

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Indian Journal of Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ijt_01.php

Thinkers of Contemporary India[†]

S. P. DUBEY*

In this section we shall present, in brief, the thinking of some of the leading thinkers of India today. The order of presentation will be chronological.

J. Krishnamurti (b. 1895)

Krishnamurti is supposed to be one of the universally known independent thinkers of the day. His central place now is at Rajghat, Varanasi, but he travels throughout the year in different parts of the world propagating the independence of thought. Although a discovery of Charles Leadbeater, a close collaborator of Mrs Annie Besant of Theosophy, Krishnamurti severed all connections with the Theosophical Society and disowned divine personation.

Krishnamurti is said to be the world-guru though he himself does not believe in the concept. He has been opposing throughout the traditional way of thinking but he cannot be called anti-traditionalist. He quietly challenges spiritual, moral and religious authority, but contributes a lot to the tradition. He lays enormous stress on the importance of the present and makes man feel free to shape his own destiny. According to him man in search for true knowledge must realise that the mind harbours preconceived ideas that prevent him from realising the truth. If one becomes aware of the partiality of the mind one can approach reality better. Awareness is a silent and passive alertness of mind that leads to a self-consciousness which has immense delight.¹

Krishnamurti develops his ideas primarily to solve urgent problems of life and to provide a firm basis for morality and spirituality which he thinks to be in great peril. His sole purpose is to make man absolutely and unconditionally free. According to him love is the only panacea for the ills of the world. The mind should be in the state of love, not dependent on persons, things or ideals. He believes that evolution itself is leading man to perfection. It is impossible for humanity, even if it wishes, to remain forever in ignorance of ultimate truth. Here he is very close to the evolutionary ideas of Sri Aurobindo.²

† A paper presented at the Institute of Religions and Philosophy organised by the Senate of Serampore at Leonard Theological College, Jabalpur, in November 1977. This article is a sequel to 'Recent Trends in Indian Philosophy', published in *IJT*, Vol. 27, No. 1.

* Dr Dubey teaches philosophy at the University of Jabalpur.

¹ J. Krishnamurti, *Commentary on Living* (2nd series), p. 6.

² For detailed studies see A. D. Dhopeswarkar, *J. Krishnamurti and Awareness in Action*, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1967; *Krishnamurti and the Experience of Silent Mind; Krishnamurti and the Texture of Reality*.

Vinoba Bhave (b. 1895)

Vinoba is the national saint of India. He is the most sincere disciple of Gandhi, translating the Gandhian philosophy into life. In him we also find a distinct impact of Tolstoy. Making an intensive journey through India during the major part of his life, he has now settled at Wardha Ashram (in Maharashtra), emanating his wisdom and peace throughout. He worked for the establishment of a non-violent social order, mostly in the villages of India, by a voluntary redistribution of land that is known as *Bhudana*, which is a step to achieve a social order of equality. Equality, according to him, is not absolute but like that of the five fingers on our hand.³

Vinobaji did not write any systematic philosophical book but his philosophical system can be constructed from any two or three of his important books.⁴ His metaphysical outlook can be summed up in brief by saying that for him Brahman is truly existent and the world is full of it, the world being its vibrant manifestation.⁵ We can see here clearly the impact of Isha Upanishad on his thinking. Keeping this in mind, he pursues the goal of life which is truth.

Vinobaji himself does not think he is making any departure from the general teaching of the Vedanta. However, he tries to bring about a happy reconciliation between the ancient Vedantic tradition and the modern scientific age. Philosophically he synthesises Sankara, Jnanesar and Mahatma Gandhi. His commentary on the Gita interprets modern life with the help of the ancient torch-light. He calls it the philosophy of *Gita Sama Yoga*, a discipline leading to equilibrium. This philosophy of equality is the way of life and it reflects the highest level of equality (*Parama Samya*) between soul and the absolute. According to him nothing exists besides Brahman or the Absolute. Thus the world and souls are just variations of this absolute. In his *Vichara Pothi* he speaks of Brahman as pure (*shudda*) and accomplished (*siddha*).

The asceticism of Vinoba is not world-negating. It points to service: service to one's neighbours is service to God. This is a superior type of Yoga which he calls cooperative-work (*Saha Yoga*).

T. R. V. Murti (b. 1902)

Professor Murti is perhaps the senior idealist thinker to be born in the beginning of the present century. He is still with us, making his sharp intellect and deep Vedantic convictions available to his admirers and students. Varanasi is the place where he has lived for the major portion of his life, serving Banaras Hindu University as Professor of Philosophy. Through his publications he is known to be a Buddhist scholar,⁶ but he is a traditional Vedantin well-versed in Buddhist and European dialectic.

³ V. Nargolkar, *The Creed of Saint Vinoba*, B.V.B., Bombay, 1963.

⁴ *Geeta Parvachan, Wardha, Sthita Prajna Darshana, Jivan Dristi*, etc.

⁵ *Brahma Satyam, jagat, sphurtih, jivanam satya sadhanam*.

⁶ See his *Central Philosophy of Buddhism*, Allen and Unwin, London, 1960.

His approach to philosophy is essentially traditional. He does not think philosophy to be an affair of intellectual curiosity or theoretical analysis, but a serious spiritual discipline (*sadhana*) directed towards the attainment of freedom. Philosophy for him is the discovery of spirit (*adhyatma vidya*). Realisation of spirit is not necessarily by philosophy alone. Religion too has the same goal. The spiritual is the genus of which philosophical and religious consciousness are the species.

Professor Murti speaks of two orders or levels that could be necessary for the discovery of the spirit. Science investigates the natural order, but there is a cultural order which expresses itself through language and is the mirror of all our attainments. The task of philosophy begins with the negative judgement or with the consciousness of the *false*. Rejection of our wrong views may lead towards the real. For him *prajna* (unknown knowledge) is the total negation of all views (*dr̥ṣṭi*). This is what is called the dialectical approach.

For Dr Murti realisation of spirit is the realisation of all values. Philosophy is the most significant expression of the human spirit. Spirit is not something different from man. Man shorn of his accidental characteristics is spirit. If we develop a spiritual philosophy it would form the basis of a world-culture. The essence of spiritual philosophy consists in utter negation of all egoity and the realisation of the unity of all beings. It is only absolutism of spirit that can make for the fundamental unity of existence and at the same time allow for the differences that are exhibited in the great cultural groups of the world.⁷

P. T. Raju (b. 1903)

Professor Raju has been the foremost scholar of comparative philosophy, but he himself, like Professor Murti, subscribes more to the Vedantic tradition. The impact of Samkhya, the Katha Upanishad, Vedanta, the Agamas and of Swami Vivekananda, Gandhi and K. C. Bhattacharya is clearly visible in his writings. Dr Raju holds that God is the innermost being who has created both man and the world. The subject, according to Raju, is a knot (*granthi*) which has been studied in psychology in detail and it requires the subjective as well as the objective. When the knot is released this subject becomes the pure *atman* which is one with absolute reality or Brahman. But before we come to know the subject or the self we have to postulate the knowledge of other selves. The relation between I and thou is manifested in love. In love one is most sure of one's own self as well as of others. The categorical imperative, according to Raju, should be love's command.⁸

T. M. P. Mahadevan (b. 1911)

Professor Mahadevan has been an important magnet of Indian philosophy in South India. Inheriting the Advaitic tradition of S.S.

⁷ T. R. V. Murti, 'The Spirit of Philosophy,' in *Contemporary Indian Philosophy* (1st series), pp. 457-471.

⁸ P. T. Raju, 'The Inward Absolute and the Activism of the Finite Self,' in *Contemporary Indian Philosophy* (1st series), pp. 509-534.

Suryanarayana Shastri at Madras he develops Advaita both at the intellectual and practical levels. Being a sincere devotee of Sankaracharya of Kamakoti Peeth, he moves in South India as a symbol of Advaitism. He is also a great admirer of Raman Maharshi of Arunachala on whom he has published some books. But he is better known in the philosophical world for his work on the philosophy of Vidyanaraya⁹ and also for the study of Gaudapada.¹⁰ He holds a distinguished position in a line of notable Indian scholars who have interpreted culture and philosophy. He combines a rare gifted mind and formidable attainments.

Professor Mahadevan believes in the non-dualistic absolute reality which is Brahman. Reality for him is non-dual (*advaita*). Advaita Vedanta does not profess to formulate conceptually what reality is. Therefore it cannot be called a system of thought and it is not a school among schools of philosophy. It is not opposed to any partial view. Therefore Advaita is the supreme truth. The non-opposed attitude of Advaita in the spiritual life is evident from the fact that the teachers of Advaita freely adopt terms and expressions and even concepts that belong to different religio-philosophical traditions. Gaudapada has particularly made use of the Buddhist terms in bulk and Shankara cannot be said to be a puritan in this sense.

Dr Mahadevan feels that the insights of Advaita are extremely relevant to all men of all times. According to him the Advaita philosophy gives insight to humanity on three counts, Consciousness, Value and Release. For Advaita consciousness is the very nature of the self. Being of the nature of ultimate reality consciousness is also the plenary value for Advaita. The Bṛhadaranyaka Upanishad (1.4.8) declares that the self is the supreme value and is dearer than the son, wealth and everything else (*Atmanstu kamaya sarvam priyam bhavati*). The self is also the innermost. The Advaita philosophy further holds that the self and liberation are synonymous. The self is ever free. *Moksha* or release can be realised here and now. One of the Upanishads declares that one realises Brahman here (*atra Brahman samasrute*).

Thus Professor Mahadevan tries to present the philosophy of Advaita to the modern world in a most sincere fashion.¹¹

Kalidas Bhattacharya (b. 1911)

Dr Bhattacharya is a retired Professor of Philosophy at Santiniketan where he still stays, continuing his philosophy. He is the illustrious son of the noted contemporary Indian philosopher of the first generation, namely, K. C. Bhattacharya. He is predominantly a metaphysician defending the traditional metaphysical systems and thus opposing the philosophical developments in the modern fashion. He feels that the traditional approach to philosophy has several advantages over the

⁹ *Philosophy of Advaita*, Ganesh, Madras, 1957.

¹⁰ *Gaudapada, A Study in Early Advaita*, M. U. P., Madras, 1960.

¹¹ See Mahadevan 'Contemporary Relevance of the Insights of Advaita,' in *Contemporary Indian Philosophy* (2nd series), pp. 109-132.

current ones. He shows that, in spite of all the triumphs of modern science, we are facing increasingly a situation where the gap created by modern philosophers is largely filled up by existential literature. In fact literature translates the clear concepts of philosophy into a fluid language of life, which can be absorbed, and indirectly we are sent back to philosophy, i.e., metaphysics.¹²

According to Dr Bhattacharya philosophy is after all some kind of study and the traditional notion of philosophy is that it is a study of reality, meaning thereby the entire field of the real. In general the traditional thinkers took the over-natural to be more natural. The word over-natural or the metaphysical has not been used casually. It has a long background of reflection. The normal logical demonstrative method is not applicable to metaphysical words but this does not mean that all the words used by the metaphysician are over-natural or intuitive. The belief in the over-natural real is not due to the confusion between logical categories. It has its own corresponding objects which are simple as well as complex, having some status of their own. The distinguishing feature of the over-natural is that it has to be real. This real sometimes has been intuited and also at times inferred. But the conclusions of the metaphysician are not absurd, as the anti-metaphysicians do not go beyond the surface level of the metaphysical world and make hurried judgements about the non-sensibility of metaphysics.

The thinking of Kalidas Bhattacharya on metaphysical problems is scattered through several of his collections that are available in print.

N. K. Devaraja (b. 1917)

Professor Devaraja had been a Professor of Philosophy at Banaras Hindu University till recently and has been a voracious reader and writer both in literature and philosophy. His acquaintance with the tradition and his critical mind has bewildered those who want to categorise his conclusions. Earlier he had been a student of Sankara's philosophy but of late he emerges as a philosopher of culture wherein he develops qualitative or creative humanism. For him the function of philosophy is to enlarge and interpret the general forms of value bearing consciousness, of man, as embodied in different sets or kinds of symbols.¹³ He treats philosophy as a descriptive and critical study of human culture. It is an instrument of the qualitative improvement of man as he expresses himself in his cultural activity.

The creative nature of man is visible in his efforts to disturb the natural order and rearrange the same according to his utility and aesthetic likings. Man also responds to objects and events not mechanically but in changing fashions and this is expressive of his creativity. Moreover, man seeks to extend the scope of his responsiveness to an ever-widening circle of reality. Thus we find a definite progress and advance in man's creative history and man is qualitatively improved.

¹² K. D. Bhattacharya, 'Metaphysics and Life' in *Contemporary Indian Philosophy* (2nd series), pp. 121-141.

¹³ N. K. Devaraja, *Philosophy of Culture*, Kitab Mahal, Allahabad, 1963, p. 167.

The philosophy of culture or creative humanism as developed by Devaraja is not altogether novel. He discusses Lamont and Schiller and gives a more satisfactory account of the situation. In his attempt to construct this philosophy, Dr Devaraja steers between naturalism and idealism. The former is rejected, but the latter is appreciated although with some reservations. Since man is the centre of creative humanism, according to Devaraja, the place of God in his philosophy does not seem to be an important one, although he could not exclude religious experiences from the human fold. The sense of the detachment of man towards his own interests and involvement in wider human interests is a very important contribution of religion and this is accepted by Devaraja.

G. Misra (b. 1917)

Professor Misra is a senior Professor of Philosophy at Utkal University, Bhubaneswar, and has been a close student of the leading positivist A. J. Ayer. His work on Sankara and Bradley on analytical lines remains an important study of idealism from an analytical point of view.¹⁴ He himself belongs to the analytical tradition and maintains that most of our problems arise because of linguistic confusions and bad logic. The respective metaphysical works have brought the East and the West to conflicting situations. The metaphysical model of the East is pure thought, whereas that of the West is pure action. It is the task and duty of philosophy to point out logical errors in the traditional thinking. Clarity is the aim of modern philosophy, logical analysis its method; clearing away misunderstanding is the result which it achieves.¹⁵

The logical approach to philosophy for Dr Misra is also humanistic and cultural. Because of the new philosophical outlook, he feels, cultural isolation is disappearing fast. Modern philosophy helps the modern man to see the baselessness of clashing cultures. Deepening the human understanding is the role of modern linguistic and analytical philosophy and removal of clashes is the result.

R. K. Tripathi (b. 1918)

Dr Tripathi is a senior Professor of Philosophy at Banaras Hindu University and is imbued with the traditional Hindu manner befitting the scholars of Varanasi. He has been a favourite student of Radhakrishnan and T. R. V. Murti and the dialectical approach and deep rooted faith in the Hindu culture make in him a healthy mixture of the traditional and the modern.

The latest and a clear description of Professor Tripathi's philosophical approach is available in his contribution to the Devaraja edition under the title, 'My Quest for the Self'. According to Dr Tripathi,

¹⁴ S. S. Barlingay, *A Modern Introduction to Logic*, National Publishing House, Delhi, 1965.

¹⁵ G. Misra, 'Metaphysical Models and Conflicting Cultural Patterns,' in *Indian Philosophy Today*, pp. 13-167.

philosophy is a search for the true self. The self is the centre of one's universe. In the beginning it is reflection that has to be accepted as the important feature of philosophy. In fact for Dr Tripathi reflection is the only universal feature of philosophy. It is a form of consciousness turning in upon itself; instead of going ahead it retraces and becomes reflective. Thus philosophical consciousness is a reflective awareness of certain types of objective consciousness.

The birth of philosophy for Dr Tripathi is in disillusionment when one cancels all phenomenality and reflects upon what is permanent and eternal. Thus philosophy is not a matter of choice but is indispensable. The philosophical method, according to Dr Tripathi, is not merely rational or critical. If philosophy is the search for complete truth it has to pass from reason to revelation and then to *anubhuti* (realisation).

To understand the nature of reality, Dr Tripathi analyses the states of deep sleep, *samadhi*, and death. The deep sleep state is a situation where we exist without our being aware of existence and this shows that there can be a pure consciousness, independent of content, self-evident and self-luminous. It is also a state of happiness unending. This leads us to the notion of immortality which could be visualised even after death. Pure self devoid of accidental qualities is pure consciousness that endures deep sleep, *samadhi* and death. It is the realisation of deathlessness or eternity within ourselves that makes us free from our ignorant situation. Since this attitude towards life and death is discussed more satisfactorily in Advaita Vedanta, Dr Tripathi considers it to be a more complete philosophy than any other Indian or Western system.

D. P. Chattopadhyaya (b. 1918)

Dr Chattopadhyaya has been the leading Marxist philosopher in India. He has been an important political figure in West Bengal and at the national level. For a few years, he was a minister in the Central Cabinet. He has served the Department of Philosophy at Jadavpur University (Calcutta). His book on Lokayata is widely known. Of late he has evolved a concept of philosophy which is called Anthropological Rationalism which emerges from the answer to the question, 'How is man related to the world?' A manless world or even a world where man is ignored (in science dominated studies) is not a sound idea according to Chattopadhyaya for whom philosophy necessarily must reflect on the man/world situation.

Man, according to Chattopadhyaya, is neither completely absorbed in the world nor is he absolutely free from it. His relation with the world is existentially dialectical. On the one hand man's being defines the world in nature and on the other the world defines his being. Thus Chattopadhyaya's approach to man cannot be called either idealistic or realistic. This approach he terms anthropological which is more descriptive and less interpretative than the other two.

The anthropological rationalism of Dr Chattopadhyaya holds that the world is both within and without man. It is dependent on as well as independent of him. Man on his side is subject to errors and

mistakes. He learns from experiencing but not by experience alone. Reflective inquiry is one necessity for anthropological rationalism and human fallibility another necessary concept.

S. S. Barlingay (b. 1919)

Dr Barlingay of Poona University has been a sincere worker for the freedom movement in India and a keen student of Ryle at Oxford. He has written on logic¹⁸ and various Indian problems of logic in books and journals. The tradition to which he predominantly belongs is the analytical. But he has a high regard for the ancient wisdom of our land. Philosophy for him is basically the analysis of concepts that can be distinguished when one dissects the experience. These broken elements are different from physical units which are separable and can also be reassembled; but philosophical concepts, if reassembled, create confusion and anarchy.

The clarity of concepts has to be kept in mind while pursuing our philosophical course and nothing should be accepted blindly. Perhaps this kind of scepticism might not be accepted by many of the traditionalists but this is how philosophising is understood in modern circles.

A. G. Javadekar (b. 1919)

Professor Javadekar holds the chair of Philosophy at M.S. University, Baroda. An idealist by temperament and writings, he has developed a valuational theory of knowledge which he calls Axionoetics. The word is derived from Greek *axio* (to be worth) and *nous* (mind) and the philosophy, which is claimed to be an initiation of a distinctive discipline, is a valuational study of human experiences in general and intellectual acquisitions in particular. Almost all the branches of knowledge, aesthetics, epistemology, sociology, history, metaphysics, science, religion and art have been studied by Dr Javadekar from a valuational point of view, the view-point which received a set-back through the rise of logico-empiricistic trends in Europe and elsewhere.

The concept of value according to Javadekar is fundamental and universal in human experiences. He is of the view that our enquiries and investigations can very well entirely be oriented in terms of values. Value, though experienced subjectively, has an objective meaning and an universal appeal. The improvement in the study of knowledge is from objectivity to subjectivity and from subjectivity to valuation; or, from facts to ideas and then to ideals; or from ontology to epistemology and then to axiology.

Daya Krishna (b. 1924)

Dr Daya Krishna is a Professor of Philosophy in the University of Rajasthan at Jaipur. He is a scholar who has been writing on social philosophy, of late. His analytical approach to the problems of philosophy is clearly expressed in the book *The Nature of Philosophy*. In

¹⁸ S. S. Barlingay, *A Modern Introduction to Logic*, National Publishing House, Delhi, 1965.

his article contributed to Mrs Chatterjee's volume he discussed the relation between logic and ontology. He feels that the problem of the ontological presuppositions, implications and status of logic is an important one because in recent times people have attempted to develop a logic with no ontology. What type of world would it be if we had all logic and no ontology? The attempt to free logic from ontology thrives on a distinction between what logic is *about* and logic itself, but this distinction fails to make sense when the basic ontological issue is in question. The crux of logic lies in the 'if-then' relationship.

At least the reality of relations has to be accepted. But if logic is not possible without assuming the reality of relations it means some kind of provision for reality, for logic would not like to commit suicide. The relational world now implies a pluralistic world. The situation is that logic implies relations and relations on their part imply plurality. We might conclude that the reality of logic implies a pluralistic ontology.

Margaret Chatterjee (b. 1925)

Mrs Chatterjee of the Philosophy Department at Delhi University is a poet, exhibitioner and a philosopher at the same time. She contributes to the anthropological view of philosophy. A precise account of her philosophy is given in the volume edited by Dr Devaraja. She introduces two concepts, (i) 'Hinterland' and (ii) 'Context' which determine the shape and direction of thought. For her philosophising is a queer kind of extrapolation on the basis of experience. Both analytical philosophy and phenomenology prove to be deficient as regards their responsiveness to the hinterland and the context of concrete human problems. The anthropological view, on the other hand, is more relevant and meaningful even for ethical and religious matters. Ethical responsibility for her is a function of our relation with others and our knowledge of them. Religious experience, she holds, is an extension of the experience of transcendence with which we are familiar in a variety of dimensions.

Rajendra Prasad (b. 1926)

Dr Prasad is a Professor of Philosophy at the Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur. He has been trained in the analytical tradition and writes frequently in Indian and overseas periodicals both in Hindi and in English.

Dr Prasad has contributed quite a bit to what we call metaethics and develops a persuasion theory of moral language. By 'persuasive' Dr Prasad means that which actually persuades or that which tends to or is intended to be an attempt to persuade.¹⁷ For him moral judgement is an attempt to persuade the recipient to act or at least to show a mental preparedness to act, favourably or unfavourably, as intended by the speaker, towards the object judged; the speaker's intention is ordinarily clear from the moral terms used by him and the context of

¹⁷ R. Prasad, 'A Persuasion Theory of Moral Language,' in *Contemporary Indian Philosophy* (2nd series), p. 162.

use. The ultimate and primary purpose of the use of a moral judgement is to make the hearer actually do the intended action and this purpose is only partially fulfilled if he shows his readiness to do that. It is not primarily evocative but persuasive.

Dr Prasad treats moral judgement as non-cognitive because the primary purpose of the use of moral judgement itself is not cognitive.

Yashdeva Shalya (b. 1928)

Sri Shalya is a unique Indian thinker of contemporary times who, without being in any important position in the philosophical world of universities, makes a landmark that cannot be ignored by any reviewer of Indian philosophy today. He is now heading the Rajasthan Hindi Grantha Academy at Jaipur.

Earlier Sri Shalya was known to be a student of analytical philosophy but now he has come to be a philosopher of culture. According to him culture and philosophy are closely associated and interwoven. The modern trends in philosophy that try to ridicule national culture in the name of universality have been criticised vehemently by Shalya. He feels that the very adjectives Indian, German, Chinese, etc., for philosophy are superfluous if philosophy is just logic and not culture. He is particularly sad over the state of affairs in current Indian philosophising which either looks back towards the past or imitates the West. The present situation is a crucial one where the Indian philosopher is likely to face a breakdown if one does not try to fall back upon one's culture. Medieval India faced the challenge from Islamic invasions by reviving the Bhakti movement. The European onslaught was also met by thinkers like Vivekananda, Gandhi, Aurobindo, Bhagwan Das and Krishnamurti, but it seems that we are not able to stand firm against contemporary European trends because we are at the moment in a state of cultural infatuation (*sommoha* or *vimuda vastha*).¹⁸ Western culture is obviously dominantly materialistic whereas Indian culture is spiritualistic and for Shalya more perfect because of its transcending and all comprehensive nature. Shalya feels that Western culture is trying to destroy our individuality by entering deep into us. But the technological advancement of the West is now simply a means to economic growth and pleasure. Our national consciousness as represented by the cultural spokesmen of India has been throughout of a spiritualistic nature. When we imitate the West blindly, we take to be real what is not so and enter into a situation from which safe return is impossible. A philosophy deeply rooted in our Indian national consciousness (*jatiya anubhava*) is the only way out from the present impasse.

Shalya takes culture to be *sui generis* and creative. It is the expression of the unconditioned in finite forms. It expresses the tension between the timeless and the temporal, between the perfect and the imperfect. A race or a nation can be defined in terms of geographical extension or a governmental form as well as culturally. The former

¹⁸ Y. Shalya, 'Bharat Sankranti Men,' in *Darshinik Traimasika*, April 1974.

two aspects of the nation can change. Only the cultural form remains enduring.¹⁹

While writing the present essay I have been conscious of what I have not been able to do. The interesting areas of Sikhism, Saktism have not been covered. Scholars like Sibjiban Bhattacharya of Burdwan, K. K. Bannerjee of Jadavpur, K. J. Shah of Karnataka and Dr R. De Smet of Poona have not been introduced. The limits of space, time and lack of information as well as my own inactivity are responsible for this deficiency. But this essay will lead me to work further at a later date and I hope to give a more satisfactory account of those already included and some introduction about those trends and thinkers missing here.

¹⁹ Y. Shalya, 'Hamaras Jatiya Anubhava,' in *Darshinik Traimasika*, July 1974.