THE NATURE OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

Philosophy is usually said to have arisen in the West when a few Ionic Greeks sought to account for the facts of our experienced world without appeal to the Olympian mythology. However, if argument for position is an essential ingredient of philosophy—as I believe it is—then the first Western philosopher was not Thales, as is commonly stated, but probably Zeno, who supported the speculations of his teacher Parmenides by arguing that the opponents of Parmenides landed themselves in logical paradoxes. If "philosophy" is used in the narrow sense as argument for position, the earliest philosophical writing in India does not appear until the third century A.D.; this is the *Sāṁkhya Kārikā* of Īśvarakṣṛṇa. However, if "philosophy" is used in the broad sense, that is, as speculation, then philosophy may be said to have "originated" in India with the earliest *mantras* of the *Ṛg Veda*, which means at least as early as the middle of the second millennium B.C. Surendranath Dasgupta writes, "The beginnings of the evolution of philosophical thought, though they can be traced in the later Vedic hymns, are neither connected nor systematic."[1] Again he writes of the *Vedas* that "there is not much philosophy in them in our sense of the term."[2] He also says of the *Upaniṣads* that they are "utterances of truths intuitively perceived or felt as unquestionably real and indubitable, and carrying great force, vigour, and persuasiveness with them"[3] But note—they are "intuitively perceived or felt." An example of the nonsense one often finds about the origin of Indian philosophy is this opening sentence of chapter 2 of John M. Koller's *Oriental Philosophies*:

"Indian philosophy began before recorded history. The first bits of speculation which could be called philosophical date back over five thousand years, to about 4000 B.C."[4] If one recognizes "the first bits of speculation" as philosophy, then perhaps philosophy begins with the first *homo sapiens*.

The Greek word of which "philosophy" is the transliteration means the love of wisdom. No Sanskrit word has exactly this connotation. There are, however, a good many Sanskrit terms which designate the activity of philosophizing. The most important are the following:

1. *dṛṣṭi*. This comes from the root *dṛś*, "to see." It connotes beholding, looking at, regarding, and having an opinion.
2. *darśana*. This term also means a seeing, but it has two meanings: an active and a passive. The active meaning is that of inwardly beholding or becoming one with an object of awareness. Possible translations would be seeing, looking at, beholding, meeting with, visiting, inspecting, investigating, and understanding. The passive meaning is the object of seeing, looking at, etc. The active refers to having a point of view, and the passive refers to the point of view one has. The term *darśana* in the passive sense is the term customarily used for the great systems or schools of Indian philosophy. This is very significant. The system which an Indian philosopher defends is a point of view, not the absolute truth. The implication is that there are other defensible points of view. This is the foundation of the tolerance often mentioned as a characteristic of the Indian mind. This characteristic may be overstressed by Indophiles, but it is generally the case in Indian philosophizing that each philosopher recognizes the defensibleness of other *darśanas*.
3. *tattva-jñāna*. The word *jñāna* stands for true or superior knowledge. It is close to the Greek *sophia*. The word *tattva* is from *tat* (that) so it means thatness, very essence, true nature, and essential reality. In the Sāmkhya system *tat* identifies the twenty-five fundamental realities; and in the Vedāntic *tat tvam asi* (That thou art), *tat* means Absolute Reality and *tvam* means phenomenal reality. So *tattva-jñāna* means the true knowing of the essence of things. *Tattva-jñāna* is closer to *philousia* (love of substance) than to *philosophia* (love of wisdom).
4. *viveka-jñāna*. *Viveka* means discrimination, distinction, investigation, discussion, discernment, and judgment. Therefore, *viveka-jnāna*, when used for philosophy, means discriminative knowledge.
5. *ānvīksakī*. Literally this term means second thought, but when used in philosophical discourse it means to think about thinking. Westerners would call this metaphilosophizing, but Indians use the term specifically for logic.
6. *adhyātma-vidyā*. *Vidyā* is a rather unexciting term for learning or science. *Adhyātma-vidyā* refers to learning about the inner nature of

things rather than looking at externalities. *Ātma-vidyā* (self knowledge) is used for philosophy when what is intended is the metaphysics of the self. Indian philosophy is an ātmanology.

7. *prajñā*. This is another term for wisdom, knowledge, information, discrimination, understanding, etc. It stresses the showing of things directly without distortion.
8. *bodhā*. This term originally designated the blooming of flowers, but it came to mean the "opening up" which followed from successful meditation. Psychologically it means to be fully conscious, to be awake existentially. It is used philosophically for the expanding understanding accompanying the self-awakened experience.
9. *sādhana*. *Darśana* and *sādhana* are the two most striking Sanskrit terms for philosophy. The former is essentialistic; the latter is existentialistic. No English word does justice to *sādhana*. It stands for the total comprehensive discipline designed to accomplish the full development of man. Terms such as guiding, directing to a goal, procuring, securing, subduing, vanquishing, gaining power over, acquiring, and attaining only hint at the richness of *sādhana*. In Hinduism it is a psychological-philosophical-religious term which indicates the process of becoming fully human.
10. *anu-īksakī*. This is a rather loose term meaning the survey of all things.
11. *mata*. The term *mata* means opinion or view. It can be used for "doctrine," but it does not have the richness of *darśana*.

Hindu Orientation

Indian philosophy is more than a counterpart of Western philosophy which happened to originate and flourish in the subcontinent of Asia known as India. Indeed to try to fit Indian philosophy into the molds appropriate to Western philosophy is to misunderstand it. Philosophy is the finest and most important product of the old civilization of India, for it was the unity in the apparent diversities of music, sculpture, painting, architecture, literature, dance, science, ethics, and religion.

It is an indigenous product of the Indian people. If one insists on a Western counterpart, perhaps the best is to say that Indian philosophy is to Hinduism as Scholastic philosophy is to Christianity. Indian philosophy may therefore be described as the intellectual aspect of Hinduism. But we must be careful. Hinduism is not a religion in the sense in which Christianity is a religion. To pull philosophy out of Hinduism is to destroy Hinduism.

Hinduism is inseparable from both philosophy and the communal life of the people. Another way of stating this is to say that a study

of Indian philosophy cannot avoid being a study of the Hindu religion, and conversely a study of Hindu religion cannot avoid being a study of Indian philosophy. In other words, Indian philosophy did not have to develop a system known as "Existentialism," because it has always been existential. Philosophy in India is religious in the widest sense. As Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan has said, "Every doctrine is turned into a passionate conviction, stirring the heart of man and quickening his breath."[5] The English philosopher C. E. M. Joad wrote in 1940, "I doubt whether any single person has found life easier to live, problems easier to solve, or the universe easier to understand as a result of studying the works of those twentieth-century philosophers who have occupied themselves with the problem of philosophical analysis."[6] This could never be said of Indian philosophy. Indian philosophy is pragmatic in the broadest sense of that much-abused term. All the systems—even the logical systems—set as end the diagnosis and therapy of the human condition. The Indian intellectual accuses Western philosophy of being too intellectualistic, too largely a matter for academicians; he charges Western religions of being too creedal, too dogmatic, too insistent on fixed beliefs, and too removed from the questing spirit. Hinduism is both a religious philosophy and a philosophical religion. Eliot Deutsch writes, "This intimacy between religion and philosophy in Advaita Vedānta, as in much of the Indian tradition, has been pointed out frequently. It bears constant repetition, however, for there are still a few philosophers who, in their desire to find a dominant naturalistic tradition in India, are determined to neglect (or even to deny) this relationship."[7] Deutsch does not say so, but he may have had in mind Bimal K. Matilal, editor of a new publication called *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, who announced that in his magazine, "The field of our contributions will be bound by the limits of rational inquiry; we will avoid questions that lie in the fields of theology and mystical experience." "Philosophy" as he understands it moves "without recourse to religious or ontological commitment." There is no doubt that Indian thought may be so examined, but does this get to the heart of what we know as Indian philosophy? Another way to put this is to state that whereas a Western philosopher is criticized with regard to the consistency of his ideas, the Indian philosopher is criticized with regard to the

consistency of his ideas and his life. David Hume and Siddhartha Gautama arrived at approximately the same conclusions about the nature of the self. But after reaching this conclusion Hume lived as he did before, i.e., his life style continued as though he believed in the reality of a substantial ego. But Gautama's life style changed radically after he came to this conclusion. Hume's conclusion started a round of arguments which we still continue in the West; Gautama's conclusion began a life style which has shaped East Asia for 2,500 years. Hume taught how to think about personal identity in the absence of belief in a substantial ego; Gautama taught how to live a selfless life.

The charge is often heard that classical Indian philosophers were more concerned about human needs than were the Greeks. This depends upon which needs one has in mind. The Greek philosophers were city men, living within the city in order to exert political action. Plato and Aristotle could not conceive of man living apart from the polis. Even a misanthrope like Diogenes of Sinope remained within the city to rail against man. Heraclitus was a rare dropout. But the Indian philosophers were men of the forest. They withdrew in order to meditate, and often when they established a school, it was a forest *āśrama* where study would be engaged in without the distractions of home and community. They were concerned about the soteriological aspects of human life. "In India, truth is not precious in itself; it becomes precious by virtue of its soteriological function."[8]

Mokṣa Orientation

According to Plato and Aristotle philosophy begins in wonder. Not so in India. Orthodox Indian philosophy begins with an awareness of suffering and with a desire to do something about it. According to an Indian philosopher, "A philosophy, which is merely an enquiry into the ultimate nature of the spatio-temporal world or the nature of consciousness as such and is thus merely a philosophy of being, is a truncated thing."[9] Indian philosophy is a means, not an end in itself. Philosophical truth is prized not because it is true but because it leads to liberation. Philosophy in India is existential-soteriological. As the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* says, "That Eternal should be known as present in the self. Truly there is nothing higher

than that to be known."[10] Man's life, according to the Indian philosopher, is filled with frustration, transiency, and sorrow. The Buddha's emphasis on misery was a Hindu emphasis. Nothing can give lasting happiness to man in this life. Each Indian philosophy is an effort to deal practically with *duḥkha*. Surendranath Dasgupta writes, "In fact it seems to me that a sincere religious craving after some ideal blessedness and quiet of self-realization is indeed the fundamental fact from which not only her philosophy but many of the complex phenomena of the civilization of India can be logically deduced."[11] If this suggests a pessimistic beginning of philosophy, do not forget that the goal is to attain lasting bliss (*ānanda*). Dasgupta continues, "The sorrow around us has no fear for us if we remember that we are naturally sorrowless and blessed in ourselves. The pessimistic view loses all terror as it closes in absolute optimistic confidence in one's own self and the ultimate destiny and goal of emancipation."[12] Indian philosophies are intellectual, moral, aesthetic, social, and religious devices to relieve man of sorrow and to achieve perfect joy. Because of the religious nature of Hindu philosophy and of the philosophical nature of Hindu religion we might avoid confusion by referring to Hinduism as neither philosophy nor religion but *sādhana*, a comprehensive discipline for the full development of the potentialities of man. The religious nature of Indian philosophy is illustrated in four criteria Śaṅkara established for any student who wished to study with him:

1. He must be able to distinguish the abiding from the fleeting.
2. He must have a degree of detachment from this world (and any other world), knowing that all worlds are transitory.
3. He must have already cultivated such virtues as poise, truthfulness, etc.
4. He must have a strong desire for liberation from the wheel of life.

The *mokṣa* aspect of Hindu philosophy results in action to relieve man of his suffering. The relief has taken two forms: the path of active life (*pravṛtti mārga*) and the path of renunciation (*nivṛtti mārga*). These two paths have continued throughout the history of Indian philosophy. But the interesting fact is that in India the two paths have not remained antithetical. Rather they tend to be incorporated into human life as stages of the ideal life history.

Ātman Orientation

Indian philosophy is directed inwardly rather than outwardly. It seeks to understand and to develop the self rather than to know and to manipulate the external world. The third eye of Śiva is more important than the two eyes which look outward. Intuition is stressed as a way of knowing; in fact, it is usually the ultimate point of view. Logic and reason are used in Indian philosophy to convince others of the intellectual respectability of one's point of view, but they must be superceded finally by a personal conviction of the rightness of the position. Philosophy as a logical system must always step aside for philosophy as a way of life. The inward viewpoint of Indian philosophy must not lead us to believe that the Indians were not—and are not—interested in the external world. They were and are; but the interest often takes a different slant from what we are familiar with in the West. What we might call "philosophy" and "physics" tend to get confused in India. Betty Heimann brings this out well when she says that in India theology is second physics, ontology is extended physics, and eschatology is renewed physics.[13]

Darśana Orientation

Each system of philosophy in India is called a *darśana*, a point of view. As long as one stays within the boundary of the six fundamental orthodox (*āstika*) systems, each system is recognized as a legitimate system. The systems do not seek to destroy one another—as a rule! But this lauded principle of tolerance must not be overstressed. There have been—and there are—genuine differences among the *āstika* philosophers; and the conflicts among *āstika* and *nāstika* philosophers have been as vicious as any of the conflicts in the West. In fact the systems both *āstika* and *nāstika* developed through the dialectical process of conflict with each other.

Indian philosophy is not tied to personalities. Little is known about the lives of the classical philosophers. Even Śaṅkara cannot be established as a historical person. The *āstika* philosophers say that this feature of Indian philosophy is evidence that the philosopher is a discoverer, not a formulator, of truth. The very words used

to designate the systems are terms which describe the system rather than terms which identify the founder. The West has its Platonism, Aristotelianism, Kantianism, etc., but in India there is no "Patāñjali-ism" or "Śaṅkara-ism."

We must not fail to notice the implications of using the word *darśana* for a system of philosophy in India. Whereas we in the West think of a system of philosophy as a full, complete, and exclusive organization of thought, an organization which rejects other organizations, India thinks of a system of thought as a point of view which recognizes the legitimacy and worth of other points of view. Rather than seeing things as black or white, good or evil, true or false, the Indian tends to take an inclusive attitude toward positions and systems. Rather than accepting an Aristotelian two-valued logic, the Indian thinks in terms of many degrees and aspects of truth. Differences of points of view do exist, and truth and value shift as one takes a different point of view. Much nonsense has been spoken about the tolerance of Indians. Often this is affirmed by Westerners who are taken in by clever Indians who discover that flattery of the sahib is a very effective way to manipulate Westerners. Indians often reveal an amazing instinctive psychology of human relations. Still, at the level of thought it is a fair generalization that in Indian philosophy an effort is made to reconcile differences within a larger whole rather than to push differences into sharp conflict.

Conservative Orientation

Indian philosophy seeks to preserve the insights of the past. Progress is not conceived as destroying the old in order to make way for the new. Truth is eternal. Hence, a truth once held continues to be held insofar as this is possible. A Western philosopher arguing with an Indian may find himself in the strange position of being disproven by a quotation from an *Upaniṣad*. S. K. Mitra once said that in India "contemporary" means within the last two thousand years. "Conformism is a fundamental characteristic of the Indian mind and there seems to have been no wish to deviate from tradition."[14] Richard Lannoy says that the Indian traditionalist "has no faith in his power to change history because for him there is no history."[15]

We in the West think in distinct independent steps. These steps are organized logically and/or chronologically. We are interested in the end, the results. We drop the means when the end is reached. If A leads to B, then we drop A upon reaching B; and if B then leads to C, we drop B upon reaching C. This is linear thinking. In India thought proceeds by radiations from a productive center. That which is regarded in the West as a means is in Indian thought treated as a value in itself which must not be lost in the movement of thought. Indian thought is non-linear, clustery, and configurative.

Conservatism in Indian thought does not mean holding to the old without change. It is a conservatism of moving out without losing the reality and value of the original. This can be illustrated also from the zero in mathematics—which, by the way, was an Indian invention. While in Western mathematics zero means nought and in Buddhism *śūnya* means an empty circle, the Indian zero (*bindu*) is a solid dot symbolizing a fertile seed. Zero is the productive point of potentiality. Zero is the matrix of negative and positive. Zero in Indian thought keeps wandering from the formality of mathematics into the enigma of a reality positioned between life and death. One *guru* in India, when asked to sign autograph books, made only a dot in the center of the page with the remark, "In the *bindu* all is contained."[16]

Development in Western thought usually involves destruction of the old to make room for the new, but development in Indian thought consists in retaining the insights of previous thought and building upon these insights. An ancient sage expresses his views. His followers define and systematize the views by putting them into collections known as *sūtras* or *kārikās*. Later followers write commentaries on the *sūtras* or *kārikās*, and still others write commentaries on the commentaries. Dialogue takes place with little regard to the historical date of the ideas expressed, but with great concern for the preservation of the traditional values and truths. This has been possible because of a stability unknown in the West since the Renaissance. The tolerance characteristic of Indian thinking makes it possible for Indian philosophy to avoid a shattering revolution when thrust into violent and conflicting relations with the philosophies of the West. Modern India's most unsettling experience is the

attempt to become an independent, self-supporting nation among the modern nations of the world. Although Prime Minister Nehru never stressed his non-alignment policy as rooted in Indian philosophy, one can recognize unwillingness to take sides in the cold war as a fitting manifestation of the philosophical tradition of India.

Conservatism is also noticed in the Indian attitude toward change. Richard Lannoy writes, "Change does not increase the good; there is no such thing here as progress; value lies in sameness, in the repeated pattern of the known, not in novelty. What is good in life is exact identity with all past experience, and all mythical experience. . . . In the West we see our history climactically; we plan our future experiences climactically, leading up to future satisfaction or meaning, and to fulfilment through pursuing a career. In India, action is a series of anti-climactic masquerades."[17] For example, Ānandamayi, a woman mystic of Bengal born in 1896, says no crises, no changes, have ever occurred in her life: "I am always the same." This non-climactic on-going-ness is seen in the monotony of Indian food habits, in tending of cattle, in cinema plots, and even in the anti-climactic sexual activity recommended in Tantra. The universe in its activity is a perpetual-motion machine. In fact, Āryabhaṭa, one of India's great mathematicians, wrote in A.D. 499 how to make a perpetual-motion machine: "One could cause a sphere of light wood, equally rounded, and of weight on all sides, to move in regular time by means of quicksilver, oil, and water." Bhāskara in 1150 gave even more explicit plans for a perpetual-motion machine with hollow rims filled with quicksilver. Endless cyclical change—*kalpas* and *mahākalpas*—is the order of things. The village Indian today lives a life of monotonous routine which would drive most Westerners insane. But in Hinduism the man liberated from time—which means psychologically the man free from any compulsion to program his activities to the accomplishment of goals—is the highest human ideal, the *jīvanmukta*.

Another aspect of the conservative orientation of Indian philosophy is noted in that, while the Western intellectual moves from a known A to an unknown B, the Indian counterpart moves from an unknowable, pre-empirical and pre-rational indistinct A through empirical phenomena to an indistinct post-empirical and post-

rational B which is essentially the same as the pre-empirical and pre-rational A. Intellectual research in Indian philosophy is not the creation of new knowledge but the explication of wisdom already possessed. Thus *Swāmi* Dayānanda Saraswati, the founder of the Ārya Samāj, contended that the *Vedas* contained all the knowledge men had or would ever have. He located the latest discoveries of chemistry and physics and all the latest technological advances in the *Vedas*—and even hinted of scientific knowledge in the *Vedas* which future research and experiments would discover. Dayānanda was stating what had been believed opaquely for generations by intelligent Hindus.

Not all Indians take such a charitable attitude toward Indian thinking, e.g., Nirad C. Chaudhuri writes, "There is no such thing as thinking properly so called among the Hindus for it is a faculty of the mind developed only in Greece, and exercised only by the heirs of the Greeks. A very large part of what is called Hindu thinking is woolly speculation or just mush."[18]

The conservative orientation expresses itself in synthesizing items into wholes. The Indian philosopher "is more interested in the synthetic group of the underlying principles of all knowledge than in the analytic method of discovering distinctions,"[19] writes a modern Hindu. But this, as we noted above, is a primary emphasis, not a sole emphasis. S. Radhakrishnan argues that what is needed is a synthesis of all philosophies: "The need of philosophy today is for a world perspective which will include the philosophical insights of all the world's great traditions."[20]

We must admit that Indian thinking sometimes seems to the Western philosophy too unrealistic, too fuzzy. Matters are not helped by the observation that "Hindu philosophy is too human to be logical."[21] The difference of style of thinking is rooted in different assumptions. In the West the law of non-contradiction is assumed, but Indians characteristically ask if the law of "either-or" ought not to be discarded for the law of "this-as-well-as-that." For them the thesis and the antithesis are necessary correlatives.

Indian Philosophy and Indian Culture

There is a tendency among Western philosophers who discover Indian philosophy to think of India as a nation of philosophers. The

average Indian is thought to be a philosopher, and philosophy is assumed to be the very heart and core of Indian life. This is not true. It is one of the many stereotypes that Westerners have, and one which some Indian intellectuals have encouraged in the West. Philosophy was not regarded in traditional India as a proper study for the average person. It was carefully nurtured as a special study for special people. Dasgupta says, "Any one in olden times who took to the study of any system of philosophy, had to do so with a teacher, who explained those terms to him. The teacher himself had got it from his teacher, and he from his. There was no tendency to popularize philosophy, for the idea then prevalent was that only the chosen few who had otherwise shown their fitness, deserved to become students of philosophy, under the direction of a teacher. Only those who had the grit and high moral strength to devote their whole life to the true understanding of philosophy and the rebuilding of life in accordance with the high truths of philosophy were allowed to study it."[22] In India today a distinction is drawn between the philosophy taught in the universities and the classical tradition of study with a *guru*. Life in the half-million villages of India is caught up in the daily rounds of work, the seasonal activities of planting and harvesting, gossip and tale-bearing among families, attention to the village gods, and a few *melas* (fairs) each year. The immediate problems of food, clothing, shelter, and health supplant reflection upon philosophical problems. The average Indian is more interested in his next meal than in his next life. Philosophy belongs in India, but it would be dishonest to claim it as the chief concern of Indians.

One of the reasons why Western people study Indian philosophy has been and is because they believe there is something remedial in the Hindu style of life and thought. This may be true—indeed I believe it is true, but perhaps the most foolish thing a Western person can do is to try to adopt Hindu ways. Carl Jung warned against the effort. He said once that *yoga* is fine, but for the Western person it must be a Western *yoga*. Louis Renou has put this warning in stronger fashion. He writes that of "the different theosophical sects, the anthroposophists, traditionalists, and Western schools of yoga they can be described more justly if one simply mentions and then ignores them. . . . All that these people succeed for the most part in getting out of Hinduism is an artificial vocabulary and arbitrary in-

terpretations chosen haphazardly from the total field. . . . Let us always remember that India is an Eldorado for charlatans. If Hinduism ever has a future as an integral part of a broad, generally acceptable spiritual movement beyond the borders of the country that gave it birth, this future will be created only by direct reflection from genuinely Indian forms of thought and spirit conceived and expressed by Indians."[23]

Indian philosophers have never claimed they were engaged in a value-free pursuit of learning. They begin with the sufferings of the human condition and seek to find a remedy. The Buddha, who was probably the greatest of all Indian philosophers, diagnosed the human condition as *duḥkha* (impermanence and suffering). He analyzed the cause as *upādāna* (cleaving), and he offered as therapy the Eight-fold Middle Way. To understand Indian philosophy we must put the question of the way of the human condition to ourselves. We have as yet an imperfect understanding of Indian life and thought. When we have a complete picture of Indian culture, speculates Peter Munz, "it is likely that it will cause a revolution in our thought and outlook which will dwarf the revolution wrought by the discovery of Greece some four or five hundred years ago."[24]

NOTES

1. Surendranath Dasgupta, *A History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957, p. ix.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
4. John M. Koller, *Oriental Philosophies*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970, p. 15.
5. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. I. Revised edition. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929, p. 27.
6. C. E. M. Joad, "Appeal to Philosophers," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, Vol. 40 (1940), p. 34.
7. Eliot Deutsch, *Advaita Vedānta: A Philosophical Reconstruction*. Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1969, p. 4.
8. Mircea Eliade, *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1958, p. 4.
9. L. C. Gupta in a paper entitled "Philosophy and Life" read at the 1953 Indian Philosophical Congress.
10. *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* 1. 12. Robert Ernest Hume translation.
11. Dasgupta, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-77.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 77.
13. Betty Heinmann, *Indian and Western Philosophy*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1937, p. 46.
14. Michael Edwardes, *Everyday Life in Early India*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969, p. 1.
15. Richard Lannoy, *The Speaking Tree*. London: Oxford University Press, 1971, p. 339.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 351.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 289-290.
18. Nirad C. Chaudhuri, *The Continent of Circe*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1965, p. 151.
19. P. N. Srinivasachari, *The Philosophy of Bhedābheda*. Second edition revised. Adyar, Madras: Adyar Library, 1950, p. 97.
20. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan and Charles A. Moore (editors), *A Source Book in Indian Philosophy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957, p. xxix.
21. William George Archer, *India and the Future*. London: Hutchinson and Co., 1917, p. 23.
22. Surendranath Dasgupta, *op. cit.*, p. 2.
23. Louis Renou, *The Nature of Hinduism*. New York: Walker and Co., 1962, pp. 143-144.
24. Peter Munz, "India and the West: A Synthesis," *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. V, No. 4 (January, 1956), p. 322.