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CHAPTER-VIII

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE SOCIAL CRITICISM OF MATTHEW ARNOLD AND SWAMI VIVEKANANDA

In the chapter seven, an analysis of social views of Matthew Arnold and Swami Vivekananda has been attempted. Social concern is a common platform for both of them. They act as critics of society. Victorian society becomes an object of analysis to Matthew Arnold; to Vivekananda, it is Indian society. Various evils have been exposed and reforms on firmer grounds have also been shown. Both of them aim at total perfection of an individual and of society at large. Harmonious development of society is common concern to both of them.

Arnold starts his careers as poet, whereas Vivekananda starts his as a mystic. Both of them are not simply concerned with their respective fields of experiences, but also with the socio-cultural problems of the kind of society in which they lived and wrote. Both had an aversion towards materialistic development at the cost of cultural and moral development. Arnold had his base in literature and culture, and yearned for middle ages for the ideal world. Vivekananda had his base in mysticism and yearned for the spiritual atmosphere in society comparable to the Satyayuga.

The spirit of social concern arises at certain point of time in the career of Matthew Arnold and Swami Vivekananda. Matthew Arnold’s coming into social contact was of his becoming Inspector of Schools. That exposed him to the various social classes of society and discrepancies in them. As A.L. Rowse puts it,
“His inspectorate covered a great deal of the Midlands and Wales, and he was perpetually traveling about. This gave him a country-wide acquaintance with actual social conditions such as none of his fellow-workers had - neither Carlyle nor Ruskin Tennyson, Thackery nor even Dickens. . .”

Vivekananda’s travel throughout breadth and width of his country made him to realize Indian situation in its entirety. To this effect, Romain Rolland writes: “And there was no single hour of his life when he was not brought into contact with the sorrows, the desires, the abuses, the misery and the feverishness of living men, rich and poor, in town and field; he became one with their lives; the great Book of life reversed to him what all the books in the libraries could not have done. . .” This similar experience of being exposed to their respective societies turned out Matthew Arnold and Swami Vivekananda as critics of society.

Other than mere observation of society, Vivekananda and Arnold were preoccupied with improving the society they were concerned with. This is the another reason to qualify themselves as critic of society. Arnold noticed one common trend predominantly dominant in the Victorian society of England in the 19th century. That was materialistic consideration of the materialistic prosperity as the only concern. There were railroads constructed, population increasing by leaps and bounds, and sportive activities for health maintenance; and there were industrialization, free trade movement and the amassing of wealth. The whole England seemed to be immersed in those activities. England laid down the

1 Al Rowse, Matthew Arnold Poet and Prophet (London: Thames and Hudson, 1976), P.72.
foundation of this for materialistic well-being. According to Matthew Arnold, all the same, it was besetting fault of the Victorian society. But these tendencies were all hostile to culture. Culture, according to Arnold it consist of sweetness and light; and they were essential characters of complete human perfection. Arnold uses a special term for the people who are given to materialistic consideration; they are called Philistines. This development, in England, was at the cost of culture. Arnold says, “Culture looks beyond machinery, culture hates hatred; culture has one great passion, the passion for sweetness and light. It has one even yet greater! – the passion of making them prevail. It is not satisfied till we all come to a perfect man; it knows that the sweetness and light of the few must be imperfect until the raw and unkindled masses of humanity are touched with sweetness and light.”

Victorians did not feel the materialistic prosperity as an evil; they rather felt proud of their achievement. But the fault detected by Arnold was based on his standard of culture. Arnold found this was a fault because it was at the cost or sacrifice of culture.

Vivekananda, similarly, noticed the all pervasive defect in Indian society of the nineteenth century. It was in contradiction of Victorian society; it was non-progressive, totally passive state of affairs. Because of this there was glaring scene of Indian poverty. Vivekananda puts it; “I must tell you that we are weak, very weak. First of all is our physical weakness that physical weakness is the cause of at least one-third of our miseries. We are lazy, we cannot work; we cannot combine, we do not love each other; we are intensely selfish, not three of

---

us come together without hating each other, without being jealous of each other. That is the state in which we are haplessly disorganized mobs. ... Vivekananda diagnosed the fault that lies in the lack of faith. Vivekananda said that Westerners had enough faith in themselves and were able to achieve grand things in their country and abroad. And their faith was the strength. Vivekananda wanted the same faith of the strength. Therefore, he advised his countrymen to have faith, in order to have that strength. In the words of Vivekananda, “Who will give you strength? Let me tell you, strength, strength is what we want. And the first step in getting strength is to uphold the Upanishads, and believe ‘I am soul...”

Soul is repository of infinite strength, and faith of Nachiketa, a character in Kathopanishad, achieved this mysterious state through faith. Here Vivekananda’s advaitic philosophy is a remedial measure, whereas Arnold’s is culture. Here Vivekananda’s mysticism and Arnold is culture, both aim at improving society. Their pre-occupation with improvement of society is common approach from both the sides. The remedy Vivekananda arrives at is mystical experience of the atavistic realization, that is ‘I am the soul”

Arnold in his capacity as Inspector of Schools entered the field of education. His examinations of school systems in England and abroad gave him better insight of education. He thought of state sponsored schools of French and Germany models. Park Honan writes of this as, His aim in ‘Germany’ in his school and universities is to show how English, lacking, even school boards, may

---

5 Vivekananda, Vol.3 244.
learn from Prussia's organized strong state system. Thus, it is noteworthy that he observes a flaw."

To Arnold education was civilizing and humanizing force. To achieve this force, he recognized the intervention of the State. As Clinton Machann says, "From the beginning, Arnold strongly advocated free, compulsory elementary education, supported by the state, and, from him, education combined fundamentally social, political and moral purposes." Arnold advocated compulsory education for all classes of people. By education he meant the ideals of his culture.

Vivekananda, similarly felt the governing force of education in Indian society. With tyrannical rule and caste ridden society Indian mass in general, were subjected to the state of ignorance and misery. Therefore Vivekananda wanted education to Indian mass on sounder lines. He meant the Brahmin caste should impart cultural knowledge to the low caste people. Even he meant giving them Sanskrit Education. This type of education will achieve equality in society.

Vivekananda had the similar feeling in emphasizing the need of education in uplifting Indian mass. He not only thought of cultural, religious education, but also thought science education to the people. In this connection, S.S. Mital says, "In his last analysis, education should go to the common man with the world gifts it has to offer, namely, the gift of spirituality, the gift of secular knowledge, and the give of food. That is the living example of Vivekananda's concept of mass

---

education." Added to this, Vivekananda specially emphasized women education, even on scientific lines along with India’s cultural knowledge. Both Arnold and Vivekananda are equal in their approaches in recognizing the need of education in both the societies.

Arnold and Vivekananda both meet on the same platform while examining social structure of the society. Arnold classified Victorian society in three classes, namely, Aristocratic, middle class and working class. And at the same time had studied their different bearings. Vivekananda too had probed into Indian society and had seen the degenerated caste system into Brahman, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra. Vivekananda is not against caste system in its original system, which is inevitable; but he is against its degenerated system. With respect to the above social system, V.K. Gokak observes: “But the four varnas or types characterize human society in all parts of the world. The thinker the warrior, the purveyor, and the worker typify four kinds of levels of human activity and all of them are essential for the maintenance of society.”

One thing common can be noticed here. Vivekananda and Arnold are adepts enough in sensing caste defects, and class defects respectively. Arnold classified Victorian society into Aristocracy class, middle class and working class. They are also named differently as: Barbarians, Philistines, and Populace. Arnold said that none of them are able to form the desired centre of authority, the state.

The Barbarians, he said were inaccessible to ideas. the Philistines were Hebraic and the Populace were raw and blind. He members of each of the three classes were solely bent upon doing, as they liked, which meant following the dictates of their ordinary selves. They were not fit to be entrusted with the state authority. Therefore Arnold says “...because of this our blind faith in machinery, because of our want of light to enable us to look beyond machinery to the end for which machinery is valuable, this and that man, and this and that body of men, all over the country, are beginning to assert and put in practice an Englishman’s right to do what he likes his right to march where he likes, meet where he likes, enter where likes, hoot as he likes, threaten as he likes smash as he likes. All this I say, tends to anarchy...”

Vivekananda exposed evils of the caste system. In the name of the caste, there was the practice of untouchability and exploitation. The Shudra caste was victim of this exploitation and humiliation by the upper castes. But this practice was against the principle of equality. Vivekananda hates this superiority and inferiority complex, and hates the exploitation as well. Arnold wants the three classes free from their defects and become the best selves of noble nature, as representative of culture. Vivekananda contemplates the remedy as, “The solution is not by bringing down the higher, but by raising the lower up to the level of the higher.” And advice to the low caste people not to neglect the study of Sanskrit language and spirituality. As Vivekananda puts, “Do not seize every opportunity

of fighting the Brahmin became, as I have shown you are suffering from your own fault, who told you to neglect spirituality and Sanskrit learning.”

From the above analysis, it becomes clear that there is an attempt by Vivekananda’s and Arnold aiming at getting rid of the ordinary selves and reaching the state of the best self. According to Arnold the self is being accessible to the best ideas, and according to Vivekananda’s it is through the spirituality.

In the social criticism of Vivekananda and Matthew Arnold there is no room for political consideration. Both of them display indifference to political affairs, they are disinterestedly indifferent. According to Arnold, being away from political consideration is true act of criticism. Arnold, in the essay called “The Function of Criticism at the Present Time”, says, “The rule may be summed up in one word disinterestedness. And how is criticism to show disinterestedness?” By keeping aloof from what is called ‘the practical view of things’, by resolutely following the law of its own nature, which is free play of the mind on all subjects which it touches. By steadily refusing to lend itself to any of those ulterior, political, practical considerations about ideas.”

The above consideration of Arnold means that there is not any personal involvement in politics. But the sense is more clear with his use of the phrase, “disinterestedness” a phrase borrowed from Indian sacred scripture, namely, Bhagavadgita. The sense really echoes with Vivekananda’s Karmayoga. Although Arnold is not in the political field, but he does supply valuable suggestions to

---

12 Vivekananda, Vol 3 p 298
13 Matthew Arnold, “The Function of Criticism” Ed. Collini 36-37
political life He provides information about the state as centre of authority as corporate or collective self of all

Arnold in his essay called 'Culture and Anarchy' says, "We want an authority, and we find nothing but jealous classes, checks, and a dead-lock. culture suggests the idea of the state We find no basis for a firm state-power in our ordinary selves, culture suggests one to us in our best self" 14 If there is a common tendency in all the classes to do as one likes, and it necessitates the authority to curb this trend and to rightly direct them Arnold says it is all in the right reason, and the right reason is represented by the State

Arnold's disinterested endeavour of criticism refrains from political sphere of activities As referred in the preceding paragraph, disinterestedness echoes Vivekanand's Karma yoga Disinterestedness eschews all selfish motives, it is just like working only for the love of truth and, for the sake of truth Again to refer to the phrase of Mathew Arnold "seeing things as really they are"

This spirit of disinterestedness can be pointed out in one of the circumstances of personal life of Mathew Arnold Arnold belonged to liberal group Bishop Colenso also belonged to the same group An occasion arose, Arnold criticized Bishop Colenso's celebrated first volume Bishop Colenso in his book was not able to distinguish between the facts of religion and the facts of science clearly, there was much confusion Hence there was sarcastic criticism against the book by Arnold Arnold writes in his essay, "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time", the hue and cry that was raised by his liberal

14 Matthew Arnold 'Culture and Anarchy Ed Collin 99
fellows  As Arnold puts it, "Immediately there was a cry raised what is this? Here is a liberal attacking a liberal  Do not you belong to the movement? Are you not a friend of truth? Is not Bishop Colenso in pursuit of truth? Then speak with proper respect of his book"\(^{15}\) This shows disinterested stand of Matthew Arnold, which is akin to karma yoga

Vivekananda was also not politically motivated  In the sense, he had not any desire to be involved himself in the political question of the day  In the words of R K Das Gupta, "He was an exponent of a non-political, that is, moral and spiritual approach to the problems of India"\(^{16}\)

Never did he politically instigate people against British Government  What Vivekananda wanted, in fact, from Indian people was their spiritual heritage, and revival of active life of Indian based on the spirituality itself  He had patriotic feelings, not of destructive kind, but constructive in its nature based on the cultural identity of India and its past glory

He did not have faith in politics as base for superstructure of welfare society  He had observed western ideals as political goals  As Vivekananda puts it, "Politics, social improvement, in one word, this world, is the goal of mankind in the west, and God and religion came in quietly as helpers to attain the goal"\(^{17}\) Political and social changes have not worked effectively to enhance the lasting stability in society  In other words Vivekananda has found out that the political


\(^{16}\) R K Das Gupta, *Swami Vivekananda's Vedantic Socialism* (Calcutta The Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, 1995), p 20

\(^{17}\) Vivekananda Vol 3 179
and social change cannot effectively cure the evils of life Therefore he says, “It is a change of the soul itself for the better that alone will cure the evils of life No amount of force, or government, or legislature cruelty will change the conditions of a race, but it is spiritual culture and ethical culture alone that can change wrong racial tendencies for the better”18

According to Vivekananda, the sole interest and goal of Indian people is their spirituality. It is part and parcel of their life, and it can be removed from their life. Hence Vivekananda says, “It would be impossible for this country to give up her characteristic course of religious life and take up for herself a new career of politics of something else”19 The idea behind this quotation is that religious life is the sole refuge of Indians. They can rise high from their spirituality. Thus Vivekananda and Arnold repose their faith in spirituality and culture for the upliftment of society rather than political affairs. This is the common attitude in them.

Arnold's synthesizing technique is dynamic one, it is suited to achieve something the best. It is also an outcome of critical spirit, which is in search of the best things. As Arnold says, “Here, in general, its course is determined for it by the idea which is the law of its being, the idea of a disinterested endeavour to learn and propagate the best that is known and thought in the world, and thus to establish a current of fresh and true ideas.” 20

18 Vivekananda Vol 3 182
19 Vivekananda Vol 3 179
20 Matthew Arnold, “Function of Criticism” Ed. Colini 49
Arnold detects two dominant traits in the personality of a man. He identified them as Hebraism and Hellenism, the Greek concept. They mean doing side and thinking side respectively. Arnold feels that the dominance of either will lead to anarchy. To avoid this, both should be proportionately balanced. Arnold observed nineteenth century British society was totally dominated by Hebraism. There is strictness of conscience, i.e., doing side which predominates at the moment. Therefore Arnold thinks the need of the hour is Hellenism to the British society. As Arnold says, “This fundamental ground is our preference of doing to thinking. Now this preference is a main element in our nature, and as we study it we find ourselves opening up a number of large questions on every side.”

The aim of both Hellenism and Hebraism is spiritual discipline and man’s perfection. But still they pursue different courses. As Arnold puts it, “The uppermost idea with Hellenism is to see things as they really are, the uppermost idea with Hebraism is conduct and obedience.” Arnold’s opinion as regards their need, he says, they form component unit of human evolution. In the words of Arnold “Hebraism and Hellenism are, neither of them, the law of human development, as their admirers are prone to make them, they are neither of them, contributions to human development.” According to Arnold, the combination of both the forces Hellenic Hebraic will enhance human perfection, thereby one sided development is removed.

21 Matthew Arnold, “Culture and Anarchy” Ed Collini 126
22 Matthew Arnold, “Culture and Anarchy” Ed Collini 127
23 Matthew Arnold “Culture and Anarchy” Ed Collini 133
The employment of synthesizing technique is commonly seen in Vivekananda also. The four Yogas, Karma Yoga, Jnana Yoga, Raja Yoga and Bhakti Yoga all of them lead to the same goal of realization of the truth. They are different paths leading to the same goal. As Vivekananda says, "Our various yogas do not conflict with each other, each of them leads us to the same goal and makes us perfect. Only each has to be strenuously practiced."\(^{24}\) Vivekananda's analogy of the bird sums up the importance of the synthesis of yogas.

Vivekananda's apt analogy of the bird illustrates the importance of synthesis of yogas. Vivekananda observes, "It is not given to all of us to be harmonious in the building up of our characters in this life yet we know that the character is of the noblest type in which all these three knowledge and love and yoga are harmoniously fused. Three things are necessary for a bird to fly the two wings and the tail as a rudder for steering. Jnana (knowledge) is the one wing, Bhakti (love) is the other, and yoga is the tail that keeps up the balance."\(^{25}\)

Synthesis proves to be wise policy in handling complex human problems. Vivekananda and Arnold are able to handle the technique very effectively. An instance is worth mentioning here to point out to Arnold's approach. Arnold confronted religious antagonism in Christian society whether to adopt or overthrow ritualistic practices of the established churches. The Nun-conformists had an aversion to such practices.

\(^{24}\) Vivekananda Vol 1 92
\(^{25}\) Vivekananda Vol 3 333
Arnold resolves this issue in convincing manner. His religion is, religion touched with emotion. There is speculation side as well as emotional side of the religion. Accordingly, both have to be needed. It is just like Bhakti yoga, the emotional side, and, Jnana yoga, the speculative side. As Vivekananda professed that the Bhakti yoga is the easiest and the simplest to practice by the vast majority of people. So Arnold advocates the ritualistic side of the practice which has its advantageous to practice in the group. As Arnold puts it, “In religion there are two parts, the part of thought and speculation, and the part of worship and devotion. Jesus Christ certainly meant his religion, as a force of inward persuasion acting on the soul, to employ both parts as perfectly as possible.”

With this consideration Arnold has supported Church establishment and ritualistic worship.

Harmonious expansion of human society on all sides was the common criteria both for Arnold and Vivekananda. Arnold’s the very concept culture implies the broader outlook as study and pursuit of perfection. For this purpose, Arnold wants all the available knowledge, the best ideas from all corners of the world. Even his concept of literature is not limited in its scope. So he speaks in the essay called “The Function of Criticism at the Present Time” as

One may say, indeed, to those who have to deal with the mass-so much better disregarded-of current English literature, that they may at all events endeavour, in dealing with this, to try it, so far as they can, by the standard of the best that is known and thought in the world, one may say, that to get anywhere near this standard, every critic should

26 Matthew Arnold, “Culture and Anarchy” Ed. Colliini 157
try and possess one great literature, at least, besides his own, and the more unlike his own, the better. But, after all, the criticism I am really concerned with, the criticism which, throughout Europe, is at the present day meant, when so much stress is laid on the importance of criticism and the critical spirit is a criticism which regards Europe as being for intellectual and spiritual purposes, one great confederation, bound to a joint action and working to a common result, and whose members have, for their proper outfit, a knowledge of Greek, Roman, and Eastern antiquity, and of one another. Special, local, and temporary advantages being put out of account, that modern nation will in the intellectual and spiritual sphere make most progress, which most thoroughly carries out this programme.

Vivekananda similarly interested in the expansion of Indian society at all levels. He did not want his people live in isolation. He had studied ancient Indian society, which had give and take relationship with the outside world. India has unfailingly exported her gods of religion and spirituality to other nations. As Vivekananda says, "Each nation must give in order to live. When you gave life, you will have life, when you receive, you must pay for it by giving to all others, and that we have been living for so many thousand of years is a fact that stares us in the face, and the solution that remains is that we have been always giving to the outside world, whatever the ignorant may think. But the gift of India is the gift of religion and philosophy and wisdom and spirituality." 

---

27 Matthew Arnold, "Culture and Anarchy" Ed. Collini 50-51
28 Vivekananda Vol 3 273
From the above consideration it becomes clear that Vivekananda had given importance to interaction with other nations. Hence Swami did not hesitate to go abroad to spread the gospel of Vedanta. There was threat of ostracization from Orthodox Hindu Community, but Vivekananda did not heed it. He says quoting from Man that knowledge may be had from any community of high or low. It emphasizes need of the knowledge, therefore, for the sake knowledge, Vivekananda wants Indian to cross their territorial border and step into the external world. In the words of Swami Vivekananda:

All such foolish ideas that Indians must not go out of India are childish. They must be knocked on the head, the more you go out and travel among the nations of the world, the better for you and for your country. If you had done that for hundreds of years past, you would not be here today at the feet of every nation that wants to rule India. The first manifest effect of life is expansion. You must expand if you want to live. The moment you have crossed to expand, death is upon you, and danger is ahead. I went to America and Europe, to which you so kindly allude, I have to because that is the first sign of the revival of national life, expansion. This reviving national life, expanding inside, threw me off, and thousands will be thrown off in that way. Mark my words, "It has got to come if this nation lives at all. This question, therefore, is the greatest of the signs of the revival of national life, and through this expansion our quota of offering to the general mass of human knowledge, our contribution to the general upheaval of the world, is going out to the external world."29

29 Vivekananda Vo 3 273
Arnold similarly has referred to social change of expansion and concentration in the words of Arnold as: “Epoch of concentration and epoch of expansion. It is possible only when any nations open their doors to the external world of influence for the best ideas. Arnold and Vivekananda have got an optimistic note for the glow of national life and revival with this type of expansion. During mid-nineteenth century Arnold sensed in British society the epoch of expansion slowly opening in England. In the case of Indian society Vivekananda was a representative example of the trendsetter. Thus, we find similar approach for the life of expansion in human society in British as well as in India.

As for the patriotic feeling is concerned, Vivekananda and Arnold show their feelings in an exemplary manner. Although Arnold in way seem to be anti-British in his attitude, always speaking of the foreign models namely. French and German, but he is to the care British patriot. Arnold’s harsh criticism of the British society of the nineteenth century is not out of his unpatriotic feelings, but for the good of the British Society. Stefan Collini defends Arnold’s patriotic feelings as, “Arnold himself was not certainly not without deep patriotic feelings, but this emotional allegiance only made him detest English complacency and parochialism the more, and his diverse essays in social criticism were united by the purpose, much translated but resourcefully prosecuted, of teasing, educating, and shaming this country men into a greater awareness of these shortcoming.”30

Vivekananda also criticizes Indian society harshly with a view to wake up Indians out of slumber and lethargy. His voice is in the tone of national

awakening. Although Vivekananda did not instigate Indian against British rule politically, he was engaged in rousing Indians spirituality where actually lies the strength of Indians. His works really proved to be the bible of freedom movement, and many revolutionaries arose out of the inspiration of his soul shirring writings. This should be understood that Vivekananda was never a revolutionary in the political sense of the term. Actually, he rejected the whole idea of a political revolution for a social change. But he had a philosophy of revolution rooted in spirituality. Vivekananda’s campaign of uplifting Indian society speaks his love for his country. Matthew Arnold and Swami Vivekananda could not tolerate backwardness and shallowness of their age. They diagnosed the ailments of their age, in the societies they lived in. They may be labelled as the physician of the Iron Age. Both of them sufficiently examined their societies, and at the same time sought solution to the social problems. In this way, they are proved to be critics of society.

Arnold and Vivekananda play significant rules in the religious revival their countries. Religious revival is common factor in Arnold and Vivekananda. They both gave lively support to the religious belief when the people were growing irreligious. In the case of Arnold significant role of preserving traditional religious faith was a Herculean task to him. He had noticed the movement of time-spirit and had felt the need of defensive mechanism against this with his foresightedness. In the words of Basil Willen, “Arnold’s aim was not to awaken the English from their provincial unconsciousness. the time spirit would soon do this in any case. His aim was to supply them with a new and true basis for their
religion, so that when the inevitable awakening come, it should not lead them to reject Christianity itself along with their untenable traditional beliefs."

When the scientific spirit was swaying the minds of the people in their religious belief, it was Arnold as the founder of English modernism tried to preserve a spirit of sober piety and rational religion. Biblical truths were doubted. They were found to be unverifiable. Arnold’s matter of fact, common sense comes to the rescue of traditional religious faith. He strikes a good balance between science and religion. Two things Arnold mentioned in his preface to Gold and the Bible, about Christian religion are unmistakably clear. They are: that men cannot do without the Christian religion, and that they cannot do with it as it is. Arnold’s critical role rests upon clinical process of cleansing the dross.

So the prime duty in Arnold’s case was to restore the Christian faith against growing discredit befalling miracle and the supernatural. Arnold had to distinguish between the essence of religion and the superficial things that surround it. Thus, in way, giving a new and true basis to religion. Arnold first of all reduces the anthropomorphic deity, God, to the law of righteousness, and the extra beliefs that were associated with it in the form of stories and miracles. So Arnold’s god stand for “The eternal not ourselves that makes for righteousness.” As Basil Willey remarks, “The importance of realizing that religion is founded upon moral experience is, for Arnold, immense; his whole position, the whole force of his pleading, depend upon this” Conduct being the object religion, and that conduct is three fourths of life. Hence, the edifice of religious is to be built upon this.

32 Willey, 269.
The rules of morality are arrived at by experience. Man is not merely the creature of the moment, not merely as the ordinary self, but the best self or whole self. If the due attention is paid to it, it will result in liberty, peace and joy. There morality seems to be dry as bundle of rules. But these rules with due respect and devotion to the Lawgiver are converted into religion. Therefore religion happens to be morality touched with emotion.

In order to clear the unverifiable facts of religion, Arnold says that the language of Bible is not rigid, fixed and scientific, but fluid, passing and literary. Hence the biblical language should be considered as poetical language. The concept that is associated with this language is imaginative reason. Arnold in the study of poetry has clearly mentioned that the strongest part of religion is unconscious poetry.

The religious facts are better communicated through poetry, symbolism of church liturgy and mythology. Therefore the due respect should be shown to them. Thus Arnold interprets the Christian religion in a convincing manner and establishes religion as the governing factor of life. So he tactfully avoided scientific spirit encroaching upon religion.

Vivekananda similarly experienced the challenge of time during later half of the nineteenth century. This period is characterized as Indian Renaissance and the effect of European thought and ideas were on the life of Indians. The orthodox section stuck to their Vedic heritage, not being influenced by the foreign thought. The other section of the society was fascinated by the Western ways and views of life had blindly adopted their style. And these people considered to be Indians
meant to be declared as uncivilized. But there were moderates who were shaken by the western impact but not shattered.

In this social context Vivekananda sensed a threat to religion. As S.S. Mital puts it, "Vivekananda faced the challenge to the religion and spirituality of India posed not only by modern science and secular thought but also by the insistent and many-faced Christian missionary propaganda."

The pitiable condition mentioned above can be attributed to the political situation of the country. British rule was in sphere of Indian life and the process of anglicizing was going on. This period, in a way, characterized low tide in Indian society. There was lack of vitality and creativity. And the people had forgotten the high ideals of Vedanta and Upanishads. The superficial show of the religion was kept without diving deep into the recess of spirituality as S.S. Mital says: "Worship of innumerable gods and goddesses; idolatry, evil practice like safi, polygarphy enforced widowhood, girl intancide untouchability and extremely rigid caste system - with thousands of caste and sub-castes - were eating into the vitals of the Hindu social body. Six hundred years of Islamic authority over the Indian Gangetic plans from Delhi to Calcutta had left Hinduism in a state of depression. It was the religion of the subject race, looked down upon with contempt by the Muslim’s idolatry. It enjoyed into prestige and for many centuries its practice had only been tolerated under considerable disadvantage in many cases. It had no central direction, no organization and hardly leadership."  

33 Mittal 13.
34 Mittal 14-15
Indian Renaissance was meant to kindle the real spirit and value of ancient Indian culture, which was nearly forgotten. It was in a way reawakening of spiritual knowledge into new forms of philosophy, literature, art, science and critical knowledge, restoring pride in the past heritage was silent characteristic feeling of Indian renaissance. This task was fulfilled in the real sense by Vivekananda. He emphasized that the national spirit of India lies in its spirituality.

As Vivekananda had correctly diagnosed that the degradation of India was due to the foreign rule and therefore he wanted his countrymen to revive faith in themselves. He expounded religion in the modern context as compatible with modern science. According to Vivekananda science and religion occupy different fields to be dealt with. For instance, the natural science deals with the truths of the physical world; as the Chemistry is the book of nature. Religion is the book of one’s own mind and hearts. As Vivekananda puts it, “This science of religion is based on the analysis of human soul. It has no creed.”

Vivekananda showed clear-cut distinction between dogmatic religion and the essential aspect of religion. According to Vivekananda dogmatic religion differs in its practices everywhere, suiting the different temperament of the minds. But in the case of mystical experience of religion, there is common experience. As Vivekananda says “In the Church, religionists first learn a religion, then begin to practice it; they do not take experience as the basis of their belief. But the mystic starts out in search of truth, experiences it first, and then formulates his

35 Vivekananda, Vol.6 82.
creed. The church takes the experience of others; the mystic has his own experience. The Church goes from the outside in; the mystic goes from the inside out."

In the above consideration Vivekananda draws our attention to the difference between the temporal and universal experience. Differed from the ritualistic religious experience, the mystics everywhere have similar experience. This similarity of experience receives universal validity and is tantamount to the experience of science. Hence, Vivekananda says that the natural science Mathematics remains the same everywhere; so the mystic too do not differ in their experience everywhere. In this approach Arnold and Vivekananda have discharged the timely duty of critical function and have succeeded in removing the confusion of the people.

Arnold and Vivekananda have exposed stagnation period in the nineteenth century of England and India respectively. Arnold for such period, specially coined phrase for this period as period of concentration, and opposite to this, a period of expansion. According to Arnold the period of concentration mean the lack of movement of ideas, even from the foreign source. The opposite period, epoch of expansion, brimming with ideas, even from the foreign source. There will be national glow of life and thought. Particularly the first quarter of the nineteenth century represented the stagnation period. The epoch of contraction as
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Arnold puts it "... the English poetry of the first quarter of this century, with planty of energy plenty of creative force, did not know enough".37

To Vivekananda the later half of the nineteenth century looked stagnant. Indian people were not reacting activity to the changing circumstance. They were found to be utterly lethargic. To get rid of such weakness, Vivekananda wanted his countrypeople to arouse faith in themselves and strive for the best. Therefore he would recommend dynamism and scientific spirit of the west to their spiritual life. S.S. Mittal says, "He tried to bring the East and the West together and gave a synthesis of the best values in their culture. He can be looked upon as an intellectual giant who built a bridge between the East and the West as also between reason and faith. To this end he drew out of Vedanta a social philosophy and outlook at once dynamic and practical."38

As for the harmonious development in the society concerned Arnold and Vivekananda have the similar approach. Victorian England was materialistically prosperous. Railroad, liberty, population, health and wealth, the Industries were the object of pursuit; greater importance was given to them. According to Arnold these were the things just means for the higher end. But the deplorable fact was that these things were valued as if they were the end in themselves. Victorians were happy with this achievements; the feeling of complacency was the order of the day. Arnold’s subtle perception noticed the widening disparity between the rich middle class and the working class. This is highlighted with an example relating to Elizabeth Wragg. Elizabeth Wragg murdered her illegitimate child out
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of starvation and was in custody. This really is ugly scene presented by Arnold in Victorian Society.

This type of exposition quelled the pride of the two M.P.s, namely, Sir Charles Adderly and Roebuck. These two M.P.s had boasted much about the Anglo Saxon race, and its achievements. But Arnold’s humming tone of the story of Elizabeth Wragg which is the revealing fact of disparity. According to Arnold this is not total perfection in society. The harmonious development of all classes is ignored. Therefore Arnold sarcastically says, “If we are to talk of ideal perfection of ‘the best in the whole world has any one reflected what a touch of grossness in our race, what an original short-coming in the more delicate spiritual perceptions, is shown by the natural growth amongst us of such hideous names..., the gloom, the smoke, the cold, the strangled illegitimate child, ‘I ask you whether, the world over or in past history there is anything like it.’ Perhaps not, one is inclined to answer; but at any rates, in that case, the world is (not) very much to be pitied. ... There is profit for the spirit in such contrasts as this; criticism serves the cause of perfection by establishing them.”39

Vivekananda, like Arnold, had noticed disparity in Indian society. The upper class and the lower class were living diametrically opposite life. The rich enjoyed the luxury, the poor suffered. This disparity pained Vivekananda. Therefore he thought improving the lot of the poor. Vivekananda exposed this social evil and took to the task the people who were held responsible for such state of affairs. As Vivekananda observes, “British power and foreign conquest have

trod them down for centuries and at last the poor of India have forgotten that they are human beings. They are to be given ideas; their eyes are to be opened to what is going on in the world around them; and they will work out their own salvation.”

This observation of Vivekananda highlights his attitude towards total perfection in society.

In connection with marriage man-woman relationship Arnold and Vivekananda uphold sanctity. Arnold in his critical essay, “Culture and Anarchy” speaks against the practice of marrying deceased wife’s sister. According to Arnold, it is ignoble. He hates hearings of divorce cases in the court. He wants the marriage bond to be scared. This own life is exemplary of true love between him and his wife. This true love is emphasized in his poem “Dover Beach”.

Vivekananda, similarly, uphold the sanctity of marriage. Therefore, he highly speaks the model of Sita for emulation. Vivekananda wants enough freedom to women folk, only thing he does not like woman, ill-treating her husband. He favours inter-caste marriages for the vigorous race of the nation; but at the same he hates child marriages for their selfishness.

Views related to political aspect of life can also be analyzed here. Although Vivekananda and Arnold were not politicians, but their views on the national political life are worth considering. We will notice the similar approaches on the part of Vivekananda and Arnold towards Democracy, equality and state action. Arnold was in favour of state-action in democratic set up. According to Arnold, extreme liberty with the least inference of the state is not good sign in
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society. Because this tendency, in turn, will lead to anarchy. Therefore Arnold was against this tendency of British people's privilege doing as they like. Such extremity of doing things had led the Hyde Park riot, indeed a sign of anarchy.

The possibilities the anarchic tendency can be attributed to active role of the state-action. As the people of the Victorian society had developed aversion to state-action, and state had a little role to play in the society. The reason for such attitude of the English people towards state-action was their fear of the state curbing their freedom. Arnold tried to convince them that the state represents their best self or the right reason and any untoward would not take place. This fact is explained by Arnold as, "Now, if culture, which simply, means trying to perfect oneself, and one's mind as part of oneself, brings us light, and if light shows us that there is nothing so very blessed in merely doing as one likes, that the worship of the mere freedom to do as one likes is worship of machinery, that the really blessed thing is to like what right reason ordains, and to follow her authority, then we have got a practical benefit out of culture, we have got a much wanted principle a principle of authority to counteract the tendency to anarchy which seems to be threatening us."

As stated by Arnold the State represents the right reason, and it will also consist of the representation of the people; that means it represents the collective will of the people. And it is not subjecting themselves to some foreign power; it is rather ruling themselves by electoral representation. Thus avoiding the erroneous
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notion of the people, he exhorts faith in the state-action for their own betterment in society.

The idea of the state gives rise to the best self. The best self, as explained by Arnold is 'aliens' in society. The world aliens sounds to be strange because of different bearing from the rest of the classes of the society. These aliens rise above their class-consciousness and ready to work for the betterment of all. All in all, Arnold favoured the democratic set-up as the best organ of the power.

Arnold has spoken highly about this democratic spirit as, "Democracy is trying to affirm its own essence, to live, to enjoy, to possess the world, as aristocracy has tried, and successfully tried, before it. Ever since Europe emerged from barbarism, ever since their minds began to stir, this effort of democracy has been gaining strength; and the more their condition improves, the more strength this effort gains. So patent is the charm of life and expansion upon the living; the moment men are aware of them, they begin to desire them, and the more they have of them, the more they crave."42

As the state in a position to level differences between the diverse social classes, Arnold favours this act of the state. Speaking of equality, Arnold quotes George Sand’s words as, "'The human ideal, as well as the social ideal is'; says George sand, 'to achieve equality'; she calls equality; 'the goal of man and the law of the future.' She asserts that France is the most civilized of nations, and that its pre-eminence in civilization it owes to equality."43 But the state of affairs in
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England, as pointed out by Arnold is quite different. People are more inclined towards inequality. As Arnold puts it, “France, too, counts for but one nation, as England counts for one also. Equality may be a religion with the people of France, as inequality, we are told is a religion with the people of England.”

The conclusive remarks of Arnold on Equality as a source of humanizing and civilizing force. But the lack of it has already manifold in materializing the upper class, vulgarizing the middle class, and brutalizing our lower class. Arnold in his essay ‘Equality’ he makes severe comment on inequality as religion with the people of England. The age, as commented by Arnold, is tooth and nail opposed to the very idea of equality. This scene is very much perceptible in the distribution of the property. The families in possession of great estates do not break them up. This act itself perpetuates the state of inequality. In Arnold’s view equality gives equal opportunities to all and creates civilizing atmosphere in society and takes the society towards total human perfection and his concept of culture sufficiently speaks of this perfection.

Vivekananda, like Arnold, did not favour aristocracy. He calls it the tyranny of minority. He is in favour of self-government as the best form of government. According to Vivekananda, an individual will get ample opportunities for his moral, mental and material development. In preference to self government, Vivekananda does not prefer a government run by a single person, although the person may be good like personality. Vivekananda did not like the parliamentarian government of British model and American model of

presidential government. Even in such governments, Vivekananda senses the exploitation of the weak. From Vivekananda’s point of view real democracy does not exist in European countries. In fact, he stood, for spiritual democracy in every country. According to him a good government must be based upon the teachings of Upanishads.

In the final analysis other than similarities, differences as well as unique features can also be seen at the subtlety of the approaches of Arnold and Vivekananda. Beginning with Arnold’s concept of culture, which has already been referred, is an indication of state of profusion still needs to be analyzed in comparison with Vivekananda’s mystical view. Culture is Arnold’s grand concept, standing for poetical beauty, moral and intellectual world order. And such periods in history are phenomenon to be seen. But Arnold’s implicit faith in the disinterested criticism to propagate the best that is known and thought in the world will lead to create such an animating atmosphere in the society. So the whole endeavour of critical function was to create the current of the best ideas in society.

The implication of the above consideration is that the society should always be filled with a current of fresh and true ideas. According to Arnold such porch and true ideas are not always on the native source, a critic should rely upon foreign source or thought. it is so because critics one business is to judge. But to judge most satisfactorily and properly, he needs his relationship with the best sources available to him. Therefore Arnold puts it, “Again, judging is often spoken of a the critic’s one
business and so in some sense it is, but the judgment which almost insensibly forms itself in a fair and clear mind along with fresh knowledge, is the valuable one; and thus knowledge, and ever fresh knowledge, must be the critic’s great concern for himself.” And this is very swell proved in the Arnold’s case drawing upon foreign sources for his tool of criticism. This foresightedness can be seen in his barrowing from the Indian sacred text, Bhagavadgita, a term, disinterestedness. This term has lent true approach to Arnold in his criticism.

Over-all implication of the above view is that Arnold’s mind in constantly endavouring with the assimilation of progressive views from whatever source, towards the ideal condition of the society. He once suggested English people to make the adaptation of decennial factor, counting by tens, which is universally accepted. But the Britishers in the beginning were reluctant to adopt this method. This one example proves that whatever may be the foreign source, it should be assimilated to its best possible use. In this connection Joseph Carrd puts it, “The only absolute standard, as Arnold says in culture and Anarchy, is the progress towards perfection and the idea of progress necessarily entails a relativity of social values and social theories. If perfection is to be attained or even approached, all the elements of culture must be regarded a building Blocks at the free disposition of the critical intelligence. All social structures are erected in accordance with the needs of their times, and the only permanent authority is the mind that recognizes and submits itself to the stream of change.”45

Further, to have clear-cut idea of Arnold’s culture and Vivekananda’s mystical view, it should, first of all, distinguished from religious concept. To Arnold, culture was not religion. As we have already seen in Hebraic and Hellenic concepts described. Alaric element, usually represent religious element, whereas Hellenic represent intellectual element. In the case of the Italian poet, Dante, although he possessed enough Hebraism, but he was not entitled to be regarded as the man of culture. The glaring defect in him could be pointed was the lack of Hellenic spirit, which according to Arnold, would make complete man. So, the religious element is not all in all.

In the light of above consideration, it becomes clear that Arnold’s concept of culture goes beyond religion. In fact Arnold’s concept of religion exists in the concept of conduct which is three-fourths of life. And his God is impersonal, eternal law, which stands for righteousness. Therefore conduct is not only the criteria for the best that is known and thought in the world. Religion, in way becomes just a component part of Arnold’s concept of culture. The extremity of religious one-sidedness is presented in the Hebraic concept.

In the above analysis, it shows that Arnold wanted to keep Hebraism in its perfect balance. So, that it does not give use to religious fanaticism. Therefore Arnold thought of administering another component of human tendency, viz., Hellenism as an antidote. This approach of Arnold show the clear cut distinction between culture and dragon.

So, it can be clearly deduced that Arnold’s concept of culture is not purely derived from religious side. Moreover, Arnold is more intent on enhancing a
perfect social order, where all sections of the society are harmoniously placed. In a sense, individual development, in turn, contributes to the development of society. Therefore, according to Arnold, it is not only an individual. Perfection, but also total perfection of the society. It also implies taking society progressively towards perfection.

And Arnold’s concept of the best self is in line with the principles of culture. An ideal individual, according to Arnold is above his class consciousness, and thinks of the everybody’s welfare. On the best lines, He is an ideal individual devoid of practical and political consideration. In the Arnold’s barrowed word of India’s sacred book Bhagvadgita, it is a man of disinterested nature. And this spirit of the best self is represented in the state as corporate of the best selves. The very implication of the best self or the state as the best self is to take cadre of all classes in the society. As Lionel trilling puts it, “In short, these are the currents of history and it is for the ‘best self’ to be sensitive to them, go along with them, further them. Culture has separated the best self from the ordinary self and culture will show the best self its method of action. Failing the action of the best self the ordinary self will take the lead and this is a “contravention of the natural order,...”

In the above quotation of lionell Trilling, it is clean that the best self stands for the best social order, whereas the ordinary self stands for contravention of the natural order. In the Arnold’s concept of culture and its representative agent, ‘the best self’, predominantly stands for the better social order, leaving the world

---
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better than found. So it is clear that Arnold’s culture does not go beyond social
to pia. Hence Arnold’s critical insight, instead of becoming divine, becomes
social criticism of culture; he, as a critic of a society. In other words, his critical
type halts on the frontier of society, and it does not move beyond it. This is the
limitation of Arnold as a critic of culture. Arnold’s unique feature can be seen as a
critic of society as well as creative artist.

Arnold’s unique feature as a literary and social critic lies with his showing
inseparability of the two.

In other words, Arnold’s criticism can create literature and literature its
criticism. T.S. Eliot has aptly expressed as, “We know, or think we know, from the
enormous mass of critical method or habit of the French; we only conclude (we
are such unconscious people) that the French are ‘more critical’, than we, and
sometimes even plume ourselves a little with the fact, as if the French were the
less spontaneous perhaps they are; but we might remind ourselves that criticism is
a inevitable as breathing and that we should be none the worse for articulating
what passes in our minds when we read a took and feel an emotion about it, for
criticizing our own minds in their work of criticism.”

Arnold has elevated poetry to the level of religion. To him Bible is poetry.
Even poetry with his usual spirit of culture goes beyond religion. That is why he
says in essay. The study of poetry as the future of poetry is immense, because in
poetry, where it is worthy of its high destinies, pour race, as time goes on, will find
an ever surer and surer stay. There is not a creed which is not shaken, not an
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accredited digamma which is not shown to be questionable, not a received tradition which does not threaten to dissolve. Our religion has materialized itself in the fact, the fact is failing it. But for poetry the idea is everything, the rest is a world of illusion, of divine illusion. Poetry attaches its emotion to the idea; the idea is the fact. The strongest part of our religion today is its unconscious poetry."

In this respect it is similar to the over-head poetry of Indian Geotactic. This is really special characteristic feature of Arnold’s poetry.

Vivekananda as a mystic is endowed with special vision, the enlightened intellect; he is Jnana who has acquired the knowledge of the ultimate reality. Arnold’s culture, although of a superior kind, did not possess that mystical insight which Vivekananda possessed it. Vivekananda’s vision like in the worlds of Aurbindo, soul the seer, the creator, and the enjoyer in the artistic creation. Arnold’s culture in this respect lacks that elevated mystical vision. The semblance of this type of vision can be seen in the Wordsworth’s poems on nature, where the presence of all pervasive spirit is presented. Vivekananda possessed this vision as a mystic. But this vision was not possible to Arnold.

With the above consideration, we arrive at the boundaries of respective insights of Arnold and Vivekananda. The one is mystical; the other, secular Vivekananda joins with Arnold as far the better social order and its beauty is concerned. But Vivekananda’s social order and its beauty is more deeply rooted in the spirituality. Unlike Vivekananda’s, Arnold’s the better social order is based on the components of culture. According to Arnold things of culture are primary, whereas materialistic achievements are secondary.
In comparison with Arnold’s viewpoint of culture, Vivekananda’s mystical approach differs. According to Vivekananda social life is not only the end and aim of life. It is just beginning, a preparation for the eternal life divine. In other words the better social life and it beauty are just means for the liberation of the self. The mystical paths expounded by Vivekananda speaks about this fundamental factor of liberation of the self from the wheel of death and birth. Therefore Arnold’s ideal ends with the better social order. But Vivekananda’s mystical vision gives beyond the social order. In short, Arnold’s end itself becomes Vivekananda’s means to the further goal of life, vi., Liberation. So with this consideration, it can be concluded that Vivekananda’s sociological implications of mysticism is one with Arnold’s cultural ideal. Both meet on this common platform of their social views on society as its critics.

But on the mystical or spiritual plane Vivekananda differs from Arnold. This is the special feature of Vivekananda’s mystical view.

Swami Vivekananda’s mystical paths (Yogas) can be compared with Arnold’s basic concepts of his criticism. In the first instant Vivekananda’s Jnana Yoga and Karma yoga can be taken up in comparison with Arnold’s concepts of Hellenism and Hebraism.

Hellenism is derived from the Greek concept of free flow of thoughts on all matters. The uppermost idea is to see things as they really are. And the Hebraism is derived from the Hebrew race. The uppermost idea of Hebraism is conduct or obedience. According to Arnold these two tendencies of the mankind are eternal in their nature and cannot be affected. One or the other predominates.
alternatively. They are the different laws of human existence. But both of them lead human beings to the same goal. As Arnold puts it, "So long as we do not forget that both Hellenism and Hebraism are profound and adsorb manifestations of man's life, tendencies, and power, and that both of them aim at a like find result..."

The two are infinitely different, but although the two tendencies are towards the same goal, but the two currents which carry them are infinitely different one is the thinking side, the speculative side; the other is doing side; the conduct.

The spirit of Hellenism and Hebraism can be explained as below. Greeks believed that the body its deserves came in the way of their thinking. Hebrew felt the quarrel of the body and its desires as they hundred right acting. The Hebrew and the Greek felt a desire native in man for the reason and the will of God, which truly represents universal order. In the case of Hebrew Spirit, it is the motive propelling towards the destiny of God. Hellenic spirit speaks of the clarity of vision and flexibility of mind, and seeing things not only their reality but also their beauty and harmony.

In short, the governing idea of Hellenism is spontaneity of consciousness; and that of Hebraism is strictness of conscience.

But these human tendencies or two powers are not antagonistic, to one another. But they are needed for human evolution. Arnold speaks of inseparable features of this tendencies as, "Hebraism and Hellenism are, neither of them, the low of human development, as their admirers are prone to make them; they are,
each of them, contributions to human development, august contributions, invaluable contributions; and each showing itself to us more august, more invaluable, more preponderant over the other, according to the moment in which we take them, and the relining which we stand to them”. These two forces act as alternative forces in human society, one overpowering the other. Of Christianity, one times, was Hebraism; the movement of Renascent not was.

The Tramps of tclartienity, the moral impulse, one time, was Hebraism. The Renascence movement was another time that of intellectual impulse at another time, was Hellenism. In the historical perspective there are periods predominated by certain tendencies of the period.

The sixteenth century was the period of Hellenism in England. The seventeenth century was the period of Hebraism. Similarly Arnold’s period predominated by Hebraic tendency. Vacationland cultivated more of strictness of conscience, the moral impulse. Arnold stressed the need of Hellenism as a balancing force. Extremity of either forces gives rife two unwanted development. The extremity of Hellenism funds towards moral laxity; the extremely in Hebraism is blind adherence. These tendencies are not properly proportioned with the time perspective. That is why England not having Hellenism at this moment, ahs Hebraism. Therefore, in the words Arnold, “Everywhere we see the beginning of confusion, and we want at clue to some ground under and futurity. This we can.... and rule of life”.

After the brief analysis of the Hellenic and Hebraic tendency, we can work at the two yogis of Swami Vivekannada Arnold’s vision of really – seeing things
as they are – bespeak of Hellenic spirit. Jnana yoga of Swami Vivekananda, similarly speaks of the knowledge of reality. Vivekananda’s knowledge of reality is comprehensive; it includes both secular and spiritual, knowledge as well. Truth itself becomes the measure of all achievements. As Vivekananda puts it, “Societies should be molded upon truth, and truth has not to adjust itself to society.”

When Vivekananda stresses the importance of knowledge, it is spiritual knowledge, which is source of strength. Therefore he says, “without the knowledge of the spirit, all material knowledge is only adding fuel to five, only giving... them”

He is also against such stuff of knowledge which breeds superstitions beliefs and weakness. Although he honored dualistic ideas, Burt would not tolerate weakness generating out of it. Therefore he says, “I know that truth alone gives life, and nothing but going towards reality will make us strong, and none will rich truth until he is strong.” So the systems which do not bring any good, but mobility of the mind will not be the mind, the fit receiver of growth. Therefore he emphasizes. The ideas of monism, the non-dual philosophy, the field of knowledge as the source of strength.

Arnold in his Hellenic concept one time, he means it humanitarian which most concerns to the human society. The sixteenth century renaissance spirit corresponds with Hellenic spirit.
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In other words in the phrasing of T.S. Idiot, the Hellenic spirit halts on the fraters of the metaphysics. Vivekananda, as stated earlier it encompasses the two boundaries what of secular and spiritual as well. The Hellenic spirit, in its extremity is moral laxity. Vivekananda’s Vedantic knowledge is not of moral laxity. Knowledge according to Vivekananda is the strength of the spirit, it elevates the man who is in the possession of it.

Arnold’s critical sensibility aiming at things that are said and thought to be the best is put of Hellenic spirit, that means it is not only seeing things as they are but also seeing them in their beauty.

Vivekananda also has the historical perspective, the periods were periods, dualistic rather than monistic. For instance, Buddhistic period was dualistic, whereas Adishankaras was no dualistic. But Vivekananda had felt the need of the dualistic and non-dualistic equally important periods in the evolution of human development.

Now we shall have glance at Hellenism, which is similar in spite with Karma yoga. Vivekananda means to say that Karma yoga is a system of ethics through which freedom can be attained.

It does not have anything to do with metaphysical speculation. The practitioner is immersed in doing side, in selfless activates. As Vivekananda put’s it, “He has got his own special aim of realisms selflessness, and he has to work it out himself. Every moment of his life must be realism because he has to solve by
mere work, without the help of doctrine or treaty, the very same problem to which the Jnani applies his realism and inspiration and the Bhakta his love.”

Vivekananda gives equal importance to knowledge. He hates mere talk of Vedanta, did not according to him should be practical. That is why he has condemned esthetic tendencies of the people. Therefore he had to say that salvation could be achieved through hot ball. It is good, unselfish action that leads to freedom. Vivekananda like Arnold, has similar faith the doing side also leads to the freedom of the soul. Therefore he say: “If you are genuine Karma yoga is and wish to train ourselves to the attainment of this stat, wherever we may begin we are sure to end in perfect self-self has gone, the whole world which at first appears to us to be filled with evil, will appear to be heaven itself and fell of blessedness... such is the end and aim of Karma Yoga, and such is its perfection in practical life.”

Raja yoga can be mainly compared to the Hellenic spirit. As Arnold’s Hellenic spirit partakes of the scientific sprint, it can also be better compared with Raja yoga. Raja Yoga with scientific sprint does move not outside, but inside. According to Vivekananda, it is through Raja-Yogic method one can confront religions experience. Simply believing in religion without its experience, does not help us to understand what religion is through

The Hellenic sprint in Raja Yoga culminates al last in mystical experience, the transcendental knowledge of the spirit, the ultimate reality. The Raja Yogic method really broodings one’s understanding.

Vivekananda’s Bhakthi yoga can be compared with Arnold’s concept of religion touched with emotion. This concept goes beyond. Hellenic spirit and also violates the norms of the scientific spirit. Arnold does not want to go deeper into the meter physical speculation as Vivekananda goes. Arnold does not want penetrate into deeper religious experience, yet his reverence to religion, as the supreme truth is undeniable. He does not want verify religious facts with scientific approval.

According to Arnold, religion has to be experienced emotionally. Therefore religion to Arnold was simply a conduct and conduct according to him was three fourths of human life. Hence, religion was not simply morality but morally touched by emotion. The emotion, in turn, ensues the love of righteousness. Therefore God has to be experienced through one’s own feeling and experience.

What is common between Arnold and Vivekananda can be seen in the mystical paths and Hellenism in and Hebraism concepts. One thing in common stands in prominent in comparison with the respective concepts of Vivekananda and Arnold. Finally it can be concluded with quoted statement of Vivekananda as “Here we find that Jnana Bhakthi and Karma-all come to one point”

In conclusion, it can be stated that Arnold and Vivekananda have some of the similarities as well as differences with exceptional unique features.