

UNITED WISDOM

Bhakti: A Personal Relationship with the Divine

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-21-N05 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Bhakti: A Personal Relationship with the Divine

1. When Conviction Becomes Address

Imagine someone returning home after a difficult conversation. They could state their convictions: the world has meaning, life is more than success, human beings can love. But today they want to say something else: “I do not know what to do; help me see.” The speaker's position changes between the two statements. In the first, they report something about a subject. In the second, they address someone they believe capable of hearing. This is a hypothetical scene, rather than evidence that prayer necessarily receives an answer or that everyone should pray.

What this article explores. Bhakti is usually translated as devotion or religious love. We will consider what happens when a relationship with the divine becomes personal: how the meaning of knowledge, the character of action, and the question of oneself change. Bhakti nevertheless does not constitute one philosophical school with a single answer about God. Our principal interlocutors here will be the Bhagavad Gita, Ramanuja's theological reading, and John Stratton Hawley's historical inquiry.

A personal relationship begins with the distinction between “it” and “you.” We can know details about someone without ever speaking to them. Conversely, we can trust them while retaining many questions. Yet this familiar situation does not establish that religious address works in exactly the same way. A person before us can be observed, object, leave, or correct our image of them. The divine addressee is understood within a particular teaching and practice. Comparison helps us notice a relationship's structure, but proves nothing by itself about its addressee's existence.

Another question matters: does address mean abandoning reasoning? If love is understood as a prohibition on asking, it can indeed make someone dependent. But another meaning is possible: a question is asked from within a relationship the person values. They do not stop thinking; they stop treating the subject of thought solely as a problem to solve and close. For bhakti, this distinction matters. Becoming convinced of a thesis and dedicating oneself to the divine are different events; their connection still needs explaining.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

2. One Word, Several Histories

In *A Storm of Songs*, historian John Stratton Hawley examines the origin of the familiar narrative of a unified “bhakti movement.” The university's description of the book emphasizes that this unifying narrative has its own history and political circumstances, particularly in its twentieth-century formulation. A single later scheme therefore cannot be transferred to all South Asian devotional traditions. Hawley, book description at Columbia University Seminars.

It does not follow that modern historians invented devotion. Religious life itself differs from a way of gathering its many forms into one history. Imagine a large family album. The photographs are real, but arranging them “from a southern beginning to a northern completion” already expresses the compiler's particular design. It may reveal connections or conceal individuals' independence. Likewise, “movement” both helps comparison and creates an expectation of a shared route.

The practical meaning of this caution is simple: with every text, ask whom it addresses, whom it calls divine, which community it assumes, and what salvation it promises. Love for Krishna cannot automatically be replaced with an impersonal feeling toward “the universe.” A relationship with Vishnu in a particular theology does not coincide with every poetic utterance about the highest. Even identical words such as “love,” “name,” and “self-surrender” may perform different tasks.

We must also distinguish a general category from an independent religious tradition. Comparing devotional language with Sikh practices is permissible; dissolving the Sikh tradition into “another Hindu bhakti” erases its own history and authorities. Relationships and questions should be compared while preserving the names of those who carry them.

A reader may object that so many distinctions dissolve the article's common subject. Yet that subject remains clear enough: someone organizes life around a relationship with the divine and considers it valuable in itself. We can study this structure without declaring it identical everywhere. Commonality opens a question here, while the answer belongs to a particular text or community. Reading becomes slower, but we can hear why participants in different traditions might disagree with our convenient generalization.

3. A Gift That Is Not Measured by Price

In Bhagavad Gita IX.26, Krishna accepts even a modest offering brought with devotion; IX.27 extends dedication to everyday actions. In XII.13–20, devotion is related to a person's qualities, including the absence of hatred and compassion. This is a brief paraphrase of particular passages, rather than a definition of all forms of bhakti. Bhagavad Gita, IX.26–27, XII.13–20.

The meaning of a modest gift deserves separate consideration. If a relationship's value depends on an offering's expense, wealth becomes a condition of access. If the giver's orientation matters, the measure changes. A small gift ceases to be a reduced copy of a large one. It may express all the attention available to a person. Yet attention cannot be counted like coins or reliably proved to an outside observer.

An inner motive does not cancel an action's quality, however. An imagined person brings a gift while humiliating someone unable to reciprocate equally. Their own feeling of generosity does not yet make the action good. Likewise, dedicating work to the divine does not remove questions about what is produced and who is harmed. “I dedicate this” can itself conveniently conceal an action that deserves correction.

A gift also differs from a transaction. In a transaction, I transfer something for an agreed result: paid, received. A gift may include hope for a response, but the relationship breaks down if that response becomes the condition of all devotion. A difficult question arises: can someone address the divine when what they want does not happen? This does not call on anyone to endure every misfortune without help. It examines whether they regard God as a controllable source of benefits or as an addressee whose value exceeds a particular use.

Such an understanding makes bhakti more demanding than a pleasant experience. The giver must also ask about themselves: why does it matter that my gift is noticed? What am I trying to obtain: recognition, protection, proof of my own correctness? These questions do not devalue a religious action. They help distinguish dedication from bargaining without assuming that anyone will ever fully escape mixed motives.

There is also a question of how someone experiences their inability to give with a “pure heart.” A demand for complete purity can postpone every action: while a desire for recognition remains in me, help seems invalid. But mixed motives differ from deliberate deception. An imagined person can notice their need for gratitude and still refrain from presenting it to the recipient as a debt. Acknowledging a motive allows a change in action, rather than only a sentence upon oneself.

On the other hand, motives' complexity cannot authorize leaving everything unexamined. “Everyone benefits” does not prove that every way of giving is equivalent. A gift conditional on submission and help that can freely be accepted or declined create different relationships. If devotion is discussed as dedication, the question concerns its human forms too: does my action leave the other their own voice? Inner intention here encounters an external boundary, the consequences for the person I help.

4. Devotion, Knowledge, and a Dispute About Reality

In Ramanuja's interpretation, bhakti is not a consoling addition to real knowledge. It is connected with direct awareness of Brahman; theoretical familiarity with the teaching alone is insufficient. Shyam Ranganathan shows this in the sections on salvation and bhakti, with references to *Vedārthasaṅgraha* §238 and *Śrībhāṣya* I.1.1. Ranganathan, “Rāmānuja,” §§4 and 5c.

Why does philosophy matter here? Because relationships involve participants. If ultimate truth consists in completely removing the real separation of lover and beloved, their relationship's meaning needs one explanation. If individuality remains and the person really depends on a higher whole, the explanation differs. We cannot declare the answers identical in advance merely because “devotion” appears in both.

An imagined musical analogy can help us understand the difference. We can learn definitions of mode, rhythm, and performance. Yet knowing these definitions does not mean having heard a particular work. At the same time, an impression of music does not make theory useless: theory may help us hear what was previously unnoticed. The religious case involves a stronger claim, knowledge of the divine; the analogy only shows why description and participation can differ.

The objection is obvious: intense involvement can generate the desired impression and then mistake it for knowledge. A loving person can idealize too. Psychological intensity alone therefore does not establish the truth of religious understanding. For an outside reader, bhakti as knowledge remains a theological and philosophical assertion requiring discussion. For an adherent, it poses another question: does participation change the ability to see the subject, or merely intensify confidence in an already accepted picture?

This dispute is more interesting than the simple opposition of “reason or feelings.” Cognition may include disciplined attention, trust in a teaching, and a changed relationship to action. Yet each of these conditions permits error. Conscientious reading neither turns a possible experience into a proved universal fact nor reduces it to an emotional surge. It notices the tradition's precise claim: devotion can be a way of relating to what is considered real, rather than only a believer's mood.

5. The Personal and the Unmanifest

At the beginning of Bhagavad Gita chapter XII, Arjuna asks about devotees of Krishna and those oriented toward the unmanifest. The answer distinguishes the paths, acknowledges the latter's attainment of the goal, and discusses the unmanifest's difficulty for embodied beings. XII.9–12 then offers a sequence of possibilities: sustained concentration, practice, action, and renunciation of its fruits. Bhagavad Gita, XII.1–12.

It helps not to hurry toward modern labels. “Personal” does not necessarily mean an enlarged copy of a human personality with its resentments and incidental preferences. “Unmanifest” does not necessarily mean an empty void or an absence of the divine. A form of address and a claim about ultimate reality are connected but different questions. Someone may use a name and image without believing that their imagination exhausts the highest.

A problem of specificity arises. To address someone, a person needs words. But every word limits: father, lord, friend, light. Literally transferring every property of an earthly father or ruler to the divine can justify fear and arbitrariness. Removing every definite word risks depriving address of its addressee. Traditions answer this tension differently; readers need not resolve it through one universal formula.

We can imagine someone starting a letter to a loved one several times. Each greeting seems inadequate, but language's inadequacy does not force them to abandon the letter. In a religious relationship, such caution can retain two requirements: speaking specifically and remembering that what is said does not exhaust the subject. It does not mean all names are interchangeable. A chosen name is connected with a particular narrative, text, and community.

The sequence of possibilities in chapter XII should not be read as a ranking of people's worth either. It allows discussion of the gap between desire and ability. Someone may not sustain uninterrupted concentration but may be able to change the character of their work. A small, achievable action then does not merely indicate the failure of a great one. It has meaning of its own. Our analytical interpretation of this passage is that devotion is tested in repeating an available action, rather than only awaiting an exceptional inner event. The text nevertheless remains religious instruction, rather than a universal psychological handbook.

6. Dedicating an Action and Its Fruits

When someone says, “I perform this action for the highest,” the question of results changes. In ordinary work, results are needed: a house must stand, food must be suitable, and a promise must be fulfilled. Renouncing ownership of the fruits cannot mean a right to disregard quality. Otherwise, devotion would justify negligence, and others would suffer from it.

Consider a hypothetical scene. A volunteer prepares food for a shared table. They hope to be thanked and also want people to eat. When someone else receives the praise, the principal desire becomes visible. This does not make the first volunteer a bad person or demand immediate selflessness. Yet the situation shows the difference between useful work and a need to affirm one's worth through it.

Dedication may mean that the result does not belong to me entirely, even if I made an effort. Other people, circumstances, and things outside my control participate in it. This does not remove responsibility. Instead, a person answers for the part available to them while ceasing to treat the entire world as an extension of their will. In the theological context, this limit is defined by a relationship with God; a secular reader can understand the question about the limits of appropriation while retaining their own worldview.

The reverse risk is to declare every success a gift from God while shifting every error onto circumstances. Dedication then becomes asymmetrical: it adorns success and protects pride in failure. More honest reasoning asks which decisions were mine, what I knew, and what I could correct. An imagined manager who calls a project service must still listen to someone whose payment was delayed.

An action can become dedication only together with a particular attitude toward its participants. If one's own feeling of holiness alone remains central, the surrounding people become instruments of spiritual self-confirmation. Bhakti then loses what made it a relationship: the ability to move beyond one's own advantage. This is our examination of dedication's practical meaning, rather than a claim that all communities define work, duty, and grace identically. The question stays specific: what changed in the action because of the one to whom it is dedicated?

7. A Song That Sounds Before Others

Readers often encounter devotion in a song or poem. This matters to understanding itself. An argument can be stopped to ask the meaning of each term. A song moves through time; repetition, pause, and voice make address audible. Yet musical force does not certify theological truth. A text the listener disagrees with can also sound persuasive.

Instead of calling every song “an expression of one eternal truth,” it helps to discover what a particular work does. Does it praise, ask, dispute, lament the beloved's absence, or address a community? These actions differ. Gratitude assumes one kind of relationship, longing another. If all religious speech is translated in advance into a peaceful “unity with everything,” we lose the ability to hear separation's pain and the tension of waiting.

An imagined listener understands the song's language only partly. They feel its beauty but do not know who speaks or to whom. Several honest possibilities remain: continue listening, read

a translation, or ask about the performance's circumstances. It is less honest to declare one's impression the full meaning of another tradition. In that case, the listener does not hear another person's address, but uses their voice to confirm an already familiar picture of the world.

Singing together poses another question: how does a personal relationship become shared? One person addresses the divine, and others take up their words. This may open a space of participation or create pressure: someone who does not feel the expected emotion appears insufficiently devoted. Attention to freedom of participation helps distinguish these possibilities. A participant may remain silent, learn, and ask questions; an absence of tears does not indicate an absence of dignity.

A song also cannot be separated from who may perform and explain it. Beautiful sound does not cancel questions of language, access, and authority. A historical account of bhakti becomes more substantive when it shows particular connections among voices, rather than listing great poets as interchangeable illustrations. Independent reading begins with a small but significant step: acknowledging that a song has its own addressee, who may differ from ours.

8. Devotion and Power: A Difficult Objection

The skeptical objection is serious: devotion trains people to submit and thereby facilitates abuse. The transition from God to a human representative demanding unconditional trust in themselves is particularly dangerous. The theological meaning of service does not prove a teacher, leader, or community infallible. A separate question about authority lies between these assertions.

Imagine a participant being asked not to discuss a teacher's questionable action because doubt supposedly destroys love. The object of devotion needs clarification here. If a relationship with the divine has been replaced with defending a particular person's reputation, spiritual language closes ordinary examination of actions. An accuser's motives may be complex, but that does not remove the need to consider the assertion itself and its grounds.

Another objection concerns exclusivity: love for a particular divine image may accompany contempt for others. It would be wrong to answer that all bhakti excludes such possibilities by definition. A personal relationship can unite, but group membership alone does not guarantee respect for outsiders. The particular requirements for a devoted person therefore matter, rather than only the intensity of their declarations.

Yet the possibility of abuse does not establish that every commitment is harmful. Loyalty to a friend, work, or a promise also limits arbitrary choice. The distinction is between a freely acknowledged meaning of commitment and a prohibition on examining its limits. Someone may consider service good and still refuse to participate in humiliation. Preserving others' dignity does not obstruct love merely because someone declares the contrary.

Bhakti poses a particular version of the question: how can we relinquish exclusive preoccupation with ourselves without granting another person the right to control our entire life? “Trust no one” destroys relationships, while “Trust completely” removes responsibility for discernment. Between them, reasoning remains necessary. Readers should attend not only to the promised spiritual result but also to rules for treating disagreement. Religious love deserves sufficiently serious discussion that its human forms are not exempted from questions about consequences.

9. What This Means in Practice

If religious language resonates with a reader, they can voluntarily consider one ordinary action as dedication. There is no need to begin by promising to change an entire life. They might choose care for a loved one, preparing food, or fulfilling an obligation already accepted, and ask “What am I serving here, and how can another person notice it?” The answer should be checked through action, rather than the elevation of its wording.

It then helps to separate the quality of the work from an expectation of recognition. If the action was performed well but no gratitude came, what exactly causes hurt? Different answers are possible: a need for fair division of labor, fatigue, or a wish to be noticed. They are not equivalent. “I should not desire the fruits” is insufficient: sometimes a broken agreement needs discussion, while sometimes a gift is an attempt to buy admiration.

A reader who does not share the faith need not call this observation bhakti. They can retain another vocabulary and consider a question encountered in the text: can I value something beyond its usefulness to me? This is a philosophical encounter with a tradition, rather than a concealed religious initiation. The distinction allows learning without appropriating another's identity.

For primary reading, take Bhagavad Gita XII.1–12 and compare two things: Arjuna's question and the sequence of answers. Where does the text distinguish paths? Where does it acknowledge the difficulty of embodied existence? Where does it move from a state of attention to action? Readers may disagree with the initial assumptions. The task is first to see the proposed argument accurately enough.

Finally, when encountering a song, note the author's name, title, translator, and particular addressee. If these are unknown, acknowledge a limit to understanding. A liked line can invite further reading, but cannot prove that “all religions say the same thing.” A few minutes of such attention sometimes offer more than a broad list of universal aphorisms: a distinct voice appears, one that need not agree with our interpretation.

None of these proposals promises an obligatory experience. They can be postponed. Devotion that one is forced to feel immediately already sits poorly with the honesty of personal address.

10. A Relationship That Cannot Be Finished with a Definition

Bhakti opens a question about a relationship's value. If the divine exists only as a useful explanation of the unknown, the need for it may disappear once an explanation is obtained. If it is understood as the addressee of love and dedication, the relationship does not end when a particular problem is solved. Here lies bhakti's strength: a person connects life's meaning with what they consider worthy of love independently of immediate advantage.

Yet this strength does not remove philosophical difficulties. We still need to understand who loves, whom they address, what grace means, whether individuality persists, and how truth is recognized. Different teachings answer differently. “Love” alone does not make their answers identical or allow difficult reading to be replaced with pleasant agreement.

Return to the imagined person after a difficult conversation. Their address may change nothing in this evening's circumstances. It may nevertheless pose a more precise question: do they regard the other participant only as an obstacle to their desire? If tomorrow they listen more attentively, correct an unfair remark, and preserve a necessary boundary, an action appears that can be examined. If the address merely confirms their superiority, the question remains open.

Such a criterion does not replace faith with an assessment of everyday usefulness. It recalls where a religious relationship enters human life and becomes answerable to others. The theological claim remains broader than this criterion; a person is not reduced to a list of useful acts. Yet here readers can see a difference between declaring devotion and its possible enactment.

The article can end without a general reconciliation of all traditions. It is enough to retain distinctions between a thought about the divine and address to it, a gift and a transaction, dedication and abandonment of responsibility. Bhakti allows us to ask how love changes ways of knowing and acting. Believers and outside readers need not reach the same final answer. An attentive encounter remains possible when difference remains.

Sources Used

1. Bhagavad Gita, IX.26–27; XII.1–20. English translation by Kashinath Trimbak Telang, *The Bhagavadgītā*, Sacred Books of the East, vol. 8, 1882. Chapter IX, chapter XII. The article uses our own brief paraphrases; the translation is not reproduced.

2. Shyam Ranganathan. Rāmānuja, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, §§4 and 5c; primary locators discussed by the author: *Vedārthasaṅgraha* §238, *Śrībhāṣya* I.1.1.

3. John Stratton Hawley. *A Storm of Songs: India and the Idea of the Bhakti Movement*. Harvard University Press, 2015. The university book description was read, rather than the book's full text.

Tags: bhakti, Bhagavad Gita, devotion, religious love, Ramanuja.