Goreh was a Brahmin pundit of the Hindu Sastras at Benares before he was converted to Christianity, partly as the effect of the teaching of some Christians on eternal hell fire. He was a Maharashtrian. A prolific theological writer, he attempted to refute Hinduism, Roman Catholicism, and the Brahmo Samaj. He became an Anglican Father, spending his last years in Poona. His most famous convert was Pandita Ramabai, especially influenced by his Marathi book in 1883, Christidharma Iahmardatta Ahe Kai? (Is There Any Proof That Christianity Is A Divinely-given Religion?) and Proofs For the Divinity of Our Lord. His most famous book was probably The Rational Refutation of Hindu Philosophical Systems. He wrote much against the Brahmo and Prarthana Samajs. His Theism and Christianity is the most significant.
Nehemiah Goreh was one of the first Christian Indian writers to attempt to show that the Christian religion had the answer to the question of the future of man after death. As a former Brahmin who grew up in Benares and was well educated in Hindi and Sanskrit, he felt compelled to answer the street preaching of Christianity by William Smith. Smith loaned him a Sanskrit book by John Muir, *MATANARIKSHA: AN EXAMINATION OF THE TRUE RELIGION*. He refuted this in Sanskrit.

Because Muir quoted from the Bible, Goreh began to read it and was greatly moved by the Sermon on the Mount. He began visiting Smith and gave him a paper on *DOUBTS CONCERNING CHRISTIANITY*. Smith spent much time on the doubt concerning eternal punishment. When faced with the possibility that it might be true and that Christianity might be the only escape from it, he eventually decided to become a Christian. (It might be noted here that the same teaching has made many Christians skeptics; most genuine conversions are not inspired by fear of punishment but rather by the love of God as shown in the death of Christ for man's redemption).

Goreh rejected the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophy on the ground that it is not ontologically sound—God is a mere god, and not very God: "without God ethics cannot be metaphysically sustained." He failed to find the answer in *ŚAMKYA-YOGA* because:

1. If the supreme Self-Puruṣa or Brahman—Tīman is detached, forever perfect, and non-mutative, it can never explain cosmological genesis and the rise of knowledge.
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Goreh felt that Vedanta of Shankara showed "intellectual incoherence" by its teachings of māyāvada and sathos or dasas. His main argument was to this effect:

If paramathika satta abolishes the vyāvaharika satta as vyāvahirika satta abolishes the pratibhasika satta, what is left is that all apprehensions of plurality are 'illusion,' for undifferentiated Brahman alone exists. This, according to Goreh, does not do justice to the experiences of pluralistic perception and interpretation. And thus, in fact ... it made nonsense of experience.5

Goreh did not have the interpretation of Dr. Radhakrishnan and other later Advaita writers that māyā was not illusion but is truth and reality, and it may be possible to show that Śaṅkara did not actually teach cosmic-illusionary views. This was, however, the prevailing interpretation in his day.6

Goreh felt that pantheistic views of the Absolute could not either historically or logically sustain Ethics "as an absolute dimension of Reality." He felt the Christian personalistic concept of God (ontologically) was necessary.7

Goreh felt that the Omnipotence of God was affected by the Hindu Šastras in that, according to all philosophical schools of religion among Hindus it is taught that:
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there are substances and beings, and among them our own souls that are self-existent and eternal, not created by God. And so the essence and existence of these innumerable self-existing substances and beings being independent of God's will and power, are not under the control of His power.8

He felt that although God was called Sarvashakti (Almighty), these ideas, in fact, limited His Almightiness, making him less than Supreme in power.

Goreh discussed the Brahmo Samaj idea of immortality. He said:

The Brahmos believe that our souls will ever continue to exist after death, yea continue to exist forever, and will always retain consciousness, and the consciousness of their personal identity.9

He then compared this with the Hindu belief concerning the soul, affirming that the Shastras do indeed teach that the soul in a sense continues to exist after death. But the real sense is that this existence is without the consciousness of personal identity, so that a man may "become a horse or a dog or a cat, or if he has accumulated much merit he may become a learned Brahmin or a king." He then stated:

9. Ibid., p. 60.
Where there is not consciousness of personal identity, there is no continuation of existence worthy of the name.\textsuperscript{10}

Goreh discussed the Brahmo concept of eternal life in relation to ancient Hindu beliefs. He believed that the Hindu philosophies actually do not teach this as something an individual may enjoy:

But the state of Salvation according to all ancient systems of Hinduism is not only to get rid of transmigration and of the body itself, but also the organs of consciousness, which according to the Nyāya system is called manas, and according to the Sāṃkhya and Vedanta, is called antaksharana, and therefore of consciousness itself. Such a state does not deserve to be called eternal life.\textsuperscript{11}

Goreh made clear that in Christian teaching the means by which man obtains eternal life is unique:

Whereby alone, by the operation of the Holy Spirit we become entitled to obtain eternal life, who by nature are the children of wrath and eternal perdition.\textsuperscript{12}

The Spirit makes effective in the life of the believer what has been accomplished by the life and death of Jesus Christ, freeing man from the penalty and power of sin.

\textsuperscript{10} Balwant A. M. Paradkar, \textit{The Theology of Goreh}, pp. 60, 61.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., p. 61.
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Goreh defended the idea of eternal punishment because he felt that sin was something morally evil. He stated that if this were not true then virtuous acts could not be thought of as morally good. If there is no such thing as moral good or moral evil, then there is no basis for religion. If this syllogism is accepted then there is no religion. He felt that it is intuitive in men to feel that certain acts deserve reward or punishment. If the punishment is purely for reformatory purposes, he felt that this would constitute an act of mercy on God’s part, not justice. Justice does not seek to show mercy. The sinner is punished because he deserved it. This is the only real purpose of punishment, not as an act of kindness or mercy, but because the bad act deserves it. He felt that if sin does not deserve punishment then it is a natural evil, like a disease and not a moral evil. The sinner "like as a machine" has sinned not by his own free will and choice, but by necessity. If this is true then there is really no virtue, "no moral government of God, and in short, no religion." 

(It may be pointed out that it is not necessary to inflict eternal punishment on the sinner because of God's justice. On the contrary, an unending punishing for a few years of life, no matter how sinful, would seem to rational thinkers a blight of God's justice.) Goreh felt that if it is possible for men to make moral progress toward virtue to the extent that they could become morally good, it should also be possible for a person to decrease in virtue and become at last wholly evil so that it could no longer be just on God's part to forgive him, but he must consign him to eternal punishment.

Goreh commented on the teachings of the Apostle Paul concerning the resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15 where the statement is made that if Christ has not been raised, "ye are yet in your sins. They they which have fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." Goreh explained:

He means that if Christ is not risen from the dead then the hope that those who believe in Christ will have eternal life is false, but they will perish when they die. And if that is the case, he means, then we who have become Christians are the most miserable of men. For we have abandoned all worldly comforts with the hope that we shall have eternal life hereafter. In this life we are undergoing all sorts of suffering, and if we have no hope in the next world, who can be more miserable than we?15

He discussed the fact that the disciples were not expecting the resurrection but that they accepted it when they had undeniable evidence of it; they saw their risen Lord. Again and again in the New Testament it is made evident that "they did really believe in His resurrection."16 Paul himself mentioned that Christ appeared to Peter, to the other disciples, and to more than 500 at one time.17

Goreh discussed the Hindu teaching of the Samkhya and Vedanta philosophies and also the Bhagavad Gītā in relation to action and the individual. According to this teaching:
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Our souls are not really the doers of good or bad deeds. All actions belong to prakriti and are attributed by us to our souls, that is, to ourselves, through error, "While all actions are done by the gunas of prakriti (that is, by the Antahkarana, the senses etc) the man stupefied by ahankara thinks that "I am the doer." (Bhagavad Gita 2:27). According to this (Hindu) doctrine then, it is (ultimately) a mistake to confess our sins before God. No, it teaches that we ought to believe that we, that is, our true selves, have never committed and never commit sins. Sin as well as virtue belong to antahkarana which is erroneously identified with ourselves. And it is only because we are involved in ignorance that we must worship God and acknowledge ourselves to be sinners and so forth. But according to the true state, the paramathika dasa, we never commit sin and there is no such thing as sin or virtue. (Théism, pp. 55-57.)

He then having set forth these teachings as widely taught and believed, concluded:

The state of Salvation according to all ancient systems of Hinduism is not only to get rid of transmigration and of the body itself, but also the organ of consciousness, which according to the Nyaya system is called manas and according to the Sphakha and the Vedanta is called antahkarana, and therefore of consciousness itself. Such a state does not deserve to be called eternal life.

If a person loses "all the faculties of apprehension, will, and all manifestations of sensibility" Goreh questioned, how this could differ from a state of annihilation?

Some Hindu pundits challenged the idea of happiness belonging to "the emancipated state" on the ground that some might become envious over another's position or degree of happiness, and that if will survived, it would be possible that evil desires could rise in such a state and this would in turn lead to sinful acts. To Goreh this was simply a question of inadequate understanding by such surmizers of the power of God and the "greatness of His grace. Those who have God's Word (The Bible) and learn of and accept God's offer of salvation, and receive the grace of God will:

be translated after death to the abodes of bliss, and they shall nevermore be affected with evil desires, envy, enmity, pride, and such like. To them will be given the heaven celestial, and indefectible bodies, and they will retain all the mental characteristics of conscious beings, and will be forever blest with the beatific vision, and with the highest joy, ineffable and divine, in being near to Him and in paying Him adoration, and their nature being made pure—with serenity of soul, and with peace,—their happiness always increasing and subject to no intermission. And tell me, pray, which state deserves rather to be called the highest aim of man; this, (the Christian view) or (the Hindu philosophic view) one of total unconsciousness? ... But as we believe in God, inscrutable in power, replete with all goodness, most bountiful, all merciful, and the Giver of every felicity; and
as we hope for emancipation at his hands; it seems to us reasonable to expect an emancipation better than the miserable state (of unconsciousness or annihilation). 20

Goreh was sure that God made a knowing soul aware of its surroundings. Since "God made the soul cognitive, who shall make it incoherent?" He felt that simply telling ourselves, "I am not the mind," "I am not the body," could not annul the soul's basic nature. He was sure that our souls will ever remain conscious. Our part is to make a conscious choice between two alternatives, with two sure results:

God in His Word points out the way of salvation. If we accept it, we make our consciousness the instrument of eternal joy. If on the other hand we reject it, we shall make our consciousness the instrument of eternal affliction and torment. 21

Goreh pleaded for an unbiased and thoughtful consideration, setting aside former beliefs and teachings and giving a clear evaluation to the possibility of the truth of the way he presented.

21. Ibid., pp. 158, 159.
MISCELLANEOUS CHRISTIAN COMMENTS

Narayan Vaman Tilak (1861-1919)

Narayan Vaman Tilak was a famous Christian Indian Poet. Many of the songs in the Marathi Hymnal were composed by him. When he was converted to Christianity it roused a storm of indignation. He wrote in 1894:

My mind is being drawn toward the religion of Christ. Here appears a faith capable of giving the mind of man peace, devotion, righteousness, salvation. Better to live in this small garden of Christianity, forever filled with flowers and fruits, than to inhabit the boundless spaces of Hinduism, with its thorns and trees, deep rivers, terrible mountains, fearful deserts and pleasing mango groves.¹

In his poetry are found the following:

Here neither loss nor ruin is, (At the Feet of Christ in Homage)²

¹ Lakshmibai Tilak, From Brahma to Christ, p. 30.
² Ibid., p. 87.
Here death and ending hold no sway;
In Christ is life beyond decay,
A treasure trove of purest bliss (Christayan)³
Ah, love, I sink in timeless sleep,
Sink in the timeless sleep.
One image stands before my eyes,
And thrills my bosom's deep;
One vision bathes in radiant light
My spirit's palace-halls;
All stir of hand, all throb of brain,
Quivers, and sinks, and falls.
My soul fares forth; no fetters now
Chain me to this world's shore.
Sleep! I would sleep! In pity spare;
Let no man wake me more! (Love's Ecstasy)⁴

O dear and inmost soul
Of all the joys that be,
My action, thought and speech,
Yea all, I yield to Thee
Lord Christ beloved, accept me now;
Unfailing rest alone art Thou.
(The Transforming Presence)⁵

O Brother, on my shoulder rests thy hand,
And fearless waits my soul;
O Way, erect on Thee I take my stand,
And radiant gleams my goal;
O Truth, within the warmth of Thy embrace,
All doubts dissolving die;
O Life, before the sunshine of Thy face,
Death perisheth, not I,
Thy servant saith, Today there draweth near
That latest valley--and wherefore should I fear?
(The Last Valley)⁶

As he neared the end of his life he said:

---
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Life is not to be measured by time but by the performance of useful work. It is better that a man should die than that he should do no useful service. Everywhere in the world I see but two things—Beauty and Ugliness. I delight in Beauty, therefore have I loved it. My only reason for loving Christ so deeply is that He is the essence of Beauty. He himself is the image of this Beauty. No one can truly love this Beauty in the hope of heaven or the fear of hell. Love knows no desire, I delight in Beauty, therefore have I loved Him sincerely. ... No one knows where his calling will come from God, and no one should waste time in futile thought about it. I shall never describe the calling of God as 'Death', because it is to be called of God, God's calling. It is an awakening to a new life.

Again, thinking of life soon to end he said:

A mother knows how long to let her child play outside; when he is tired of playing she lifts him up, and takes him in beside her, and makes him rest. God does the same. If not today, tomorrow He will take each in His turn. We should look forward to that day.

7. Lakshmibai Tilak, From Brahman to Christ, p. 83.
8. Ibid., p. 84.
Dr. Paul D. Devanandam, Ph.D.
1901 - 1962

Chiefly educated at Madras University, Dr. Devanandam gained his Ph.D. degree at Yale University. He served for a time as Professor of History of Religion at the United Theological College, Bangalore, and as Literature Secretary of the YMCA. He founded and became Director of The Christian Institute for the Study of Religion and Society in Bangalore. He has written The Concept of Maya (London, 1950), Christian Concern in Hinduism (Bangalore, 1961), and from his Collection of Essays was published in Bangalore in 1964, Preparation For Dialogue. He actively sought a common ground of discussion between the two religions of Christianity and Neo-Hinduism.
P. D. Devanandam was a Christian who sought to create a better understanding between Christians and Hindus. He attempted to lay a groundwork, to find a meeting point where free and open discussion could follow. He rejected the idea of Dr. S. Radhakrishnan who proclaimed that all religions lead to the same goal. He found changes in India since independence, including an increasing tendency to secularism, relegating prominent ideas such as the world as māyā and the fatalistic acceptance of one's position in life as determined by the karma of previous existence. He also found an increasing emphasis on Hinduism as sanatana dharma (as believed by Gandhi), a religion comprehending all religions and applicable to all men everywhere at all times. These changes have been partly brought about by the Brahma Samaj, Vivekananda, and others, but also through the discoveries of science and the contact with world thought, including the modern humanism with its belief that the daily living conditions of man should be and can be altered.

Because man's origin, in Christian thought, is by a divine Creator, therefore the creature is different from and other than God, as the thing made differs from the Maker. However, the Christian also believes that man is different from the rest of creation, because he "alone is capable of responding in fellowship to the Creator." Furthermore, Devanandam stated that it is believed by most Christians that man was created for the purpose of entering into "such fellowship with God" to the fullest possible extent. Thus man was created "in the image of God." This image is not God, just as an image seen in a mirror is not the actual person.

2. Ibid., p. 69.
Man reflects the nature of God, but ... he is not the same substance as God. Man's reality is derived from the nature of God, and the more truly he reflects the nature of God, the more truly he is man, man as God intends him to be. The figure of the "image" conveys the meaning of kinship, not of identity.4

The kinship is expressed by the parent-child, or Father-son relationship. This is used to express both the "bond of loving concern" between God and man, and also the complete dependence of man on God for ability to reflect truly the image of God.5 Other figures used to illustrate man's complete dependence on God are King and subject, and Master and slave (in the sense as known in New Testament times when a slave's life was totally subject to his master's wish and whim).

Dr. Devanandam brought out that instead of "I am That," the Christian would say, "I am, because Thou art." "Man's sense of being an 'I' is due to his being confronted by the 'Thou' of God." This man-that-God-intends-to-be is not just manava (heart) or purusha (person) but bhakta (a devotee).6 The Christian believes in the Ultimate Reality, but maintains that with this Reality there is a personal relationship of empirical individual men and women with God ... because the very nature of man as created by God in His image and likeness rests four-square on the twin foundations of Personality and Community.7

4. Ibid., p. 147.
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He went on to explain that the principle of *karma-samsara* could "only apply in all fairness to individuals in severe isolation, whether such individuality is real or unreal." Thus the Christian who thinks of God as just could not accept an idea that actually is contrary to principles of social justice. The actions of every individual have an effect upon the community—home, neighbourhood, and to a lesser extent on all men.

This man made in God's image shares with God the power of choice—free will. He has freedom "either to accept or reject the Will of God." He is not a creature of Blind Fate, but can "actively participate in the creative purpose of the Bhagavan in the here and now." His desire is that "God's will be done on earth as it is in heaven." This desire he shares with others of the community who are similarly impressed.

On the other hand, Devanandam wrote of empirical man—"man the sinner," who was created to reflect God's image. This man innately knows what he should be, what God intended him to be, yet he is inclined to be sinful. Thus he finds an inherent inability to be "what he truly is, what he is intended to be, and what he will be eventually because of a rift within his being.

The history of man shows the result of man in opposition to God, following his own self will. Here is man's freedom and his bondage together—free to choose, yet bound. Yet his existence is centered in God, Himself sovereign and free, yet choosing to redeem man. Man is unable to "be good by himself," yet at the same time man, by relying on God's grace and power can succeed in doing good.

---

9. Ibid., p. 151.
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Man's duty is summarized in two great commands, the second of these usually better known as the Golden Rule:

Love the Lord thy God (here the Isvara is the same as the Brahma) with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.\(^{11}\)

Devanandam emphasized that since it is thus the total man involved in loving God, this meant that it was possible only by the bhakti of "devotion-in-community" and not for any individual atman. Sinful acts prevent man from being the truly devoted bhakti. However, beyond this, God's underlying purpose and will direct the affairs of men and nations as He silently, slowly, but none-the-less surely works out the counsels of His will. Man does suffer illusion; his personal self seeks its own advancement and loses sight of Reality. Devanandam spoke of the world as

a world of Mâyā, a world which is both real and unreal, conditioned by time and shot through with eternity, the scene of human endeavour and the plane of Divine Activity. But here the sat-asat nature of world life is not understood in terms of Ultimate Reality but Final Purpose. ... The Christian man thus works in time but lives for eternity.\(^{12}\)

Self-seeking holds him in bondage, but by God's grace man can live "as a child of God who is constantly endeavouring to do His Father's will. Though Christianity witnesses concerning man's sinfulness, yet its major emphasis is on God's forgiveness of sin. This

12. Ibid., p. 155.
took place in an act which in Christian thought is the focal point of history, in an act which Devanandam spoke of as:

- the coming into history of God Himself in order to initiate a new era. It is the beginning of the New Creation.\footnote{13}

This was not an Incarnation for the purpose of providing wonderful gems of thought, but for the purpose of releasing man from sin. Man needed to learn entire dependence on God, (as was the divine -human Christ) in order to achieve his real future and destiny. God provided a way by which empirical man-the-sinner could become empirical man-the-reflector-of-God's-image. When man would commit his way to God, he could be made over again. By a new infusion of power from the Holy Spirit of God, man could be "restored to be the man he was intended to be—not just an isolated individual here or there, but the redemptive work of Christ included all men—"whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life" John 3:16.\footnote{14}

The resurrection of Christ foretold the believer's resurrection, but also was a lesson—a rising to newness of life, leaving the old sinful life behind, in "fellowship with the living Christ he is being made over into the new being." In the Christian view, this work is the work of God; man's part is surrender to God's will and perseverance to overcome every wrong practice. The believer joins a group or community of like-minded individuals who assist him and he them, in their endeavour to more closely follow the pattern of Christ's life.\footnote{15}

\begin{itemize}
\item[14.] \textit{Ibid.}, p. 157.
\item[15.] \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 159, 160.
\end{itemize}
Man is not yet, in this life, wholly the New Creation. He waits the ushering in of the everlasting kingdom of God, where there will be "no opposition of any sort to the absolute sovereignty of God:

Human destiny is thus conceived not as absorption into the divine, but as loving fellowship with God, which in Biblical language is described as the 'hope of glory.'

This glory awaits the end of time when the whole community will together share in it. "That would be the destiny of man, then, in Christian faith-transformed life in the Kingdom of God."17

Devanandam discussed ultimate truth. This he defined:

Ultimate truth would then mean ultimate reality in the sense of that which is, in the final analysis, the eternally real, beyond and beneath the temporal actual.18

He pointed out that "the actual is not to be equated with the real," but went on to say that:

if the actual is to have any significance at all, it should in some sense reflect the real. Thus the concept of truth should be inclusive of the now and the always.19

Devanandam alleged that to the Christian God is both personal and supra-personal. He quoted H. H. Farmer concerning existence of

17. Ibid.
18. Ibid., p. 162.
19. Ibid.
The inexhaustible suggestiveness of the religion of Jesus consists in this, that personality, the mystery of persons, their co-existence and communion dwell at the heart of it. Who and what am I? And who and what is God? What constitutes the worth of personality? These are questions of eternal interest and concern. ... They recognize the mystery of our being, of the relation of us men to God; and they contain a profound suggestion of fellowship and unity in God of which we have but dimly conceived, which we express still less perfectly. ... It would seem therefore to be legitimate to expect that our awareness of one another as personal beings should afford us some clue to our awareness of God as personal. If there is a divine reality which is (a) akin to ourselves in respect to being intelligent purpose, yet (b) always non-akin to ourselves in respect of being divine, it is to be expected that He should disclose Himself to us in a way which (a) is similar to that in which we become aware of one another as intelligent personal purpose, yet which (b) has, without losing that similarity, a certain distinctive quality of its own conformable with its distinctive origin. (H.H. Farmer, Towards Belief in God, p. 45). 20

Devanandam took issue with Dr. S. Radhakrishnan's statements:

It is the aim of religion to lift us from our momentary meaningless provincialism to the significance and status of the eternal, to transform the chaos and confusion of life to that pure and immortal essence which is its ideal possibility ... the divinizing of the life of man in the individual and the race is the dream of the great religions. It is the moksha of the Hindus, the nirvāṇa of the Buddhists, the Kingdom of Heaven of the Christians. It is for Plato the life of the untroubled perception of the pure idea.21

His major point of difference is the "redemption of humanity," "the redemption of the world," not by a process of conversion of individuals, but by "the redemptive activity of God in this very world." He then quoted 2 Peter 3:18, "We look for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." This is brought about by a transformation of a radical nature, "whereby creation itself will be set free from bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the sons of God (Romans 8:18ff)" 22

Devanandam stressed that the Ultimate Reality is a Personal Being. Man is able to speak to Him, because He has first spoken to man. The Christian holiness is a "revelation of God Himself, not of truths about Him," and "the mind and heart of God are revealed in events, not that the Eternal is concealed by the temporal." Christians believe further that:

22. Ibid., p. 168.
in the Person and work of Jesus Christ God has made known His mind to the world of men in a manner which is once-for-all and for all men ... in the living Person of Jesus Christ the nature of the ultimate truth both about God and man has been made manifest. 23

These beliefs should not cause a Christian to be proud and to feel unable to learn from others. His belief should cause him to live the truth as he understands it before others and as Bishop Neill is quoted as saying:

If the Christian has really trusted Christ, he can open himself without fear to any wind that blows from any quarter of the heavens. If by chance some of those winds should blow to him unexpected treasures he will be convinced that Christ's storehouses are wide enough to gather in those treasures, in order that in the last day nothing may be lost. 24

Devanandam then would find the way to immortality through the redemptive act of Jesus Christ, which by the power of God's Holy Spirit brings about a transformation of the individual, transforming the sinner into a child of God. To him the world has purpose, origin, and end. There will be a fulfillment of the divine purpose in creation. There is meaning to individual life, and a purposeful intelligent future. 25

24. Ibid., pp. 170, 171.
RAYMOND PANNIKAR

Raymond Pannikar is a Roman Catholic theologian and a student of Hinduism and of Indian Philosophy. He is a leader in the ecumenical movement within the Christian Church and has constantly sought Christian-Hindu ecumenical understanding. He teaches at the University at Benares, has taught at Mysore and is also teaching at the Center for the Study of Religion in Harvard University. His unique background of a Spanish Catholic mother and a Hindu father established him in early years in the study of the Vedanta and the Bible at the same time. His book, The Unknown Christ of Hinduism, does not consider Hinduism as wrong, but he sees Christ working within it already, and feels that much of Hindu philosophy has a place in Christianity and provides a way to understanding of some of the basic relationships of man to God.
Raymond Pannikar believed that in Hinduism many have found salvation in past ages; however, he believed that is was by virtue alone of the grace of Christ, whom he calls the universal redeemer. He said:

Where there is no redemption there is no salvation. Therefore, any human person that is saved—and we know by reason and by faith that God provides everybody with the necessary means of salvation—is saved by Christ, the only Redeemer. ¹

He took note of Dr. S. Radhakrishnan’s misunderstanding of the teachings of Christianity.² In this Dr. Radhakrishnan took exception to the teaching of Augustine that "only a small fraction of humanity, the elect, are destined to bliss, while the many are reprobates, predetermined to everlasting damnation."³ Dr. Radhakrishnan apparently believed that this was a cardinal truth of the Christian Church, whereas in reality it is a dogma of segments of Christianity, but is widely rejected by large numbers. To Pannikar, Christ is the only means of salvation; this he felt was a part of the idea that Christianity is a universal religion. The belief that it is a universal religion is based upon the two Christian conceptions that Christ is:

not only the historical redeemer (by his death on the cross for man’s sins) but also as the unique Son of God, as the Second Person of the Trinity, as the only one ontological —temporal and eternal—link between God and the world.⁴

---

¹ Raymond Pannikar, The Unknown Christ of Hinduism, pp.49,33.
⁴ Ibid., p. 51.
He believed that this link unites the Father, the Supreme God, with mankind "by the loving power of the Holy Spirit." He taught that the signs, symbols and Sāṃśāras of Hinduism are means of saving grace. He said:

The good and bona fide Hindu is saved by Christ and not by Hinduism but it is through the sacraments of Hinduism, through the message of morality and good life, through the Mysterion that comes down to him through Hinduism, that Christ saves the Hindu normally. This amounts to saying that Hinduism has also a place in the saving providence of God.

Pannikar discussed the belief set forth by Dr. Radhakrishnan, Vivekananda and others that all religions are equal and all more or less pointing to the same goal. Along with this he discussed the belief of some that Hinduism is "the end and fulfillment of Christianity." He showed that Christianity was clearly meant to be a world religion. Many of Christ's teachings revealed that there were others to be saved; the "other sheep not of this fold," (John 10:6); the "good news" of salvation to go to "every creature."

He discussed the epistemological process of how men can realize or know God. He set forth the following points:

1. If there is a God, this basic truth affects everything in the universe.

6. Ibid., p. 54.
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2. Some knowledge of God is available to all men.
3. My knowledge of God, or the lack of it, does not affect the fact of His existence.
4. God cannot be understood by men, nor really described by men.
5. God transcends all human thoughts.
6. If God is, then there must exist a way for every human being to realize His presence.
7. In God the entire universe had its origin and will have its end.
8. There is nothing in the universe outside of God, independent of Him or existing beside or without Him.
9. If God exists, He has absolute priority.
10. If God exists, we are His—the "you" of God. "Everyone of us is the 'thou art' uttered by the 'I Am.'" "I' myself am in the measure as He—the I--utters my being as His 'you'.'"
11. "He is the Absolute, the Being", related to man in an intimate personal way as "my Source, my Maker, my Sustainer, my Utmost Self, my Father."
12. My approach to Him may be "integral, total, involving body and soul, intellect and will, knowledge, service and love as well, and all this in a personal unique and unchangeable way."
13. If God exists, man has primarily no rights, but duties--this as a result of his duty to reflect as a man, as a person, the divine.
14. If God exists, the foregoing "hypothesis is not irrelevant to anything, is not superfluous in
any action of the cosmos, but is really the hypothesi, the underlying-support of the whole universe together with all our being and acting." 

In discussing the origin of all things and their ultimate destiny, Pannikar suggests that nearly all would agree with the Bādarāyana statement: "Brahman is that from which all things have come forth into which they will return and in which they are maintained." Yet the difficulty of agreement is in the definition of Brahman, as to whether He is by nature, in essence, Being, Knowledge, and Bliss or "Truth, consciousness and Infinitude." Or does this second sutra merely refer as to the existence of Brahman, who is made known to us by the property which makes the thing known? As a common meeting ground of Indian philosophy he sets forth the position that "Brahman is essentially: omniscient cause, eternally pure, intelligent, and free." He summarized the position of Śaṅkara:

1. Brahman is the cause, i.e., cause of origination, sustentation, and destruction of this world.

2. This cause cannot be inferred by any means of valid knowledge, for

3. This cause is not the object of sense-knowledge, but

4. It is the object of the Vedanta texts, and
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It is discovered by a special experience: the advaitic intuition.  

He brought out that Sankara's followers indicated that it is actually Isvara who is the cause of this world. He suggested that since Hindus and Christians refer to the "Lord", one to Isvara and the other to Christ, that this may be the common meeting ground between the two religions. He further discussed the intuition of Brahman as being, along with the Scriptures, the "means of valid knowledge (pramāṇa) of Brahman." The reasoning power of man, the anumāna, is valuable as a "means of confirming" the divinely revealed truths of the Vedanta.

Man's desire to know Brahman comes as an imparted gift. The real nature of Brahman must be revealed to man, because if man unaided could discover Brahman, he would thus be in the human sphere, and not the Principle underlying the world and its existence. Sankara interpreted the knowledge of Brahman as being brought about by the epistemological process of superimposition. Thus even the desire to know conveys the acceptance of the idea that Brahman is, and can be somehow known. The fact that knowledge of the world does not satisfy the desire to know Brahman shows that the world is not Brahman, especially since the knowledge of the world suggests to our reasoning powers the need of an Origin, and means of sustaining of the world, and hence the need for a Source, an Origin, a Cause.
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Pannikar tried to show that if a desire for Brahman knowledge occurs, this means that:

- we could not desire Brahman if we were It, or if the world were an absolute;
- it is rather that our very desire represents our peculiar nature as creatures. This desire cannot be described, it can only be experienced, or rather, suffered. 18

Reason may show the need for a divine cause or end, but revelation is necessary to describe the nature of the Cause. 19 Our reasoning powers "impel us toward an Absolute", "Either this world is an Absolute, or we require an Absolute beyond it." 20

As Pannikar reasoned, the desire to know the eternal Brahman proceeds from the fact that the world we can know is not an Absolute. The Absolute is beyond the world, yet we seek to reach it. As he put it:

We experience the world as contingent because it is contingent; we can arrive at the existence of a Cause only because such a Cause exists; we wish to prove such an Existence, not only because such an Existence exists, but because that very Existence leads us to transcend the world and go to Itself. God is the very cause of our desire and the very motor of our reasoning dynamism. 21

Furthermore he added that man:
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could not question whether God exists or not if that God did not exist. If that God did not exist he could neither question, or even be.\textsuperscript{22}

He explained that in his search for truth man in Western or Eastern philosophy both may discover God:

One discovers God as the logical implication and ontological presupposition of the question about him; the other discovers God as the logical conclusion and ontological result of the question about him.\textsuperscript{23}

Pannikar discussed the differing concepts of the Ultimate Reality, whether called God or Brahman, whether the Brahman with attributes (\textit{saguna}) or without (\textit{nirguna}). He felt that the identity of Brahman and God is necessary in human reasoning because:

The personal God without the corrective of Brahman may well become an anthropomorphic idol; the transpersonal Brahman without its complementary vision as God may well dissolve in the mere abstraction of the \textit{en\ a\ commune}.\textsuperscript{24}

God is thus both immanent and transcendent. As a transcendent being, a personal God, He is the goal of the mystics, the bhaktas seeking union with Him. As the immanent God He may be known and worshipped within man—to the Hindu as the \textit{atman}, to the Christian as the Holy Spirit. God is a God to be worshipped and also the World-ground of the philosopher. Indian or Christian alike are not:

\textsuperscript{22} Raymond Pannikar, \textit{The Unknown Christ of Hinduism}, p. 103.
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satisfied with an amorphous Brahman; they want a living Brahman, pure consciousness, perfect bliss and supreme being, not as a kind of sum-total being, but as that which, being in all beings, yet does not rest in them.  

Pannikar tried to reconcile the differences in concept between a God as First Cause, Prime Mover, Isvara, Maker, Divine Power or Creator and the Absolute Reality by suggesting that the Supreme Reality has different aspects,—as First Cause which our reason can partly comprehend, and as the Absolute, He said:

The Reality that the First Cause is, is not exhausted by its causality function. This is only its face, its 'relation' to us, its 'knowable' aspect. The internal being, the transcendent existence, the inner side, that is Brahman. There is diversity between the concepts of Brahman and that of First Cause. They are not the same, and yet they refer to the same Supreme Reality.  

Pannikar commented that the "That" from which all things proceed and to which all things are (sustained in their own beings) that 'That' is God—not a God who is inaccessible, not God the Father, not the inaccessible Brahman, but "the true Isvara, God the Son, the Logos, the Christ."  

The 'That' is God, it is identical with the Absolute, it is not a plato­nic demiurge, or a secondary sa­guna Brahman, for there is only one

---
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Source, only one Ultimate Reality, and yet it is distinct from it, for it is its expression (Hebrews 1:3), its image (2 Corinthians 4:4), its revealer (John 7:16). May we say that this divine 'that', this divine Person is begotten by God (as Man) (John 1:14), equal in nature (John 17:11, 21, 22), and yet distinct in its subsistence, in its personality. (John 1:1; 17:5)²⁸

He pictured this "true Iśvara" as the "Principle and End of all things." He has two separate aspects of his nature, two faces—one which is the "full and equal expression and bearer" of divinity, and another face turned to the world, and is the "giver of its being" and "its Sustainer." (Colossians 1:16,17).²⁹

At the same time he held that this "Principle and End" was"not two, but one, one principle, one person." (John 8:18, 21, 25, 28). This divine Logos is in itself totally God, the full manifestation. He pictured the Logos as reflecting in the divine face of itself the divinity, yet not lacking in divine substance as the Father gave this to Him.³⁰ (On this point many Christians would hold that Christ is very God; there never was a time when He was not God, that He is equal with the Father in duration and in power; His origin as Son is in His humanity, not his divinity.) He did refer to this later; he wrote of the Iśvara as the

Mystery of Christ, a being unique in His existence and essence and as such

²⁹. Ibid., p. 127.
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equal to God. He is really God, not simply 'God' but 'equal to God', 'Son of God', 'God from God.'

He stressed that He is "one with God the Father, so that God is—shall be—all in all and nothing else beyond or behind or besides." This being is Mediator between God and man, Himself possessing "indivisibly", "inseparably", "without mixture" and "without change" both the nature of man and the nature of God. (These conclusions were formulated at the Church Council of Chalcedon.)

Man in seeking immortality—spoken of as the "thirst for eternity"—cannot find it in an Absolute, particularly nirguna Brahman, for he would not be, Pannikar coined the term tempiternal to express how the created being can abide in one eternal being. The answer is found in the Isvara—

he that from which being is, in a non-temporal or rather tempiternal way, and toward which being becomes, within the temporal process.

To reach this state the "temporal helping factor" of man must be suppressed as man reaches the end of his time. The temporal part of man he considered:

only an image, because we have to transcend imagination and even thinking if we want to have a glimpse into the 'tempiternal,' which is more than mere non-temporality.
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The goal, then, is the realization of being in Christ, who is the revealer of the total Reality, three personalities, yet one substance, in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Pannikar sought to answer the problem of dualism by the doctrine of the Trinity. He could conceive of Christ not as a separate "I" equal to the Absolute, but as "an eternal thou, equal to him, and yet not a second 'I', but a Thou." This Thou is the Son, but Pannikar included in Him as one with the Son "the new heavens and new earth;" "all human beings participate in it, find their place in it, and are fully what they are through being one with the Son." Thus:

All that is the whole of Reality, is nothing but God; Father, Christ and Holy Spirit. 37

He recognized that the conception of a Christ who has two natures but one Person requires faith. But he did believe that:

the place made in the Vedanta for Isvara, his postulation as a role which the philosophical mind finds necessary in order to explain and connect God and the world without compromising the absoluteness of the former and the relativity of the latter, this place is filled by Christ in Christian thought. 38
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He also thought that for Christian theology the "discovery of" "Sankara and Ramanuja" was "as important for Christian theology today as the incorporation of Plato and Aristotle was in past ages." 39 (Not every Christian would place value in the incorporation of Plato and Aristotle into Christian theology, many believing that such action by the Roman Catholic scholars compromised some of the basic teachings of the Christian faith by introducing ideas actually not a part of the teaching of the Scriptures, such as the doctrine of the immortality of the soul.)

Pannikar had a place for man and an eternal future for man. He taught that Christ was in all religions as the element of truth contained in them, and that by following this truth which originated in Christ all could find salvation. He taught that such was the way for the long centuries before Christianity became known. Man's end was union with Christ, more as a spiritual than ontological union, brought about by the working of the Holy Spirit. His 'tempiternal' relation of the creature to the Eternal, and Trinitarian Oneness of the Absolute were attempts to solve the problem of dualism raised by man's hopes of immortal existence, but he does not in fact return the universe and man to resolution with the Absolute; man was not, but when made by God began to share eternity with Him. A western Christian writer has stated in somewhat similar form the idea of light and salvation in other religions:

We can trace the line of the world's great teachers as far back as human records extend, but the Light was before them. As the moon and stars of the solar system shine by the reflected light of the sun, so, as far as their teaching is true, do

the world's great thinkers reflect the rays of the Sun of Righteousness. Every gem of thought, every flash of the intellect is from the Light of the World.  

Among the heathen are those who worship God ignorantly, those to whom the light is never brought by human instrumentality, yet they will not perish. Though ignorant of the written law of God, they have heard His voice speaking to them in nature and have done the things which the law required. Their works are evidence that the Holy Spirit has touched their hearts, and they are recognized as the children of God.
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Cardinal Gracias became the first Cardinal from India in the Roman Catholic Church. He organized the Eucharistic Congress in Bombay in 1964. He is a member of the Vatican Secretariat for Non-Christians.

Like most Christians, Cardinal Gracias accepts the belief in "one God, Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth and of all things, visible and invisible." His belief in God he described as "a profound personal conviction, the deepest that I hold." Without God he felt human life would be "meaningless, something without orientation and purpose, a beginning which ends nowhere,—it is in Him that we live and move and have our being" (Acts 17:28). He said that "In man there are inextinguishable intimations of immortality."  

Gracias does not find in this life its complete answer. Just as Plato looked beyond to the "realm or world of ideas for the righting of the wrongs of this world and life," and to find the "Justice, truth and beauty that he did not find here," so:

The true Christian looks for all these in the world to come because his faith and hope are centered on Jesus Christ, who is his Way, his Truth, and his Life.

In that world to come he hoped to have communion with a Personal God whom I can address as 'Father,' a triune God, who is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and who offers me a share in His divine help, according to the Christian revelation." He believed "that the ineffable, mysterious, transcendental God is a God of love, who is my Father."  

---
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