



REVIEW OF RESEARCH

ISSN: 2249-894X

IMPACT FACTOR : 5.7631 (UIF)

UGC APPROVED JOURNAL NO. 48514

VOLUME - 8 | ISSUE - 9 | JUNE - 2019



NEO- VEDANTISM OF RADHAKRISHNAN

Dr. Nabanita Barua

Assistant Professor, Dept of Philosophy , Gauhati University.

ABSTRACT:

Radhakrishnan is one of the greatest figures of the Indian Renaissance. He has a place of eminence amongst the most important thinkers of the contemporary world of philosophy and creative thought. As a Neo-Vedantin philosopher Radhakrishnan has given a new orientation and a restatement of the philosophical doctrine of the Upanishads and the Advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara. His aim was to give a philosophical justification of the Vedānta philosophy of Śaṅkara which he believes as a cream of Indian Philosophy, comprising of the three prasthanas, the Upanishads, the Brahmasutra and the Bhagavadgita. The central theme of his philosophy is same as that of Advaita Vedānta. Although he relies heavily on non-dualistic Vedānta, he introduces modifications into the earlier doctrines of it. He considers the Personal God as an aspect of the Absolute instead of treating it as a lower illusory manifestation of the Absolute. Moreover he gives a different interpretation of Śaṅkara's doctrine of Māyā. For him the world which we experience is temporal and dependent, in contrast with Brahman, who is uncreated and eternal. According to Radhakrishnan, Māyā has not meant to Indian Philosophers, even to Śaṅkara that the world is illusion. He has defended the reality of the empirical world; it finds its basis in the Absolute. The Absolute is the source of its many transformations, but these transformations in the world of the here and now do not in turn affect the integrity or absoluteness of Brahman. In this way Radhakrishnan overcomes the greatest obstacle to Western cordiality to the most highly –developed philosophy in India, Śaṅkara's Advaita Vedānta and paves the way for greater understanding of India's greatest heights of thought and for a possible meeting of the minds of East and west.



KEYWORDS: Neo-vedantism, Brahman, Isvara, Maya, Illusion.

INTRODUCTION :

Radhakrishnan wrote a thesis on the "Ethics of the Vedānta and its Metaphysical Presuppositions" while he was a student of the Madras Christian College. This repudiated the charge against Vedānta that it is non-ethical. Radhakrishnan's most

significant contribution is the new dimension that he added to Advaita Vedānta and the justification of the Vedānta in the context of modern philosophy. But when we say that Radhakrishnan is a neo-Vedāntin philosopher then thereby we indirectly point out that there is some element of newness in the Vedāntic ideas put

forward by Radhakrishnan. There is no doubt that Advaita is the basis of religious thought which Radhakrishnan expounds and defends. Radhakrishnan represents most important interpretational developments in the Vedāntic thought in the present day. Unlike an orthodox Vedāntin he does not recoil into

the narrow circle of theosophy, but widens the Vedāntic thought to have touch with science and practical life. Radhakrishnan is himself conscious of his reconstruction of idealistic thought and of his fresh interpretation of the Advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara. Radhakrishnan's originally lies in boldly re-interpreting the much abused doctrine with special reference to the present world and its needs. However in this paper, we shall confine ourselves to two important aspects of Advaita Vedānta that is the concept of Ultimate Reality, and the concept of Māyā.

According to Śaṅkara there is only one Supreme Reality and it is Brahman. The entire philosophy of Śaṅkara is expressed in a beautiful verse which runs as follows- "Brahma Satya Jagatmithyā Jivo Brahmaiva na parah, i.e. "The Brahman is the only Reality and everything else this world of manifestation is unreal, as mere appearance, the individual soul (Jiva) is non-different from Brahman, the Absolute. Now the fundamental problem of the Advaita Vedānta is, if Brahman be the one, Absolute Reality, then how can we explain the world appearance at all and what is the status of the world appearance. The various systems of Indian philosophy since the time of Vedic religion have advanced various interpretations of the nature of the world appearances, and the reality behind it. But the most of the interpretations are theistic and dualistic in character. What goes to the credit of Śaṅkara is that his interpretation provides for the reconciliation of dualistic theism with non-dualistic absolutism by giving us a two - fold conception of the Absolute, both as devoid of attributes (Nirguna) and as endowed with attributes (Saguna). However he does not place these two conceptions on the same level of existence which may involve self- contradiction. Śaṅkara clearly distinguishes the higher from a lower Brahman. The higher Brahman, Brahman viewed from the aspect of knowledge (Vidyā), is free from all adjuncts, all name and form. It is Nirguna Brahman and it is knowledge of this Brahman that constitutes liberation. According to Śaṅkara, Saguna Brahman or God is the lower Brahman, it is Brahman viewed from the aspect of ignorance (Avidyā).

According to Śaṅkara, it is God who creates the world-appearance. The question of the relation between God and Brahman arises when we try to explain the world. Śaṅkara observes that the entire visible world, with which both science and history are concerned and which provides the theatre for all our activities, and which we believe to be there from the beginning of time and running to an indefinite future as altogether illusory, because it comes in conflict with the scriptural description that reality is absolutely non-dual and tolerates no other. Therefore, we have to regard the world as mere appearance, i.e. it is something which we cannot deny but which at the same time cannot really be there. The fundamental difficulty of the Advaitic theory is how to explain this false appearance. To regard that the infinite Brahman is the cause of the finite world and creates it, is to admit that the infinite is subject to the limitation of time. We cannot simply apply the relation of cause and effect to the relation of Brahman and the world. We cannot say that Brahman is the cause and the world is the effect, because this would distinguish Brahman from the world and make it into a thing related to another thing. The relation between Brahman and Īśvara is a special application of the general problem of the relation between Brahman and the world. According to Śaṅkara the world though it hangs on Brahman does not affect Brahman by distinguishing that kind of causality where the cause without undergoing any change produces the effect.

Śaṅkara claimed that God is a lower category than the Absolute. According to Śaṅkara God has no independent reality. For him God is not identical with Brahman. Though he does not consider God to be identical with Brahman yet he thinks that God is associated with the creative power of the all knowing Lord. This creative power is Māyā. So from the Vedāntic point of view behind the creation of the world God may be considered both as the material and efficient cause. The Absolute or Brahman is the only Ultimate Reality. He is the undifferentiated Eternal Being without any second, whose appearance is God. The Absolute is unconditioned and unrelated, and cannot be the God of religion, who is conceived as a personal being related to the finite individuals through prayer and worship. By this distinction between the Absolute and God, Śaṅkara however does not mean that the God of religion is unreal and illusory. To us, the persons of the empirical, God is the highest object of worship and through

worship and devotion to this God, man attains liberation by realising himself to be identical with Brahman.

Thus in the philosophy of Śaṅkara a distinction is drawn between God and the Absolute. The Absolute is beyond all the characterizations and descriptions. It is regarded to be wholly transcendent. It is considered to be beyond the creator-created dichotomy. According to Śaṅkara it can be described only negatively. In the philosophy of Śaṅkara God in relation to the Absolute is a lesser reality. For Śaṅkara Īśvara or God is the phenomenal appearance of the Absolute. That God is an appearance of Brahman can merely be signified as “neti-neti.” Śaṅkara asserts that God vanishes only from the level lying beyond human knowledge. Though initially Śaṅkara makes a great effort to establish God as the all powerful cause of everything finally he has brought God into a lower state of deceptive appearance i.e. Māyā. It is quite clear that in the Advaita Vedānta philosophy of Śaṅkara Brahman is the central point of discussion and at the same time it can also be observed that he keeps God in a momentous position. Nevertheless, from the empirical stand point God appears and disappears when viewed transcendently. Śaṅkara neither identifies God with the Absolute nor says that is different. He says that the Absolute is God, associated as it were with Māyā. So long as one is under the influence of Māyā, God appears to be real, but ultimately God disappears along with Māyā. Śaṅkara puts so much emphasis on Absolute or Brahman that God merely appears and disappears in his philosophy. God ceases to exist with the cessation of Māyā.

In connection with the question of Ultimate Reality Radhakrishnan is particularly interested in the Upanishadic term ‘Brahman’, the use of which is so overwhelming and comprehensive that the very utterance of the same makes one think that he is nearer to the reality and the reality is within himself. Radhakrishnan takes up the monistic character of the Vedāntic reality and combines it with some of the important aspects of Absolute Idealism. Like Vedānta he believes that the reality is one and like Absolute Idealism he shows that everything is a necessary aspect of the One. The supreme reality is conceived by Radhakrishnan as Absolute and God. Since God represents the religious aspirations of common men, it should be accepted as the Absolute in action. Radhakrishnan asserted that as long as the world is real, God is also real. Radhakrishnan says that God is the Absolute considered as the ground of this world. According to Radhakrishnan, there are four poises of reality, the Absolute Brahman, the creative spirit, Īśvara, the world spirit Hiranyagarbha and the world, the Virāt- Svarupa. When the supreme reality is viewed in relation to the cosmos, we call it God. God is the Absolute from the cosmic point of view and the Absolute is the pre cosmic nature of God. Radhakrishnan believes that the ultimate explanation of the universe has to be monistic. The Absolute in itself is essentially one. Like the Advaita Vedāntist, Radhakrishnan also believes that the Absolute does not admit even of internal differentiation, the Swagata – bheda as the Vedāntist calls it.

Radhakrishnan did not accept Śaṅkara’s concept of the Absolute. As we have mentioned in the philosophy of Śaṅkara, God in relation to the Absolute is lesser reality. But Radhakrishnan has wholly rejected this view. Śaṅkara’s Absolute is an undifferentiated unity. It is not an organized whole and therefore excludes all internal relations. Radhakrishnan thinks that Śaṅkara by “denying all relations reduces the ultimate being to bare existence which is absolute vacuity.”¹ Unlike Śaṅkara, Radhakrishnan’s Absolute is a whole where differences are reconciled and not obliterated. Radhakrishnan says that “the Supreme in its non – relational aspect is the Absolute”².

Radhakrishnan’s Absolute is a pure and passionless being which transcends the restless turmoil of cosmic life.³ However Radhakrishnan says that from the point of view of one specific possibility of the Absolute which has become actualized, the Absolute appears as God. The Absolute as God is organically related to the world. Moreover Radhakrishnan says that God is the creator, sustainer and judge of the world is not totally unrelated to the Absolute. God is the Absolute from the cosmic end. At the end of the cosmic process, God does not simply disappear. He recedes into the background of the Absolute. It seems that formless and passionless Absolute as such has no meaning for a religious man. The Absolute acquires meaning only when it assumes the form of God. Radhakrishnan’s Absolute and God are like two sides of the same coin. Absolute and God refer to the same truth that is the Supreme.

Reality is One and the same, although there may be different points of view of looking at the same Reality. Radhakrishnan holds that the Absolute of Philosophy and God of religion are distinctions of value and those who contemplate on the abstract impersonal Absolute are spiritually more advanced than those, who worship God. In the Advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara the emphasis is more on the Absolute, whereas in the attenuated Advaitism of Radhakrishnan there is more stress on the concrete character of God. For Śaṅkara, Īśvara or God is a phenomenal appearance of the Absolute. Radhakrishnan expressly denies that God can be a mere appearance of the Absolute. Śaṅkara neither identifies God with the Ultimate Reality nor says it is different from it. Śaṅkara ascribes the term Māyā to associate the term Absolute with the term God. According to him God appears to be real as long as one is under the influence of Māyā; but God disappears when the lid of ignorance is uncovered. But Radhakrishnan is not in favour of reducing God to nothingness by making it a product of Māyā or nescience. To quote Radhakrishnan, "Both the Absolute and personal God are real, only the former is the logical prius of the latter."⁴ The entire philosophy of Śaṅkara is so much dominated by the idea of Brahman that God appears and disappears in his philosophy. But Radhakrishnan gives equal emphasis to both God and the Absolute. He wrote, "While the Absolute is the transcendental divine, God is the cosmic divine."⁵ God in Radhakrishnan's philosophy continues to exist till the very end of the cosmic process. As the cosmic process does not cease to exist, ultimately God does not disappear but unites with the Absolute. To Radhakrishnan, the difference between God and the Absolute is logical and not chronological. Radhakrishnan says that the difference between Absolute and God does not mean that there is a particular point at which the Absolute moves out. The stages are only logical but not chronologically successive.

Both Śaṅkara and Radhakrishnan hold that the Absolute never kindle in the soul adoration and intense love. Radhakrishnan holds, "We cannot worship the Absolute whom no one hath seen or can see who dwelleth in the light that no man can approach unto. The formless Absolute is conceived as formed for the purposes of worship."⁶ God is the form in which alone the Absolute can be pictured by the finite minds. Śaṅkara declares that Brahman is both determinate (Saguna) and indeterminate (Nirguna). He asserts that when the methods of logic are employed, the highest reality is not the indeterminate Brahman – but determinate Īśvara. For Radhakrishnan, the Absolute assumes the form of God. God is not the figment of our minds. God himself is the highest reality as well as Supreme value. Such a God regarded as the highest Reality is an object of genuine worship. So, it seems that formless and passionless Absolute as such has no meaning for a religious man. The Absolute acquires meaning only when it assumes the form of God. Radhakrishnan's Absolute and God are like two sides of the same coin. They refer to the same truth that is the Supreme Reality. The Supreme as Absolute is inconceivable and is ineffable, whereas the Supreme as God is conceivable and apprehensible.

Māyā is a philosophical concept employed by Hindu Idealism in its traditional literature as the basic and the common explanation of the relationship of Appearance and Reality. Man seeks an explanation of life and the world, its relation to the infinite. The notion of Māyā makes its appearance as an explanation to the mysteries of the world. Both classical and modern Hindu philosophers would however agree that without the notion of Māyā it would be impossible to explain the mystery of life and world. The interpretation of the notion of Māyā is different at different periods of time.

The doctrine of Māyā is the keystone of Śaṅkara Vedānta. Śaṅkara boldly and logically announced the doctrine of Māyā as an explanation of the relation between the world appearance and Brahman. Through the theory of Māyā, which is an indescribable power of Brahman Śaṅkara proved that Brahman is the only reality and the world is an appearance. Śaṅkara is of the opinion that though the world is ultimately unreal, for all practical purposes it is real. In order to explain how the Real appears as the world Śaṅkara admits the principle of Māyā. Brahman with the Māyā Sakti becomes Īśvara who creates the world. Brahman appears to be the sole underlying reality from the transcendental point of view. There is no Īśvara who brings this world into being. It is only from the human end that Brahman appears as Īśvara. Śaṅkara describes Māyā as the root cause of the world appearance. Śaṅkara has used the term ajñāna, avidyā, māyā, prakṛti, avyakta etc as synonymous in

most of the cases. Māyā in Śaṅkara's philosophy denotes the Divine Power or Sakti of Īśvara. It is the inherent force residing in the Supreme Brahman. Radhakrishnan writes, "Māyā', according to Śaṅkara is the dividing force, the finitising principle, that which measures out the immeasurable and creates forms in the form less".⁷ Śaṅkara in his Advaita Vedānta neither identifies God with the Ultimate Reality nor says that it is different from it. Śaṅkara ascribes the term Māyā to associate the term Absolute with the term God.

Although Radhakrishnan is highly influenced by the Vedāntic Absolute Idealism, and fascinated by the deep philosophical insight of Śaṅkara, he is not fully persuaded by the philosophical viewpoint of Śaṅkara. He does not hold strictly with Śaṅkara that the world is neither real nor unreal, and regards Māyā not as illusion, but as a concept of explanation. Radhakrishnan's reinterpretation of the concept of Māyā is one of his greatest contributions to Indian Philosophy. Māyā as he interprets is a realistic concept. It is not the same as illusion. The world is real and not an illusion. It is as real as man himself. Radhakrishnan holds that Māyā only points to the phenomenal character of the world. According to him, what is not self-explanatory and yet cannot be denied as an unreality is Māyā. While admitting that the appearance of the world is without explanation, Radhakrishnan does not cover up our confusion by the use of the word Māyā. He does not consider that the world is devoid of value and importance. He holds that the things of the world ever struggle to recover their reality. So it follows that Radhakrishnan regards the world as a combination of Being and non- Being, sat and asat, rather than neither Being nor Non-Being as most of the Advaitins would hold.

Radhakrishnan introduces the principle of Māyā in his philosophy of the world and makes it serve a number of purposes. At times it is conceived as the principle of creation. At other times it is used to provide an answer to the question regarding the way of creation and at still other times it serves the purpose of illustrating the relation between God and the world. One important characteristic of Radhakrishnan's approach to the problem of Māyā is that he rejects the traditional view of Māyā which holds the world is an illusion. He wrote, "Many of my critics were puzzled by my discussion of the Upanishads, since I did not fly a banner and fix a label to my view. My criticism of the theory of 'illusion', generally associated with Śaṅkara's metaphysics and supported by Deussen, led some of my critics to imagine that I was opposed to Śaṅkara's view. My indifference to personal theism made it equally clear to some others that I was not friendly to Rāmānuja's interpretation. But if one is not follower of Śaṅkara or Rāmānuja or any other classical interpreter, it is assumed that one can only be a reveller in strange un-philosophical confusion. I submit that my interpretation of the Upanishads is not an unreasonable one, though it may seem to differ from this or that tradition in this or that point."⁸

Radhakrishnan approaches the problem of Māyā by criticising Śaṅkara. By referring to the concept of Māyā in Śaṅkara's philosophy, Radhakrishnan says that he may perhaps develop Śaṅkara's suggestive idea in his own way. In Śaṅkara's Advaita Vedānta Māyā is mithyā or illusion; it has no independent existence other than Brahman. It is only because of our ajñānam or ignorance that we consider Īśvara's māyāsakti or power of illusion as Satyam or real. In the Vedas the word Māyā has been used to mean the mysterious powers that God possess and it is because of their mysterious nature that it is impossible to comprehend the Divine nature and to penetrate into its depth, and secretes and mysteries of it. Therefore Māyā stands in between God and man, and God and the world because it stands in the way of man's complete knowledge of God. According to this interpretation of the meaning of the word Māyā, the world which is the expression of the creative powers of God becomes his revelation or expression rather than something that projects the world which does not exist at all, but only makes it appear to exist. The world which is the product of Māyā stands in between God and man. Māyā in this sense suggests the transcendence of God and not the delusive character of the world even though not standing on the same footing as God is real being. The world cannot be considered to be an addition to Brahman. From the point of view of God, the world cannot be regarded to be a matter of real addition to God, even though it arises from Brahman and being sustained in Brahman. Though definitely real in a sense, it is not real in full sense. All growth or evolution has to be within Brahman and consequently the world not being taken to be real addition to Brahman may either be looked upon as

Brahman itself or may be declared as illusory. This point of view has been adopted in Śaṅkara's doctrine of Māyā. The relationship between Brahman and the world must be understood in terms of world's relation with the Brahman. The world is said to be the illusory expression or vivarta of Brahman.

In Advaita Vedānta there are some other interpretations of the doctrine of Māyā. Māyā cannot be different from Brahman which has no second. The process of the world is due to gradual deprivation of the reality. Māyā is used here as the name of the dividing force, the finitising principle, which measures out the measurable and creates forms in the formless. Māyā is the principle of time and change. It indicates the reality of time and change on the one hand and on the other hand it indicates the immutable nature of Brahman. Māyā, therefore points to both reality of the world and its false appearance. Śaṅkara gives Māyā an altogether different characterisation, its being described neither as real nor as unreal. It becomes indescribable or anirvacaniya. It indicates the fact that the world has reality of some sort and is altogether not false or fictitious. In Śaṅkara's philosophy this doctrine of Māyā has been responsible for the doctrine of two Brahman. One is the higher or pre-cosmic Brahman and the other is the creator Brahman who brings about the existence of the world. It is because of Māyā, Brahman comes to possess duality of nature, one is pre cosmic nature and the other is cosmic nature. Śaṅkara's whole object in his formulation of the doctrine of Māyā is to establish the identity or oneness of Brahman by declaring the illusory nature of the world which disappears at the dawn of spiritual wisdom.

Radhakrishnan thoroughly metamorphoses the doctrine of Māyā and gives it a realistic turn. Radhakrishnan says that though the emergence of the finite from the infinite is not intelligible at all, the finite can have its source in the infinite. The doctrine of Māyā contains this inexplicability of the process of the emergence of the finite from the infinite. Māyā points to the revelation and expression of Brahman in the world rather than its obscuration by it. Radhakrishnan has brought out certain implications of the doctrine of Māyā, as employed in Advaita Vedānta. Māyā reveals the truth that the world is not self-explanatory. It pre-supposes a higher reality which alone can explain its existence. Māyā also underlines the incomprehensibility of the relation of infinite Brahman with the finite world. Māyā suggests the impossibility of the conjunction of the intuitive and intellectual conceptions of the Ultimate Reality. Māyā also points to the non-existence of any temporal relationship between Brahman and the world. Again Māyā is the indicative of a technique that is adopted to emphasise the integrity of Brahman. The appearance of Brahman as the world is also called Māyā. Māyā is also regarded as the energy or power of God, the perfect personality who has the power of self-expression and by virtue of which He reveals Himself through the world.

Radhakrishnan in his philosophy upholds the unity of God and Absolute, and so he interprets the doctrine of Māyā as to preserve the reality of the world. Radhakrishnan emphasises the primacy of Being as the ground of all existence. The existence of the world implies the existence of Being from which the world derives. Being which is the most universal and comprehensive concept is the foundation of all existence. Radhakrishnan following the Upanishads hold that Reality is one and not many. There is only one Being and that Being is Divine Spirit. Thus Radhakrishnan is an avowed monist who clearly identifies God and the Absolute. The question of the status of the world is bound up with the interpretation of the doctrine of Māyā. The world is the manifestation of the creative energy of God. In that case the world is dependent upon Brahman. Brahman alone is the absolute, independent reality and all the rest is relative and dependent. Radhakrishnan maintains that the empirical world is between being and non-being that it is not an illusion, but it is not ultimate also. He argues that it is a distortion of Śaṅkara's doctrine of Māyā to say that the world is an illusion, without meaning and significance. Other Indian thinkers hold that to Śaṅkara the world is an illusion. But Radhakrishnan strongly defends Śaṅkara on this view. Radhakrishnan holds that in the history of Indian thought although many thinkers have misunderstood Śaṅkara's doctrine of Māyā as illusionism, Śaṅkara himself never claimed that this world is unreal. Radhakrishnan wrote, "Śaṅkara, who is rightly credited with the systematic formulation of the doctrine of Māyā, tells us that the highest reality is unchangeable and therefore that changing existence such as human history has not ultimate reality (pāramārthika sattā). He warns us

however against the temptation to regard what is not completely real as utterly illusory. The world has empirical being (vyavahārika sattā) which is quite different from illusory existence (pratibhāsika sattā). Human experience is neither ultimately real nor completely illusory.....The world is not a phantom, though it is not ultimately real.”⁹

The world is dependent on the Absolute. But the absolute is not dependent on the world. Yet the world is not for that reason unreal. The relation between the Absolute and the world is brought out by the term Māyā. The world is not essential being like the Absolute. It is also not mere non-being. It cannot be described as either being or non-being. Radhakrishnan examines the whole doctrine of Māyā and concludes that it does not make the world an illusion. It simply indicates that the world is ‘relatively real’. He has interpreted the doctrine of Māyā ‘so as to save the world and give it a real meaning.’¹⁰ There are several interpretations of the doctrine of Māyā in Radhakrishnan’s philosophy and not all of them have implications for the status of the world.

Māyā indicates that the world is ‘derived being’. The world is an expression of the Absolute, not the Absolute itself. “To mark the distinction between Absolute Being and dependent being we call the later Māyā.”¹¹ The world depends on the Brahman, but the Brahman does not depend on the world. “The world is not an essential being like the Brahman; nor it is mere non-being. It cannot be defined as either being or non-being.”¹² Therefore, the world is described as Māyā, which means that its being is dependent or derived being. Māyā describes the temporal or transitory character of the world. The Brahman is eternal, whereas the world is temporal. There was a time when the world was not and there will be time when it will cease to be. History has a beginning and an end. But this does not mean that the interim period between the beginning and the end is an illusion.

Thus without violating the basic principles of Vedānta, Radhakrishnan by his analysis of the concept of Ultimate Reality and the concept of Māyā made a separate attempt and also succeeded to a great extent to save the reality of the world. Some critics raise a question whether Radhakrishnan’s interpretation of Māyā is faithful to the classical values of Hinduism. Some feel that he has apparently deviated from traditional lines. The answer to such criticisms can be easily met when we note that even amongst the classical exponents of the Vedānta there are strong differences of opinions on points of interpretation. It is felt that the most important thing in India today is not so much the question of loyalty to tradition as meaningfulness, coherence and relevance to the needs of the present. There is no other philosopher either in India or elsewhere who has been so successful to represent the modern Vedānta as Radhakrishnan is. He may be regarded as the outstanding representative of the modern Vedāntic thought which may be characterised as Neo-Vedāntism. He represents the most important interpretational developments in the Vedāntic thought in the present day. He is a non-orthodox Vedāntin with a mind not to accept the whole tradition of the Vedānta. He accepts only those parts of the tradition which are logically coherent. He strongly holds that opinions cannot grow unless traditions are altered. So with his full unswerving reverence to the classical Vedānta he is at liberty to form his own opinions on it so as to adjust it with modern thinking. He avoids exaggerated and extreme orthodoxy and with the full devotion to the perennial philosophy enriches the Vedānta with many modern thoughts. He regards the Vedāntic ideas as the truths of spirit which are permanent and cannot be changed. What, therefore he changes are the rules which according to him change from age to age. Therefore we may unhesitatingly stamp him to be a Vedāntin of the Advaitic line. He explains and interprets the tenets of the Vedānta with realistic touch and convinces the reader by putting the arguments logically irrefutable.

REFERENCES:

1. Radhakrishnan S (1972), *An Idealist View of Life*, p 80.
2. Schilpp P.A (ed) (1992), *The Philosophy of Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan*, p 796.
3. Radhakrishnan S (1972), *An Idealist View of Life*, p 271.
4. Radhakrishnan S, (1989) *The Principal Upanisads*, p 79.
5. Radhakrishnan S (1979), *An Idealist View of Life*, p 269.
6. Radhakrishnan S (1948), *Indian philosophy*, vol-II, p 649.

7. Ibid, p 570.
8. Ibid, Vol I, p 674
9. Radhakrishnan S (1967), *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*, p 86.
10. Radhakrishnan S, "Reply to Critics", in Schilpp P. A (1992), *The Philosophy of S Radhakrishnan*, p 800.
11. Radhakrishnan S, "Reply to Critics", in Schilpp P. A (1992), *The Philosophy of S Radhakrishnan*, p 800.
12. Radhakrishnan S,(1985), *The Bhagavad Gita*, Introduction, p 38.