HINDU REVIVALISM AND A WESTERNIZED MIDDLE CLASS REINTERPRETATION OF THE BHAGAVADGĪTĀ

V. Subramaniam

I

Historians from Tacitus to Toynbee have been fascinated by the phenomenon of civilizational encounters and have made interesting studies of conflicts and mutual influences. Among them, encounters involving conquest have invited more attention than encounters through commerce or religious exchange and the responses of the conquerors and conquered have been analysed sometimes smugly and sometimes with deep insight. Much of this analytical work was done in the first instance by the scholars and administrators of the conquering civilization and rebutted later by the conquered. These general observations are true of the most recent and most influential of civilizational encounters in history, namely, the conquest and colonial administration of Asian and African countries by European nations, mainly Britain and France. Millions of words have been written on this encounter from every angle - that of the (Christian) missionaries, Marxists, British Conservatives, Liberals and Radicals, French assimilationists as well as left wingers and Indians and Africans of different persuasions.

But in all this literature certain phenomena get much less attention - and the most significant of these is creative revivalism. This paper will concentrate on the most interesting case study of this phenomenon, namely, the resuscitation of the ancient work-ethic of the leading Hindu scripture Bhagavadgītā - in this century to face up to the Protestant work ethic of the British rulers of India. Our thesis may be summed up thus:

(i) From the first decade of this century Karmayoga or the work - ethic was accepted as the very essence of the Gītā and this interpretation has acquired wider acceptance with time.

(ii) This emphasis is totally different from the centuries old emphasis on Jñānayoga (the path of self-knowledge) and Bhaktiyoga (the path of devotion).

(iii) The new emphasis and interpretation coincided with the challenges posed and faced by the new Indian professional middle class vis-à-vis the hostile British administrators and was a product of it. It was also a product of a static Hindu cultural integration as it released itself from the rigidities of feudal Moghul control.

(iv) This was part of the overall phenomenon of radicalist revivalism in the decades round the turn of the century in India and elsewhere. Let us now develop these points in some detail.

To members of the Indian intelligentsia in this century, the Bhagavadgītā (or The Song of the Lord, as it is known to readers of Edwin Arnold) is synonymous with Karmayoga or activism with detachment.[1] The Gītā injunction to enshrine the Lord at heart and jump into the fray - has been the life-guide of several leaders of modern India such as Vivekananda, Tilak, Mahatma Gandhi and Rajaji - and also of hundreds of educated Indians. It was a basic source of inspiration of the Indian freedom struggle from the turn of the century,

right down to the nineteen forties. Tilak's Bhagavadgītā Rahasya revived and sparked off this latent and age-old source in the first decade of this century and put it to work in the service of the freedom struggle. But it was Mahatma Gandhi's interest in the Gītā that carried that message to all parts of India. Almost simultaneously, Sri Aurobindo was making it popular in scholarly circles with a more rounded interpretation while Rajaji harked back to the activist interpretation in the thirties. Since Independence, the activist Gītā ethic is sought to be used for nation building purposes by many, particularly in administration and management. Thus both the National Academy of Administration which trains all the young recruits to India's higher services and the National Productivity Council, have chosen the (same) motif from the Gītā - proclaiming that 'Yoga is efficiency in action.'

My thesis is that this interpretation of the Gītā is not traditional but just a half century old and its startling effect of India's national movement and her middle class was a by-product of Indian revivalist reaction to Western efficiency, early in this century. This rather unusual conclusion can be sustained by comparing the evidence about the interpretation of the Gītā before and after 1900. To put it briefly, the traditional interpretation till the turn of the century, hardly put the central stress on Karmayoga and the Gītā itself, though philosophically held important for centuries rarely affected social and political life. After the turn of the century, however, it came quickly into the very centre of national consciousness, mainly through Vivekananda's and Tilak's activist interpretation which was influenced subtly by the impact of Western thought and action on them. A study of this rather quick change is an interesting exercise in the history of ideas.

The first observation about the predominance of the non-activist interpretation in the earlier centuries can be sustained without much difficulty. Though we do not know anything about the origin of the Gītā, it is clear that it took shape after the period of the major Upanishads as a composite work, including different outlooks on life and salvation.[2] In other words, it was not composed under the same social conditions as the Calvinistic ethic to propound a single body of doctrine. Secondly, it follows therefrom that the Gītā is not exclusively devoted to Karmayoga which is just one of the three yogas and occupies less than a fourth of the textual space.[3] Though it is praised in Chapter V unequivocally as superior to Sāṅkhya, this praise is not sustained throughout the book.[4] For a lay reader, the emphasis on each of the three yogas looks randomly and perhaps evenly distributed.

Karma itself is interpreted in three different senses. In the first place, it is interpreted as rituals of all sorts, as for example in chapter III where Krishna describes an injunction from Prajāpati to the humans to perform rituals and to Devas to grant boons in return. The Mīmāṁsakas also interpreted Karma as rituals and Śaṅkara follows them generally in equating Karma with rituals of different types such as the Nitya (daily) the Naimittika (occasional) and the Kāmya (for a desired end).[5] But (Hindu) rituals are complex in their function. At times, a ritual is just sympathetic magic imitating the phenomenon desired, at times it is propitiatory prayer to the deity in charge of the phenomenon and at other times, it keeps the community together through the discipline of common traits.[6] Strictly, in none of these guises it is equivalent to productive work in the Protestant Weberian sense. Perhaps, on the basis of subjective rationality, a ritual which integrates a community and instils discipline may be regarded as releasing its performer for hard work. The remarkable success of the ritualist Tamil

Brahmin in middle class professions and management in the last hundred years may partly be attributed to such reasons.[7] But all told, karma in the sense of ritual is not work in the Weberian or ordinary Western sense.

It is used in a second ultracomprehensive sense in the same chapter to include every physical and physiological movement including thinking and day dreaming. In this sense no one can be inactive even if he tries vainly and this is used as an argument in favour of action without desire for its fruits.[8] In this sense Karma includes productive work only by including every movement useful or useless. In a third sense, Karma is closer to productive work, when Krishna declares in the same chapter that even he, the Lord, wanting nothing, does work incessantly to keep the world going and that it behoves the great, to set an example to the rest of the world. To sum up our simple examination, the Gītā, prima facie puts more emphasis on the path of Karma in the first four chapters but on the basis of overall space allotment and tone, this emphasis is reduced. Secondly, of the three meanings of Karma in the text, only one pertains to work in modern parlance. But at the beginning and towards the end, the Gītā's immediate objective of impelling Arjuna to fight, relates clearly to intense activity in the Protestant sense. All told, while advocating detached action Gītā is not devoted to it exclusively or with unmistakable emphasis.[9]

This wandering advocacy of Karmayoga was clearly diluted by its three great commentators over the centuries. To Śaṅkara, the essential teaching of the Gītā is the path of Jñāna (knowledge) while the other two paths are merely ancillary and preparatory, Karma (action) contributing to mental purification and Bhakti (devotion) to concentration. The great philosopher could not even wait to emphasize this step by step and takes issue with the Karmayogīs right at the beginning of his commentary and asserts categorically

that there is not a shred of evidence in the Gītā to conclude that action per se will lead to self-knowledge and salvation.[10] His belligerent tone confirms the existence of a strong contemporary school of thought in favour of ritualism and Śaṅkara's determination to fight it tooth and nail. It is a fact of history that this school joined issue strongly with Śaṅkara's interpretation. Ramanuja and Madhva, while rejecting Śaṅkara's emphasis on the path of knowledge and advocating that of devotion (Bhakti) are nearly as averse to the merits of the path of Karma as Śaṅkara is. Indeed all three of them dismiss the inconvenient sentence at the beginning of Chapter V that Karmayoga is superior, by calling it mere hyperbolic embellishment or Arthavāda.[11]

Thus from the 9th century of Śaṅkara to the 13th century of Madhva, Hindu philosophical thought ignored the detached activism of the Gītā but for the exception of Jnandeo's commentary. It is also clear from the evidence of Alberuni in the 11th century that the Gītā was at the centre of the Hindu faith, but Karmayogic activitism was probably not considered its chief message.[12] It is most likely that in the later centuries under Muslim rule in North India knowledge of the Gita was confined to a small educated minority. Even in these circles the path of devotion is likely to have been stressed in the prevalent atmosphere of North India, laden with the Bhakti songs of Rāmānanda, Kabīr, Mīrābāī, Sūrdās and Vidyāpati. In the South too, the Jñāna and Bhakti schools of interpretation crowded out those who might have liked to stress Gītā's activism.

The sole exception to this trend was Jnandeo in Maharashtra whose commentary follows a line somewhat different from those of the three orthodox philosophers.[13] In the first place, Jnandeo stressed the unity of all

the three paths and in interpreting Karma and its importance, he partly anticipated Tilak. Thus, he highlights the meaning of Karma as doing one's daily duty and equates that with service to God. He also glorifies to some extent the ordinary men and women performing well the duties of their allotted station - as housewife, farmer or blacksmith. Moreover, according to his classification of the chapters of the Gītā, nine of the eighteen are devoted to Karma; thus Chapter III is devoted to Karmakāṇḍa as such and Chapters IV to XI constitute Upāsanākāṇḍa which embraces Karma. All told, his interpretation of Gītā gives a high place to social duties and might have helped to some extent in inspiring the successful liberationist movements in Maharashtra against the Moghuls and the British. But even so, it would be stretching the meaning too far to call the Jnaneshwari the gospel of modern productive work in the Protestant sense. It was too imbued with devotion to a loving Lord as against obedience to the great Task Master of Calvin and its concept of social duty is still different from the Protestant competitive drive to work.

But apart from this sole (modified) activist interpretation, the social influence of the Gītā till the turn of the century was marginal. In South India and in northern centres of learning like Vārāṇasī, the Gītā was essentially a source book of Vedānta philosophy through all these centuries. In other areas, it was mostly forgotcen by the people and whenever there was need of activism, the inspiration came from elsewhere. Thus Hindu resistance to Islam in the North from Rajputs like Hammīra and Pratāp acknowledged no direct debt to it. Populist resistance movements such as that of the Satnāmīs would have drawn more from Tulsīdās' Ramcharit Manas. More strangely, Guru Gobind Singh whose life was the best example of Karmayoga in

Indian history and who changed Nanak's religion of peace into militant devotion to duty, does not give primary importance to the Gītā. Even Samartha Rāmdās who could have drunk deep from Jnaneshwari did not seem to have used it as much as the Hanumān cult to inspire the Maratha peasantry. It is clear that throughout the Muslim period, the influence of the Gītā was confined to philosophical circles - and that it was rarely used as a popular gospel by militant activists.

This applies equally to the British period down to the turn of the century. The early founders of Modern India such as Ram Mohan Roy were Christianized Liberals interested in the Vedas and Upanishads more than the Gītā. Even when the Gītā was made available to the West in translation, what struck Western savants such as Emerson and Edwin Arnold about it at first were things other than detached activism.[14] Much later, when that most militant activist of Hinduism, Swami Dayananda, sought inspiration, he went back to the Vedas, ignoring the Gītā as a later accretion.[15] Almost down to the end of the last century in spite of increasing popular recognition in the West as in India, the Gītā was still not the activist's gospel.

II

By the turn of this century, however, a number of factors were combining to give the Gītā the status of the Bible of India's national struggle. A keen observer, Risley, writing to Lord Moreley in 1908 takes note of the new popularity of this work which he recommends to Moreley as essential reading.[16] This was the time when Tilak's new interpretation of the Gītā, equating it with Karmayoga was just firing the imagination of the Indian intelligentsia

and of the nationalists in particular. What were the factors which conduced to this dramatic result?

The Hindu-British encounter went through three phases, an initial phase of friendship up to 1857, a second phase of silent hostility and contempt till the turn of the century and the third phase of Hindu activism. The first phase was marked by cultural cross-fertilization and some confident revivalism and produced the Raja Ram Mohan Roy type of Indian Liberal. In the same phase, the discovery of ancient Hindu civilization and its glories gave Hindus a new pride in the lost heritage and led to religious revivalist movements. But these were not anti-British and indeed down to the 1857 rebellion, the Hindu elite and the British were on friendly terms on the whole. This Anglo-Hindu honeymoon was, however, reversed by the racial aloofness and contempt of the post-1857 period constituting the second phase. There were callous murders of Indians by Englishmen who were let off lightly and there followed terrorism, angry Kali-worshipping Bengali nationalism and repressive laws against the Indian vernacular Press. It was in the first decade of this century that this conflict crystallized into the third phase: British anti (Hindu) middle class feeling on one side and the Hindu middle class reaction to it on the other. The former reaction is fully documented in hundreds of remarks, memos and asides of Englishmen in authority as well as in their general behaviour and has been well taken note of by Indian historians.[17] Lord Curzon's contempt for the Babus and Lord Lytton's holding of the Delhi Durbar, his creation of the Statutory Civil Service and his open encouragement to the separatism of the Muslim nobility, all these were clear indications of antagonism to the Hindu middle class. The continuing refusal to hold simultaneous examinations in India for the Indian Civil Services was based

on an implicit criticism of the executive efficiency of successful Indian competitors and the secret fear that they would swamp the civil service, if allowed to compete freely in India.[18] This fear and antagonism spilled over into the commercial sphere in which the early Punjabi middle class ventures were discouraged and it affected British colonial policy in Africa in the direction of "Indirect Rule."[19] In short, the British critics, while suspicious of the Indian middle class at heart, declared in the open that it cannot perform as efficiently as the European middle class in the political, administrative or commercial sphere. It was this open contumely that spurred the Indian middle class to action.

They challenged this assumption on several fronts. In politics and journalism they showed that they could handle agitational methods very well during the Bengal partition movements. Vivekananda showed how religious propaganda could be organized to awaken a people into social activity.[20] The Arya Samajist Punjabis showed how they could organize commercially. The ignominous failure of the British-controlled Arbuthnot Bank gave the Madras Hindu middle class an occasion to show how badly their critics could themselves fail.[21] Moreover, the success of a number of Indian candidates in the I.C.S. examination in London supported the Indian claim that more would succeed if it was held in India simultaneously.

In short, during the first and second decades of this century the Hindu middle class competed with its British counterpart in all branches of activity to show it could do as well or better. This meant emulating the Protestant virtue of hard work without expecting immediate reward. The emulative mood was expressed tauntingly by Gokhale who declared that man for man, the British civil servant was more devoted to duty and his country and more

hardworking than the Indian. Vivekananda declared that Indians who could not manufacture a pin had no right to criticize the English. Indeed all Indians, moderates and nationalists were equally convinced of the need of Western Protestant virtues and differed only in looking to different sources for an ethic. The former looked to the West itself and the latter to traditional Hindu sources.[22]

Fortunately for the latter, their leader Tilak combined immense traditional and modern scholarship with active political agitation and drew his inspiration from the half-forgotten karmayoga of the Gītā. This was appropriate in more senses than one. Gītā's activism was a more controlled philosophical activism than the aggressive natural Aryan activism of the Ṛg Veda. In its original context, it served to revive Arjuna's drooping spirits and a precedent for a partially activist interpretation existed already in the great Marathi commentary Jnaneshwari. And just recently, Vivekananda had increased that stress with his lectures on Karmayoga and his highly activist conduct and his activist approach to all things religious and social.[23]

This search for a Western worth-ethic in the Hindu scriptures was also of a piece with socio-historical traditions of Hindu culture. Its repertoire of living concepts was much wider than that of any other culture - simply because there was a more tolerant and even permissive market of ideas in Hindu society at all times - and every idea was kept alive one way or the other. The Muslim military challenge promoted essentially - military counter-organization through Hindu Kings and Hindu Sanyasis - and the Muslim spiritual challenge was countered by Hindu cultural isolationism on the one hand and prophylactic measures through the Bhakti concepts of human equality and the Sikh replication of the Millat in the Khalsa. But the British

challenge after conquest was more subtle; it was less in terms of military and more in terms of ethical superiority. The Herodian response of just imitating his work habits involved some inefficiency in the process and loss of self-respect - while Tilak's rediscovery of the same ethic in Hindu scriptures guaranteed both efficiency and pride.

The results of Tilak's exposition were predictably dramatic. Not only was Maharashtrian political consciousness set ablaze at once. In a more solid way, it prepared the minds of hundreds for a long-drawn-out struggle under Mahatma Gandhi without expecting immediate results, as the revolutionaries did. While Vivekananda had prepared the way generally, it was Tilak's exposition of the Gītā in speech and writing that led others such as Gandhiji and Rajaji to use it as a political weapon.

This paper is not concerned with the philosophical and logical merits of Tilak's Gītā Rahasya. What reached the intelligentsia was a simplified version of it preached by him and his followers on platforms. We may, however, refer briefly to the breath-taking scholarship and the interpretative brilliance of his exegesis. Tilak brings to bear, not only a deep knowledge of all the Sanskrit philosophical sources such as the Upanishads, Brahmasūtra, and the traditional commentaries thereon by Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Madhva and Jnandeo's Jnaneshwari but also his deep acquaintance with Western philosophy and sociology. He explains that in the West as well as in the East, the path of renunciation and the path of works were recognized as leading to self-realization separately.[24] He then goes on to establish that Gītā's path is the latter (a) by opposing the traditional interpretations which soft-pedal it and (b) by drawing on the whole corpus of Hindu Smṛtis, Upanishads and philosophical commentaries to show that they advocated the same thing. Thus he

exposes at some length how the crucial sentence in Chapter V about the superiority of Karmayoga is put aside most unconvincingly by Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Madhva.[25] He shows how Īśāvāsyopanishad has advocated Karmayoga in its opening verses and how other sources such as Smṛtis Dharmaśāstras and Purāṇas have done the same.[26] It is a magnificent performance of scholarship in the course of which he fights the traditionalists successfully with their own weapons.

It is also clear that Tilak was not concerned with other means of interpretation. From a psychological point of view, the Gītā has not carried the emphasis on detached action far enough to make it evident without some advocacy - and it tries to describe other paths at even greater length. Historically it was perhaps conceived as a compendium of several viewpoints rather than as the sponsor of one. As the last great Acharya commenting on the Gita, Tilak used the traditional weapons of exegesis without psychological or historical analysis to establish his point with polemical ability rather than academic objectivity. From the latter viewpoint Aurobindo's interpretation is more rounded if less erudite in traditional methodology.[27]

We are, however, less concerned with Tilak's performance than his source of inspiration and those of Mahatma Gandhi and Vivekananda. We have shown circumstantially and historically that the new activist interpretation of the Gītā coincided with a period of Hindu middle class emulation of Protestant virtues and was indeed its expression. This evidence can be supplemented by some curious reflexions of Vivekananda, Jayakar and Mahadeo Desai. Thus Vivekananda explains in his East and West how the Europeans follow the Gītā's precept of tireless and detached action while Indians follow Christ's injunction to emulate the lilies of the field.[28] Jayakar described Englishmen during

the 'Battle of Britain' as the true followers of the Gītā. Mahadeo Desai's list of Karamayogis contains more Europeans than Indians. None of the three seems to have suspected that Gītā was being reinterpreted in this century to emphasize the Western Protestant ethic of work.

We have attempted to prove this point with circumstantial evidence for no direct proof is possible. The purpose of the exercise is not to give less credit to Tilak and Vivekananda for originality but to unravel a most interesting instance of the revival of an ancient source of inspiration under the subtle influence of foreign challenge. That it was done successfully without the proponents being aware of such an influence is a tribute to their greatness as well as the comprehensive range of Hindu thought from which they could draw inspiration. Indeed, this revivalist activist reinterpretation of the Gītā is more important in the history of Indian reaction to the West than the earlier Ram Mohanist adaptation of Western Liberalism or the simple revivalism of the Aryasamaj or the various Indian modifications of Marxist thought in this century. It can only be compared to the Bhakti movement's reproclamation of human equality in the face of Islamic challenge and Gobind Singh's counteracting the idea of Millat with his concept of the Khalsa.

Footnotes to Appendix I

1. All these great men implicity or explicity acknowledged Gītā as their life guide, Vivekananda in his three pamphlets on Jñāna, Bhakti and Karma Yogas, Tilak in his monumental Bhavagad Gītā Rahasya, Mahatma Gandhi in his collected essays called Anāsakti Yoga and Rajaji in his Kannaan

Kaattiya Vazhi. My own attitude study of administrators in Chapter 7 of my Social Background of India's Administrators revealed how much importance they attached to the Gītā. The National academy of Administration, which trains India's higher civil servants also arranges regular lectures on the Gītā every year. Again, the majority of 'discourses' advertised in various Indian cities today are on the Gītā. In all these expositions, the activist ethic is stressed specially as for example in Swami Chinmayananda's and Swami Ranganathananda's lectures - particularly to urban middle class audiences.

It is also interesting to note that the great Acharyas differed in interpreting Gītā in regard to its emphasis on Jñāna or Bhakti. But the modern authors are all agreed that Karmayoga is its essence. Professor P. Nagaraja Rao notes this in his Introduction to Vedānta, B.V. Bhavan, Bombay, almost in passing without any comment or explanation. This paper sets out to explain it.

2. The speculation on the date and authorship of the Gītā is referred to in Vivekananda's Karmayoga and discussed in K.M. Panikkar's Survey of Indian History, National Information Publication, Bombay, pp.122-3. Internal evidence clearly suggests that it is post-Upanishadic and post-Buddhist.

3. Of the eighteen chapters only II, III, IV and V are directly devoted to Karmayoga with an overspill into the sixth.

4. In reply to Arjuna's straight question as to whether Sannyāsa or Karma is superior, at the beginning of Chapter V, Krishna clearly states that Karmayoga is superior. But this observation is not referred to again in later chapters.

5. Swami Atmananda, Sankara's Teachings in his own Words, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, Chapter II.

6. I agree with this (communist rationalist) view of ritual as sympathetic magic. See Bhattacharya's Hindu philosophy, People's Publishing House, Bombay.

7. I have explained this a little further in my article "Emergence and Eclipse of Tamil Brahmins", Economic and Political Weekly, Special issue, July 1969. We may also note that the Western work ethic owes a lot to the transplantation of monastic ritualism and Benedictine time consciousness to the layman's life.

8. Chapter III, Verse 5.

9. It was this aspect more than the internal content that Tilak stressed when he summed up the essence of the Gita as "Think of me and Fight".

10. Bhagavad Gītā with Śaṅkara's Commentary (in Sanskrit) Chowkamba Vidya Bhavan, Varanasi. Śaṅkara takes off right from the part where Krishna chides Arjuna, then puts down briefly the contemporary Mīmāṁsaka case for Karmayoga and starts demolishing it straightaway.

11. On this Śaṅkara says casually "Now he praises Karmayoga".

12. Alberuni contrasts contemporary Hindu exclusiveness with the receptivity of their ancestors but does not contrast Gita activism with the contemporary Hindu defeatist mentality before Mahmud of Ghazni for the plausible reason that the former was not much stressed in contemporary India.

13. Professor S.V. Dandekar of Ramakrishna Ashram, Poona, in a special private communication.

14. The Western scholar was more impressed by the idea of the indestructible soul than by the Gītā's activism. Thus Emerson's Verse translation "If the killer thinks, he kills..." became famous enough to attract Rudyard Kipling to parody it.

15. Satyartha Prakash, Introduction.

16. Risely to Moreley 13 May 1909, Moreley papers; quoted by D. Rothermundt Politishe Willensbildung in Indien.

17. K.M. Panikkar, Survey of Indian History, pp.217-2. Much of this anti-middle class literature is summarized and referred to in my article "Graduates in the Public Services - A Comparative Study of Attitudes" Public Administration (London) Winter, 1957, p.278, especially.

18. This was what Indian Liberal leaders claimed for years and this was admitted by L.S. Amery with his own proviso at the Imperial Co-operation League Private Discussion Dinner in London on 22 June 1910. "If you held the examination on a single list, I think you would be bound to hold it in India as well and you might have the whole of your Indian Civil Service flooded by clever young Babus who were able to cram up. That would be a disastrous result to the efficiency of Government in India." (From a report fro limited circulation, Commonwealth Archives, Canberra).

19. The anti-middle class feeling of British administrators in India communicated itself to their counterparts in Africa and led to the use of traditional chiefs in government instead of educated Africans. See V. Subramaniam, Transplanted Indo-British Administration, Ashish P.H., New Delhi, 1977, Chapter 10.

20. K.M. Panikkar. Survey of Indian History, p.269. See also Christopher Isherwood, Ramakrishna and his Disciples, Chapter 21, especially pp.324-27.

21. Re. The Arbuthnot Bank Case, see K.M. Balasubramania Iyer, Life of S.V. Krishnaswamy Iyer (In Tamil) Madras.

22. Christopher Isherwood, op.cit., p.325. For Vivekananda's favourable orientation towards American vigour, see p.319.

23. Vivekananda though he wrote about all the three yogas of the Gītā slowly shifted the emphasis to Karmayoga - by his own active life, by his more enthusiastic language on Karmayoga and by his constant appeal to nationalist and welfare activity.

24. Balgangadhar Tilak, Bhagavad Gītā Rahasya. Translated by Balachandra Sitaram Sukthankar, Poona, 1935. See Chapters X and XI in particular.

25. Op.cit., pp.426-27 Tilak specifically criticizes Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja by name.

26. Op.cit., Chapter XI draws support from practically all major Hindu philosophical works.

27. Sri Aurobindo, Essays on the Gita.

28. Vivekananda, East and West, Advaitashrama, Nainital, pp.3-5. For Mahadev Desai's list of Karmayogis, see his The Gita according to Gandhi, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1951, pp.118-120.