of reference to that which is already known. In the present case, however, the example can also be a hindrance because the *prīti* that is known is material (*prākṛta*), whereas the *prīti* that is under investigation is transcendental (*aprākṛta*). Since these two types of *prīti* belong to two entirely distinct categories of Being, the comparison between them can only be in terms of the identity of their defining characteristic and not in terms of their essential constitution. Consequently, in his explanation of this verse, Jīva Gosvāmī first emphatically makes the point that the two types of *prīti* share a oneness in terms of their defining characteristic (*lakṣaṇaikya*). In spite of this, however, he goes on to say that the two types of *prīti* are categorically distinct since the material *prīti* is a functional capacity of the extrinsic potency (*māyā-śakti-vṛtti*), whereas the transcendental *prīti* is a functional capacity of Bhagavān's own intrinsic potency (*svarūpa-śakti-vṛtti*). This distinction must be carefully kept in mind throughout the

² *yā prītir avivekānām viṣayeṣv anapāyini*
tvām anusmarataḥ sā me hṛdayān nāpasarpata (māpasarpata)

discussion. Otherwise, one type of *prīti* may be misunderstood for the other.

This brings us at last to Jīva Gosvāmī's formal definition of *prīti*. He first makes the point that the word *prīti* signifies both "a state of profound happiness" (*sukha*) — which includes joy (*mut*), delight (*pramoda*), exuberance (*harṣa*), and bliss (*ānanda*) — and "a state of fondness" (*priyatā*), which includes affection (*bhāva*), tenderness (*hārda*), and friendliness (*sauhṛda*). He then defines happiness (*sukha*) as a particular state of consciousness (*jñāna-viśeṣa*) that is rooted in the feeling of elation (*ullāsa*). Fondness (*priyatā*), on the other hand, is defined as a particular state of consciousness (*jñāna-viśeṣa*), the very essence of which is a favorable disposition toward its intended object (*viṣaya-ānukūlya-ātmaka*), without any self-serving motives for personal satisfaction. Additionally, this state of consciousness is pervaded by a feeling of elation (*ullāsa*) caused by the immediate experience of love's object (*tad-anubhava*), which itself proceeds from the yearning to attain it (*tat-sprhā*). The foundation of this elation, however, is the core attitude of agreeableness toward love's object (*tad-ānukūlyānugata*), because it is the root even of the yearning to attain love's object, which sets the causal chain of affectivity in motion. Whatever is pleasing to the beloved also gives pleasure to the lover, resulting naturally as a concomitant effect of *prīti*. Consequently, even though *priyatā* also includes the affective state of happiness (*sukham*), it is distinguished from and superior to it.

The state of fondness (*priyatā*), which is *prīti*'s primary defining characteristic, is essentially rooted in the selfless disposition to bring about the happiness of the beloved. For this reason, it transcends the state of happiness (*sukha*) by disregarding all considerations of one's personal happiness. The fact that the beloved is happy brings happiness to the person who extends love. But even such concomitant happiness may occasionally become an obstacle if it then impedes the initiative to please the beloved through continuous loving service. The true lover disdains any such happiness. Indeed, the lover does not even desire to obtain the beloved for her own pleasure if this desire hinders in any way the happiness of

her beloved. In this case, the perpetuated state of separation from the beloved does not cause distress to the lover because the very thought of the beloved's happiness brings joy to her heart.

On the other hand, if the beloved is happy and this brings joy to the lover's heart, even this joy is not independently relishable but is grounded in the recognition that happiness is being afforded to the beloved. Thus the happiness experienced in love is not the same type of happiness one experiences by contacting pleasurable sense objects. It is a different standard of happiness. In fact, externally, it may even occasionally appear like suffering, as in the case of the separation between the *gopīs* and Kṛṣṇa. Thus in love, although one's concern is exclusively for the happiness of one's beloved, bereft of any conscious desire for personal satisfaction, the lover is nonetheless afforded a distinct quality of joy that transcends the normal type of happiness experienced in general.

This type of *prīti* is not to be found in material relations. Although worldly love may externally appear similar to spiritual love, it is always self-centered because it is based on the egoic identification with the material body. The word "self" in the term "self-centered" refers not to the authentic self (*ātmā*) but to the body-mind complex, which is a phenomenological construct. Accordingly, material love is a functional capacity belonging to material nature (*prakṛti*). Spiritual love, however, is a functional capacity of Bhagavān's own intrinsic potency. It is conscious and perpetually evolving, and its very nature is bliss. It is bereft of all vested interest and awards complete fulfillment to the living beings. Having once attained it, nothing further remains to be obtained. Although it is not inherent in the constitutional makeup of living beings, it can be sympathetically imbibed through the grace of a highly realized devotee or Bhagavān. The cowherd damsels of Vraja are the supreme ideal of this *prīti*.

To build on his above explicit definition of *prīti* and significantly extend it, Jīva Gosvāmī then specifies the partial and complete manifestations of *prīti*. In this regard, he undertakes a critical examination of the various graded stages of incomplete love based on an analysis of the intent (*tātparya*) involved in the loving act and

the degree to which other attachments may still be present (*anyā-saṅga*). The key point being made in this examination is that in the most profound sense, *prīti* has *prīti* alone for its intended aim (*tātparya*). From the stage of *prīti*'s explicit arising (*prakaṭodaya-avasthā*), in which no more than a semblance (*ābhāsa-mātra*) of other attachment is to be found in the agent, *prīti*'s manifestation is said to be complete (*samyak*). By thus explicitly clarifying what he means by *prīti* through this critical analysis, Jīva Gosvāmī lays the foundation for its relevant discussion in the remainder of *Prīti Sandarbha*.

Developmental Unfolding of *Prīti*

Up to this point in this introduction, we have briefly examined the first two of the four major themes in Jīva Gosvāmī's presentation of *Prīti Sandarbha*. The first major theme is concerned with establishing *prīti* as the *parama-puruṣārtha* in the most universal terms (*Anucchedas* 1–60). The second major theme is concerned with providing a precise definition of *prīti* that serves as the basis of its ongoing elucidation (*Anucchedas* 61–83). The third major theme deals with the developmental unfolding of *prīti* (*Anucchedas* 84–109), and the fourth, with the examination of *prīti* as *rasa* (*Anucchedas* 110–429). In this schematic design, the first three topics lay the groundwork for the discussion of the final topic, which occupies the greater portion of the book. As a convenience to the reader, this thematic division of topics is concisely shown in the “*Prīti Sandarbha* at a Glance” schematic diagram found in the appendix. This diagram serves as an effective navigational tool to make evident how the major topics, along with their subtopics are interknit to form a synthetic whole.

In discussing *prīti*'s developmental unfolding (*Anucchedas* 84–109), Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī first delineates the eight graded stages of *prīti* — namely, *rati*, *prema*, *praṇaya*, *māna*, *sneha*, *rāga*, *anurāga*, and *mahā-bhāva*. In this connection, he then discusses the different integrated self-concepts (*abhimānas*) with which the liberated devotees are endowed in response to the disclosure to them of

a specific essential nature (*svabhāva-viśeṣa*) of Bhagavān. In this regard, he shows the developmental unfolding of the integrated self-concept (*abhimāna*) from its most rudimentary form in the *jñāni-bhaktas* to its radically complete form in Kṛṣṇa's amorous lovers (*kāntās*). Then, to link the gradation of *prīti* to that of the devotees' *abhimāna*, he specifies the extent of *prīti*'s manifestation in the different categories of liberated devotees, from the *jñāni-bhaktas* to the *preyasīs*.

In the context of the same discussion, Jīva Gosvāmī emphasizes the importance of Bhagavān's own *abhimāna* in regard to the *parikaras* and the critical role played by *mamatā* and *abhimāna* in the intensification of *prīti*. Without assuming the identity (*abhimāna*) of a lover, there can be no extension of love, and without the profound sense of relatedness by which one looks upon love's object as "mine" (*mamatā*), *prīti* remains enfeebled. Finally, to bring a sense of completion to this entire discussion, Jīva Gosvāmī explains the gradation of *bhāvas* in the *parikaras* from the *dāśya-bhaktas* up to the amorous lovers (*kāntās*). Among the latter, the Vraja-devīs are shown to be supreme, and among them, Rādhā is the foremost. A key factor that serves as the basis of discussion throughout this section is the analysis of the two aspects of Bhagavān's intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*), namely *aīśvarya* and *mādhurya*. It is the *parikaras*' experience of either of these two features or some combination of both that determines the qualitative nature and magnitude of their *prīti*.

The Establishment of Prīti As Rasa

This brings us at last to the culminating topic of this book and, indeed, of the *Sandarbhās* as a whole — namely, the elaboration of *prīti* as transcendental aesthetic delight (*aprākṛta-rasa*, Anucchedas 110–429). From the time of Bharata Muni, the original systematizer of the *rasa* theory in his *Nāṭya-śāstra*, up to Abhinavaguptā, the fourth major commentator on Bharata's seminal work, *bhakti* was not accepted as a *rasa* by the secular aestheticians. Consequently, Jīva Gosvāmī's first strategy in this section is to establish the validity of *bhakti* as a *rasa* with reference to the same criteria set by the recognized authorities in the field of secular aesthetics (Anucchedas 110–111.7).

In this regard, Jīva Gosvāmī specifies that the criteria of eligibility for the enablement of *rasa* are of three varieties — namely, “fundamental fitness” (*svarūpa-yogyatā*) of the primary constituent (*rati*) to function as the *sthāyi-bhāva* of the aesthetic experience (*rasa*); “fitness of the supportive components” (*parikara-yogyatā*) to nourish the *sthāyi-bhāva* into a relishable sentiment, here referring to the *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas*, and *vyabhicāri-bhāvas*; and “fitness of the agent” (*puruṣa-yogyatā*) to function as the existential support for the manifestation of *rasa*. By systematically demonstrating that *bhakti* fulfills all these criteria by its essential nature, Jīva Gosvāmī affirms that there can be no objection to its admittance along with the eight or nine *rasas* accepted by the secular aestheticians.

Having accomplished this first essential task, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī then takes a radical step and completely turns the standard view of aesthetics on its head. By examining the qualitative nature (*vastu-vicāra*) of the emotive components of the secular *rasa*, he demonstrates that these components themselves are incapable of giving rise to the otherworldly bliss (*alaukika-sukha*) that is the hallmark of *rasa*. In this vein, he argues that in the case of *laukika-rati*, its supportive components beginning with its determinant causes (*kāraṇas*), due to their phenomenal character (*laukikatva*), are incapable of their own accord to nourish *rati* through their respective functions, beginning with enabling *rati* with the fitness

to sprout in the form of subtle relish (*vibhāvana*). Moreover, the *rati* of secular aesthetics is itself unstable (*asthāyi*). Its stability is only in the form of the observer's psychic predisposition (*vāsanā*) to empathize with the emotion being portrayed based on previous experience of the same emotion. Thus in *laukika-rasa*, it is due only to a master poet's skill in artistic composition that the emotive components are elevated to an otherworldly status (*alaukikatva*) and thus become fit (*yogya*) to nourish *rati*. In the case of *bhagavat-prīti*, however, the supportive components are transcendental (*alaukika*) and essentially constituted of wonder (*adbhuta-rūpatva*) by their very own intrinsic nature. Thus in the most fundamental sense, *bhagavat-prīti-rasa* is the only genuinely transformative aesthetic experience by its very constitution.

The Emotive Components of Bhagavat-prīti-rasa

Having completed his critical analysis of the standard *rasa* theory, which provides ample justification for the acceptance of *prīti* as *rasa*, Jīva Gosvāmī begins the discussion of *bhagavat-prīti-rasa* in earnest. He first lays the foundation for the elucidation of the individual *rasas* that come later by presenting a general overview of the emotive components of *prīti-rasa* (*Anucchedas* 111.8–158.6). In this regard, he discusses in order the two divisions of *ālambana-vibhāva* (*viṣaya* and *āśraya*), *uddīpana-vibhāva*, the two divisions of *anubhāvas* (*udbhāsva* and *sāttvika*), and the *sañcāri-bhāvas*, illustrating each with examples from the *Bhāgavata*. In this section, Jīva Gosvāmī's main concern is with the elaboration of the excipients (*uddīpanas*) of *prīti-rasa*, which he breaks down into five categories — namely, Kṛṣṇa's divine attributes (*guṇas*), the native community to which He belongs (*jāti*), His transcendental acts (*kriyā*), personal paraphernalia (*dravya*), and sacred occasions related to Him (*kāla*, such as *Janmāṣṭamī* and *Ekādaśī*). These same five categories of *uddīpanas* will be examined again later in specific reference to the five primary *rasas*. Jīva Gosvāmī concludes this entire section by stating that *bhagavat-prīti-rasa* is essentially constituted

of the conjunction (*saṁvalana*) of the emotive components thus described.

Gauṇa-rasa

Having presented a general overview of the emotive components of *bhavadat-prīti-rasa*, Jīva Gosvāmī then takes up the discussion of the individual *rasas*, beginning with the seven secondary (*gauṇa*) *rasas* (*Anucchedas* 158.7–174.1). He humorously justifies his decision to treat the *gauṇa-rasas* first by stating that this is in keeping with the principle “that one should save the sweets for last” (*madhureṇa samāpayet*). The seven secondary *rasas* in order are wonder (*adbhuta*), humor (*hāsyā*), chivalry (*vīra*), fury (*raudra*), terror (*bhayānaka*), abhorrence (*bībhatsa*), and pathos (*karuṇa*). The five primary (*mukhya*) *rasas*, which are discussed at the end of the book, are to be understood as devotion predominated by the immediate intuition of Bhagavān (*jñāna-bhakti-maya*), divine servitude (*bhakti-maya*), parental affection (*vātsalya*), friendship (*maitrī-maya*), and amorous love (*ujjvala*).

To distinguish these two categories of *rasas*, Jīva Gosvāmī makes the significant point that the permanent foundational affects (*sthāyi-bhāvas*) of the five primary *rasas* are the primary emotive states (*mukhya-bhāvas*) because they are the refuge (*āśraya*) for the seven secondary *bhāvas*, beginning with wonder (*vismaya*), as well as their permanent substratum (*niyata-ādhāra*). For this reason, the *rasas* corresponding to these five *sthāyi-bhāvas* are also primary (*mukhya*). On the other hand, the seven secondary *sthāyi-bhāvas* are secondary emotive states (*gauṇa-bhāvas*) because they are included within *bhāgavata-rasa* only by virtue of their relation to *bhagavat-prīti* and because they are temporary substrata (*anīyata-ādhāra*), arising only occasionally within the five types of loving devotees. Consequently, the *rasas* corresponding to these secondary *sthāyi-bhāvas* are also secondary (*gauṇa*).

Rasābhāsa

After concluding his description of the seven secondary *rasas*, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī begins his elaboration of the topic of *rasābhāsa* (*Anuccheda*s 174.2–202), which he divides into three categories — namely, *ābhāsatva*, or the occlusion of an appropriate *rasa* by combination with an inappropriate *rasa* or *bhāva*; *rasollāsa*, the exultation of *rasa* by combination with an inappropriate *rasa* or *bhāva*; and *rasābhāsollāsa*, the exultation of a semblance of the aesthetic experience. Among these three, he specifies the occlusion (*ābhāsatva*) of *rasa* as “the obstruction in the relishing of *rasa*” (*bādhyamānāsvādyatvam ābhāsatvam*). This obstruction occurs when the *sthāyi-bhāva* that is being developed into the experience of *rasa* is inhibited by contact with other aesthetic sentiments (*rasas*) that are inappropriate to its fundamental constitution (*rasasyāyogya-rasāntarādi-saṅgatyā*). This topic forms the major point of discussion in this section.

In the course of this examination, Jīva Gosvāmī cites numerous examples from *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* that seem to involve instances of *rasābhāsa*. Because, however, the *Bhāgavata* has been established as the supreme authority in the matter of the disclosure of the Absolute as Bhagavān, who is *rasa* Himself (*raso vai saḥ*), there is no possibility of it containing any impure or occluded *rasas*. Jīva Gosvāmī carefully examines these cases and vindicates them of any potential deficiency. He thereby demonstrates that *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* is free of the defect of *rasābhāsa*.

The Five Primary Rasas

The five primary (*mukhya*) *rasas*, which are essentially constituted of specific varieties of *prīti* for Bhagavān, are discussed in the final subsection of the book (*Anuccheda*s 203–429). Jīva Gosvāmī designates these five *rasas* as follows — *śānta-bhakti-rasa*, *bhakti-maya-rasa* (of three varieties, *āśraya*, *dāśya*, and *praśraya*), *vatsala-rasa*, *maitrī-rasa*, and *ujjvala-rasa*. In his treatment of each of these

rasas, Jīva Gosvāmī discusses in order the objective support (*viṣaya-ālambana*), namely Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the subjective supports (*ādhāra* or *āśraya-ālambana*), the five categories of excitants discussed above under the general *rasa* theory (*uddīpanas*), the intentional ecstatic responses (*anubhāvas*), the involuntary ecstatic responses arising from the state of unalloyed being (*sāttvika-bhāvas*), the transitory emotions (*sañcāri-bhāvas*), the permanent foundational affect (*sthāyi-bhāva*), and the *rasa* in question, illustrating each with examples. The first four *rasas* are discussed in *Anuccedas* 203–273, with the treatment of each successive *rasa* becoming progressively more elaborated. The discussion of *ujjvala-rasa*, however, is by far the most intricate and comprehensive, taking up the major portion of this entire subsection (*Anuccedas* 274–429).

Ujjvala-rasa, also called *mādhurya-* or *śṛṅgāra-rasa*, is the culmination of all the *rasas*. Jīva Gosvāmī specifies three divisions of the subjective supports (*ādhāra*) of this *rasa* — namely, the common heroines such as Kumbhā (*sāmānyā*), Kṛṣṇa’s queens who lawfully belong to Him (*svīyā*), and the Vraja-devīs, to whom he assigns both the terms *parakīyā* and *parama-svīyā*. By using the two terms together, his intent is to say that although in the *prakāṣa-līlā* the *gopīs* appear as though wives of other men (*parakīyā*), from the perspective of ontological being (*vastutaḥ*), their belongingness to Kṛṣṇa is of the absolute transcendental order (*parama-svīyā*). The Vraja-devīs, who are in the mood of *parakīyā*, are the supreme subjective supports (*āśraya*) of *ujjvala-rasa*, being endowed with incomparable beauty, a plethora of divine attributes, and exceptional skill in all the aesthetic arts, by which they are optimally suited to please Kṛṣṇa in the most utterly complete fashion.

To round out the topic of the subjective supports (*ādhāra*) of *ujjvala-rasa*, Jīva Gosvāmī then discusses the varieties of heroines among the Vraja-devīs as well as the divisions of their friends and rivals. He states that Kṛṣṇa’s consorts (*vallabhās*) are of three classifications — namely, *mugdhā*, “young and inexperienced,” *madhyā*, “intermediate in youth and experience,” and *pragalbhā*, “mature and highly experienced.” These three classifications of consorts are

determined on the basis of their respective ages and corresponding behavior. Additionally, in accordance with the differences in their basic natures (*svabhāva*), there are three further divisions — namely, *dhīrā*, “composed,” *adhīrā*, “contentious,” and *dhīrādhīrā*, “a mixture of these two dispositions” (i.e., “partly composed and partly contentious”).

As an extension of the same topic, Jīva Gosvāmī makes the point that according to whether the mutual interrelations between the *gopīs* of differing affective dispositions (*bhāvas*) are marked by compatibility (*sādrśya*), slight compatibility (*kiñcit-sādrśya*), indistinct compatibility (*asphuṭa-sādrśya*), or opposition (*virodhitva*), there is a further fourfold division of the *gopīs* as friends (*sakhī*), well-wishers (*suhṛt*), neutral participants (*taṭasthā*), and rivals (*prātipakṣikī*), respectively. In this regard, he clarifies that among the divine sports of Śrī Bhagavān, the essential nature (*svabhāva*) of His amorous play in particular (*śṛṅgāra-kṛīḍā*) is such that by drawing support from an astonishing variety of affective states displayed by His beloveds of diverse natures (*tat-tad-bhāva-vaicitrī*), which conform externally even to adverse emotional responses such as envy, self-conceit, and pride, it nourishes the experience of aesthetic delight (*rasa*). Consequently, even these normally turbulent emotions are of a transcendental nature, categorically distinct from their material counterparts.

In accordance with his standard procedure, Jīva Gosvāmī next treats in order the five categories of excitants (*uddīpanas*), the ecstatic responses (*anubhāvas*), which are of four classifications (*udbhāsva*, *sāttvika*, *alaukika*, and *vācika*), and the transitory emotions (*sañcāri-bhāvas*) (*Anucchedas* 289–362). Moving on to the discussion of the *sthāyi-bhāva*, he specifies that *kānta-bhāva* is of two varieties — namely, that which is essentially grounded in the relation of direct union (*sākṣād-upabhogātmaka*), and that which is grounded in the relation of approval of the union of others (*tad-anumodanātmaka*). The first type of *kānta-bhāva* is evident in the direct *nāyikās*, whereas the second type is found in their friends, the *sakhīs* (*Anucchedas* 363–369).

Having elaborated the various emotive components of *ujjvala-rasa*, Jīva Gosvāmī then examines *ujjvala-rasa* itself, which is essentially constituted of the conjunction of all these components (*Anucchedas* 370–429). This is the culminating topic of the entire book and, indeed, of the entire *Sandarbha* anthology. Jīva Gosvāmī first specifies two divisions of *ujjvala-rasa* — namely, *vipralambha*, “separation,” and *sambhoga*, “union,” which he further defines as the psycho-emotive state (*bhāva*) in which the united couple’s enjoyment (*bhoga*) occurs through intimate mutual bonding (*yūnoḥ saṅgatayoḥ sambaddhatā*). He then makes four classifications of the state of separation (*vipralambha*) — *pūrva-rāga* (prior to meeting), *māna* (arising from indignant anger), *prema-vaicittya* (out of “love’s perplexity” or “counterintuitive response”), and *pravāsa* (when the beloved is sojourning far abroad). Accordingly, the state of union (*sambhoga*) is also of four types corresponding to the four types of *vipralambha* after which it ensues.

In his treatment of this topic, Jīva Gosvāmī explicitly brings to light the amorous sentiment (*ujjvala-rasa*) that is relished in each of the four types of *vipralambha* and their ensuing states of *sambhoga*, illustrating each of them with examples from the *Bhāgavata*. He concludes the book in *Anuccheda* 429 with a description of the *sambhoga* and *vipralambha* of Śrī Rādhā in the *rāsa-līlā*. This is elaborated through the statements of the *gopīs* in a key set of verses (SB 10.30.27–34) that disclose Rādhā’s supremacy among them all. Since Śrī Rādhā is the ultimate refuge and direct embodiment of *prīti* for Śrī Kṛṣṇa, it is perfectly appropriate to conclude *Prīti Sandarbha* with this glowing depiction of Her transcendent glory.

Unique Features of *Prīti Sandarbha*

(1) *Prīti Sandarbha* is a unique contribution to the domain of Indian philosophy and religion. The great thinkers of India envisioned four primary objectives of human life (*puruṣārthas*), popularly known as moral integrity (*dharma*), prosperity (*artha*), fulfillment of meaningful life aspirations (*kāma*), and liberation from worldly existence (*mokṣa*). Among them, *mokṣa* is universally regarded as the topmost goal. In *Prīti Sandarbha*, however, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī skillfully demonstrates that *prīti* is far beyond the much sought-after goal of *mokṣa*. Indeed, in this world, what is most sorely lacking is *prīti*. Everyone yearns for unconditional love, and yet hardly anyone experiences it or even knows what it is or how and where to obtain it. The problems of the world, be they social, economic, political, or family-centered, are all rooted in the machinery of ignorance and self-deception, and their sole viable solution lies in *prīti*.

Unfortunately, however, our modern educational institutions do not offer any knowledge or relevant guidance regarding *prīti*. Never in the history of the world has there been such a profusion of freely available knowledge as currently on offer in this age of information technology. Yet never before in history have people been so starved for loving relationships than at present. This is the paradox of modern life. In this book, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī unravels the mystery of *prīti* in a rigorously systematic manner, placing it on the highest pedestal of all human pursuits. If his radically insightful discourse can be grasped and implemented even by 0.01 percent of the population, the world will gain substantial access to the psycho-technology of self-transcendence, to affordances of profound significance and prosperity in all domains of life, and to a stable state of optimal fittedness to the ever-shifting socio-cultural environment and the ever-evolving world, all grounded in the consciousness and dynamics of unconditional love.

(2) Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī provides a precise and comprehensive definition of *prīti* that serves as the basis of *prīti*'s radical reconsideration as the highest form of enlightened awareness, beyond the immediate intuition of the Self or Brahman. Everyone talks about love, but most people have no idea what love actually is. *Prīti* is not just an emotion, a fleeting quality of the mind. Rather, it is a conscious functional capacity constituted of the intrinsic potency of Bhagavān (*svarūpa-śakti-vṛtti*) and is thus transphenomenal by its fundamental nature. *Prīti*, as defined by Jīva Gosvāmī, should not be confused with worldly love, which is based on the identification with the material body. *Prīti* categorically transcends such egoic identification and is thus bereft of all ulterior self-serving motives. Moreover, all wisdom virtues are reciprocally manifested in a person who has become assimilated to *prīti*, which is attained by the grace of Kṛṣṇa or His pure devotee. Having once attained *prīti*, one never loses it, and it goes on evolving, leading the subject unflinching to its Ultimate Source, Bhagavān.

(3) Jīva Gosvāmī's discussion of *prīti*'s developmental unfolding from *rati* to *mahā-bhāva* clearly demonstrates that *prīti* is a conscious entity, multidimensional in its fundamental constitution, and reciprocally adaptable both to the specific agent in which it appears and the existential arena in which its play is exhibited. In this respect, *prīti* reflects Bhagavān's own multifaceted essential nature (*svabhāva*), which discloses a limitless spectrum of Being drawn forth along the two primary developmental lines of His divine majesty (*aiśvarya*) and His enticing mellifluousness (*mādhurya*). It is in direct response to the disclosure of a specific essential nature of Bhagavān from out of this vast spectrum of Being that the devotee's core identity (*abhimāna*) emerges in one of the five primary relational modalities of *śānta*, *dāsyā*, *vātsalya*, *sakhyā*, or *mādhurya*. And the extent and aesthetic quality of *prīti*'s manifestation in the devotee is optimally suited to impel the appropriate empathetic response to Bhagavān's specific loving disclosure. Jīva Gosvāmī thus concludes that from whatever perspective one examines the question, Bhagavān's *svabhāva* alone is the root cause of *prīti* for Him.

(4) In wisdom traditions around the world, the prototype of enlightenment is typically the self-realized sage or mystic philosopher. From this well-founded perspective, it would seem perfectly preposterous to uphold as one's highest ideal of enlightened consciousness a group of simple village girls deeply enamored with a mischievous village boy. And yet it is precisely the *gopīs* of Vraja who are shown to be supreme among all the various types of devotees due to the quality and magnitude of their unconditional love. Thus on the basis of the superiority of the *gopīs'* *prīti*, which includes and transcends *jñāna*, they are established as the foremost realizers of the Absolute. Even Kṛṣṇa feels indebted to their service and love. And among all the *gopīs*, Śrī Rādhā is supreme.

(5) Another unique feature of *Prīti Sandarbha* is its unequivocal establishment of *bhagavat-prīti* as *rasa*, a multilayered emotional complex of aesthetic delight rooted in love. Most of the Indian wisdom schools do not make any accommodation for affectivity within the scope of the quest for liberation or enlightenment. Emotions are seen as problematic and must be eschewed. The schools of Advaita Vedānta, Yoga, and Sāṅkhya, in particular, advocate extreme renunciation. They consider emotions to be a source of bondage. There are other philosophers and mystics, however, who regard the caring element that is at the core of affectivity to be vital to the process of self-transcendence, being interdependently and reciprocally related to cognitive awakening. The aestheticians, the Vaiṣṇavas, the Śaivites, and the Tāntrikas all include affectivity within the scope of their spiritual practice.

As discussed previously, most of the traditional scholars of *rasa* theory prior to Śrī Rūpa Govāmī and Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī accepted *bhakti* or *prīti* only as an affect (*bhāva*). Because of the rigidly restrictive framing through which they categorized *bhakti*, they did not think it capable of attaining the status of the aesthetic experience (*rasa*). In *Prīti Sandarbha*, however, Jīva Gosvāmī forcefully argues against the objections to *prīti* being admitted as *rasa*. He limits the objection of the orthodox aestheticians to the conditional love (*rati*) that is directed to the *devas* and not to the unconditional divine love that originates from and finds its ultimate repose

in Svayaṁ Bhagavān Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In fact, he goes as far as to say that it is only *prīti* for Bhagavān that is genuinely capable of being experienced as *rasa* and not the *laukika-rati* exchanged between worldly heroes (*nāyakas*) and heroines (*nāyikās*). For that matter, the *laukika-rati* itself is incapable of being determined as a permanent foundational affect (*sthāyi-bhāva*) because it is unstable. Since its subjective and objective ground, the *nāyaka* and *nāyikā*, are both temporary, how can *rati* itself be permanent (*sthāyī*)?

(6) In Jīva Gosvāmī's examination of the topic of *rasābhāsa*, the determining factor is the precise nature of the interplay that prevails between incompatible emotive components when they happen to come in contact, leading to the three varieties of *rasābhāsa* previously described (*ābhāsatva*, *rasollāsa*, and *rasābhāso-llāsa*). Since these occurrences are illustrated with examples from *Śrīmad Bhāgavata*, it would seem to suggest that the *Bhāgavata* itself is marred by instances of aesthetic incongruity (*rasābhāsa*). Jīva Gosvāmī meticulously pinpoints and critically examines all such verses, vindicating them of any tinge of factual *rasābhāsa*. This is in keeping with Śrī Sūta Gosvāmī's statement at the conclusion of his discourse on the *Bhāgavata* in which he affirms that *Śrīmad Bhāgavata* is the spotless Purāṇa (*śrīmad-bhāgavatam purāṇam amalam*, SB 12.13.18). Correspondingly, at the very beginning of the book, the author himself, Śrī Vyāsa, declares that this book is simply *rasa* — purely and pervasively — and he exhorts the *rasika* devotees to relish this *rasa* up to the point of liberation and beyond.

(7) Another novel contribution of Śrī Jīva Gosvāmī is his elaboration of the principle that just as Śrī Kṛṣṇa contains within His essential being an unlimited manifold of identical *prakāśa* forms that can all be manifested simultaneously, so too the same principle applies to His divine abode, to His liberated associates, and to the manifest and unmanifest domains of His *līlā*. By this principle, Jīva Gosvāmī demonstrates that Kṛṣṇa's liberated associates, such as the *gopīs* of Vraja, are in eternal union with Him in a separate invisible dimension of being (*prakāśa*), even when they experience separation from Him in the manifest *līlā*.

(8) There are some Vaiṣṇava scholars, such as Śrī Hit Hari-varṁśa Gosvāmī, who advocate the view that Śrī Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa are inexorably grounded in the state of perpetual union (*nitya-vihāra*). These scholars do not admit that Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa can ever be separated. Jīva Gosvāmī, however, propounds the principle that without separation (*vipralambha*), there is no relish in union (*sambhoga*), just as in the absence of hunger, one does not relish a meal. Most of the pastimes of Kṛṣṇa would not be possible if the concept of *nitya-vihāra* were accepted. Rather, Jīva Gosvāmī's above-mentioned theory of *prakāśa* manifestations is a much more nuanced solution to the question of the causally interactive relation that pertains between the states of separation and union.

(9) In *Prīti Sandarbha*, the ritualistic aspect of *bhakti* has been completely ignored. This was already dealt with at length in the previous volume of the anthology, namely *Bhakti Sandarbha*. Here, the emphasis has been laid exclusively on *prīti*, which is manifested in a devotee's heart by the grace of Bhagavān or His unalloyed devotee. Consequently, the entire examination of *prīti-rasa*, beginning from *Anuccheda* 110 till the end of the book, presupposes the existence of *prīti* in the devotees who are under consideration. From this point of view, the discussion of *prīti-rasa* is primarily of theoretical value for those in whom *prīti* is not yet manifest. Yet, as pointed out at the beginning of this introduction, because of the integral and interdependent relation that pertains between *sambandha*, *abhidheya*, and *prayojana*, the theoretical elucidation of *prīti-rasa* significantly impacts the practitioners' relational metaview (*sambandha-jñāna*) at the existential level, which then informs, shapes, and refines the precise nature of their practice (*abhidheya*), leading to the ultimate goal being illuminated in the discussion (*prayojana*). Moreover, by this vivid disclosure of *prīti*'s limitless and variegated unfolding within the transcendental domain of *prīti-rasa*, the intentful yearning for *prīti* is awakened in the heart of sincere practitioners, extinguishing the desire for all other lesser pursuits.

Division of the Book into Two Volumes

Because of the length of this work, *Prīti Sandarbha* has been divided into two volumes. Of the book's four major thematic divisions shown in the "Prīti Sandarbha at a Glance" page in the appendix, the first three divisions and part of the long fourth division are contained in the first volume. The remaining subsections of the fourth division are treated in the second volume, which also contains all the references, including glossary, subject index, and bibliography. Due to the arrangement of the text in two volumes, it has been necessary to adopt a concordant numbering system wherever page references are given in the two books. A Roman numeral (either I or II), followed by a period, is placed before the page number to indicate in which volume the reference occurs. In volume I, this system was necessary only for the "Contents at a Glance" page, where these numerals appear in the right-hand column. In volume II, the same system has been applied for the "Contents at a Glance" and "Table of Contents" pages and throughout the subject and verse indexes.

