

A SOURCE BOOK IN

Philosophy

SARVE BAPIAKRISHNAN
AND BESA. MOORE



PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
1957

Copyright, 1957, Princeton University Press

Published in Great Britain, India, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand by Oxford University Press

All rights reserved

L. C. Card: 55-6698

$T_{\it 0}$ GREGG M. SINCLAIR



Generally speaking, Western students of Indian philosophy are limited to secondary sources and to a few primary sources, such as translations of the Rg Veda, the more important Upaniṣads, and the Bhagavad-gītā. The need for primary as well as secondary sources is obvious, and it is also clear that acquaintance with only a very limited range of source material—that dealing exclusively with the religious background of Indian philosophy rather than the wide range of Indian philosophy as a whole—is highly unsatisfactory.

This Source Book in Indian Philosophy fulfills the two needs involved here, namely, to supply Western readers with basic source material on Indian philosophy in convenient and usable form and to present source material which represents all of the major philosophical systems and perspectives of India, not merely its earliest and most religious background. In addition to selections from the Rg Veda, the Upanisads, and the Bhagavad-gītā, this volume contains substantial selections from all the major systems of Indian philosophy, orthodox and unorthodox. These selections are adequate for a comprehensive general study of all the systems and of India's basic social philosophy.

There is a general introduction giving a brief history and outline of Indian philosophy, as well as a short explanatory introduction accompanying the selections from each major system. The introductions—prepared by Dr Radhakrishnan except where noted—are intended as guides for the study of the source material; the source material provides the basic material for study of the systems. Part of the function of this volume is to "prove" both the substantiality and the wide range of Indian philosophy and also to convince skeptical Westerners that much of Indian philosophy is *philosophy* not only in its unique Indian forms but also in accordance with the strictest standards of open-mindedness, critical analysis, and rational investigation.

A source book in Indian philosophy may appear to be of questionable merit on two counts: because, of necessity, it makes *selections* from the comprehensive material of the systems involved, and because it is extremely difficult to translate Indian philosophy, originally

written in Sanskrit and Pali, into English without distorting or confusing the meanings of basic concepts. The first of these objections is well taken, but, in view of the general unavailability of complete texts for most of the systems, a source book which provides adequate selections is thought to be at least a minimum requirement on the part of anyone who is seriously concerned with Indian thought. This volume of selections is not intended as an adequate substitute for the texts themselves; it is intended to encourage the student to go to the texts, wherever possible, for fuller and more adequate study. Any volume of selections must merely scratch the surface of the vast amount of fundamental philosophizing represented in the many basic texts related to every one of the systems, orthodox and unorthodox. The selections concentrate on basic original formulations of the philosophies of the systems. All developments in the long history of Indian philosophy could not be included. In choosing the selections stress has been laid on expository material. This fails to do justice to the vast amount of polemical material in most of the systems—including, unfortunately, Samkara's disproofs of the validity of all other major systems. It is further admitted that it is very difficult, at times, to translate some of the more complex terms and concepts of Indian philosophy into exact English equivalents. Nevertheless, in the selections made available here, the translations are adequate, if not perfect. Also, it would be a serious loss to philosophy if the great richness of the thought of Indian philosophers for approximately 4000 years were to be lost or abandoned, because, here and there, certain concepts cannot be expressed precisely and exactly in English. The gain to be derived from a study of translations of Indian philosophy is great; the loss suffered by virtue of the difficulty of exact linguistic or philosophical equivalents is serious at times but is never so great as to destroy the intelligibility or the significance of the material under study.

For the most part, existing translations have been used. In general, these translations are quite satisfactory, although some improvement could undoubtedly be achieved by undertaking the Herculean task of a completely new translation. In some cases, new translations are offered, and at times existing translations have been revised slightly to clarify and to correct questionable readings. This volume also includes several original translations made exclusively for this source book. These translations are of basic material which cannot be found elsewhere in English.

In addition to selections from all of the basic systems of classical

Indian philosophy, selections are given from two outstanding representatives of modern Indian thought, Sri Aurobindo and Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan. There are other important names in contemporary Indian philosophy, but these two represent the most important interpretational developments in Indian thought in the present day and offer philosophies which bridge the gap between the East and the West, philosophies which achieve synthesis by fundamentally different methods—Sri Aurobindo by intuition and mystical insight and Radhakrishnan by synthetic rationality and "enlightened intellect," his equivalent for intuition.

The difficulties of translating (as such, and especially from the Indian languages), the differing styles of the original texts, the great number of texts involved, the varieties of styles among the several translators (including the degree to which they give literal or liberal translations)—these and other unavoidable difficulties peculiar to an undertaking of this kind have posed many editorial problems. The attempt has been made throughout to meet the demands of exact scholarship as far as possible. In matters of detail:

- (1) Transliteration of Sanskrit terms has been made uniform throughout the volume, except in bibliographical items, where the titles have been retained exactly as in the published volumes. The only exception is the occasional inconsistent use of n or m—both of which are correct—to accord with common practice.
- (2) Punctuation, wherever it is misleading in the texts used, has been corrected.
- (3) Capitalization has been modified so as to overcome the too profuse and sometimes confusing use of capitals, a common practice among Indian translators.
 - (4) Mistakes in spelling and grammar have been corrected.
- (5) No attempt has been made to achieve uniformity of spelling according to the English or the American usage—the style in the translations used is retained in the selections here.
- (6) Differing translations of the same Sanskrit term appearing in different selections are retained, although in these cases care has been taken to include the Sanskrit word for purposes of identification. A Sanskrit word often has different meanings in different contexts. For this reason no glossary is included.
- (7) "Self" and "self" are sometimes considered preferable to "Soul" and "soul" to denote respectively the ultimate spiritual reality and the individual spiritual essence in man in much of Indian

philosophy. The word "Soul"—or "soul"—may carry Western connotations that might be misleading, although "soul" may well be used to denote the embodied individual self. The texts from which selections have been taken disagree widely on these matters. For the sake of clarity, some changes have been made, but it was not felt that the desirability of editorial consistency would justify the hundreds of changes which would be required. Also, mechanical uniformity itself may be misleading at times. The reader is strongly advised to avoid the tendency to misinterpretation in terms of traditional Western connotations.

- (8) In order to avoid possible confusion, brāhmin (not brāhmaṇa) has been used to refer to the priest-teacher class or caste, and Brahman (not Brahma or Brahmā) for the Absolute in Hindu thought. (Brahma is also technically correct but the term is susceptible to ambiguity.)
- (9) The use of parentheses and brackets is not altogether consistent. In general, brackets indicate the translator's explanatory addition to the translation, whereas parentheses indicate a concept or definition implied but not literally found in the Sanskrit text. Translators differ in this usage, however, and no attempt has been made to force all such cases into a strictly consistent style. In some cases, neither parentheses nor brackets are used to indicate material implied and necessary for a clear translation but not actually a part of the Sanskrit original.
- (10) In general, the footnotes are those of the editors. Authorship is not specified except when a note is extensive or controversial.

Much of Indian philosophy is written in a style which is very different from Western style. In many cases, poetic verses or certain basic statements of aphoristic form (sūtras) constitute the fundamental and original texts of the systems. From time to time in the course of the development of these systems, commentaries were written to elucidate the brief and often cryptic statements of the original sūtras. Without these commentaries, the sūtras are often unintelligible. In this volume, the commentaries are printed in smaller type than the sūtras. This style is used, not because the commentary is unimportant, but to point up the basic sūtras and also to permit use of a greater amount of the indispensable commentary without enlarging the volume beyond convenient size.

This volume has been planned as part of a projected series of source books. Others in the series will concern Chinese philosophy, Buddhist philosophy, and Japanese philosophy. This series had its origin in preliminary work done with Dr Wing-tsit Chan, now Professor of

Chinese Culture and Philosophy and Chairman of the Division of the Humanities at Dartmouth College, on what was originally planned as a one-volume source book in Oriental philosophy. It was found impossible to present in one volume adequate selections from all the great systems of philosophy in the East. It was considered a much sounder policy to devote an entire volume to each of the major Oriental philosophical traditions, so as to provide adequate selections of fundamental material from all the various schools and systems involved in each of these traditions.

An expression of deep and sincere gratitude is hereby extended to the following authorities in the field who have assisted in the preparation of this volume: B. L. Atreya, Arabindu Basu, Wing-tsit Chan, S. C. Chatterjee, Haridas Chaudhuri, George P. Conger, Daniel H. H. Ingalls, T. M. P. Mahadevan, T. R. V. Murti, Johannes Rahder, P. Nagaraja Rao, S. K. Saksena (who examined the entire manuscript and made many valuable suggestions), D. T. Suzuki, and Judith Tyberg. I owe a special debt of gratitude, of course, to Dr Chan. Without his collaboration on the source book as originally planned, this volume would never have been undertaken. At the present time he is working on a source book in Chinese philosophy, which is projected as the second volume in this series.

I also wish to express my thanks to Dr Henry Allen Moe, Secretary General of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, and to the Foundation, for the grant which made it possible for me to go to India and to Oxford to work with Dr Radhakrishnan on this project and to undertake advanced studies in Indian philosophy at Banaras Hindu University.

Appreciation is also gladly extended to those who provided necessary financial aid which made publication of this volume possible: the Honorable Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Minister of Education, Government of India; the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation and its Secretary General, Dr Henry Allen Moe; the Edward W. Hazen Foundation and its President, Dr Paul J. Braisted; the Watumull Foundation; and the McInerny Foundation.

Appreciation is hereby expressed to the following publishers for permission to include in this volume selections taken from their publications, these are cited in the several chapters and in addition Appendix C gives publication data of all of the English translations from which passages have been chosen: George Allen & Unwin Ltd. and Harper & Bros.; The Academy of Sciences of the USSR; The

American Oriental Society; Association Press (Calcutta); Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Poona); The Central Jaina Publishing House (Arrah); E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., The Eastern Buddhist; Harvard University Press; Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., Ltd.; Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.; University of Madras; John Murray (Wisdom of the East Series); The Oriental Book Agency (Poona); Oriental Institute (Baroda); Oxford University Press; The Pali Text Society; The Panini Office (Allahabad); Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd.; Asiatic Society of Bengal; Shri Jain Shivetambar Education Board (Bombay); Sri Vyasa Press (Tirupati); and Mr M. S. Srinivas. Very special appreciation is expressed to Oxford University Press for permission to publish all the verses in Dr Radhakrishnan's translation of the Dhammapada and to George Allen & Unwin Ltd., for permission to quote all the verses in his translation of the Bhagavad-gītā. Both of these volumes are still in print and are highly recommended to students in this field because of Dr Radhakrishnan's superb introductions, explanations, and notes as well as the translations themselves. In some cases it was impossible to contact publishers, especially those in India, to obtain formal permission to use selections from their books. If any fault in this connection is mine, an apology is hereby extended to these publishers, including E. J. Lazarus & Co., The Bharata Press, and the Wesleyan Mission Press.

I also want to express my sincere appreciation to the personnel of Princeton University Press for assistance and encouragement—to Mr Datus C. Smith, Jr., former Director, to Mr Herbert S. Bailey, Jr., present Director, and to Miss Harriet Anderson for her understanding, patience, and help throughout the processing of this complicated and difficult volume.

I wish to express my deep gratitude to Dr Radhakrishnan for consenting to work with me on this material and for the great amount of time and effort he contributed to its completion. The honor of being united with him in an undertaking of this kind is a rare privilege which I appreciate very greatly.

I have been personally responsible for the preparation of the manuscript for submission to the publisher and therefore assume responsibility for the many changes made in punctuation, capitalization, romanization, etc., and for any errors which might be found in the text.

CHARLES A. MOORE

Honolulu, Hawaii 9 October 1954





HISTORY OF INDIAN THOUGHT

At the very outset, it should be emphasized that Indian philosophy has had an extremely long and complex development, much more complex than is usually realized, and probably a longer history of continuous development than any other philosophical tradition. While the historical perspective is undoubtedly of immense importance in the study of such a tradition, it is impossible to present an exact historical survey of this development. Because of the Indians' lack of concern for chronology, many of the details of the chronological sequence of the writings either are lost or no record of them was kept. In a sense, the history of Indian philosophy can be written, if only in broadest outline, but no history of philosophy can be complete without some acquaintance with the philosophers who were responsible for the doctrines and for the development of thought. However, so unhistorical, or perhaps so deeply-philosophical, was the nature of the ancient Indians that much more is known about the philosophies than about the philosophers. Relatively few of the great philosophers of ancient Indian thought are known to us and some of the most famous names to which history attributes certain philosophical doctrines or systems are now admitted to be legendary. On the one hand, we are occasionally aware of the author of some doctrines but, as in the case of Indian materialism and some other movements, original texts are not available and the details of the systems are completely unknown.

In broad outline, Indian philosophy may be said to have had four major periods of development up to the time of its serious decline about A.D. 1700. The Vedic Period is dimmed by obscurity, but it may be placed approximately between 2500 and 600 B.C. This is the period during which the Āryans, having come down into India from central Asia, settled their new homeland and gradually expanded

and developed their Āryan culture and civilization. In the technical sense of the term, this can hardly be called a philosophical age. It is to be thought of as an age of groping, in which religion, philosophy, superstition, and thought were inextricably interrelated and yet in perpetual conflict. It is an age of philosophical development, however, and its culminating doctrines, those expounded in the major Upaniṣads, have determined the tone if not the precise pattern of the Indian philosophical development ever since.

The literature of this period consists of the four Vedas (Rg Veda, Yajur Veda, Sāma Veda, and Atharva Veda), each of which has four parts, known as Mantras, Brāhmaņas, Āraņyakas, and Upanisads. The Mantras (hymns), especially the later ones in the Rg Veda, constitute the actual beginning of Indian philosophy. By progressing from the not unusual polytheism of the early Vedas, through monotheism, to suggestions of monism, these poems and songs paved the way for the monistic tendencies of the Upanisads. The Brāhmaṇas are chiefly religious documents, including ritualistic precepts and sacrificial duties. The Āranyakas and the Upanisads constitute the concluding parts of the Brahmanas, and in these philosophical problems are discussed. The Brāhmanas provide the ritual to be observed by the householder, but when the householder has reached old age, he resorts to the forest and needs a substitute for the ritual he has known as a householder. The Āranyakas, which come between the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads, supply this need by encouraging meditation for those who live in the forest. The Āranyakas form the transition link between the ritual of the Brāmanas and the philosophy of the Upanisads. While the hymns are the creation of poets, the Brāhmaṇas are the work of priests, and the Upaniṣads are the meditations of philosophers. The Upanisads, though in one sense a continuation of the Vedic religion, are in another sense a strong philosophical protest against the religion of the Brāhmanas. It is in the Upanisads that the tendency to spiritual monism, which in one form or another characterizes much of Indian philosophy, was first established and where intuition rather than reason was first recognized as the true guide to ultimate truth.

The second period of philosophical development is the Epic Period, dated approximately from 500 or 600 B.C. to A.D. 200. This period is characterized by the indirect presentation of philosophical doctrines through the medium of nonsystematic and nontechnical literature, especially the great epics, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. In

addition, however, the period includes the rise and early development of Buddhism, Jainism, Saivism, and Vaisnavism. The Bhagavad-gītā, which is a part of the Mahābhārata, ranks as one of the three most authoritative texts in Indian philosophical literature. Furthermore, the beginnings of the orthodox schools of Indian philosophy also belong to this period. Most of the systems had their beginnings about the time of the rise of Buddhism, and developed side by side for centuries. The systematic works of the major schools were written later, but the origin of the doctrines of the several schools most probably occurred during the Epic Period. This was one of the most fertile periods of philosophy in India as well as in several other parts of the world—Greece, China, Persia, and elsewhere. A great amount of philosophical or semiphilosophical material was produced during the period, and it is very probable that our knowledge of the doctrines developed at that time merely scratches the surface of the wealth, depth, and variety of philosophical speculation that took place. It was during this period that such philosophies as skepticism, naturalism, materialism, etc., arose along with the other heterodox systems of Buddhism and Jainism and what were later to be known as the orthodox systems of Hinduism. It is out of this wealth of material that the later systems—the orthodox systems of Hinduism and the unorthodox systems of the Carvaka, Buddhism, and Jainism-were perforce brought into clearer perspective by the construction of systematic treatises.

It was also during this period that many of the Dharmaśāstras, treatises on ethical and social philosophy, were compiled. These, like the rest of the philosophical texts of the period, are classed as *smṛtis*, that is, traditional texts, as contrasted with the literature of the Vedic Period, which is known as *śruti*, revealed scriptures or authoritative texts. The Dharmaśāstras are systematic treatises concerning the conduct of life among the Āryans, describing their social organization and their ethical and religious functions and obligations.

The third period is the Sūtra Period, which is dated approximately from the early centuries of the Christian era. In this period the systematic treatises of the various schools were written and the systems took the basic form they were to preserve henceforth. The doctrines of each of the systems were presented in orderly, systematic, and logically developed sets of aphorisms, extremely brief, sometimes enigmatic, statements which, according to some interpretations, are merely reminders for the initiated to enable them to recall the details

of philosophical systems to which they belonged and whose fuller doctrines were known only to those within the fold of the system. During this period the critical attitude in philosophy was distinctly developed along with the systematic, and the Sūtras themselves contain not only the positive developments of the systems but also keen and comprehensive polemics against opposing systems. Whereas during the preceding period philosophical thought and discussion had their origin, they were at that time carried on at the precritical level. In the Sūtras, however, we have self-conscious thought and reflection and no longer merely constructive imagination and spontaneous insights.

The six Hindu systems presented in sūtra form during this period are the Nyāya or logical realism; the Vaiśesika or realistic pluralism; the Sāmkhya or evolutionary dualism; the Yoga or disciplined meditation; the Pūrva Mīmāmsā or earlier interpretative investigations of the Vedas, relating to conduct; and the Uttara Mīmāmsā or later investigations of the Vedas, relating to knowledge, also called Vedānta, the "end of the Vedas".

The fourth period, the Scholastic Period, is that in which commentaries were written upon the Sūtras in order to explain them. Without elaboration and explanation the Sūtras are almost unintelligible. Not only were commentaries written upon the sūtras, but also commentaries upon commentaries, and commentaries upon these, almost without limit. It is impossible to provide dates for this period with any great degree of certainty. It is dated generally from the Sūtra Period to the seventeenth century. The literature of this period is primarily explanatory, but is also strongly and sometimes grossly polemical. There is a brood of "Schoolmen," noisy controversialists, indulging in oversubtle theories and finespun arguments, who fought fiercely over details of philosophical doctrines and who were in constant philosophical conflict with representatives of other schools. Sometimes the commentaries are more confusing than enlightening. Instead of clear explanation and thought, one often finds mere words; instead of philosophy, logic-chopping. Obscurity of thought, subtlety of logic, and intolerance of opposition are marks of the worst types of commentators. The better types, however, are invaluable and are respected almost as much as the creators of the systems themselves. Śamkara, for example, the writer of a famous commentary on the Sūtra of the Vedānta system, is thought of more highly as a philosopher than is Bādarāyana, the seer who wrote the

original Vedānta Sūtra (also called the Brahma Sūtra). The Scholastic Period is one of explanation of the original Sūtras, but, like any scholastic period, it has also produced quibbling and unphilosophical debates which are relatively worthless. On the other hand, it has brought forth some of the greatest of all Indian philosophers. Among these, in addition to Śamkara, are Kumārila, Śrīdhara, Rāmānuja, Madhva, Vācaspati, Udayana, Bhāskara, Jayanta, Vijnānabhiksu, and Raghunātha. These great thinkers have been much more than commentators on ancient systems, although, in their modesty, they have claimed to be no more. In fact, however, they have been, to all intents and purposes, creators of their own systems. In the guise of commentators, they have elaborated points of view which, though capable of being related to the original system of which they are supposed to be commentaries, are new expositions rather than mere explanations. For example, the three major forms of Vedanta, those developed by Śamkara, Rāmānuja, and Madhva, are distinct and elaborate systems, although they all stem from the same Vedānta Sūtra of Bādarāyaṇa. This type of development is indicative of the unique way in which Indian philosophers have maintained their traditional respect for the past and their recognition of the value of authority in philosophy, but, without seeming to break this tradition, have also carried along the free development of thought as their insight and reason directed.

While, in a sense, the Scholastic Period is still in progress, since interpretations of ancient ideas and systems are still being written, Indian philosophy lost its dynamic spirit about the sixteenth century when India became the victim of outside powers. First the Moslems and then the British assumed control of the country, not only physically but also in the realm of thought. The Moslems undermined Āryan culture and thought as far as possible, and the British, in their time, did as much as they could to belittle the thought of traditional India. For a long time, the English-educated Indians were apparently ashamed of their own philosophical tradition, and it became the mark of intelligence as well as expediency to be as European and as English in thought and in life as possible. While the coming of the British brought about a revival in education, the resulting revival of Indian thought was unintentional, to say the least. During this period indigenous reform movements like that of the Brāhmo Samāj and the Ārya Samāj took a leading part in India's philosophical and religious renaissance. More recently, especially since the nationalist

movement began, and more especially since the re-establishment of India as a free and independent nation, the revival of Indian philosophy as such and the consciousness of the greatness of India's philosophical past have been the most prominent developments in the field. During the twentieth century, the Indian mind has been affected by the Western, but the Western mind has also been influenced by the Indian more than ever before, through the writings of contemporary poets, sages, and philosophers. To be sure, the revival of the Indian consciousness of the greatness of its own philosophical past has tended in recent years to develop a nationalistic tone in philosophy as well as in politics. The resulting tendency of extremists to minimize or reject the revival and development of philosophy which was effected by the contact of Indians and Westerners has not been a healthy sign. We of today are able to see further than our predecessors, since we have climbed on their shoulders. Instead, therefore, of resting content with the foundations so nobly laid in the past, we must build in harmony with ancient endeavor as well as with contemporary thought. The future development of Indian philosophy, if one may hazard a guess, will be in terms of a more synthetic approach to Indian and Western points of view.

The Spirit of Indian Philosophy

Indian philosophy, it has been noted, is extremely complex. Through the ages the Indian philosophical mind has probed deeply into many aspects of human experience and the external world. Although some methods, such as the experimental method of modern science, have been relatively less prominent than others, not only the problems of Indian philosophy but also the methods used and the conclusions reached in the pursuit of truth have certainly been as far-reaching in their extent, variety, and depth as those of other philosophical traditions. The six basic systems and the many subsystems of Hinduism, the four chief schools of Buddhism, the two schools of Jainism, and the materialism of the Carvaka are evidence enough of the diversity of views in Indian philosophy. The variety of the Indian perspective is unquestionable. Accordingly, it is very difficult to cite any specific doctrines or methods as characteristic of Indian philosophy as a whole and applicable to all the multitudinous systems and subsystems developed through nearly four millenniums of Indian philosophical speculation.

Nevertheless, in certain respects there is what might be called a distinct spirit of Indian philosophy. This is exemplified by certain attitudes which are fairly characteristic of the Indian philosophical mind or which stand as points of view that have been emphasized characteristically by Indians in their philosophies.

- (1) The chief mark of Indian philosophy in general is its concentration upon the spiritual. Both in life and in philosophy the spiritual motive is predominant in India. Except for the relatively minor materialistic school of the Carvaka and related doctrines, philosophy in India conceives man to be spiritual in nature, interested primarily in his spiritual destiny, and relates him in one way or another to a universe which is also spiritual in essential character. Neither man nor the universe is looked upon as physical in essence, and material welfare is never recognized as the goal of human life, except by the Cārvāka. Philosophy and religion are intimately related because philosophy itself is regarded as a spiritual adventure, and also because the motivation both in philosophy and in religion concerns the spiritual way of life in the here-and-now and the eventual spiritual salvation of man in relation to the universe. Practically all of Indian philosophy, from its beginning in the Vedas to the present day, has striven to bring about a socio-spiritual reform in the country, and philosophical literature has taken many forms, mythological, popular, or technical, as the circumstances required, in order to promote such spiritual life. The problems of religion have always given depth and power and purpose to the Indian philosophical mind and spirit.
- (2) Another characteristic view of Indian philosophy is the belief in the intimate relationship of philosophy and life. This attitude of the practical application of philosophy to life is found in every school of Indian philosophy. While natural abundance and material prosperity paved the way for the rise of philosophical speculation, philosophy has never been considered a mere intellectual exercise. The close relationship between theory and practice, doctrine and life, has always been outstanding in Indian thought. Every Indian system seeks the truth, not as academic "knowledge for its own sake," but to learn the truth which shall make men free. This is not, as it has been called, the modern pragmatic attitude. It is much larger and much deeper than that. It is not the view that truth is measured in terms of the practical, but rather that the truth is the only sound guide for practice, that truth alone has efficacy as a guide for man in his search for salvation. Every major system of Indian philosophy