

Trinity as Sat-Chit-Ananda in the Thought of the Indian Theologian Brahmabandav Upadhyaya

K. P. Aleaz

Professor of Religions at Bishop's College and Dean,
North India Institute of Post-Graduate Theological Studies,
Kolkata, klez@satyam.net.in

Abstract: Many authors, including Julius Lipner, holds that Upadhyaya was interpreting Sat-Chit-Ananda and Maya of Advaita Vedanta in terms of the neo-Thomism of the day and therefore his originality in these matters was only limited for an Indian Christian theology. Taking a drastically different approach, our author studies Upadhyaya's interpretation of Trinity as Sat-Chit-Ananda. First he traces the insights of authors like Keshub Chunder Sen (1838-1884), J. Monchanin (1895-1957), Swami Abhishiktananda (1910-1973), Bede Griffiths and Vandana Mataji. Keshub Chunder Sen is important because sixteen years before Upadhyaya, in 1882, he was the first one to interpret the Trinity as Saccidananda. For Sen Trinity was only a symbol and the three members of the symbol, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were just pointing to the reality of God in different ways; the three members do not represent three persons sharing the same essence but they are just three functions of the same person. Moreover, Sen gives only a very brief account of Trinity as Sat-Chit-Ananda. The author affirms that if Upadhyaya's Saccidananda represented God in Himself as unrelated alone, for Abhishiktananda the concept signified the inseparable aspects of the mystery of God in Himself/Herself as well as the mystery of the divine presence in the innermost sanctuary of a person's being. Abhishiktananda at least outwardly believed that the Hindu experience of Saccidananda should be remoulded to attain the Christian experience of Saccidananda and once that is actualized, the renewed experience of Saccidananda would

be the Trinitarian culmination of advaitic experience. According to our author, the uniqueness of Upadhyaya's interpretation of Trinity as Saccidananda lies in showing the fact that they both are exactly the same.

Keywords: Trinity, Sat-Chit-Ananda, Keshub Chunder Sen, J. Monchanin, Swami Abhishiktananda, Bede Griffiths, Vandana Mataji.

The Context

It is ironical that after so many years of study of Brahmabandav Upadhyaya a professor of the stature of Julius Lipner concludes that Upadhyaya was interpreting Sat-Chit-Ananda and Maya of Advaita Vedanta in terms of the neo-Thomism of the day and therefore his originality in these matters was only limited for an Indian Christian theology.¹ According to Lipner the theological conclusions of Upadhyaya "are largely neo-Thomism in Sanskrit disguise".² Upadhyaya's interpretation was a straightforward fulfilment theology.³ In his scheme of theology, says Lipner,

Catholic Theology *completes* Advaitic theology.... Revealed truth in their existing Western-Catholic formulation simply needed to be superadded to a receptive corpus pre-interpreted as crypto-Thomistic. This leaves very little room indeed for an original formulation of the Catholic faith in terms of indigenous tradition.⁴

The non-Roman Catholic scholars are in the same boat in such negative projections of the theological contributions of Upadhyaya. Robin Boyd notes:

Brahmabandhav is not a Hindu drawing an interesting parallel between Saccidananda and the Trinity. Rather, having come himself to know God in Christ, his own personal experience of God is triune, and he finds the Vedantic teaching fulfilled here in a more meaningful way even than in Sankara. And so, for the benefit of his countrymen, he is led to explain the mystery of the Godhead, the real meaning of Brahman, in terms of the Trinitarian Saccidananda.⁵

Even Kaj Baago is of the opinion that Upadhyaya presents the doctrine of the Trinity as "the solution to the problem of how Brahman is to be known"⁶ If that is the state of affairs, we in this paper are

making an attempt to bring out the positive theological contributions of Brahmabandav Upadhyaya.

What we have discovered is this: In Upadhyaya's view, the Vedanta conception of God and that of Christian belief are exactly the same, and Maya of Advaita Vedanta is the best available concept to explain the doctrine of creation. Though he is honestly actualizing his primary assumption that the function of Vedanta is to supply a new garb to an already formulated Christian theology, Upadhyaya does not reinterpret either of the Vedantic concepts Saccidananda and Maya to serve as the explanation of a ready made Christian theology. Rather he shows that Saccidananda is the Trinity and Maya expresses the meaning of the doctrine of creation in a far better way than the Latin root *creare*. This indeed is a valuable contribution. From such a conclusion the way ahead for us is clear. It is possible for us to bring out new insights on the mysteries of Trinity and Creation from the Vedanta doctrines of Saccidananda and Maya. This position is entirely different from putting already formulated doctrines of Trinity and Creation in Vedantic terms. Here Vedanta receives authority to formulate an understanding of Trinity in terms of Saccidananda, of Christ in terms of Chit and of Creation in terms of Maya. Of course Brahmabandhav Upadhyaya has not explicitly proclaimed so. But he has indicated to us the way forward. In as much as he was the first to indicate such a way, as early as 1898, he is truly the Father of Indian theology.

Here in Upadhyaya's thought, we are invited to a theological position that goes beyond Inculturation. Inculturation goes against the Indian vision of integral relation between religion and culture. It separates religion and culture and then tries to take in some cultural aspects, after Christianizing these. Both Aloysius Pieris and Raimundo Panikkar have pointed out that separation of religion from culture does not make sense in Asian society. In Christian triumphalism if inculturation means the insertion of 'the Christian religion minus European culture' into an 'Asian culture minus non-Christian religion', that is an impossibility. Cultural incursions have religious consequences. For example if Christians use Om or Gayatri, they are participating in the Hindu religious experience related to these in a profound way. In Asia what is needed is not just inculturation but enreligionization.⁷ It is to such a

vision that the theological contributions of Brahmababdhav Upadhyaya⁸ inspire us. We are encouraged to participate in the Vedantic religious experience related to the theological concepts Sat-Chit-Ananda and Maya. What happens here is, Vedanta fulfills Christian faith and not the other way round as Lipner and Boyd thought.

Trinity as Sat-Chit-Ananda

Sat-Chit-Ananda in Sankara's Writings

It is the Upanishads and Sankara's writings, which Upadhyaya takes as the basis for his explanation of what Sat-Chit-Ananda is. First let us see what, according to Upadhyaya, is the position of this concept in Sankara's Advaita. In Sankara's Advaita, Sat-Chit-Ananda points to the Supreme Being Brahman. Brahman is Sat (Positive Being), Chit (Intelligence), Ananda (Bliss).

Referring to Sankara's Brahma Sutra Bhasya 2.3.18 and 1.1.12 Brahmabandhav Upadhyaya points out that Sankara held the conception of Brahman as Sat-Chit-Anandam. To quote:

In refutation of the Vaiseshik doctrine that God is potential knowledge, Sankara says: *Parasya hi Brahmanah chaitanya-svarupatyam amnatam* (that Parabrahman is essential knowledge-chaitanyam-is spoken of in the Upanishads). He quotes many texts from them against the theory that the Supreme Being attains consciousness (vide Bhashya-Vedanta Darsanam, 2.3.18). In his explanation of the Vedanta Sutra "*anandamayah abhyasat*"(1.1.12) Sankara says: *para eva atma anandamaya bhavitum arhati* (Parabrahman is anandam).⁹

In Sankara's Advaita the Supreme Being is called Sat-Chit-Ananda as well as Nirguna. Both these terms point to Brahman in Himself/Herself, Brahman as unrelated, and there is no contradiction in meaning between them. Upadhyaya warns that a student of Advaita should be very careful not to misunderstand the term Nirguna. One should not at once conclude from the use of this term that the God of the Vedanta is an impersonal, abstract, unconscious Being. According to Upadhyaya, "Nirgunam means that the attributes which relate the Infinite to the finite are not necessary to His being. For example, Creatorhood is not an intrinsic attribute of the Divine Nature".¹⁰ Brahman is said to be Nirgunam in the sense that He/She

possesses no external attributes, no necessary correlation with any being other than His/Her Infinite Self.¹¹ The conception of Brahman as Nirguna is not contradictory to the conception of Him/Her as Sat-Chit-Ananda because the meaning of Sat-Chit-Ananda is as follows: “He is *Sat*- existing by Himself; He is *Chit*- self-knowledge, knowing Himself without any external intervention; He is Anandam- supremely happy in His self-coloquy.”¹² Moreover, it should be noted here that for Upadhyaya, personality means “self-knowledge”.¹³ So it is wrong to say that the Vedanta has an impersonal conception of God.¹⁴

Sat-Chit-Ananda in the Upanishads

Referring to various Upanishadic verses, Upadhyaya points out that in the doctrine of the nature of God the Vedanta conception and Catholic belief are exactly the same.¹⁵ Vedanta conceives the nature of God as *Sat* (positive being), *Chit* (intelligence) and *Anandam* (bliss). There are references in the Upanishads to the only one Eternal Being who is the cause of all other beings. Upadhyaya cites the Upanishadic verse: *atma va idameka evagra asit: nanyat kinchana mishat* (in the beginning there was only one being: nothing else existed).¹⁶ He points out that Parabrahman is *Sat* (being) for nothing cannot be a cause.¹⁷ Further he points out the verse *Om tat sat* (that is being)¹⁸ as the mystic *mantra* of the Vedanta. For explaining *Chit* Upadhyaya quotes the verse *sa ikshata lokan nu srija iti* (he beheld; shall I create the *lokas*?) and narrates Sankara’s comment on it: “The great Sankara says that He beheld the universe not as yet actualized; He beheld the origin, the preservation and the destruction of the universe. He beheld all these before He had created it.”¹⁹ What Upadhyaya infers from this is that the Upanishadic rishis had a very clear conception of the universe existing ideally in the intelligence of God from eternity.²⁰ The further explanation which he gives of *Chit* on the basis of the Upanishads, is as follows:

Parabrahman, the supreme Being, is essentially *Chit*. For him to be is to know. It is written in the Upanishads that He grows by brooding (*tapas*) and His brooding is knowledge. He reproduces His self as Sabdabrahman (*Logos*) by *Ikshanam* (beholding). The knowing God is mirrored as the known God in the ocean of *Chit*.²¹

To point out the Vedantic position of Brahman as Ananda Upadhyaya describes the narrative in the Taittiriya Upanishad in which through the directions from his father Varuna, Brigu came to the knowledge that Brahman is Bliss²², and then writes:

Brahman is Bliss. He is blessed, ineffably blessed by His very nature. He knows Himself and from that self-knowledge proceeds His eternal beatitude.... He is in Himself, by himself.... He affects all things but is not affected in return. He is self-satisfied. He is ananda.²³

Upadhyaya's own explanation of Sat-Chit-Ananda

Brahmabandhav Upadhyaya's own explanation of Sat-Chit-Ananda can be summarized as follows: We have to admit a self-existent eternal being, otherwise we would be compelled to admit the absurdity of existence proceeding from non-existence.²⁴ Further, intelligence alone can relate to that which does not exist, for it can *think the non-existent*. If something has begun that which began was *known* by that which existed. Apart from intelligence, beginning is absurd.²⁵ Moreover, if the Eternal Being finds no repose in the infinite Image of His own being, mirrored in the ocean of his knowledge, then it is wanting in perfection. But to say that the Infinite Being is wanting in perfection is a contradiction.²⁶ Thus is proved Sat-Chit-Ananda.²⁷ What does it mean to say that Brahman is Sat-Chit-Ananda? It means that Brahman knows Himself/Herself and from that self-knowledge proceeds His/Her eternal beatitude. Brahman is in Himself/Herself, by Himself/herself. He/She is related of necessity only to the Infinite Image of His/Her own Being, mirrored in the ocean of His/Her knowledge. This relation of Being (Sat) to Itself in self-knowledge (Chit) is one of perfect harmony, self-satisfaction, beatitude, bliss (Ananda). So Sat-Chit-Ananda shows us how Brahman is ineffably blessed in Himself/Herself; blessed in His/Her very nature.²⁸

The Christian doctrine of God as Trinity is exactly the same as the Vedantic conception of Brahman as Sat-Chit-Ananda Upadhyaya explains the Christian doctrine of God as Trinity, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit in the following way: God comprehends Himself by one act of eternal knowledge. The knowing self is the Father, the known self or the self-begotten by His

knowledge is the Son; and the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of reciprocal love proceeding from the Father and the Son.²⁹

Upadhyaya compares Sat-Chit-Ananda, the nature of Parabrahman, with the Christian doctrine of the nature of God and proclaims:

We can boldly and safely affirm that this Vedantic conception of the nature of the supreme Being marks the terminus of the flight of human reason into the eternal regions. The Catholic belief is exactly the same. God is the only eternal being; He is purely positive for the particle 'not' cannot be predicated of Him. He knows Himself and reposes in Himself with supremest complacency.³⁰

Upadhyaya wrote a Sanskrit hymn *Vande Saccidanandam* in adoration of Parabrahman who in Catholic faith is referred to as Father, Son and Holy Spirit.³¹ As an explanation of the hymn, he writes that it is an adoration of that ancient *Parabrahma*, the Supreme Being whose eternal act finds, according to Catholic faith, an adequate resultant within his own Self, who is not obliged to come in contact with finite beings for the sustenance and satisfaction of His nature. His knowledge is fully satisfied by the cognition of the Logos, the infinite image of his Being, begotten by thought and mirrored in the ocean of His substance.. His love finds the fullest satisfaction in the boundless complacency with which he reposes on his Image and breathes forth the Spirit of bliss³²

It is revealed in Jesus Christ that the differentiating note in Divine knowledge is the response of intelligence. God begets, in thought, His/Her infinite Self-Image and reposes on it with infinite delight while the begotten Self acknowledges responsively His/Her eternal thought-generation.³³ Jesus Christ acknowledges responsively His eternal thought-generation from the Father. Between Him and the Father, there is no division in the divine substance; it is a relation of perfect reciprocity. This relation is the relation between Sat and Chit and Ananda is the result of that relation.³⁴ Trinity as Saccidananda means that there is a response of knowledge in the God-head. God knows His/Her own self-begotten in thought and is known in return by that Begotten Self. God reproduces in knowledge a corresponding, acknowledging Self-Image, and from this colloquy

proceeds His Spirit of Love which sweetens the Divine Bosom with boundless delight.³⁵

Conclusion

When we analyse Upadhyaya's interpretation of Sat-Chit-Ananda, it should be pointed out that nowhere in the early Upanishads or Sankara's writings do we come across that term as such. The term Saccidananda perhaps first appears in the Tejobindu Upanishad of the 9th or 10th c. CE. But at the same time, as Upadhyaya rightly shows, there are many instances in the early Upanishads as well as in Sankara's writings where Sat, Chit, and Ananda are discussed separately. Upadhyaya was one who believed that Sankara should be understood with guidance from post-Sankarite Advaita traditions. Hence there is nothing unusual in his search for support in Sankara's writings for a post-Sankarite concept. On the whole Upadhyaya's interpretation of Sat-Chit-Ananda can be accepted as true to the spirit of Advaita Vedanta and nowhere does he reinterpret the concept in terms of neo-Thomism. True, progress and creativity we can notice as emerging regarding the concept. First the three words of the concept were separately used. Then the three words were combined to explain the one Reality. Now we are able to experience that one Reality as Trinity and in that process witness to a convergence of the Hindu and Christian experiences.

While we study Upadhyaya's interpretation of Trinity as Sat-Chit-Ananda, mention has to be made of other persons who did similar work, namely Keshub Chunder Sen (1838-1884), J. Monchanin (1895-1957), Swami Abhishiktananda (1910-1973), Bede Griffiths and Vandana Mataji. Keshub Chunder Sen is important because sixteen years before Upadhyaya, in 1882, he was the first one to interpret the Trinity as Saccidananda. For Sen Trinity was only a symbol and the three members of the symbol, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were just pointing to the reality of God in different ways; the three members do not represent three persons sharing the same essence but they are just three functions of the same person. Moreover, Sen gives only a very brief account of Trinity as Sat-Chit-Ananda.³⁶ Monchanin did not make any important contribution. His Saccidananda is a mere exposition of the traditional Christian doctrine of Trinity. What he believed was that the Hindu Sat-Chit-Ananda finds its fulfilment in the already formulated Christian

doctrine of Trinity.³⁷ If Upadhyaya's Saccidananda represented God in Himself as unrelated alone, for Abhishiktananda the concept signified the inseparable aspects of the mystery of God in Himself/Herself as well as the mystery of the divine presence in the innermost sanctuary of a person's being. Abhishiktananda at least outwardly believed that the Hindu experience of Saccidananda should be remolded to attain the Christian experience of Saccidananda and once that is actualized, the renewed experience of Saccidananda would be the Trinitarian culmination of advaitic experience.³⁸ Bede Griffiths³⁹ and Vandana⁴⁰ continued the Christian reinterpretation of Saccidananda in the line of Abhishiktananda. The uniqueness of Upadhyaya's interpretation of Trinity as Saccidananda lies in showing the fact that they both are exactly the same.

Notes

- 1 Julius Lipner and George Gispert-Sauch, *The Writings of Brahmabandhab Upadhyay, Vol.I*, Bangalore: UTC, 1991, introduction, p.xxxviii.
- 2 Julius J. Lipner, *Brahmabandhab Upadhyay. The Life and Thought of a Revolutionary*, Delhi: OUP, 1999, p. 387.
- 3 *Ibid.*, p.201.
- 4 *Ibid.*, p. 196.
- 5 R. H. S. Boyd, *An Introduction to Indian Christian Theology*, Madras: CLS, 1975, p.73. Cf. Pp. 71, 74.
- 6 Kaj Baago, *Pioneers of Indigenous Christianity*, Bangalore/Madras: CISRS/CLS, 1969, p. 40.
- 7 Aloysius Pieris, *An Asian Theology of Liberation*, Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1988, pp. 42, 52-53,83-85; R.Panikkar, "Indian Christian Theology of Religious Pluralism from the perspective of Interculturation" in *Religious Pluralism. An Indian Christian Perspective*, ed. By Kuncheria Pathil, Delhi: ISPCK, 1991, pp269-70.
- 8 Brahmabandhav Upadhyaya (1861-1907), whose original name was Bhavani Charan Banerji, was a disciple of Keshub Chunder Sen for some time. He was a friend of Vivekananda and Rabindranath Tagore. It was with him that Rabindranatha Tagore founded Shantiniketan. Upadhyaya came to know Jesus Christ through Keshub Chunder Sen and through his own uncle the Rev. Kalicharan Banerji. In 1891 he received baptism from an Anglican priest but, in the same year, he became a Roman Catholic. In 1894 he became a Sannyasin and adopted

the new name. His literary activities include the editing of *Sophia* (Jan. 1894-March 1899), a monthly Catholic Journal; *Sophia* (June 16, 1900-Dec. 8, 1900), a weekly paper; and *The Twentieth Century* (Jan. 1901-Dec. 1901), a monthly magazine. Due to a total discouragement from church authorities he almost stopped his theological writings in 1901. Upadhyaya then became fully engaged in the nationalist movement in Bengal. In November 1904 he brought out a Bengali daily called *Sandhya* (1904-1907) and in March 1907 a Bengali weekly called *Swaraj*. In September 1907 he was imprisoned by the British and in October 1907 he died after a hernia operation.

- 9 B. Upadhyaya, "Hinduism and Christianity as compared by Mrs. Besant", *Sophia*, Vol. IV, No. 2, Feb. 1897, pp. 6-7.
- 10 B. Upadhyaya, "Notes", *Sophia*, Vol. 1, No.4, July 7, 1900, p.6.
- 11 B. Upadhyaya, "Notes", *Sophia*, Vol. 1, No.2, June 23, 1900, p.7.
- 12 *Ibid.*
- 13 B. Upadhyaya, "Christ's claim to attention", *The Twentieth Century*, Vol.1, No. 5, May 1901, p.116.
- 14 Summary of the lecture by Upadhyaya, "Hinduism, Theosophy, and Christianity", *Sophia*, Vol.IV, No.12, December, 1897, pp.1-2. Brahmabandhav Upadhyaya may be perhaps the first Christian who proclaimed that the conception of God in Advaita Vedanta is not impersonal. This is a truth which is often forgotten by Christians and even by Hindus. Further, it is worth noting that according to Upadhyaya the philosophical meaning of the term 'person' in Catholic theology is "a rational *individuum*, a being endowed with reason and free will." Cf. B. Upadhyaya, "Hinduism and Christianity as compared by Mrs. Besant", *Sophia*, Vol. IV, No. 2, Feb. 1897, p.9. Hence the similarity between the Christian and Vedanta conceptions of God.
- 15 B. Upadhyaya, "An exposition of Catholic Belief as compared with the Vedanta", *Sophia*, Vol. V, No. 1, Jan. 1898, p.11.
- 16 *Ibid.*, p.13. The reference is to *Aitareya Up.* 1.1.1a.
- 17 *Ibid.*
- 18 *Ibid.* The reference is to *Bhagavad Gita* 17.23
- 19 *Ibid.*, p. 14. The reference is to *Aitareya Up.* 1.1.1b and the *Sankara Bhasya* on it.
- 20 *Ibid.*
- 21 B. Upadhyaya, "Chit", *Sophia*, Vol. VI, No.3, March 1899, p.238.

- 22 B. Upadhyaya, "A Vedantic Parable", *Sophia*, Vol. V, No. 8, Aug. 1898, p.119. The reference is to the third *Valli* of *Taittiriya Upanishad*.
- 23 *Ibid*.
- 24 B. Upadhyaya, "Sat", *Sophia*, Vol. V, No. 10, Oct. 1898, pp.150-51.
- 25 B. Upadhyaya, "An exposition of Catholic Belief as compared with the Vedanta", *Sophia*, Vol. V, No. 1, Jan. 1898, pp.13-14.
- 26 B. Upadhyaya, "Being", *Sophia*, Vol. 1, No.7, July 28, 1900, p.7.
- 27 In a series of articles entitled "Being" in *Sophia*, Vol. 1, No. 2, June 23, 1900, p.8; No. 3, June 30, p.7; No. 4, July 7, p.7; and in No.6, July 21, p.7 Upadhyaya shows that self-existence is a necessary content of being and that being is eternal, immutable, infinite and one. In the last of the same series No. 7, July 28, 1900, p.7, he also proves that the necessary contents of being are *Sat* (Self-existence), *Chit* (intelligence) and *Anandam* (bliss).
- 28 B. Upadhyaya, "A Vedantic Parable", *Sophia*, Vol. V, No. 8, Aug. 1898, p. 119; "Being", *Sophia*, Vol. 1, No. 7, July 28, 1900, p.7.
- 29 B. Upadhyaya, "Hinduism and Christianity as compared by Mrs. Besant", *Sophia*, Vol. IV, No. 2, Feb. 1897, p.8; "Question and Answers", *Sophia*, Vol. 1, No. 11, Aug. 25, 1900, p.7.
- 30 B. Upadhyaya, "An exposition of Catholic Belief as compared with the Vedanta", *Sophia*, Vol. V, No. 1, Jan. 1898, p.11.
- 31 B. Upadhyaya, "Our new Canticle", *Sophia*, Vol. V, No. 10, Oct. 1898, pp. 146-47. The hymn is mainly an exposition of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity and does not have much theological significance. More important than the hymn is the explanation Upadhyaya gives of it. Still, it is significant to note that all the words used to explain Trinity are put as adjectives to *Saccidananda* and adoration is to *Saccidananda*. Moreover in the hymn, *bhavavrakshabijamabijam* (the rootless principle of the tree of existence) denotes *Sat*; *chinmayarupa* (one whose form is intelligence) denotes *Chit*; *Saccidomelanasaranam* (one who proceeds from the union of *Sat* and *Chit*) and *anandaghanam* (intense bliss) denote Ananda. But if we isolate this hymn from the rest of Upadhyaya's writings on the Trinity as *Saccidananda* and interpret it, such an interpretation could be misleading as has been proved in the case of G Gispert-Sauch, "The Sanskrit hymns of Brahmabandhab Upadhyaya", *Religion and Society*, Vol. XIX, No. 4, Dec. 1972, pp.60-79. Upadhyaya, in his theology, does not give 'new meaning' (p.68) to the Vedanta concept *Saccidananda*, nor are the terms heavy with mythological or historical association (pp. 68-74) relevant to his theology of the Trinity as *Saccidananda*, as Gispert-Sauch thinks. Jo-

seph Mattam, "Interpreting Christ to India Today: The Calcutta School", *The Indian Journal of Theology*, Vol. XXIII, Nos3-4, July-Dec. 1974, pp.192-98, is also misleading, as reference is given to this hymn alone (p.195) to explain Upadhyaya's doctrine of the Trinity as Saccidananda.

- 32 B. Upadhyaya, "Our new Canticle", *Sophia*, Vol. V, No. 10, Oct. 1898, p.146.
- 33 B. Upadhyaya, "The Incarnate Logos", *The Twentieth Century*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan.1901, p.6
- 34 *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7. Cf. Summary of the lecture by Upadhyaya, "Hinduism, Theosophy and Christianity", *Sophia*, Vol. IV, No. 12, Dec. 1897, pp.4-5.
- 35 B. Upadhyaya, "Christ's Claim to attention", *The Twentieth Century*, Vol. I, No. 5, May 1901, p.116. Cf. B. Upadhyaya, "The Incarnate Logos", *The Twentieth Century*, Vol. I, No. 1, Jan. 1901, p. 7.
- 36 Keshub Chunder Sen, "That Marvelous Mystery-The Trinity", *Lecture in India*, Vol. 11, London: Cassell and Co., 1904, pp.1-48.
- 37 Cf. *Swami Parama Arubi Ananda- A Memorial*, Tiruchirapalli, 1959.
- 38 Cf. Swami Abhishiktananda, *Saccidananda. A Christian Approach to Advaitic Experience*, Delhi: ISPCCK, 1974; *Hindu-Christian Meeting Point. Within the Cave of the Heart*, Bombay/Bangalore: IIC/ CISRS, 1969.
- 39 Cf. Bede Griffiths, *Return to the Centre*, London: Fount Paperbacks, 1978; *The Marriage of East and West*, London: Fount paperback, 1983.
- 40 Cf. Vandana, *Waters of Fire*, Madras: CLS, 1981; *Jesus he Christ. Who is he? What was his message?*, Anand: Gujarat Sahitya Prakash, 1987.

No of Words: 4,091
Date Received: December 12, 2007
Date Approved: December 28, 2007