THE DEFINITIONS OF RELIGION

Why do we need Religion or God? This question is constantly heard from all thinking persons who would answer in the affirmative if they could, but find that neither. God nor Religion is capable of definition but not descriptions. It is because it is so very difficult to convey to the modem mind, built as it is in a purely practical and intellectual manner that it has become necessary to investigate into the nature of God. Before we reply to the question as to the need for God or Religion we have to know exactly the nature of Religion. Religion has been described in many ways. It may be stated at the very start that not all these have been complementary. The modem mind has several interests, biological, social, rational, psychical and materialistic. A few indeed have always felt that religion should be viewed from the standpoint of the spiritual or mystical. These interests have therefore prevailed in the description of the nature of Religion. It is not the ;purpose of this essay to cirticise the definitions so as to arrive at the truth behind all these. Rather it is the other way about. Religion is a mystical fact needing no proof. It is an imperative of the individual consciousness as it evolves towareds the apprehension or rather comprehension of the Godhead in a trans subjective form, indwelling in all creation yet exceeding all, in whom all can indwell.

Religion is stated to be ‘an emotion resting on the conviction of harmony between ourselves and the universe at large’. Schleirmacher’s definition of religion is in terms of feeling. “If man is not one with the eternal in the unity of intuition and feeling which is immediate, he remains in the unity of consciousness which is derived, for ever apart.[2]” Religion is “a feeling of dependence on the Divine. “Dr. Warde Fowler defines religion in terms of desire. “Religion is the effective desire to be in right relations with the power manifesting itself in the universe.”[3] Dr. E.O. James writes that Religion is a belief in the existence of a transcendental reality giving rise to a system of super – causation expressed in rite and myth. “This he considers may be taken as a minimum definition.[4]

Religion thus has elements of emotion, desire, feeling and belief in transcendental realities or reality. The several definitions given above are all found to insist upon the element of harmony, or unity which is the essential basisi of righteous relationships with the transcendental reality. The last definition gods farther than the previous in so far as it adds an element of consciousness or knowledge on the part of the system of super causation possible to the transcendental Reality. Religion in Hinduism entails belief in Life after death, a life lived in other workds and performance of actions conducive to man's living happily and peacefully in this and the next world or other worlds. That this involves the concepts of a transcendental Reality and duper causation is clear

Sigmund Freud, the greatest psycho – analyst of our century, has traced the origin of religion to man's infantile helplessness, which Schleirmacher has called the feeling of dependence. But he considered Religion to be the control of the instinctive wishes of incest, of cannibalism and of murder, innate in the should or ego.[1] Religion thus becomes a result of the community, a self-protective activity of an organization to repress the instinctive wishes aforementioned. Thus Freud considers religion to be instinctive in origin though not an instinct as such it is a fruitful source of psychic disorders.

While Freud has defined religion as a reactive agency, Prof. Huxley says religion cannot be described as an instinct, as it is buy a capacity for feeling emotions termed religious. I shall deal with the kinds of emotion termed religious elsewhere. But if we are prepared to accept the definition of instinct as a dependable behavior.'; 'innate' and 'fundamentally purposive,' then religion call well be an instinct. Studies in Corporative Religion have clearly shewn that man has this instinctive reaction to objects which have a glow of holiness, and his ways of adjustment towards such objects are well – defined and dependable and universal.

Mr. Lyman defines religion as an experience of kinship with the human group 'with its more mysterious inner bond and principle of unity.[1]' An equally social definition has been given by Durkheim. "Religion is social institution, holding certain definite beliefs and entailing certain obligations and duties in the members of the society. [2]" But it may well be seen that a social or humanistic definition of religion cannot explain why such an institution should ever come into being. Religion, though capable of becoming institutionalized and of becoming an effective check on individual instincts that are anti – social, is not exhausted by such a definition.

Indeed we find that the utmost that can be said on behalf of religion is that it is *weltenchauung* or world – view based upon a transcendental vision. Mr. Julius Hecker gives very clearly four aspects of religion: (i) an emotional, unconscious, irrational impulse which expresses itself in awe and subjection to the incomprehensible usually termed God and in its worship which takes the form of a stereotyped cult; (ii) a manner of life and of conduct developing into ethical norms; (iii) an urge relationally to justify emotional and moral experiences developing into theology and *weltenchauung;* and (iv) an organizational form developing into a Church. [3]

---

[1] The meaning and Truth of Religion: E.W. Lyman p53

[2] Quoted in Origin and Development of Religion in Vedic Literature; P.S. Deshmukh. P.18

[3] Religion: Julius Hecker. P. 7

The definition and description of the four aspects of religion can be seen to focus the essential ingredients of religious consciousness in so far as it has a tendency to abjectly itself in the world of men. Religion tries to occupy the entire life and activities of man through all the four ways of instinctive experience, ethical conduct, philosophical justification termed theology, and Church or

Organization for the presentation and dissemination of the *weltenchauung.* This in Indian philosophical terminology is the *ādhibhautika* aspect can be a great danger to individual freedom. The dependence – feeling, however, which is said to be the element of consciousness, is not on the objective world but on organizational efficiency that constitutes the religious experience of the Transcendent. Religion as commonly understood has the air of a Sunday – institution and bears a distressing meaning to the free dome aspiring individual. The essence of the mystical consciousness is the struggle for individual liberty from all types of limitation. The consciousness of limitation, ignorance, finitude, even of individual or personality instead of yielding a 'sense of the Infinite, Absolute, Limitless, Omniscience[1]" in the individual in respect

---

[1] Kuno Fischer (History of Modem Philosophy P.103) wrote "Magic takes its course (to God) through external nature; Mysticism through internal; that though the mystery of Nature this through that of Man. Mysticism is the deeper and more abiding form, since it seeks by a sure way which always leads to new discoveries. They agree in that they seek the same goal and strive to reach it immediately through the peaceful absorption into life itself." Bruno's doctrine of all embracing Unity is naturalistic. God is related to the universe as producing to produced Nature.

---

of God, had on the other hand in some mystics led to the apotheosis of the individual himself. They are the ideas to which one must push forward relentlessly. This is the excessive moment which tends to obscure and annihilate all individuality and personality or merge it in an other, the Absolute Experience, whose degradations they appear to be. Certain modems like J. Krishnamurti and Nicolai Berdyaev hold that man can never become happy or free through institutions of religion, nor through their techniques of rituals and hierarchies. "Man will be happier never when his life is better organized; his suffering will merely manifest itself in more subtle and more intense forms. Happiness cannot

be organized.[1]' Delight or $\bar{a}$nanda may be realized by every individual in his subjective experience primarily and only there.

Certain writers, mainly theologians, feel this inner meaning of religion, the $\bar{a}dhy\bar{a}tmika$ version, to be a fall. According to Dr. Headlam there are two elements in mysticism, which make it incapable of helping the realization of religious knowledge. It marks a return from rationalism and dogma to the religions instincts of mankind, and, secondly, it has a fantastic side, unreal and even immortal, namely, its uncontrolled imagination. It mistakes imaginations to be realities. It believes in direct insight into the divine mind, and it is a heresy[2]. But we may say that though this fantastic side is likely to become exaggerated in some cases, and dreams,

---

[1] Life in Freedom: J. Krishnamurthi cf. Spirit and Reality: Berdyaev p. 128

[2] Christian Theology: Headlamp. 48

---

visions, and insights may be taken to be realities, we cannot altogether rule them out. Religion may be precisely the rational explanation of these experiences, which may reveal some sound uniformities. Myths, symbols, and dreams are real and no religion has an absolute right to invalidate the latter experiences. The principle of growth in each religion insists upon this constant renewal of these experiences directly and not merely by sympathetic induction with the past experiences. Mystic consciousness goers to the basis of our religious need and attains direct insight, $s\bar{a}ks\bar{a}tk\bar{a}ra$. It discovers the inner teacher, the Guru; the Divine within, and the Voice of this inner Guru is the $\acute{s}abda$ or $\acute{s}ruti$, the really head Word, the revelation. That this revelation may be even of the form of outer experience though or objectified experience need not be denied as the Divine is ultimately the inner essence of Nature as well as the souls, individuals. But primarily the message of the dream, the vision, is to the individuals. But primarily

the message of the dream, the vision, is to the individual who has gained this boon of super – perception though as comparative religions study shews these most private experiences seem to extend their significance to others also. It is also possible that this inner voice may be assisted by other mystics who has gained this boon of super – perception though as comparative religions study shews these most private experiences seem to extend their significance to others also. It is also possible that this inner voice may be assisted by other mystics who have had this gift of inner vision and voice. The soul then speaks to the soul and the *āptavacana* equivalent to *śruti* and *śabda* and gave the sanction of universality to their deliverances. Freedom is the feeling of oneness with the Transcendent being, for freedom means the consciousness of transcendence over all limitation. The religious consciousness is in this sense mystical consciousness is suffused with the sense of freedom, and is available as the instinct towards liberty which is to be distinguished from mere escape – instinct[1].

The *ādyātmika* or psychological definitions of religion constantly harp upon this mystical seeking after liberation, freedom. It is essentially an attempt to cross over the ocean of *saṃsāra*, to abolish or arrest the chain of causal succession or karma, an endeavor to triumph over all obstacles to immortal being including death. Nicolas Berdyaev writes about mystical experience as confrontation and an experience of the transcendental. Mysticism is a spiritual path leading to the highest achievements. It is opposed to social and objectifying processes, and it, therefore, contradicts historically manifest religion, indeed it is a transcendence of the created world[2]. mysticism is the path of the pioneers who break through the 'closed' society into the open spaces of the spiritual expanse[3]. in organized religion we hare democratization of life, for religion organizes the many for its own social ends, and in doing so it loses itself in its own organizations it becomes a closed society ! Thus objectified religious consciousness is in constant need of the mystic martyr to give it back the life of freedom it tends to lose in its preoccupation with details of preservation

[1] Mystic and Religious types: K.C. Varadachari, Annals of the Sri Venkateswara Oriental Institute Vol. 1 & A clue to the nature of the relationship between the Mystical and Religious consciousness: Proceedings of the All – India Oriental Conference, X Session, Tirupati p. 278-284

[2] Spirit and Reality: N. Berdyaev pp. 129, 130, 131, 128

[3] Two Sources of Morality and Religion : Henri Bergon (Eng. Tr.)

---

and conservation. *Ādhyātmic* consciousness demands this freedom for the individual, and true religion sneeks this freedom. For Self is Freedom. Indian Philosophic thought and religion have always had this, one aim, the realization of freedom – Moksa. This is the fundamental transcendental goal of man.

Dr Alfred North Whitehead defined religion psychologically when he said that it "is what an individual does with his solitariness"[1]. At another place he says that it is "the reaction of human nature to its search for God[2].

The *ādhidaivka* definition of religion or the theological definition of religion will involve reference to the Object of the religious consciousness. This object will be naturally transcendental and divine such as Absolute Truth, Absolute Good, Absolute Beauty), Absolute Delight, and Absolute Power. The response of the human or divine mind even to such absolute perfections will be important. Dr Nathan Soderblom writes, "Holiness is the great worked in religion. It is even more essential than the notion of God" [3]. We cannot help remarking that in trying to be scientific, Dr. Soderblom, Dr. Otto and others, exalt the process over the Object that evokes or instigates the process called holiness or profanity. Awe, Holiness, Reverence, Dependence – feeling and others are all an individual's responses. The sense of mystery and wonder are the intuitions into the transcendent nature of the deity. As Dr.

---

[1] Religion in the Making: A.N. Whitehead, p 31 & 48

[2] Science and the Modern world: p.

[3] Living
g God: N. Soderblom and cf. Artc. On ‘Holiness’ E.R.E

---

whitehead remarks[1] “Religion is the vision of something which stands beyond, and within, the passing flux of immediate things; something which is real and yet waiting to be realized; something which is a remote possibility and yet the greatest of present facts; something that gives meaning to all that passes and yet eludes apprehension; something whose possession is the final good and beyond all reach; something which if, the ultimate and yet the hopeless quest.,”

Religion is the culmination of knowledge of God in Vision of God. Religion, said Plato, is the culmination or consummation of wisdom in knowledge. But it is dynamic experience of the Divine Being every where and at all times. It is a living experience of unit not merely with one’s fellows, not merely with the entire world of our intellectual and perceptual knowledge, but also of unity with the spheres and planes of consciousness that we cannot become aware of through our physical and intellectual organs. Religion which can call itself most universal must possess this integrating and integral character, for such is the nature of the Divine, the Object of its aspiration and realization. Because it is dynamic and seeking individual realization in all awakened minds, it is profoundly personal. Personal communion with the transcendent spirit is the essential aim of religious aspiration. Our looking for God, which Pearl Buck considers to be the ’most powerful force on Earth’ is a manifestation of our integral unity with God. It is the paradox of spiritual life, of mysticism as well as religion , to pass from the subjective to the objective by turns till we realize the Unique Synthesis of these in the Divine Transcendent, who

---

[1] Science and the Modern World: A.N. Whitehead p. 22

---

is personal and trans-subjective. “Mystic experience is profoundly personal while at the same time appearing to discard and dissolve personal existence in the

impersonal and super personal existence" [1]. Indeed the Person is above personality and impersonality.

So far we have sketched the nature of Religion from the standpoints of the *ādhibhautika* (pragmatic social), *ādhyātmika* (psychological and personal), and the *ādhidaivika* (Divine and trans-subjective) aspects. It is this nature of Religion as triple that must be considered to be important. Sri Aurobindo has most luminously expressed the nature of Religion to be: "A divination of Godhead, the impulse towards perfection, the search after pore truth and unmixed bliss, the sense of secret immortality."[2]

This definition embraces all the three aspects and the transcendent possibility. Religion is or has all these aspirations. And the realization of all these is the purpose of Divine Life. [3]

Do we need Religion then? We can now answer that it is indispensable, because it is a need that is almost an imperative of our existence. Our sense of misery, our finitude, our fragmentariness, our colossal ignorance, and falsehood.

---

[1] Spirit and Reality: N. Berdyaev. P 142 of Life Divine II. P.

[2] Life Divine: Sri Aurobindo Vol

[3] Benjamin Whichcole, a. Cambridge Platonist of the 17th century rightly said "Religion is the introduction of the divine life into the soul of man.

---

and mortality impel us to escape from these[1]. It is possible to transcend these because we feel, and hope that this world, this misery and imperfection, mortality and finitude not the essence of ourselves. They are transitory. God is the Object of our quest because He is other than these, and He can grant us all those attributes and excellences that help transcendence. We need Religion because we cannot for ever get satisfaction from the world, because we cannot subscribe to the values of the world, and are intuitively aware of the deeper and universal

or spiritual values which sustain these terrestrial values, and make them objects of our limited consciousness. We wish to transform ourselves into free beings, perfect, and omniscient, efficient and joyful, and it is religion that promises to lead us to that fulfillment. Science, Ethics, and Art lead as to just certain aspects of reality and arrive at partial truths, it is Religion that grants us the integral apprehension of Reality as Truth, Beauty, Goodness, Harmony, Unity, Perfection, Omniscience, Omnipotence and Universality or rather supra – universality. Such is the transformation that is affected by the integral or organic view of Religion conceived of as teaching the integral Divine in all these truths received through our humanistic sciences and arts.

At this point, it may be asked whether it is necessary to have religion if we could get science or philosophy or humanism to do that job. Our whole contention is that science, philosophy and humanism together even cannot do what the spiritual consciousness understood in its $\bar{a}dhy\bar{a}tmika$

---

[1] Escape, however, can never help us unless we can face them and transcend or annual them.

---

and $\bar{a}dhid\bar{a}ivika$ aspects could do. Spiritual life is the realization of the immanence of the Divine in the human. It is the vision, supersensory vision, of the abiding unity in the Divine of all creatures. Neither science and behind the sensory. Materialism is the solace of science and of philosophy understood as systematic and coherent knowledge of the perceived world. Of the ultimate knowledge that demands on our part purified and transformed instruments or organs of sensing these can have not even the slightest idea beyond a feeling of helplessness frustration and others which are the causes of the return into the self or mysticism. This is not the entire truth about mysticism: its heat has to be distinguished from this nature or content. Spiritual truth is apprehended as something transcending the processes of the phenomenal universe. It intimates itself through a direct infiltration of the consciousness of its own transcendence

which promises to relate it to all individuals from their depths, and realize the unity of the entire reality in and through the deep and super – personal spirit that has within it the mystery of Manifestation and the perfection of the Eternal Nature`

Philosophies of Science or even Religious of Science and Reason (intellect) usually arrive at the theory of Monism or bare identity[1]. Philosophies of Society arrive at theories of

---

[1] Cf. Moder Philosophies live and swear by the scientific developments whether these developments belong to the region of Physics, Chemistry, or Biology. Cf. Religion of Science: Wood: Religion of the Artist: Hon. John Collier: and works of Hon. B. Russell, Joad, Huxley and others, and identity of Reality: Emile Meyerson: and also cf. My article “Modern Philosophy and Religion, ‘Aryan Path” Nov. 1934

---

pluralism. They could not go beyond to the postulation of an organic unity which could effectively reconcile monistic identity and pluralistic differences; they find the problems of manyness or identity rather inconvenient. They have been forced to treat the inconvenient as fiction or illusion. Spiritual life, on the contrary, does not infer undifferentiated identity. Nor does it affirm unmitigated pluralism. The nature of the Divine is such as to involve in an organic manner the self – identity of His eternal nature with the self – projection or extension of His infinite Being into manyness. Integral synthesis of Reality is the aim of all world – philosophies and this certainly is not arrived at by monistic philosophies or Absolutisms either of the materialistic or intellectual or spiritualistic kinds, which deny utterly plurality. They either affirm a supra – existential Being void of all differences, or an non – existential Being, void of every kind of manifestation except the illusory. An integral or Organic Synthesis recognizes the reality of manifestations and the reality of the Suprapersonal or trans-subjective Reality but their realities are inextricably and inalienably intertwined. It is not reason but supra – reason that

helps the realization of this unique synthesis between the Absolute and the phenomenal, One and the Many where the stress is on the Absolute and the Oneness[1]. It is clearly true that real or absolute knowledge can only be had through the identity of the one in all manifestations, the Brahman who is the Self of all things and being whereas we must only be content with differences

---

[1] Rsi $Y\bar{a}j\bar{n}avalkya's$ view that all beings are lovable for the sake of the Divine in them is an effective or $samj\bar{\bar{n}}ana$-version of the view propounded by Sri Aurobindo that our knowledge is by modified identity, $vij\bar{\bar{n}}ana$, supermind. *Life Divine* Vol II.

---

when we try to understand the manifestations through differences or outer similarities or surface identities[1]

Thus it follows that we need religion. The apprehension of our nature or life as extending beyond the frontiers of the perceptible and inferable worlds, and beyond the regions of mortality and ignorance, and beyond the finitude of our actual space-time nexus, is the reason for this need. We have a consciousness that receives impressions, however confused or impregnated with the defects of our temporal habitiation and evolution, from beyond itself namely, the most perfect being that alone is the reason for its own participation in the scheme of Reality. Man's aim is to achieve his unity or participation with this transcendent Reality that is the foundation of his existence and aspiration. The fact remains that, for whatever occulet reason[2], there has happened disruption or outer separation from that unity which it is the business of the conscious being to restore or recognize or remember.

The problems of Religion are not less of the individual self than those of the Divine Nature. As we have shown earlier, God is the inward unity of the many, and man's problem is to know this inward Being, for through That alone could he

---

[1] Spirit and Reality: N. Berdyaev p. 136 “Authentic mysticism is not affected by opposition of transcendental dualism and immanent monism.” “Monism postulates rationalization, a mental process rather than experience”. ibid 139 p.

[2] It is the experience of this disruption and restoring that is problem of Metaphysics. Sri Aurobindo’s *Life Divine* is a big contribution in this direction.

---

restore himself to the status of a free bing even amidst the most complicated environment. Thus it will be necessary not only to know the nature of the Ultimate Being but also to know the nature of the seeker of that Ultimate Being. The means to realize or recognize the ever – present Ultimate Being in one’s consciousness are also to be known and understood and defined. These are stated to be *Tattva, Hita* and $Purus\bar{a}rtha$. The $vin\bar{a}\acute{s}a$ and $sambh\bar{u}ti$ to use the language of the $\bar{I}\acute{s}avasyopanisad$ or the mystical and the religious methods, to use the language of Religion.

In our sketch of these we may be aided to extent by the results of Comparative Religion. The problems of Comparative Religion have on the whole so far been anthropological, historical and to a certain extent only philosophical[1]. We find that we have to deal with traditional heritages, myths, revelations belonging to several strata and mythologies, practices that induce states of consciousness that simulate higher states of consciousness called spiritual or occult, and rituals like sacrifice, prayers and other ways of feeling communion[2] with the transcendent reality or realities. God or gods; we have to deal with general theories of relationship between the Divine and the human; we have also to reckon with theories of Creation and Nature. These theories have received scholarly treatment at the hands of modern investigators. But their general tendency has been to dub these exhibitions of common sentiments of religions as

---

[1] Cf. Easter Religions and Western Thought: S. Radhakrishnan

[2] Golden Bough: J.H. Frazer

'primitive' or the least complex tissue of human life, which are derogatory to the advanced and enlightened states of the modern man. But this is not stated in any carping spirit by evolutionary thinkers who feel that the more complex and heterogeneous always presupposes a condition of homogeneity. From a study of the primitive peoples and their customs and manners, we are indeed enabled to trace the history of ascent to completed forms as also the regression of higher and complex to homogeneous or undifferentiated forms, Climatic and geographic conditions isolate groups of people for whom the ancient and inherited habits and manners remain as fundamental assets but which due to a varitye of causes have lost their symbolic power. We have also to take note of another aspect in the life of ancient and primitive peoples. Imagination, which is the instrument of symbolism and which has been proved to be an effective weapon of self fulfillment, has helped the modification of methodologies; and the natural tendency of narrative and heroic stories to move from one country to another, from one civilization to another, have modified and even localizes these stories. The place names of many countries will bear witness to the ever-recurring myth and story of some mother–country which might have been its source[1]

---

[1] *Psychology of Primitive Culture:* Bartlett. The voyage of the *Pañcatantra* and its modifications in other countries is a classic example. Even so the Indian civilizing mission of indo – Polynesia through the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyana* and the *Bhāgavata* is an excellent instance of the spreading of place names of India to those islands. American towns have mostly European place – names.

Lest we should lose ourselves in the morass of details and similarities in symbolisms and practices of totems and taboos which form such a large part of social unifications or unities in advanced as well as in primitive cultures, we should keep before us; in any true account of religious or spiritual life, the essentials and the meaning of the spiral – curves; of ascent to true manifestation

of the spiritual life. And whether we like it or not the true source and impetus of spiritual search after God is the consciousness of misery and helplessness on the part of the individual along with a consciousness of an ever present transcendent power, universal yet personally responsive, which it may recognize clearly as God or person or merely as magical power or law or dharma which it cannot comprehend at all through its sensory or mental instruments[1], as the Upanisads have once for all clearly and unmistakably laid down.

All philosophical and mystical and religious efforts start with this experience of misery (*dhukha*)[2], and aim at arriving at

---

[1] The primitive people are said to think of the supernatural element as all pervasive and magically effective. It is a power-concept. Mana, Orenda, Grace, *Apūrva* and Adṛṣṭa are all magical powers in things. *Naiyāyika* description of *adṛṣṭa* the *Mīmāmsā* definition of *apūrva* and Moffat's description of Grace "as an impersonal power in all beings and their qualities." Cf. Grace in the New Testament p. 29. This is not however the meaning of *Dhātu – prasāda* or the choice of God in Katha Up.1.2.20 and 23.

[2] Dhukha is also terror – consciousness or dread. Distrust of reality is the cause of *vairāgya*, fear of a reality is ghora – experience. God is also stated to have ghora form in addition to a śubha-form. Salvation is the only purpose of religious and mystical experience. knowledge is thus strictly knowledge that leads to the realization of salvation or freedom from all misery and dread and ignorance and limitation.

---

sukha or delight or pleasure that is eternal and undeteriorating. Misery makes enquiry into reality of existence possible. This enquiry aims at arriving at the free and unconditioned and flawless existence of the soul, and the means are devised to struggle against evil and the powers of darkness and restriction in order to arrive at goodness and beauty and immortality with the help of the powers of

light. The religious attitude focuses the attention of man on the nature of the Divine one Supreme Deity beyond all these powers of light even, for He is their fountain and being.

Philosophy is only vaguely conscious of the truths of religious consciousness which it seeks to rationalize or rather make amenable to the fragmentary mentality of man; though it is all the while distrustful of the sensory universe of change and limitation, even as the mystical consciousness is. That is the precise reason why all philosophy is bound to realize a transcendental application of its categories of thougth[1]. Mystical consciousness seeks other instruments or ways of apprehending the transcendental reality and is held suspect by

---

[1] Kant's exploit in his *Critiques* is a classical example in modern times to effect a complete picture of the limits of reason. So early as the Upanisadic times. Hindu seers realized the fact that inferential knowledge which is knowledge that is limited to and circumscribed by perceptual experience can never help in the understanding of the nature of the salvation – granting Reality. Brahman. The real difference between philosophy and the Philosophy consists in this primary purposiveness of knowledge to discover the Ultimate Fact, namely, the spirit that alone can realize and exalt the soul.

---

philosophy. But we know that elemental truths are never baulked by sneers; they struggle to affirm themselves on the plane of reason itself more fiercely than ever. The dialectic between religious and mystical instincts will go on till they realize the double fruits of liberation and perfect subordination to the Universal Deity, the fullest and Ultimate Lord, dependence on whom is freedom itself for the devotee. Unit is realized utterly in and through multiplicity and it becomes the truth of the multiplicity which each one of the multiplicity has struggled to display or manifest or liberate.

There are several theories of Godhead and these theories are usually classified under three categories, namely, Pantheism, Deism and Theism. Pantheism holds that all is God; Deism considers that God is a causal agent external to the process and ordering the created world, if we consider that "all religion resolves itself into a conscious relation on our part to a higher than we, and on the part of the rational universe at large to a higher than all, that is, to a Mind supreme above the whole family of mind[1]," then God is considered to be not utterly transcendent to us or even the highest among us, because a conscious relationship could be established between that and ourselves[2]. it is not doubt true that the mere consciousness of such a Being as exalted over everything that we know of, may make it appear to be different in kind. Between ourselves and That, then, it would be almost impossible to establish any type of relationship. It is impossible to reduce the difference between the human and the divine,

---

[1] Study of Religion: J.Martineau. Vol.1.pp.126

[2] Realm of Ends: James Ward. P. 192

---

thought a type of relationship could well be established; and this relationship would naturally conform to the master-servant, creator-creatures, and Lord-slave types. An essential dualism exists between the infinite and the finite and to recognize religion to be essentially this would entail Service as the ambition of the soul.

While then the human cannot exalt himself to the Divine infinity, it may yet be possible for the Divine to delimit Himself in such ways as to appear amenable to the human consciousness as its 'superior partner' if we may so coin a new phrase to express the relationship between two human beings, one of whom is superiorly endowed and is a genius. This would be achieved by means of His self – power. The nature of divine transcendence is frankly superficial in the deistic system which makes it rather an externality or otherness or superiority in

aloofness. It however must be said that real efficient causality is provided only by Deism.

Theism, on the contrary, gives a more significant meaning to the quality of 'transcendence'. Any real transcendence is not merely a keeping aloof from the created process but is a constant involvement and management of it with omniscience and delight. The deistic conception keeps God out of the Universe because it cannot imperil God's nature, and thus stultifies itself, in so far as it is impossible for that godhead to incarnate in the process in some manner except at the peril of losing His eminent transcendence. That is why the theory of Occasionalism[1], for which there is no parallel in Indian Philosophy, came into existence to explain the constant occurrences of miracles which are but the incidence of the supreme spiritual on the material plane. It is thus the miracle that provides the transcendence of God in an abstract manner. Concrete transcendence means immanent transcendence, a transcendence over the process which involves guidance of it, evolution of values in the context of the created, and a constant outpouring of the higher energies of divine Nature into it and into the lives and cultures of men.

Theism affirms immanence of God in the created world. But immanence should not be narrowly interpreted locationally, that is, as confinement in matter and Nature. That is what western pantheism tends to do when it identifies God with Nature. Immanence does not not mean identity. "A bare and meaningless identity of God and World simply leaves us with God only, as in the acosmism of Spinoza or with the world only us in the 'polite atheism' of Schopenhuer[2]". God must be both the immanent ground of the world and its transcendent ground, and this is what theism holds[3], Immanence through pervasive power that includes control and direction and

---

[1] A theory put forward by Malebranche and Guilencx. Cf. section on the Yoga Idea of God

[2] *Realms of Ends*: James Ward. P. 287

[3] ibid. p. 234

---

purpose and possibility of ‘superior presence when required, will be something that wills a comprehensive relation between God and the world and man. This last view is a departure from technical theism too, and it is the view of Rāmānuja.”