Lutheran Mission Matters

Saccidananda and the Trinity: Hindu-Christian Conversations on the Supreme Reality

Sam Thompson

Abstract: In a religiously plural world, building bridges with our neighbors belonging to different faiths is a desirable task. Such an effort often requires us to make an earnest effort to understand our neighbor's worldview and religious faith. To a Lutheran whose worldview shaped by Luther's two realm perspective, such knowledge is beneficial in living out our calling in both realms of life. The effort taken in this essay is to explore into the Hindu understanding of God as *Saccidananda* in relation to the Christian understanding of God as Trinity. This essay suggests that, although both those concepts of supreme reality emerge to be fundamentally different, they could provide a common ground for a Hindu and a Christian to engage in conversation.

Introduction

The role of dialogue and conversation across religious boundaries is vital in a religiously plural world. A better understanding about each other's religious thought is no doubt helpful in engaging one's neighbor. To a Christian whose worldview is enriched with Luther's theology of two realms, an understanding about neighbor's faith finds distinctive purpose in each realm of life. Two-realm theology affirms a Christian's existence in two respective realms of life, not separate but distinct. The concerns of each realm, though distinct, find their purpose and cohesion under one God, who is the Lord and sustainer of both realms of life. The right hand realm, concerned with God's salvific purpose, finds a Christian concerned with evangelism and sharing of the Gospel in an intelligible way to one's neighbor. In a religiously plural world, a basic understanding about our neighbor's religious vocabulary and

Rev. Dr. Sam Thompson is an ordained pastor from the India Evangelical Lutheran Church. He is experienced in cross-cultural Christian missions working among people from different cultural and religious backgrounds. He has a PhD in Systematic Theology from the Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. He is currently teaching at the Concordia Theological Seminary, in Nagercoil, India. He is married to Shana and they have two children, Sasha and Shaan. mail2samt@yahoo.co.in

God talk will no doubt help us to share meaningfully without confusion or distortion our distinctive way of looking at the ultimate reality. In the left hand realm, we are concerned about the well-being of all in the areas of peace, justice, and common good. This requires people coming together beyond religious and cultural boundaries to find better ways to organize their collective existence under law in the temporal realm of life. However, ethical teachings of different religions do offer some positive value in ordering the moral lives of people. In this regard, understanding each other's faith in relation to one's own is a beneficial task to undertake. This effort would provide a window into our neighbor's religious world which shapes his moral thinking.

> In a religiously plural world, a basic understanding about our neighbor's religious vocabulary and God talk will no doubt help us to share meaningfully without confusion or distortion our distinctive way of looking at the ultimate reality.

In continuation with this rationale, the purpose of this paper is to undertake a brief conversation with the Hindu concept of Supreme reality as Saccidananda (Being, Consciousness, Bliss) and the Christian understanding of God as Trinity. Do these differently named concepts point towards the same understanding of God, or are they fundamentally different? What are some of the points of continuity and discontinuity? For our purpose, the Christian understanding of the Triune God, as articulated in classical Christianity, and the Hindu understanding of Saccidananda in classical/philosophical Hinduism, as found in the Upanishads[1] and interpreted by Sankara[2] are employed. The main thesis of this paper is that the Trinitarian doctrine present in Christian tradition and the Hindu understanding of Supreme reality seem to bear some similarities, but they are to be understood differently.

Hindu Understanding of the Supreme Reality: The Saccidananda[3]

In Hinduism, the Upanishads name the supreme reality as Brahman. According to Sankara, Brahman cannot be correctly described as this or that; thus, it is often described more as *neti neti* meaning "not this, not this." Therefore, this absolute unitary being in the Upanishads is mainly described in negative or apophatic terms. Brahman is described as infinite and limitless.[4] As a being infinite and temporal, spatial limitation does not apply to Brahman. The supreme reality is therefore ageless and deathless. Thus, this unitary being is believed to be incorporeal and incomprehensible. Brahman is also thought to be a conscious principle. The supreme reality is understood to be stable among the stable, "unmoving, the one swifter than the mind," best, all-knowing, all-wise, the blissful, without equal or superior, immutable and steadfast. Brahman is free from all evil, ageless, deathless,

hungerless, thirstless, and does not experience any emotions, such as sorrow, suffering, and pain. In other words, the Upanishads teach Brahman to be beyond the experience of the temporal world and unrelated to all empirical experiences.[5] Sankara teaches that the real Brahman, who is attributeless and formless (*Nirguna Brahman*), has a triune nature. This triune innermost mystery of Brahman could be best described by the Sanskrit word, *"Saccidananda"* (merging *sat*—infinite truth + *cit*—infinite consciousness + *ananda*—infinite bliss).[6] It is regarded as the highest point reached by natural reason in classical Hinduism in search for an understanding of the real Brahman.

Sat as being points towards the "is-ness" of God. All that we can say about God is that "He is" because He simply "is." The *Sat* is also *satyam,* which means truth. Thus, *Sat* expresses the fact that Brahman alone is the true real being. Apart from Brahman there is nothing that is true or real. Thus, Brahman is the sole reality, and nothing beside the absolute reality exists.[7] *Cit* is the pure consciousness or the self-awareness of the supreme being. *Cit* is not the attribute of *Sat*; it actually is in itself *Sat*. Thus, "In Being's presence to itself, I am present to myself, aware of myself; there I am, and I am aware that I am."[8] *Cit* is also understood to be pure knowledge, wisdom or intelligence. Thus, Brahman, being the supreme being, is absolute knowledge. He is not the knower, but the knowing; not the cognizer, but the cognition; otherwise it would involve objects of cognition and duality.[9] *Ananda* is the infinite bliss or the pure joy. It is a true joy and peace, complete felicity, which cannot be impaired by the passage of time and is in itself without end. It is bliss without the fruition of happiness. Negatively, Brahman's bliss means being free from mutations and from the world of birth, suffering, and death.[10] To conclude, the doctrine of Saccidananda points towards the Brahman, who is "pure life (with nothing to live for), pure thought (with nothing to think about), and pure joy (with nothing to rejoice about)."[11] This trilogy of attributes—Being, Consciousness and Bliss—leaves Brahman undefined and without attributes.

The impassible transcendent nature of Brahman does not mean that supreme reality is not relational, distant, and far. Robin Boyd points out that in the doctrine of Saccidananda the unity of Godhead as one is preserved; yet it takes the "the supreme felicity of self-colloquy" into the Godhead.[12] Thus Brahman as Sat-Cit-Ananda points towards a relational being, which may be "unrelated without" but certainly is "related within." Philosophical Hinduism also affirms that in various ways the supreme being is immanent yet distinct in relation to its creation. In this regard, Sankara understands the presence of Brahman to the world and life as their soul or true self. Thus, there is no real soul for a human being, and one's real self is the Brahman. Once a person realizes that his real self is Brahman, he will be liberated from this world of flux and change and return to be one with Brahman.[13]

To conclude this part of the discussion, classical Hinduism talks about a supreme unitary being called Brahman, who is impassible, distinct, and different from its creation. Yet this supreme being in a unique way is related and immanent to its creation. The inner mystery of this unitary being is triune, the Saccidananda.

> Classical Hinduism talks about a supreme unitary being called Brahman, who is impassible, distinct, and different from its creation. Yet this supreme being in a unique way is related and immanent to its creation. The inner mystery of this unitary being is triune, the Saccidananda.

The Christian Concept of the Triune God: The Trinity

The doctrine of the Trinity affirms its supreme being to be one divine being, or one Godhead, existing in three distinct persons, namely Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Each one of them is a distinct person, but one and only God. There is also no subordination among the persons in the Trinity; thus, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit are equally eternal, omnipresent, omnipotent, infinitely wise, infinitely holy, infinitely loving, and omniscient.[14]

Two important words that would provide much clarity to our discussion concerning the doctrine of Trinity are *ousia* and *hypostatis*. The Greek term "*ousia*" means essence, nature or substance.[15] Robert Preus notes that *ousia* "used of God signifies the one (in number) and undivided essence common to the Three Persons of the deity which is not partly in the Three Persons in the sense that part is in the Father, part is in the Son and part in the Holy Spirit; but the whole is in the Father, the whole is in the Son and the whole is in the Holy Spirit."[16] The word "*hypostatis*" means a person. The technical meaning of the word means "a subsisting individual, intelligent (conscious), incommunicable, and not subsisting in another."[17] When it is applied to the divine persons in the Trinity, three things should be affirmed. (1) A divine person subsists in Himself and not in the subject; (2) a divine person is Himself a centre of consciousness; (3) a divine person is distinguished from another by specific characteristics.[18] To define the Trinity from these key discussions means "The divine essence which is absolutely one and therefore absolutely single is also Three Persons: Father, Son and Holy Spirit-Persons who are distinct from each other, each according to an incommunicable personal characteristic."[19] Thus, to conclude, "the Father, Son, Holy Spirit are 1) truly such Persons 2) distinct Persons from each other and 3) Divine Persons who are in their essence the one true God."[20] This means that in the Trinity God is not divided into three persons, but the three persons, distinct from each other, participate in the one essence, which is unique and indivisible.[21]

This Triune God is also affirmed to be impassible but having divine emotions. The affirmations of the Church Fathers are very significant in this regard. Irenaeus understands God as the uncreated Creator, who made the heaven and the earth by His own free will. Being the Creator, He transcends all that He makes and thus is ontologically separate from His creation. Thus, unlike creatures, who grow in perfection and suffer desires and passions, God is wholly perfect in Himself and so is immutable and impassible in perfection.[22]

Similarly, Clement of Alexandria understands God as one indestructible, unbegotten, and with an existence that is true and real. As Creator, God is unborn, immortal, and in need of nothing, for He neither grows or changes. Moreover, He is neither genus, nor difference, nor species, nor individual, nor number. According to Clement, it is difficult to express God, since He is beyond all conception, although we may refer to Him as One Good, or Mind or Absolute Being, or Father or God, or Creator. He also insists that God, unlike human beings, is immutable and impassible.[23] But these affirmations do not mean that God does not have emotions. The Fathers understood that God possesses emotion, but in a divine manner, since the nature of man and the nature of God are totally different. God's emotion is different from man's emotion. Thus "these sensations in the human being are rendered just as corrupt by the corruptibility of man's substance, as in God they are rendered incorruptible by the incorruption of the divine essence."[24] Thus God's impassibility does not prevent Him from being loving and compassionate, but these emotions are totally different from human emotions, since they are divine emotions. Moreover the incorporeality of God and ontological difference of God's nature makes God's emotions different from human emotions.[25] Thus, classical Christianity understands the Trinity to be impassible but yet personal, loving, compassionate, and having emotions in divine a manner.

Engaging the Hindu Concept of Saccidananda from a Christian Trinitarian Perspective

In the previous two sections, we have discussed the concept of Saccidananda and the Christian perspective of God as Triune. Our discussion suggests that both Christianity and Hinduism seem to talk about God in a triune way. The purpose of this section is to engage, compare, and/or contrast the triune concepts employed in both these traditions. In doing so, I shall also briefly refer to some of the Indian Christian theologians, who tried to use the concept of Saccidananda to articulate the doctrine of Trinity to Hindu mind.

To begin, it could be affirmed that both philosophical Hinduism and classical Christianity seem to be committed to the notion of the impassibility of God. The language employed by both these traditions to describe God is apophatic in nature. Thus, Sankara described the supreme reality as "not this, not this." The concern that

God is beyond any description is the reason that led him to describe God in negative terms. We have seen that Christianity also employs apophatic qualifiers. Like classical Hinduism, they are meant to signify God's perfection and to affirm the fact the God is beyond all human description. In Christianity, the apophatic theology of impassibility is used as an ontological term. It is meant to express God's unlikeness to everything created, His transcendence and supremacy over all.[26] However, in patristic negative theology, an affirmation of God's impassibility is not intended to rule out all emotionally colored characteristics of God or God's involvement in creation.[27] But it is meant to affirm a creature-creator separation and/or distinction. Also, in a Christian concept of Trinity, although God is impassible, the supreme reality is personal, loving, compassionate, and has emotions in divine manner.

However, one fundamental difference between the Hindu and Christian concept of supreme reality is that, as Saccidananda stands for the trilogy of three attributes (sat, cit and ananda), the Christian tradition understands Trinity in terms of three distinct persons in the Godhead: the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. At this point, it is worthwhile to mention the effort of Brahmabandhab Updhyaya (1861–1907), a famous Indian Christian theologian who tried to relate Saccidananda with the Trinity. In his attempt, he equated God the Father to the Sat, the "is-ness" or I AM. The Cit, the wisdom or intelligence of Brahman, he equated with the Sophia and Logos and with the Word, by which the world was created, and specifically to God the Son, Christ. Finally, he equated Ananda or joy to the Holy Spirit, since it emphasizes one of the most characteristic aspects of God the Holy Spirit.

> One fundamental difference between the Hindu and Christian concept of supreme reality is that, as Saccidananda stands for the trilogy of three attributes (sat, cit and ananda), the Christian tradition understands Trinity in terms of three distinct persons in the Godhead: the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

The main problem with this articulation is that Saccidananda (which is understood as a trilogy of three attributes of the Supreme unitary monad) cannot stand for the inner mystery of the Godhead existing in persons. Thus, assigning Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit to Sat-Cit-Ananda is to superimpose the Christian Trinitarian understanding on a Hindu concept that does not have the same categories to understand a supreme Godhead in three Persons yet united by one substance. Moreover, in classical Hinduism, personality is a limitation; thus applying it to the Godhead is to limit the Being who includes and excludes all that is.[28] As Indian philosopher S. Radhakrishnan rightly notes: in classical Hinduism, "The personal God is a symbol, though the highest symbol of the true

living God. . . . The moment we reduce the Absolute to an object of worship, it becomes something less than the Absolute."[29]

Keshab Chandra Sen (1838–1884) was another noted Hindu theologian, but also a person well informed about Christianity who tried to relate both these concepts. Chandra Sen notes:

> The Trinity of Christian Theology corresponds strikingly with the *Saccidananda* dananda of Hinduism. You have three conditions, three manifestation of Divinity. Yet there is one God, one Substance and three Phenomena. Not three Gods but one God. Whether alone, or manifest in the Son, or quickening humanity as the Holy Spirit, it is the same God, the same Deity, whose unity continues indivisible amid multiplicity of manifestation.[30]

A careful analysis of Sen's theology points towards a modalistic framework for his articulation. Words like "conditions and "manifestations"[31] clearly point towards this. The Christian doctrine of Trinity does not understand Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as three manifestation of one Godhead, but rather three distinctive persons of one essence in the Trinity.

The soteriological implication embedded in the doctrine of Trinity in the Christian tradition is another feature that makes this doctrine different from Saccidananda. The doctrine of the Trinity is so fundamental to Christian orthodox because "To be saved it is necessary to know that God is Father, Son and Holy Spirit."[32] Although none of us can ever have an exhaustive knowledge about Trinity but "Still a distinct knowledge and confession of three persons is necessary for salvation."[33] In this regard, the Athanasian Creed asserts that "whoever desires to be saved must above all else hold the Catholic faith. Now this is the Catholic faith that we worship God in Trinity and Trinity in unity."[34] And adhering to a Trinitarian faith means to take the story of salvation seriously and to believe Jesus as true God and Savior and the only way to God and salvation.[35] Hinduism does not find a soteriological implication in holding onto the trilogy of Saccidananda.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been to engage the Hindu concept of supreme reality as Saccidananda with the Christian concept of God as Trinity. Our discussion suggests that although both these concepts seems to bear some similarities still they are fundamentally different. However, this does not mean that these fundamentally different concepts can't provide a common ground for a Hindu and a Christian to engage in conversation. Thus, a Christian who seeks to live out his calling in the right hand realm to clearly and intelligibly communicate God's Word will certainly find that "The conception of *Saccidananda* cannot exhaustively define the nature of the Trinity. But when imaginatively used it could provide a 'stepping stone' towards

the understanding of the Christian doctrine."[36] Moreover, we can affirm that the Saccidananda understanding of ultimate reality certainly provides a mind prepared for a triune understanding of God and that Hindus are more open to a Christian explanation of God as Triune than Muslims or Western Unitarians.[37] From a left hand perspective, where we are called to build bridges with our neighbors, a better understanding about our neighbors' conception of God can help us to understand their world as we seek to cooperate with them for the common good of all.

Endnotes

[1] One of the basic sources of authority for philosophical Hinduism is the Upanishads. The word "Upanishads" comes from Sanskrit words *upa* (close by), *ni* (down), *sad* (sit). It implies a form of teaching from the teacher's mouth to the student's ear. The context is a highly academic and abstract philosophical setting and a teaching that was not common knowledge of the ordinary people. The Upanishads number thirteen lengthy works dating from 4000 BCE and 600 BCE. The Upanishads mention many names in the text as their authors, but no precise information about the authors' identity can be given. There are two major schools of interpretation of the Upanishads, formed after their respective teachers, Adi Sankara (788–820 AD) and Ramanuja (1017–1137 AD). In this paper, we shall follow the interpretation of Adi Sankara. For more discussion, see Klaus K. Klostermaier, *A Survey of Hinduism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989), 185. And for more discussion on Sankara's theology, see Venkataram Iyer, *Advaita Vedanta According to Sankara* (New York: Asia Publishing House, 1964) and for Ramanuja's Theology John Braiste Carman, *The Theology of Ramanuja: An Essay in Interreligious Understanding* (London: Yale University Press, 1974).

[2] As noted, Sankara is an eighth-century Hindu philosopher–theologian from South India. He is known for developing the Advaita philosophy, a doctrine that identifies the individual self (atman) with the Ultimate reality (Brahman). Some of his important works include commentaries on the Brahma Sutras, commentaries on the chief Upanishads and the Bhagavad Gita.

[3] The task to derive at a single concept of God in Hinduism is impossible. Hinduism does not have a "unified system of belief encoded in declaration of faith or a creed"; rather, it is an umbrella term comprising a plurality of religious phenomena. The diverse system of beliefs present in Hinduism includes monotheism, polytheism, panentheism, pantheism, monism, atheism, agnosticism, Gnosticism, and the like. Thus, the concept of God is complex and depends upon each particular tradition and philosophy. Since Hinduism conceives the whole world as a single family and accepts all forms of beliefs and dismisses labels of distinct religions, it is devoid of the concepts of apostasy, heresy, and blasphemy. For more discussion on Hinduism, see Klaus K. Klostermaier, *A Survey of Hinduism*, Gavin Flood, *An Introduction to Hinduism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), Gavin Flood, ed. *The Blackwell Companion to Hinduism* (Cornwall: Blackwell Publishing, 2003) and "Hinduism" in http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hinduism.

[3] Steven Tsoukalas, *Krishna and Christ: Body Divine Relation in the Thought of Sankara, Ramanuja, and Classical Christian Orthodoxy* (London: Paternoster, 2006), 72–74.

[4] Tsoukalas, *Krishna and Christ,* 72–74.

[5] Bharatan Kumarappa, *The Hindu Conception of the Deity: As Culminating in Ramanuja* (London: Luzac & Co, 1934), 4–56. Although Sankara conceptualizes Brahman in abstract terms as pure non-differentiated substance or characterless thought, Ramanuja portrays the highest self in personal terms and with positive attributes. Thus, according to him, Brahman is characterized by the six attributes of wisdom (jnana), strength (bala), lordship (aisvarya),

might (virya), energy (sakti), and glory (tejas), thus filled with an infinite number of excellent and perfect qualities, abounding in love and free from all imperfections. Moreover, according to him, Brahman, the eternal personal Lord, possesses a personal bodily divine form (divya rupa) which is different from a changing material body. For more discussion see Kumarappa, *The Hindu Conception of the Deity,* 192–93. And Tsoukalas*, Krishna and Christ*, 98.

[6] Swami Abhishiktananda, *Saccidananda: A Christian Approach to Advaitic Experience* (Delhi: ISPCK, 1974), 166–170.

[7] Abhishiktananda, *Saccidananda,* 167–168.

[8] Ibid., 169–170.

[9] Mariasusai Dhavamony, *Hindu-Christian Dialogue: Theological Soundings and Perspectives* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994), 70.

[10] Dhavamony, *Hindu-Christian Dialogue*, 68–71.

[11] Ibid., 69.

[12] Robin Boyd, *An Introduction to Indian Christian Theology* (Madras: Christian Literature Service, 1969), 235–237.

[13] Kumarappa, *The Hindu Conception of the Deity*, 25–32.

[14] For more discussions, see Edward W. A. Koehler, *A Summary of Christian Doctrine* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1939), 29–33.

[15] Karl Rahner, *The Trinity* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2010), 2.

[16] Robert D. Preus, The *Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, Vol II (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House 1972), 122.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.*,* 124.

[20] Ibid.*,* 124.

[21] For more discussion, see Thomas G. Weinandy, *Does God Suffe*r? (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000), 19, 121–127.

[22] Ibid, 90–94.

[23] Ibid., 95–96.

[24] Ibid., 100—103.

[25] An important question could be asked here: If emotions entail change, how can we affirm God to have emotions and still be impassible? Or what makes God's divine emotion reconcile with this impassible nature? A helpful insight in this regard is Thomas Weinandy's clarification of the triune God as *actus purus* (pure act). Drawing insights from Thomas Aquinas, Weinandy argues that since God's nature is *ipsum esse*. He has no self-constituting potency that needs to be actualized in order for Him to be more fully who He is. So God is act, pure and simple. Thus he is *actus purus*. God as *actus purus* is fully in act in his intra-Trinitarian relationship and also in all His relationship to His creatures. Thus, there is no way He could be more loving, more kind, more compassionate, than He already is. Since He is fully in act, He cannot be affected by any outside forces so that He changes His mind or His emotional state, because a change would mean a move from perfection to imperfection in one who is the complete actualization of all perfection. Moreover, the possibility of a change means unactualized potentiality, which is impossible in one who is fully in act. Thus, in this understanding, God can be fully personal, loving, and compassionate, yet be impassible. The persons of the Trinity are impassible not because they are devoid of passion, but because they are entirely constituted as who they are in their passionate and dynamic fully actualized relationship of love. For example, the Father is the pure act of paternity, for He is the act by which He begets the Son in the perfect love of the Holy Spirit. The Son is the pure act of sonship, for He is the act by which He is wholly the Son of and for the Father in the same perfect love of the Spirit. The Spirit is the pure act of love, for He is that act by which the

Father is conformed to be the absolutely loving Father of the Son and the Son is conformed to be the absolutely loving Son of the Father. For more discussion, see Weinandy, *Does God Suffe*r?, 120–46.

[26] Weinandy, *Does God Suffe*r?, 48.

[27] Ibid..

[28] Boyd, *Indian Christian Theology*, 236.

[29] Ibid., 236–37.

[30] Ibid., 35.

[31] Catherine Mowry Lacugna, *God For Us: The Trinity and Christian Life,* 47.

[32] Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism,* 116.

[33] Ibid.

[34] John H. Leith, ed., *Creeds of the Churches: A Reader in Christian Doctrine from the Bible to the Present (*Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1982),704 .

[35] Preus, *Post-Reformation Lutheranism,*117.

[36] Boyd, *Indian Christian Theology,* 71.

[37] Ibid., 235.

Saccidananda and the Trinity: Hindu-Christian Conversations on the Supreme Reality

Sam Thompson

Bibliography

Abhishiktananda, Swami. *Saccidananda: A Christian Approach to Advaitic Experience.* Delhi: ISPCK, 1974.

Bassuk, Daniel E. *Incarnation in Hinduism and Christianity*. New Jersey: Humanities Press International, 1987.

Bhagavad Gita. Translated by Stephen Mitchell. New York: Harmony Books, 2000.

Boyd, Robin. *An Introduction to Indian Christian Theology*. Madras: Christian Literature Service, 1969.

Brown, Kerry. *The Essential Teachings of Hinduism.* London: Rider, 1988.

Carman, John Braisted. *The Theology of Ramanuja: An Essay in Interreligious Understanding*. London: Yale University Press, 1974.

Christopher, Seitz R, ed. *Nicene Christianity: The Future of a New Ecumenism.* Michigan: Brazos Press, 2001.

Clooney, Francis X. *Hindu God, Christian God: How Reason Helps Break Down the Boundaries Between the Religions.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Devaraja, N. K. *Hinduism and Christianity*. London: Asia Publishing House, 1969.

Dhavamony, Mariasusai. *Hindu-Christian Dialogue: Theological Soundings and Perspectives*. New York: Rodopi, 1994.

Farquhar, J. N. The Crown of Hinduism. London: Oxford University Press, 1919.

Flood, Gavin, ed. The Blackwell Companion to Hinduism. Cornwall: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Griffts, Bede. *River of Compassion: A Christian Commentary on Bhagavad Gita.* New York: Continuum, 1995.

Griffiths, Bede. *Christ In India: Essays Towards a Hindu-Christian Dialogue*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.

Hardy, Edward R., ed. *Christology of the Later Fathers*. London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.

Iyer, Venkataram. *Advaita Vedanta According to Sankara.* New York: Asia Publishing House, 1964.

Kattackal, Jacob. *Incarnation and Resurrection in World Religions*. Kottayam: OIRSIP, 1999.

Klostermaier, Klaus K. *Hinduism: A Short History*. Oxford: One World Publication, 2000.

Kolb, Robert, *The Christian Faith: A Lutheran Exposition.* St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1993.

Kelly, J. N. D., *Early Christian Creeds*. London: Orient Longmans, 1960.

Kumarappa, Bharatan. *The Hindu Conception of the Deity: As Culminating in Ramanuja*. London: Luzac & Co, 1934.

Lacugna, Catherine Mowry. Go*d For Us: The Trinity and Christian Life*. Chicago: Harper One, 1975.

Leith, John H. *Creeds of the Churches: A Reader in Christian Doctrine from the Bible to the Present*. Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1982.

McGuckin, John. *St. Cyril of Alexandria: On the Unity of Christ*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995.

O'Collins, Gerald. *Incarnation*. London: Continuum, 2002.

Pandit, Bansi *The Hindu Mind: The fundamentals of Hindu Religion and Philosophy for all Ages.* Illinois: B &V Enterprises, 1996.

Preus, Robert D. *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism* Vol II. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1972.

Rahner, Karl. *The Trinity.* New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2010.

Robinson, Bob. *Christians Meeting Hindus: An Analysis and Theological Critique of the Hindu-Christian Encounter in India.* California: Regnum Books International, 2004.

Snider, Andrew V. *Divine Impassibility: Finding The Biblical Center*. Doctoral Thesis: Masters Seminary, 2007.

Tsoukalas, Steven. *Krsna and Christ: Body-Divine Relation in the Thought of Sankara, Ramanuja and Classical Christian Orthodoxy*. UK: Paternoster, 2006.

Weinandy, Thomas Gerard and Daniel A. Keating Thomas, ed., *The Theology of St. Cyril of Alexandria: A Critical Appreciation*. London: Continuum Books, 2003.

Webliography

"*Hinduism*" in http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hinduism.