CHAPTER-1

World-View: Meaning and Theory

1.1 Introduction

Human enjoys an important position in every religion. A great part of every religion deals with inner disposition of man that is considered divine in nature. Cultivation of spiritual values is the chief aim of every religion. Man does not exist in a vacuum but in a physical phenomenon that is the ‘world’. In a way, man interacts meaningfully between the physical and the metaphysical worlds. Modern man plays a very crucial role in religion during which he faces so many problems at the emotional level too. The reason behind it is that in scientific age, every branch of knowledge is being divided into many categories. Scholars specialize or acquire knowledge of a particular branch or sub-branch. Scholarship wants to discover unknown aspects of human psyche to facilitate the intellect and reason. But by dividing itself into sub-parts, it is moving far beyond from its unified center. Alienation or isolation is becoming an indispensable part of human existence. Ultimate cause can’t be detected by unleashing one’s own mental faculties unless a central controlling authority is there otherwise they will create anarchy at intellectual level. That is the reason why with the spread of knowledge, anxiety, tension and psychological disturbance are also increasing due to lack of a universal center. In spite of remarkable advancement, informed public feels intellectually, ethically and politically lost. We find a very precise calculation of this human problem in the book, ‘World views: From Fragmentation to Integration’. Author of the book writes that “Many of us, however, experience an increasing feeling of alienation. Even though, with the expansion of society, virtually the entire surface of the planet has become a part of one house (world) often we do not feel ‘at home’ in that house. With the rapid and spontaneous changes of the past decades, so many new wings and rooms have been constructed or rearranged that we have lost familiarity with our house. We often have impression that what remains of a world is a collection of isolated fragments, without any structure and coherence. Our personal ‘everyday’ world seems unable to harmonize itself with the global world of society, history and cosmos.”

Modern man needs to integrate the scattered aspects of his world-view. Only harmonized or holistic world-view can enable human consciousness to contemplate upon reality from the
appropriate perspective. Now first of all we need to understand world-view, its meaning, nature and prominent components.

Human being lives in a surrounding called world and interacts with it. Result of this interaction is reflected in various forms like art, society, politics, culture, etc. All these reflections come from man’s mental and spiritual faculties. “The material used to construct a world-view comes from an inner experience…”\(^2\) and such expressions formulate man’s world-view. Man faces many questions which include different aspects of world-view such as what type of physical reality exists around us? Is there any higher law that motivates this concrete existence of matter? How does society satiate needs of a man? What is aesthetic and artistic that inspires the life? All these questions set the character and nature of world-view. “In this sense world views are not fixed copies or images of the world, but will somehow try to capture, as much as is possible all the aspects of this world”\(^3\) and are known as ‘collective dimension.’ At individual or group level, world-view may be supernatural or atheistic. For instance, orthodox traditions of world have different world-view as compared to heterodox ones. Marxist theory has its own notion about the world, man and their relation to other phenomenon. World-view can be categorized on two levels i.e. I. Individual II. Societal.

Man, as an individual, can formulate his own opinion about world and life. One may differ from one’s group (society) in this respect. Individual’s world-view is his/her own. It can’t be enforced on others though they belong to the same society. On the other hand as a part of a society, individual’s inner self inherits some attributes about physical reality under traditional, parental and family effects. Generally, societal world-view dominates man’s life and influences his/her personality to great extent. Generally world-view can be defined as the overall perspective from which one sees and interprets the world, and a collection of beliefs about life and the universe held by an individual or a group.

Before taking up the structure of Sikh world-view, it will be important to elaborate the key terms in the proposed study. There are three terms: world-view, Sikh world-view and Indian tradition. Words ‘Sikh’ and ‘Indian’ are relatively connected to each other in some or other way but world-view is a term that is a fundamental problem for our theoretical understanding. Indian and Sikh perspective of world-view will be explored later on. World-view is an English term evaluated by mostly English writers. It implies the view of world with reference to life. According to Dr. Nirbhai Singh, “The world is a complete environment in which man is
existentially placed. It constitutes geographical conditions, people, vegetation, cultural heritage, language and many other ingredients.\textsuperscript{4}

Contextual exposition is considered to be very useful while exploring any text or phenomenon. We are, here, required to study the structure of Sikh world-view in the context of Indian tradition. Guru Nanak took birth in Indian sub-continent and with his teachings revolutionized and influenced the Indian way of living. He presented a new set of beliefs which was a radical departure from the religious traditions. He established a novel view of world and a new group of institutions was introduced. Thus he gave rise to a comprehensive world-view that had never occurred before him in the history of India. First of all we will have to take up the very concept of world-view. Here we are not required to develop a concept of world but conceptualization of world-view is more relevant to the problem of our study.

As we generally know that mystery of the world and universe is a major concern of philosophical and religious traditions of the world. To know the reality of material world is a key issue and major task of these traditions. We try to understand the phenomenon happening around us. It means we are to know what ‘not I’ is or that is ‘not self’. The term ‘world’ is translated in Sanskrit as \textit{sansara}. As mentioned above, our central focus is not on concept of world but conceptualization of world-view. It means we have to create a speculative world that could resemble the world around us that provides ground for moral struggle. It includes every experience of activity and understanding which a man gains while living in the society. Every culture or society develops its own world-view as it perceives or understands the world around itself. This perception or understanding may go beyond the physical and natural world.

The concept dealing here, in the present research work, is about the world made of ideas. It is an epistemological structure and other dimensions of it related with the material world. Every man has his own world; his idea of world-view expands or modifies itself as new situations, experience etc. are confronted by man. This is the world of ideals followed by man which consists of beliefs, values, customs etc. A living world-view is reconstructed or modified according to the changing reality.

\textbf{1.2 Definitions and Meaning}

The term world-view is an English translation of the German word \textit{weltanschauung}. \textit{Welt} means world or physical appearance and \textit{anschauung} implies ‘view’ or ‘outlook’. Generally, it is translated as world-view. The term \textit{weltanschauung} is fundamental to German philosophy and
epistemology and refers to the framework of ideas and beliefs through which an individual interprets the world and interacts with it. “As one preeminently familiar with nineteenth century German theology, he encountered the virtually omnipresent term \textit{Weltanschauung} and its synonym and \textit{Weltansicht} in academic theory books, especially those dealing with the philosophy of religion.”\textsuperscript{5} But in German, it’s another meaning is ‘mystical contemplation’ of the world. This implication of \textit{weltanschauung} is also suitable to discuss the religious world-view. Because primitive man realized the material reality as an enigmatic phenomenon or a manifestation of some higher law i.e. physical objects of nature were regarded as sacred and were worshiped. The second reason is that every religion concentrates upon the human soul that is a central point in theological studies. Experience of human spirit mainly belongs to realms of abstraction. Mystical experience, but specifically speaking, spiritual experience, affects total character of any religion. So we are laying stress on the meaning of this term in the mystical context. World-view has been explained in different contexts with different meanings. For example, world-view is ‘a vision, intuition or a conception of world’, ‘a metaphysical view of world regarding a conception of life’, ‘practical attitude towards the world.’ According to \textit{Collins German Dictionary}, it is a “philosophy of life.”\textsuperscript{6}

According to the \textit{International Encyclopedia of the Social Science}, “World view is one of a number of concepts in cultural anthropology used in the holistic characterization and comparison of cultures. It deals with the sum of ideas which an individual within a group and or that group have of the universe in and around them. It attempts to define those ideas from the individualistic point of view holding them from inside the culture rather than outside.”\textsuperscript{7} Robert Redfield writes, “The phrase (worldview) names one of group of concepts which allows us to describe a way of life and to compare ways of life with one another.”\textsuperscript{8} Robert Cummings Neville in his research paper published in the \textit{American Journal of Theology and Philosophy} has defined the term as “A worldview is a cultured set of signs for orienting intentional behaviors that has spectra of (I) Scale (II) Sophistication (III) Valuation (IV) Identity and (V) Comment.”\textsuperscript{9}

W.T. Jones defines world-view as, “a set of very wide-range vectors in that individual’s beliefs space (a) that he learned early in life and that are not readily changed and (b) that have a determinate influence on much of his observable behavior, both verbal and nonverbal but (c) that he seldom or never verbalizes in the referential mode, thought (d) they are constantly conveyed by him in the expressive mode and as latent meanings.”\textsuperscript{10} \textit{Dictionary of Contemporary English}
defines world view as “Someone’s opinions and attitudes relating to the world and things in
general.”\textsuperscript{11} According to Michael Kearney “worldview is a set of images and assumptions about
the world.”\textsuperscript{12} Further he explains that, “the worldview of a people is their way of looking at
reality. It consists of basic assumptions and images that provide a more or less coherent, though
not necessarily accurate way of thinking about the world. A worldview comprises images of self
and of all that is recognized as not-self, plus ideas about relationship between them, as well as
other ideas…”\textsuperscript{13} Jerome Ashmore states that “Weltanschauung is a highly elastic term, but it
usually denotes a perspective and interpretation of the universe and its events held in a sustained
way by an individual or by a group. The perspective functions normatively, and as a point of
articulation. It implies cognition and values and may or may not include a supporting theoretical
structure. A Weltanschauung is something like an involuntary precipitate that has crystallized in
the mind of an individual or in the collective outlook of some group…”\textsuperscript{14}

World-view is a belief framed by an observer and afterwards put into practice. Dr.
Nirbahi Singh writes that, “Then what is the world view or weltanschauung? In English language
there is no equivalent term, but ‘perspective’ is most appropriate one…Man creates ideal world
in thought and, then tries to translate it in practical life. This is the crux of existential human
condition.”\textsuperscript{15} There are also some differences and controversies about some problems or issues
pertaining to world-view. Sometime it is thought as a set of feelings or basic attitude towards
world but at other time it is considered to be a set of formulated opinion upon world more or less
definitive.

1.3 History of the Concept

One thing must be remembered that use of the term world-view was started by cultural
anthropologists. They took it as a synonym for cosmology in order to elaborate the concept of
‘other world’. Therefore world-view is not only a picture or vision of world given by a particular
culture to its members, but rather it represents comprehensive attitudes towards life. Every area
or activity of life is subject to the concept. It imparts structure of things or forms of thought as
man conceives from his surroundings. Redfield’s definition makes man more active to know the
nature and functioning of world in which he is living. According to him world-view is “a man’s
idea of universe.”\textsuperscript{16} As already mentioned, his main focus was to distinguish so called civilized
world-view from the primitive one.
In modern times Immanuel Kant is a towering figure who coined the Weltanschauung in his work *Critique of Judgment* in 1790. “…For Kant the word Weltanschauung means simply the sense perception of the world.”¹⁷ He also used the words ‘mere appearances’ or ‘world of sense’ suggesting perception of the world. According to David K. Naugle the word Weltanschauung means world consideration or contemplation whereas another word in German is Weltansich that means worldview or opinion.¹⁸ He also quotes Martin Heidegger (*The Basic Problems of Phenomena* by Martin Heidegger) for the support of his view. Kant basically refers this term to conceptualize universe from the perspective of human factors. After him, his disciple Johann Gottlieb Fichte used this term in his first work *An Attempt of all Revaluation* (1792) which was published after two years of Kant’s *Critique of Judgment*.

Fichte, Schelling, Hegel and Wilhelm Dilthey have also used the very term. Hegel employed the term in *Phenomenology of Mind* (1807). Dilthey recognized the significance of the idea from historical perspective. Naugle states that “The powerful principal of historicism (as set forth by Dilthey) solved the problem of competing metaphysical models making a claim to universal validity…”¹⁹ Afterwards the term was used by the subsequent philosophers like Friedrich Schleiermacher also, “Though German Theologians, poets and philosophers primarily made use of the term during the first two decades of the nineteenth century, by the century’s midpoint it had infiltrated a number of other disciplines.”²⁰ Alexander Von Humboldt says that variety of languages is not that of sounds and signs, but a variety of world-views themselves. Here he is emphasizing the role of signs and symbols in the formation of world-view. Throughout the 19th century, this term became enormously popular. At the beginning of 20th century, this word saw its climax. Countless books and articles used this word but it is a matter of pity that we could not find any volume on this topic in our own vernacular and in our libraries. “For example, there is no independent entry for either weltanschauung or “world-view” in the *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (1967), though there is brief discussion of the notion scattered throughout its eight volumes.”²¹ D.K. Naugle presents the Marxist viewpoint of weltanschauung. According to him the material conditions of a particular society, its material being, give rise to its specific world-view. So weltanschauung is more than its linguistic meanings that is why prominent philosophers like G.W.F. Hegel, Soren Kierkegaard, Wilhelm Dilthey and Friedrich Nietzsche evaluated it due to its worldwide importance during the 19th century and Edmund Husserl, Karl Jaspers, Martin Heidegger and Ludwig Wittgenstein
contributed to the development of world-view. The word ‘phenomenon’ is also used for the ‘world’. Heidegger in his book *Being and Time* shows that phenomenon (which is developed from Greek) is something which manifests itself to put into the light. He also makes difference between phenomenon and appearance. According to him “appearance is an announcing itself through something that shows itself...phenomena are never appearances, though on the other hand, every appearance is dependent on phenomena.”

While tracing the history of the concept, Mendelson writes that conceptual analysis of the concept of world-view firstly started in early 1950s at the University of Chicago by a group of scholars under the supervision of Robert Redfield. His main concern was to discover the purity of primitive and folk culture. Next is Sol Tax who in his seminal paper, *World View and Social Relations in Guatemala* (1941) differentiated world-view from social relations. At the same time Robert Redfield was also searching for the same idea. His, *The Primitive World View* (1952) is considered to be very important; he explored a fully formulated concept of world-view in the same article. He presented certain universal elements of the concept and further wrote three monographs in 1953, 1955, 1956 respectively. After the death of Redfield (1958) one of his research workers Calixta Guiteras Holmes made efforts to take forward the tradition of her guide. By raising methodological problems she contributed to world-view studies. Another name to be mentioned in this context is Charles Leslie who related the world-view with the field of anthropology. E.M. Mendelson is also an important name to be discussed here. He did his Ph. D. (1956) on world-view from the University of Chicago. Employing insights of Durkheim and Levinas he took forward the world-view studies. He suggested that religion must be granted a significant status to analyze the concept.

Beyond the circle of Redfield, J.S. Slotkin and Clyde Kluchohn are those scholars who worked on the theory of world-view but in spite of dealing with it independently, they converted it into a subordinate to social values. Clifford Geertz also held the world-view as existential aspect of a culture combined with ethos and values. Leo Apostle (1925-1995) has also contributed to evolution of the idea of world-view as an independent faculty of philosophy. He, with the help of his scholar friends, created an interdisciplinary research group and with his friend Jan Van der Vaken, published a short book *World view: From Fragmentation to Integration* that is known as the manifesto of their institution. Chief objective of ‘Center Leo Apostel for Interdisciplinary Studies’ is to construct an integrated world-view from the
fragmented world-views originated out of different perspectives of different cultures. They made efforts to synthesize the wisdom found in different scientific disciplines, philosophies and religions rather than focusing on small sections of reality. They provided us with a picture of whole avoiding the compartmentalized and partial analysis. Leo Apostel, who devoted his whole life to the development of such an integrated world-view, made efforts to gather people with different backgrounds to collaborate on this study.

To sum up, we can say that since its inception in Immanuel Kant’s *Critique of Judgment* in 1970, the notion of *Weltanschauung* has become one of the central intellectual conceptions in the contemporary thought and culture, though the history of the term has been neglected in English speaking world. German scholars have contributed to a great extent to evolve this term as an independent and complete subject. We find the term in German and French dictionaries in detailed form but in English it is very definitive. In social and theological context, this term has been discussed seriously but in social and anthropological studies it is considered much more significant. That’s why we find entry of world-view in the *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* but there is no definition about world-view in Encyclopedias of philosophical disciplines and religious studies. However, insufficient material on the concept of world-view does not signify any irrelevance of this topic. Dearth of attention cannot diminish the role and significance of *Weltanschauung*.

1.4 Theory of Concept of World-View

Religion has taught the man that he is not a single entity in the universe but lives among other fellow beings. So in religion ‘Other’ is also respected and is given due place. Any religious experience can’t ignore the spiritual tradition preceding it whether agnostic or theistic and carries responsibility to trace their value and significance for humanity. Explanation of world begins with the some entity in the world that is ‘being’. This “entity with-in-the world” becomes the ontological foundation of world-view. Entity or being has properties (attributes) and extension (form) that makes up real being of that corporeal nature which we call the world. With the help of properties, substance becomes accessible to human psyche.

As we have seen in the definition given by Robert Redfield, that he adds one more quality or feature to the concept of world-view that is ‘relativity’ to other ways of living. For him, generally speaking, it is an understanding about cosmos by a particular group of people. In his article, published in *Proceedings of American Philosophical Society*, he analyses the term in
the context of culture, other modes of thought and national characters, and differentiates all these
terms characteristically. But still it creates vagueness. Though some scholars have tried to
theorize the term but no determinate meanings can be ascribed to it. Therefore, due to lack of
particularity of meanings and in the absence of precision it has been named variously. “Thus, it
tends to be confused with such concept as ethos (relating to values), modes of thought, national
character and even culture itself.” W.T. Jones remarks that “Critics suspect that a concept so
variously named is itself somewhat vague, and this suspicion doubtlessly explains why some
students of culture prefer to ignore the notion of worldview altogether and to concentrate instead
on the directly observable institutions and practices of a culture.” Paul G. Hiebert writes that,
“It is one of those fascinating frustrating word that catches our attention. Its ambiguity generates
a great deal of study and insight, but also much confusion and misunderstanding. There is no
single definition agreed upon by all.” Though worldview is considered generally useful term
to understand existential context of human being, but till date it has been interpreted from
various standpoints which is why it refers to a set of many independent, even some time,
contradictory views about human existence. “Weltanschauung is an apt term referring to various
styles of thought about the nature of existence, shared in common nationally or ethically,…”
It may obviously be called a vague term denoting several contexts in many ways but in fact as far
as we observe vagueness of meanings occurs due to its comprehensive context. Its all-embracing
nature is the main problem to its understanding it in specific context. “Worldview is not one but
many. According to Dilthey, the multiplicity of worldviews can be explained by the simple fact
that they are developed under radical conditions by radically different kinds of people.”
Because of this no definite meaning or connotation can be prescribed for the very term. This
vagueness may be considered useful and helpful for understanding because it provides one with
multitude of diverse positions.

As already mentioned, Robert Redfield adds new aspect of comparison or relativity that
does not mean in contrast to others but “in relation to all else.” Particularity or distinction of
various societies gave rise to the concept of multiplicity of world-views. This assumption
includes certain universal issues because world-view is “a man’s idea of the universe. It is
organization of ideas which answers to a man’s question: Where am I? Among what do I move?
What is my relation to these things?” Therefore worldview assumes self’s idea of universe that
formulates basis of societies other than itself. Naugle writes that “It is possible to identify the
common themes and categories with which all world-views are concerned...Every worldview addresses these universal categories, though they are filled in radically different ways in each cultural context."29 “Despite their rich diversity, worldviews retains a “structural uniformity” because of their grounding in the architecture of the human mind.”30 Though some universal elements can’t be ignored yet each individual distinguishes himself from all other. This particularity or distinction not only exists among us but within each self too. So “Every worldview distinguishes not only the self from the not-self, but distinguishes parts of the self from each other."31 When any society or individual makes effort to assert its world-view, it means he/it is addressing/facing/challenging ‘Other.’ Robert Redfield even accepts the variation among world-views among cultures and societies, yet some common points are also found in their ideas of universe. According to the author there are three points on which each world-view comes to meet with other. These are (I) nature of God (II) world and (III) man.

He also mentions some other human experiences which can be regarded as universal among different world-views but these three elements determine the overall nature of worldview. Further he writes that “It indicates a common basis for all humanity in the common elements of stage on which each society, each culture performs life drama.”32 Thus distinctions and universalities enrich human understanding in a better way. It leads us to grasp the particularities that help us to analyze or classify them and enables us to know reasons which are responsible to give rise to world-views as different from other. In his research paper Redfield tries to highlight distinctions of each world-view. These variations can be traced at varying degree in different cultures. As mentioned earlier, it is not opposite to other but an effort to know about itself. For him every world-view is a “confrontation of that, which is not the self and is outside of one’s self”33 E.M. Mendelson also agrees to it. He writes that “It stresses the self in confrontation with universe.”34 Michael Kearney comments that “using this major tripartite division in world view-Human, Nature, God, Redfield wished to know in what characteristic way different peoples “confronted” the nonhuman (Nature and God). He noted that there is much variation in the central concerns of peoples, with some attending more to the human, some more to nature, and some more to God, while others more evenly divide their concerns.”35

In this world-view man (self), nature (profane), god (sacred) play a very crucial role to fix human destiny. Robert Redfield is important for us because he attempts to explore the ancient world-view that has integrated the triangle of man, god and nature. In the next chapter we would
discuss the Indian world-view that starts with Vedic spirituality which is totally based on nature mysticism. This triangle can be attached with Vedic world-view particularly and also with the whole of Indian view generally. Redfield was also engaged in exploring the features of ancient world-views which were closely associated with these three aspects of human experience. In less or more degree like all ancient ones, Vedic world-view also consists of performance of rituals before nature turned gods. This attitude has major obligation of rituals and rites to maintain a harmonious relationship between man, nature and the sacred. As Redfield asserts that “Then it might be possible to consider every world-view with regard to two questions, what is confronted? What is the attitude a man takes as to his relation to that which is confronted?”

Above mentioned instance of similarities between Vedic and other ancient world-views include both questions. In fact it is man’s relations to other else, though there may be difference in attitude taken by man in different situations, yet involvement of these is generally seen with varying degree. It can be called confrontation but not strictly speaking in technical connotations of the term. Redfield was strictly working on primitive world-view that had encountered modern world-view based on science. He states three postulates upon which primitive world-view was based. For example (I) no demarcation among man, nature and god, (II) a thick overlapping between man and not man and (III) man, God and nature enjoyed a shared interdependence.

Redfield says that transformation has occurred from primitive to modern civilization that resulted into isolation of above mentioned features. Naugle writes that “the three traits of the primitive mind have all been weakened if not over thrown by the rise of civilization and cities. The change began when humanity separated itself from the unified order of the interdependent and moral universe, and stood over against it as something to be known and mastered. In this new environment the cosmos was conceived as a system of objective, physical properties and lost its sacred character and the moral order of the universe vanished. The world began to be perceived as an uncaring, virtually hostile order uniquely indifferent to welfare of human beings.”

Changing scenario of world that has happened due to scientific approach and technical advancements has caused and created a space for new world-views unlike to conventional ones, as in modern times it is possible to think about a world without God. Sometime God and nature as spiritual entities are also regarded as those factors which restrict our sources of information. Man-god-nature may be identified with same respect or one of these may dominate over other
two. "He (Redfield) points out that these views vary greatly with respect to their central concerns; for example, some centre on man, some on God or nature, while other confront man, nature and God about equally."\(^{38}\) Views of Iago Goldstone are also important in this context. He writes that "The earliest articulated world views were myths and cults; the later ones philosophies and religions. Today it is possible to cultivate a world view that is ethical but not religious, scientific though not philosophical."\(^{39}\) Further he explains the reason for such condition. According to him, in modern age nothing can be defined in isolated terms. Everything is getting closer to other and overlapping in many respects. Thus those categories are losing their particular identity. We have already observed that Leo Apostle also agrees with it.

Definition of R.C. Neville is also important for us to discuss here. According to him, orientation implies different situations or contexts in which one’s behavior is shaped. Intention points out to world orientations or directions that provide purpose to human behaviors. It may not be necessarily conscious behavior. An individual or a social group can be unaware of its behavior. Behavior also includes emotional and intellectual background that inspires physical action. Here ‘cultured set of signs’ means world-view is not a self-realized process but it is learned with three dimensions e.g. ritualization (habit-taking), with age development and by modifications in human behavior or making corrections. It denotes that every world-view grows, gets maturity and change according to circumstances to respond or address contemporary issues. "Dilthey isolates three main types of religious worldviews focusing in (1) “the immanence of universal reason,” which suggests a kind of idealism; (2) “spiritual all one”, which corresponds to pantheism; and (3) the “creative divine will”, which has theistic implication."\(^{40}\) Further elements of world-view as prescribed by R.C. Neville are as undermentioned:

I. Spectrum of scales has been divided into two forms (a) Ultimate ends are signs articulating grounds for value, hope, judgment, myth etc. (b) Proximate ends are signs that articulate code of conduct such as how to wash hands, when to pray etc. In his concluding remarks he says that “All along the spectrum of scale are sets of signs that mediate between ultimate and proximate matters for orienting behavior.”\(^{41}\)

II. Spectrum of sophistication implies those “signs expressing different level of abstraction.”\(^{42}\) For example Yahweh is jealous as well as kind. These are two levels of same reality that can be interpreted from different standpoints.
III. Next is spectrum of values that indicates that every culture has its own priorities. Something may be less important for one and more important for another. Element of value in world-view tells that what is important for culture or society to interpret the world.

IV. The spectrum of identity refers to an element that an individual or a group holds within a world-view.

V. Commitment connotes that any society or individual are deeply committed to a particular world-view and they live accordingly. Sometimes people may be indifferent to their world-views. Generally speaking, commitment means to what extent or how one relates himself with a particular way of living.

Model of Michael Kearney to theorize the world-view is very important. According to him there are three basic problems which outline the world-view. These are (I) There are some universal and necessary assumptions that are five in numbers (a) self and other (b) relationship (c) classification (d) causality (e) space and time; (II) Reason for differences in world-views (a) External (b) Internal, and (III) World-view’s practical impact on daily life and behavior.

Finally we can say that every world-view is considered true in a particular context and relevant sense. This supposition motivates an individual to adopt a world-view and to establish it as an authentic way of living. It leads to an intellectual exercise that takes the responsibility to interpret world-view from new perspectives. Such a practice gives rise to many competing world-views. We can say that world-view is not only an ontological conception but a concrete reality that can’t be interpreted from a specific point of view.

Another point to be discussed here is that when we perceive the world, our perception is affected by patterns underlying one’s psychology. It means everybody has a particular way to experience worldly phenomenon. Each one has lens through which he looks but can’t see the lens. So when we express or communicate our experience, we share it in referential mode. We can’t express our experience as it happened to us. So our way of expression and our experience becomes relatively distant. In a way, listener grasps second hand information or to some extent different from original. We do not relive or recreate experience that we are sharing with the other. We talk from a distance and describe in referential mode. This is the major problem in understanding a particular world-view. It may be called a hypothesis introduced by an observer.
to explain somebody else’s behavior. Due to above mentioned reasons, some scholars deny that a consistent authentic world-view is possible, every world-view is considered to be tentative.

Our planet not only belongs to man but other creatures too. However, only man can formulate a world-view through the knowledge. Man interprets values and makes judgments in a normative way. So world-view without some type of knowledge is inconceivable. Man is not only a maker of world-view or mere an observer but has capability to systematize it. Dr. Nirbhai Singh correctly remarks that, “Among other living beings, it is only man who lives purposefull life of ideals and values. He creates meaning and purpose of life to live in the world as a free individual.” Jerome Ashmore also agrees to this view that “Weltanschauung had early an empirical basis. The individual was taken to be the central agent in forming weltanschauung and, even though outside influences acted upon him, his experience dictated what the outcome was to be.” There arises also a question whether we grasp world-view or we are grasped by world-view. In other words we can say that it is a given reality derived by man as he grows. It can be assumed that a baby at the time of birth or until his younger age remains secluded from schema of the world. But as he grows, he starts to gather reflections about world and develops his views upon world. Some time it may be good and gratifying but sometime opposite. It may be confusing and contradictory too. “A worldview comes into being as an individual begins to achieve awareness of himself or herself shortly after the birth. This awareness develops as the self becomes more and more distinct from other.” All this may happen under some conditioned circumstances or emotional reaction not consciously formulated. Every experience in existential context is not unalterable but with the increasing age it may be changed or partially modified.

Therefore we can say that at initial stage, every world-view is given but with the passage of time it is also derived. Man lives in society and cultivates his opinion about culture and tradition. “He may have his own unique experiences, but initially he is contained in the ways in which he is to interpret and give rationality to his experience.” Therefore, a man inherits a world-view at his birth. At initial stage it begins with heritage that is given but not derived. But with the passage of time everybody formulates one’s own opinion about physical reality. It is an aggregate of sensation, perception, experience and memory.

World-view is a multi-dimensional concept particularly having anthropological and sociological context. Robert Redfield is considered the father of world-view studies who systematically elaborated the very concept and tried his best to define it precisely. Ambiguity
surrounds the very conception because it has been defined by many thinkers from different standpoints. So it would be helpful to have a glance at these definitions.

In anthropology, world-view denotes “The system of values, attitudes and beliefs held by social group. The German term *weltanschauung* may also be employed with the same meaning. The concept has been important in the study of folk and peasant societies.” Sociologists consider it that, “worldview refers to the set of beliefs constituting an outlook on the world characteristic of a particular social group, be it social class, generation as religious sect.” So we can say that *weltanschauung* is a conception of nature of the world and implies a system of principles followed by a group or generation. The conception has both cognitive and practical aspects. Cognitive side incorporates theoretical structures and practical one extends to action or existential position and dynamics. There is an integral relationship between praxis and action, as science is incomplete without technology. Similarly, cognitive or normative aspect of world-view too needs the assistance of applied ethics. Without practice, every idea will remain abstract or ineffective. Only practical aspect brings the solutions to problems. While talking about the Indian context, we see that the term *darshan* has been employed to denote the metaphysical or ontological aspect. Here *darshan* means not only objective observation or mechanical/calculative/normative information about reality in the western sense but also includes the transformative side of life. Thus it is clear that relationship between idea and action is common to the concept of world-view in Indian thought.

One more point is relevant here for our present study of world-view. Does idea or knowledge independently exist in itself or is determined by any other factor? Looking at the spiritual traditions of India, we can say that idea refers to spiritual experience. It is the ultimate determinant that helps other aspects. Here experience is not merely passive and mathematical observation of object but involves harmonizing of mind, body and soul collectively with the underlying truth of the universe. It is realizing the object, removing the demarcation between self and object. Another question arises about the authenticity of experience that has been elaborated in *Nyaya Sastra*. It can be suggested that true experience motivates a person to create harmony of experience. It means experience certainly influences man’s subjective element too. Therefore transformation in experience is transformation in conduct.
Now we shall try to outline theoretical structure of the concept of world-view based on Apostel’s thesis which includes I. Ontology, II. Explanation, III. Epistemology, IV. Praxeology, V. Axiology, VI. Futurology, and VII. Etiology.

Ontological aspect of world-view allows us to understand how world functions and how it is structured. World-view does not meet in singularity but in totality, in everything that exist around us, including universe, earth, life, mind, society and culture. It encompasses questions like what is nature of our world? Why is there something rather than nothing? etc.

The second component is supposed to explain the first one. It answers the question ‘Why is the world the way it is? Where does it all come from? Where do we come from?’ This is the most important part of a world-view. If we can explain how and why a particular phenomenon (life or mind) has arisen, we will be able to understand that how a phenomenon functions in a better way. It will also help us to understand how a phenomenon will continue to evolve.

Epistemology is another important element of world-view. The material reality which we observe in its some particular form is interpreted and this exposition is known as information, knowledge or theories. This data describes the phenomena that we encounter. It is equivalent to what is called ‘epistemology’ or the theory of knowledge in philosophy. It answers the traditional philosophical question. ‘What is true and what is false?’ Principles through which information is acquired are also discussed within the domain of epistemology. Knowledge helps us to construct image of this world. It characterizes the truth, existence etc. It can be related with the problem of language as well. What kind of language is used for the purpose of knowledge acquisition and what are its limitations? In this way epistemology comprises all these problems under the orbit of world-view. “It is by means of these actions that we can influence the world, and strive for certain ends. A worldview should contain an organized concept of our real and possible actions in this world.”

The next component is ‘theory of action’. It would answer the question ‘How should we act?’ It enables us to solve practical problems and to implement plans of action. In fact action is not independent aspect of human existence but it takes its birth in human mind that is a treasury of intellectual exercises. So action is directed by knowledge and some general principles are formulated for the orientations of actions. It is often said that a philosophy is of no use because it is too far from reality, that it does not give any precise answer to concrete question. To some
extent, this allegation may be true but a praxeology accepts the challenge to fill this gap between physical problems of world-view and philosophical systems.

“No only scientific experience, but also aesthetic and ethical sensitivity will have a deep influence on our attempts at world-view construction.” Though our actions are directed by epistemological systems but thinking patterns and knowledge is oriented by value system of a particular society. Human intellect is not allowed to do what it wants to. Therefore world-view considers the more fundamental issue: ‘What is good and what is evil?’ It includes ethical system which tells us about do’s and don’ts of a group of people. It deals with evolution of global reality that describes the meaning of life. Thus it also gives us a sense of purpose, a direction or set of ideals to guide our actions. As discussed above, together with the answers to the question, ‘Why’ and ‘What for’, we can understand the real meaning of life.

Another component of world-view is futurology that addresses the theory of possibilities both negative and positive. Plans and possibilities for future are explored in this aspect of world-view. It focuses on future of universe and fate of life. This will confront us with a challenge: which of the different alternatives should we promote and which should we avoid?

Last element of world-view, imparted by post-modern values, is etiology that is a meta-study of world-view on the whole. It means we can’t build the structure of world-view from scrap but we need a common relation among all the elements. This step goes ahead towards a world philosophy. It inspires us to seek partial answers found in the different structures of civilization and combine the total system existing within a world-view. “As a consequence a worldview can relate the different domains of experience, so that they are liberated from their isolation and become a part of whole. The goal is to make communication between the different layers of own experience explicit. Otherwise if extensive elements remain unconscious, there is a danger that one aspect will emerge as the view of the whole.”

1.5 Speculative Tendencies of World-View

Now we shall contemplate upon the question that how it has been perceived in the different faculties and its different ways of understanding gave birth to several traditions. World made of matter is subject to time and space and “Strictly matter is just an abstract term, a convenient name which we can apply to the substance of all possible physical things.” In spiritual traditions of the world it has also been regarded as a product of the sacred. Matter is also considered divine in its nature that’s why efforts were made to conceive absolute reality in the
form of matter. Underpinning truth was concretized into material forms that represent experience of reality more than mere statue or object. We see, therefore, idols of deities in ancient religions. World is a result of interactive dynamics of spirit, mind and body. There are three outlooks through which the world of perception can be studied I. Philosophical outlook, II. Scriptural outlook and III. Scientific outlook.

From the earlier times, every religion, nation, race and tribe has expressed its views regarding the physical world. What they realized about physical reality can be found in their scriptures, religious texts and literature. As mentioned elsewhere, existence of man is not a part of cosmos but having a whole cosmos within itself. By using its mental and spiritual potentialities, he makes advancements in different areas of life. During his life, man faces so many complications but with the help of his reason and logical capability he solves the complexities. Philosophy is a method of thinking, investigating reality against the visible phenomenon. In a way, it is spirit of experience that works in the background of decisions. Philosophy is classified into metaphysics, epistemology and axiology that explore truth of science, society, religion, language etc. in speculative terms.

Objective form of physical phenomenon is of primary interest which has been discussed by philosophers in various ways. Here, our prominent concern is not to examine cosmological structures given by philosophers and world traditions, but to introduce perspectives and tendencies about physical reality. There are three basic postulates to understand the formation of physical phenomenon. These are I. Substance, II. Time and space, and III. Theory of cause and effect. Ontology, the main offshoot of metaphysics, is the study of physics in philosophical terms. It tries to know the reality and nature of objective forms (world). What is the meaning of existence (life and world)? Is ultimate reality united or dualistic or pluralistic? what are time and space, cause and effect? All these questions are churned. A summarized description about these postulates is as under.

1.5.1 Substance

The principle of being gives rise to the proposition of substance that exists in itself. It is totally different from phenomenon. All the philosophical systems of the world are occupied with the problem of reality. To prove the entity of substance by the law of causality is not sufficient; because some basis will remain necessary in each case. Philosophers who believed in a single substance called it monism and who had faith in multiplicity of substance called it pluralism.
Ontological grounds for defining the ‘world’ lie in the idea of substance that is self-realized, not produced by any another source and is ultimate in itself. There are different views about it. Sometimes it is regarded as an element that is the keystone and root cause of the world. The very element is considered a product of some divine entity or creator too. Spiritual personalities realized it as God whereas scientists and philosophers have interpreted it as energy, agnostics and atheists named it consciousness. Monism, dualism, pluralism etc., are different tendencies which have been conceptualized by the thinkers. These are based on the origin and manifestation of substance that is the source of everything in the terrestrial world. “The concept of substance is that of a permanent substratum preserved through all changes.” In Greek it means ‘that which underlies.’ Substance is the constant matter from which everything has emanation. It imparts the beginning of all becoming. The concept of atomism is of fundamental significance that makes substance expanded at large as well as in immutable unit. Atoms are infinite in number but simple and indestructible. Problem of substance is still a question for scientists. “Of course, the permanence of substance amid all changes is nevertheless, taken by science as a postulate, for it is an axiom with which the scientific mind cannot dispense.” Though existence of substance can’t be proved by any method due to its non-perceptible nature yet it is taken as real in metaphysical context.

1.5.1.1 Monism

“Monism is a name for a group of views in metaphysics that stresses upon the oneness or unity of reality in some sense.” The term was employed to maintain the relation between mind and matter. According to it mind and body are two shades of same substance and both are reducible to that, not one another. This term is used “to denote the philosophical theories which recognize only single kind of reality whether physical or psychic.” This notion regards the world as a product of a sole substance that is working in every phenomenon of seen reality. Spinoza is regarded as the exponent of this thought but “such a view of the world is already found in a developed form in the Pre-Socratic philosopher Parmenides and was nicknamed the ‘blocked universe’.” If this root cause is material then it is called materialist monism. If it is something like spiritual then it is known as spiritualistic monism. Sometime Monism and Monoism are also differentiated from each other. “Spinoza tried to prove that two substances of
Descartes, the thinking and the extended, were but attributes of one and the same substance—a substantial one and all.”\textsuperscript{58}

It regards body and soul as equivalent aspect of a process. Spinoza’s \textit{Ethics} is the classic exposition of monism. According to him “Ultimate reality and substance is all inclusive. Causality is immanent causality, and every determinative being lies within the one substantial being. Spinoza’s doctrine of attributes, infinite and finite modes, serves to express both the all-encompassing and systematic nature of the one ultimate reality.”\textsuperscript{59} Bertrand Russell correctly says that “Spinoza’s metaphysics is the best example of what may be called ‘logical monism’—the doctrine, namely, that the world as a whole is a single substance, none of whose parts are logically capable of existing alone. The ultimate basis for this view is the belief that every proposition has a single subject and a single predicate, which leads to the conclusion that relations and plurality must be illusory.”\textsuperscript{60} “But it (monism) is also often contrasted with ‘dualism’, since so much philosophical debate has focused on the question whether there are two different kinds of thing, mind and matter or only one.”\textsuperscript{61}

1.5.1.2 Dualism

According to the \textit{The Encyclopedia of Philosophy} “Any philosophical system that divides the world into two categories or types and uses two ultimate principles of explanation and insists that there are two kinds of substance is a form of dualism.”\textsuperscript{62} Rene Descartes was the most prominent philosopher who advocated this discipline of thought. He says that world is made of mind and body. In Greek philosophy, Plato and in Indian philosophical systems Kapila were the main thinkers who followed it. Plato names it ‘world of forms’ and ‘world of reflections’. Similarly Sankhya calls it \textit{prakriti} and \textit{purusha}. \textit{Sankhya Sutra} and \textit{Sankhya Karika} are fundamental works to understand the Indian dualistic metaphysics about the world. Yoga and Sankhya are known as sister philosophies and complimentary to each other. For Descartes, world is made up of two incompatible kinds of substances known as mind or consciousness which is unextendable and indivisible; and matter which is extendable and divisible. Bertrand Russell comments that “It brought to completion, or very nearly to completion, the dualism of mind and matter which began with Plato and was developed, largely for religious reason, by Christian philosophy...the Cartesian system presents two parallel but independent worlds, that of mind and that of matter, each of which can be studied without reference to the other.”\textsuperscript{63} These two sides of reality have been named variously such as natural and supernatural, temporal and
eternal, material and mental, particular and universal etc. When the binary truth is revealed, relations between two becomes the chief problem for thinker, consequently exploration of relations produced a large number of philosophical works. Dualism explains that things are different from mind and the mind is standing outside the physical picture, thus appears a problem of causal relation between mind and body. Often mental process stimulates bodily events, but on the contrary bodily events also affect mental faculties. The theory also drew the attention of theologians who discussed principles in terms of good and evil or light and darkness in religious context.

1.5.1.3 Pluralism

Why not any more number instead of one or two? This question highlighted the idea of pluralism. Leibniz who is regarded as a standard pluralist, has a different outlook of substance. According to him the substance produces mundane world and a stuff from which world has been produced is not of singular or dualistic nature. The phenomenal reality is mixture of so many substances which he calls ‘Monad’. He says that every monad is independent in itself and two monads cannot exchange with each other. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz thought that God has created the infinity of substances (monads). All these are immaterial and in harmony. Each substance represents the whole universe and a substance does not act in random but in accordance with law governed sequence. According to Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, “Leibniz made substance not one but many. He took self-acting force or power to be substance indestructible and immaterial, and broke up the one thinking substance into a multiplicity of individuated thinking atoms.” According to Bertrand Russell “Leibniz held that extension cannot be an attribute of a substance. His reason was that extension involves plurality, and can therefore only belong to an aggregate of substances; each single substance must be unextended. He believed, consequently, in an infinite number of substances, which he called ‘monads’.”

1.5.1.4 Theism

“Theism is usually applied to a system of beliefs which has some claim to be regarded as philosophy…The etymology of word would suggest that it might cover any conception of universe which admitted the existence of deity but in practice theism has come to mean a belief in one God,…” Generally Theism is a belief in a Being who is supreme and source of universe at once. This Supreme Being is regarded neither transcendent nor immanent. It means He can’t be identified with universe nor separated from it. It is said that humans everywhere had faith in
some type of divine entity, though the idea held by primitive one may profoundly differ from later ones. Theism also incorporates the issue regarding nature of God and relation with world.

Spiritual traditions of world have followed this idea. They believe that God is the Ultimate Reality who has created the world. To experience the existence of God, love and devotion are necessary instruments. Theism also includes monism and pluralism under different names such as monotheism and polytheism. God is not like substance that is subject to analysis rather emotional attachment is compulsory in theism. Total character of theory is combination of the transcendence and immanence of God. The speculation about the relation of God to world gave rise to three forms of this concept:

I. God identified with world in pantheism.
II. God once having created the world relatively disinterested in it in Deism.
III. God working in and through the world in panentheism.

Pantheism asserts that primary substance (God) is prevailing everywhere and phenomenal reality reflects this substance. Whereas Panentheism claims that God and world are relative entities but God is first and material cause of world. According to it, world is a part of God but not identical to the God who has His existence without world but world is meaningless without God. Henotheism was firstly used by Maxmullar who was a German scholar and contributed to great extent to formulate Asian theology. He coined this word for Indian deities in his work *Indian Philosophy*. It means a chosen or selected god out of many dominates the other gods and goddesses.

1.5.2 Concept of Time and Space

When we conceive points of moments in which we are living absolutely then they are timeless but looking from relative aspect, they become timely. These are two paradoxical standpoints upon which every religion has focused in some or the other way. Science basically deals with relative conception of time, “but religion goes beyond science in attempting to understand the trans-logical connection of relative temporal stages to timeless eternity itself.” And “In theory, time can be considered abstractly as the measure of change, the principal of duration, the medium of duration, the medium of movement and order of events.” It is very difficult to trace the boundaries of time. Experienced time is immanent due to its closeness to physical domain but theoretical time is beyond our reach because of its abstract nature. The time
influences change, action and coherence of events but the question is what causes or influences
the time? This is a problematic enigma to be explored. We can’t understand the true nature of
time because we can’t get rid of time and cannot perceive time objectively. “To begin with, the
distinction between present and not-present at any rate may be usefully compared with, that
between here and elsewhere in space. Here means near my body; elsewhere means distant from
my body.”69 Time is an important postulate to understand the physical reality. Every physical
object that exists in the range of perception can be included under the influence of time and
space. Before thinking about the world, we shall have to introspect that whether it is possible that
there should exist empty space and eventless time. What is time and space when we talk about
extension and duration of the world? There was Newton who “regards space and time as real
things, containers of infinite extensions or duration within which the whole succession of natural
events in the world has a definite position.”70 In fact it is impossible to define the space and time
though we move in. Time without change and space without matter could not be defined till now.
There are so many questions like whether space and time are parallel? Is there any set of objects
spatially and temporally related to each other but not to us? Among such questions, existence of
world is sustaining. “Time is one of the most abstract and intangible concept in human thought.
Indeed, in many cultures it does not exist as a consciously expressed idea. Yet some sense of
time, however implicit, must exist in all mobile living creatures.”71 Perceptions of time may
differ from class to class and society to society. “In the first time is seen as moving, coming from
the past, passing by us, and moving into the future. In the second perception, time is seen as
absolute and self is moving through it from past to future.”72 “The beliefs that form the
worldview provide meaning for life, a means to cope with life conditions and problems and a
guide for behavior and action. The core beliefs of a world-view may be acquired in the form of
knowledge through family culture, social interactions, religion, or education and generally they
become more rigid and resistant to change in time as feelings, emotions or judgments are being
attached to them.”73 Modern age is clock oriented age in which time is spent in terms of money
and generally equated with money. Technological and industrial progress has made it an
obligatory condition.

1.5.3 Cause and Effect
“Common sense assumes that things and events are the products or results of certain other things or events- the result is called effect, and that which produces it is called the cause.”

In primitive religions and cultures, natural phenomenon were designated as anthropomorphic elements to understand the dynamics of the world, but as rational thought expanded, it removed the very sacred idea of causality, and even some scientists totally rejected it. According to this notion, everything that occurs takes its origin out of some reason. Every result is directed by some cause. Cause and effect are interrelated. According to this, nothing can happen without a cause or nothing comes out of nothing. Anything, connected with matter, that motivates the movement or change is considered as cause and result of this motivation is known as effect. Kearney writes that “It is impossible to conceive of a human society in which there do not exist some concepts of an orderly relationship between act (causes) and desired end (effects). The notion of causality -of cause and effect- has however, disappeared from modern physics, where it has been replaced by a probabilistic analysis of random events at the subatomic level.”

1.6 An Evaluation

Foregoing discussion suggests that world-view must include some type of Absolute Reality, physical reality (nature or world), man and their relation to each other. It encompasses the total conception of life. On the one hand, it is related with metaphysics but on the other hand it imparts a comprehensive model to organize every department of empirical domain. Both aspects need to be explored in the study of world-view.

The Sikh world-view has not got due attention because of lack of experts on the very subject. After studying the Sikh history and sacred hymns of the Sikh Gurus, we come to the point that these sacred hymns or teachings do not directly outline a model of world-view as different dimensions of socio-cultural-political life of man. But experience of the Sikh Gurus provides significant insights into it. This transforming experience paves the way for the formulating of a complete world-view that is a potential area for research. What has been proposed in the present study is not a detailed exploration of each department but looks into its significance and under-pins the inter-connection among various components of Sikh world-view. All the issues analyzed here are a hypothesis that has been attempted to highlight the scope for further research.
Another question arises that which group or class contributes to formulate a world-view to a great extent. No doubt possibilities of individuals or great personalities can’t be ignored specially in the case of Vergil in Rome, Homer and Herodotus in Greece, Hafiz in Persia, Iqbal in Pakistan and Gandhi and Tagore in India. Yet there does always exist a particular class or group that plays an primary role to formulate world-view that further gains considerable acceptance among the masses. A degree of resistance may be possible but generally it dominates the collective psychology of society. Here, we are committed to analyze Sikh world-view in the context of Indian tradition. World-view of Indians has been shaped and influenced to a large extent by the priestly class. A.L. Kroeber writes that, “It is expected that the formulating class will always have: (a) considerable power (b) articulateness, including primacy in writing within a literate culture, perhaps religious knowledge in a non literate; (c) and to be motivated both by idealism and self-interest.”

It has already been mentioned that world-view is generated by the experience that is deeper than the belief, ideal and behavior. Thus difference of world-view among societies, civilizations and nations is not because of their distinctive beliefs, ideals and behavior but due to their distinctive experience of physical and metaphysical realities. They may experience same reality but degree of their attitude towards it, may vary at many levels. People may say same words but having different meaning. For example God, Allah and Brahman have been used for the same reality but expression carries varied implications. During the long journey of human race, relative concerns of geography, language, behavior can’t be put aside too. Exchanges, therefore, may be there and some common traits must be interpreted with their own underlying world-view. For example, Western world-view has been shaped by Greco-Roman values, consequently conception of time and space of western world is totally different from the Oriental one. These exchanges and impacts can be found easily while studying the world history.

We want to say that some cultures have similar traits while others are awfully different from one another. Western world-view is not influenced by Indian philosophies or *darshan*. Westerners think about material world as real, according to that operating dynamics can be predicted. They decide according to their sense experience and everything is measured in accordance with it. Material advancement in west is due to such attitude towards matter. But outlook of the Hindus about matter, consider it not as complete reality but a partial reflection or shadow of Absolute Truth. For them, this creation is ever-changing that is called *maya*. 
Therefore judgments and conclusions made about material object can’t be perfect but they lack subjective authenticity that comes from deep rooted spiritual experiences but not by physical experiments. Same difference can be made between modern and primitive civilizations. Modern man due to his scientific and technological precision has more faith on machines or tools. He seems to be more assertive and authentic in his way of expression, he does not suggest but claims. Thus produces the synchronic or linear model of world-view that helps people to understand the structure of world in a different way. Modern man has also devised many forms and genres of literature. Novels, stories, movies based on science fiction expose the very tendency of modern psychology. But ancient or primitive people had discovered the way of myth to reveal the experience happened with them. In myth, many worlds run simultaneously parallel to each other. In a way, they invented a diachronic or circular dimension of world-view. Though in modern world, myth is being used to mean imaginative world or fantasy but examining closely its grand narrative spreads over the whole of universe. In a way, its Meta narrative helps us to know reality beyond physical and geographical boundaries which are free from time-space limitations. Hiebert correctly says that, “In other words, myths are transcendent stories believed to be true that bring cosmic order, coherence, and sense to the seeming senseless experiences, emotional, and ideas.” It will also be important to mention here functions of world-view that works in five ways:

I. It provides us with models or maps which impart structures to perception of reality.

II. Initiation, marriage, funeral, harvest festivals and other rituals renew the human life and persuade feelings of togetherness e.g. society.

III. It guides our behavior and shapes our perception that this is the way it is and this is the way it ought to be.

IV. It organizes the ideas, feelings and values which are less unified form of reality.

V. In changing modes of life world-view helps us to select that fit our culture and reject those that do not.

Hiebert has also found three problems with the concept of world-view. He observes that I. It focuses on cognitive aspect rather than affective and moral one, II. It establishes priority of sight over the sound, and III. It takes individuals and communities in equal terms. So to avoid these problems or to make efforts to solve them, Hiebert recommends three dimensions namely
cognitive, affective and moral. He writes that, “In reality all three operate simultaneously in human experiences. People think about things, have feelings about them, and make judgments concentrating right and wrong based on their thoughts and feelings. The moral includes people’s concept of righteousness and sin and their primary allegiances-their gods.”

To sum up we can say that, German historians used the term *weltanschauung* referring to the deep enduring cultural patterns. It is popularly translated as ‘world-view’ that points out towards hidden categories and themes with which people perceive and think of the reality. Hiebert writes that, “It become increasingly clear that people live not into the same world with different labels attached to it but radically different conceptual worlds.” It came under the mainstream study during the past decades. As scholars studied different cultures and races, they found beliefs and values under the surface of human behavior. These values and beliefs, further, are products of thought patterns arose from experience.