Hudolf Otto is one of the greatest theologians of the twentieth century. He is not a religious philosopher in the sense of one who examines religion and religious ideas for the sake of intellectual satisfaction. He is a committed theologian who looks at religion from within and with genuine concern—not with the idea of merely explaining it, but with the purpose of justifying it. Otto's religious philosophy is a bold and original attempt at justification of religion and religious ideas against the critical attitude of western rationalism, positivism and humanism towards religion.

Factors which led to the formation of his religious philosophy are diverse and not limited to Germany alone. It is a synthesis of elements of German philosophical and theological thoughts with the illuminating ideas from the Indian classical tradition.

He is the least dogmatic of all the western theologians. He has sympathy toward all religions. This explains his popularity among theologians belonging to different faiths.

In spite of his importance, works on Otto, in English, are less. And those which are available do not cover the whole range of his religious philosophy. The present study was undertaken with a view to bringing together as far as possible all aspects of Otto's religious philosophy.
The present dissertation comprises of eight chapters. The first two chapters are introductory in nature. Chapter three to seven are the core chapters. The first section of Chapter VIII gives the summary of the preceding chapters and the second section are our conclusions.

In Chapter I we have given a general introduction of Otto and the general position of his religious philosophy. In Chapter II we have traced the sources of Otto's religious philosophy. We have shown that Luther, Kant, Solesber, Fries etc. have influenced Otto. In addition, we have suggested that Śāṅkara's influence on Otto is extremely probable.

In Chapter III we have surveyed the Christian concept of God and the traditional arguments for God's existence. We have contended that failure of the rationalistic understanding of God's being and nature led Otto to give an interpretation of God's existence which has the force of an argument without being vulnerable to sceptical criticisms against it. Chapter IV first gives a general statement about religious consciousness and then describes some epistemological concepts like a priori and the faculty of divination which are fundamental to Otto's interpretation of religion. In Chapter V Otto's analysis of 'numinous feelings' is examined. Later in the chapter we have tried to describe now
the idea of God develops from the numinous feelings. We have contended that there is a close parallel between Śaṅkara's view of Brahmān-Īśvara and Otto's view of Numer-moly. In Chapter VI Otto's views on mysticism are examined, his comparison between Śaṅkara and Exkurt is also reviewed. Otto feels that in mysticism the non-rational aspect of religious consciousness is stressed and it is not necessary for one to be united with God to be a mystic. We have tried to argue that this undermines the real significance of mysticism. Chapter VII considers sin, salvation and other related conceptions like freedom and predestination, grace and atonement. We have examined Otto's comparison of Viśisṭadvaita with Christianity. We have tried to answer some of the allegations made by Otto against Indian religion of grace.

Owing to the similarity of Otto with Kurt and Śaṅkara, we have frequently referred to them. We believe that this will help in understanding Otto's position. We have not, however, dogmatically stuck to any philosophy or theology. We have given full credit to Otto whenever we have found his interpretation and insight penetrating and appealing. Theology, after all, is a part of man's unending quest for truth. Here, as elsewhere, nobody can claim to have reached the final truth.

In the presentation of our study it may appear that we have indiscriminately used the terms religious, philosophy, and theology. Theology in the strict sense implies the
interpretation of a particular religion in line with the accepted scriptures and traditions of the religion.) Otto is a Christian theologian in this sense. Philosophy of religion means a philosophical study of religion and religious phenomena. Otto does not confine himself within the Christian tradition only for the interpretation of religion nor does he make excursions to other religions just to criticise them - as common theologians would do. To that extent he is a religious philosopher. That is why we could not arbitrarily select either of the two terms for Otto's religious thoughts. So, we have adopted both and have rather liberally used them. We think that the modern trend in theology is more and more towards a merger of theology with philosophy of religion as in the case with Otto, Tillich, Kuretsky, Robinson and others.
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