

THE RELIGION OF STUDY

Klaus Klostermaier

To those, who are working on cross-cultural religious understanding, it is becoming increasingly clear that we are dealing with three variables and not with the establishment of a relationship between terms whose definitions have been determined once for ever. The more we proceed to think over the task, the more we actually try doing it, the more we do realize that we have to modify our initial concepts of culture, of religion and of understanding. That means, we will never be able to contribute really towards 'cross-cultural religious understanding' by frontally attacking it; we will have to discover an underlying structure and to find insights not immediately suggested by a plain reading of the theme itself.

THE THESIS

Taking into account a fair amount of actual dialogue experience involving representatives of various cultures and religions the thesis is herewith set forth that *Cross-Cultural Religious Understanding is based upon the Religion of Study.*

That amounts to saying that neither the so-called 'phenomenology of religion', by which the lowest common denominator of all religions may be established, (and by which our academic study of religion supposedly proceeds) nor mysticism, which may provide the highest common denominator (but is, at any event, a rare enough phenomenon), can be considered as a valid basis for cross-cultural religious understanding on any broad level. The Religion of Study is the true basis of cross-cultural religious understanding, first, because it is in fact already an integral part of the major religious traditions, and, second, because it is in itself a genuine and complete religion. It is relatively easy to deliver evidence for the first of these two premises; it will be the main burden of this essay to offer arguments convincing enough to accept the second part as well.

It should become clear through the treatment given to the theme that no attempt is being made here to resuscitate enlightenment conceptions of religion. On the contrary, the urgency of the topic and its claim to articulate a new insight derives from our own time and our own situation.

A note may be appropriate concerning the use of the term 'religion'. Karl Barth's concern to apply the term only to man's sinful attempt to appropriate the Divine and to keep it out from the Christian vocabulary is well known and need not bother us overmuch in the context of a topic which anyhow would only draw down the wrath of the great man on those who dared. More serious is the objection of Wilfred Cantwell Smith, who,

contrary to Karl Barth, is very much in favour of interreligious dialogue and cross-cultural understanding.¹ He has convincingly demonstrated that 'religion' does not figure in the books of the Bible as one of the terms that would adequately describe its self-understanding. The key-term, and the key-issue, so it becomes clear, is 'faith'; and the emergence of the term 'religion' goes hand in hand with the decline in faith, as W.C. Smith points out.

However, in our age, and especially in our profession, the word 'religion' looms large—and it means something. Perhaps it does not mean as much as 'faith' did to our forefathers, but it is more meaningful to us, and certainly more comprehensive. It may indicate a much more cerebral and abstract attitude towards reality than faith with its strongly personal and emotional overtones does—but then again, to that extent, it reflects the temper of our age which is different from that of former ages. We live in a far more formalized and de-personalized world; no wonder that our 'religion' is no longer the spontaneous and impulsive 'faith' of former ages.

The signs which were sufficient at the time of a Jesus to evoke faith in God may not be effective enough today to found genuine religiosity: how many would recognize the hand of God today if someone changed water into wine before their eyes or if someone were to walk across a sheet of water?

On the other hand, the genuine religious awe by which a physicist is overcome who, on a very sophisticated level, catches a glimpse of a 'central order of things'² or the not infrequent experience of liberating insight through Eastern methods of meditation have hardly any parallel in the books of the Bible. And yet: they are real enough for those who live today!

More than once it happened—and it happened to participants in inter-religious dialogues coming from different cultures and religions—that 'dialogue' itself produced an awareness of 'Reality' (to just use a word) which surpassed that achieved within the individual religious traditions itself. It was a highly significant moment when at one of those dialogue-meetings, in the presence of Hindus, Buddhists and Christians, a Muslim participant began talking of the 'incompleteness' of his tradition and everybody present thought that he had articulated what all perceived with regard to their own traditions.³

The Christian's *faith* does not require him to 'dialogue'; he may consider it a requirement of his faith to be kind towards all men, to announce the Good News, to bring all mankind into the Church. And yet: those Christians, who do engage in dialogue, do it with a sense of religious urgency, not out of curiosity or in contradiction to the plain words of their Gospel.

The same holds true of the followers of all religions. If 'faith' was what fired them, if 'salvation' was all they wanted, their own traditions would satisfy their needs fully. Nobody who enters inter-religious dialogue

does so in search of a faith which he is lacking or in the quest of a salvation in terms of his tradition which would be obtainable only by way of a detour, via other religions.

Nor is a dialogue meeting comparable to a seminar in comparative religion. The detachment of the one who engages in dialogue is not the detachment of the (ideal) phenomenologist. There is a concern for essential truth that does not go together with the commonplace *epoché*; an existential interest in the subject matter that goes far beyond that of the average researcher in the history of religions.

In short: it is the Religion of Study which underlies all inter-religious dialogue, which undergirds all true cross-cultural religious understanding, which justifies it in terms of religion and gives it the seriousness and sense of responsibility which we connect with academic study.

If a definition is asked for at this stage, the religion of study could be defined as *Concern for the Wholeness of Reality*—a concern for all aspects of our universe of meaning and a concern to relate all these aspects to each other so as to let one aspect illumine the other and be illumed by it in turn and reveal reality beyond its aspects.

THE RELIGION OF STUDY AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF TRADITIONS

It must be clear from the outset that not even a sketch can be given of the Religion of Study already realized in the various traditions; what is attempted here is only a token to redeem the promise to demonstrate the actuality of the Religion of Study so as to be able to proceed with the proof that the Religion of Study is the basis of a cross-cultural religious understanding because it is already present as the common element in all major religions. Countless other examples—possibly even more striking ones—could be collected as evidence. However, the examples provided could act as ‘signs’ to convince those who do have their doubts with regard to the ‘Religion of Study’.

Granted that during its long history emphasis on ‘study’ in one sense or other has varied in the Biblical tradition, but it can be asserted quite generally that the followers of the Torah did and do value study very highly. Without denying in the least the supremacy of the revealed Word and the response to it in faith, it is in and through study that man appropriates and realizes the Word of God and exercises his faith. The Law cannot be followed if not properly understood; it cannot be understood and applied without assiduous study. Quotes could be drawn from many other sources. Possibly Moses Maimonides is as good a witness for main-stream Judaism as any other.

Thus he writes:

Every man in Israel is obliged to study Torah, whether he be poor or rich, in sound health or ailing, in the vigour of youth or very old and of weakened vitality. . . Among the great sages of Israel, some

were hewers of wood, some, drawers of water, while others were blind. Nevertheless they devoted themselves by day and by night to the study of the Torah.

Until what period in life is one obliged to study Torah? Even until the day of one's death. . . Of all precepts none is equal in importance to the study of the Torah. Nay, study of the Torah is equal to them all, for study leads to practice. Hence study always takes precedence of practice.

At the judgement hereafter, a man will first be called to account in regard to his fulfillment of the duty of study, and afterwards concerning his other activities. Hence the sages said: 'A person should always occupy himself with the Torah, whether for its own sake or for other reasons. For study of the Torah, even when pursued from interested motives, will lead to study for its own sake.'⁴

Christianity has inherited from Judaism reverence for the Scriptures as the Word of God. Amongst its first and foremost propagators was Paul, trained in the Religion of Study of Israel. Within a century of its separation from its parent it had its own school at Alexandria and throughout its history its share of representatives of the Religion of Study. Again—testimonies in favour of the Religion of Study are almost countless, in spite of the sometimes overwhelming presence of the religion of politics and war, the religion of ceremony and sentimentality and a one-sided understanding of the religion of work and faith.

One of the greatest representatives of the Religion of Study, Thomas Aquinas, devoted considerable attention to defending it against its detractors from within the Christian tradition and set out its need and its merits: he relies mainly on Jerome, whose own love and zeal for study were well known.⁵

Islam too, in spite of its pragmatic and dynamic character, possesses representatives of the Religion of Study. A century after the revelation of the Holy Quran, a 'Religious Science' in the proper sense of the word was in existence and study was (and is!) considered indispensable.⁶ In the face of a disruptive split between legalistic followers of the letter and an idiosyncratic mysticism Al Ghazali saw in the 'Revival of the Religious Sciences' the saving *via media*. The Religion of Study alone is capable to mediate true understanding of revelation. It surely is no mere accident that the 'religions of the Book' developed and maintained schools and emphasized scholarship. Study was not a luxury to be indulged in by the few who could afford *otium* but was one of the basic duties and an integral part of religion itself.

The Religion of Study is eminently represented in the Indian traditions as well.

The strongly sacrificial and devotional Vedic tradition produced early in its development a Religion of Study which has survived for several millennia in an unbroken tradition.

In the brahmanical tradition study was mandatory for the brahmin,

enjoined by the creator himself 'in order to protect the universe'. For a relatively long period of his life each brahmin was expected to devote himself exclusively to this Religion of Study. *Svadhya*, study by himself, remained a lifelong obligation which had to be fulfilled daily. According to the Taittirīya Upaniṣad study is the supreme *tapas*—the highest form of religiosity.⁷

It was largely in reaction to the overemphasis on ritual and law that Jainism and Buddhism arose. They took up and further developed the inherited Religion of Study.⁸ The great centers of learning at Taxilā and Nālandā, developed by Indian Buddhists, are witness to the Buddhist variety of the Religion of Study—as are the countless volumes of scholarly writing that have survived the vicissitudes of many centuries of foreign domination.

Whatever their differences may have been—differences serious enough to lead to the development of countless *samprādayas* and schools of thought—the fact remains that all Indian religions considered *avidyā* to be the most radical evil and *vidyā* to be the supreme good. Hindu temples and *āśramas*, Buddhist and Jain *vihāras* and *caityas*, in large centers as well as in humble villages, established and maintained centers of learning, cultivating the Religion of Study.

A fleeting reference to China may suffice in this context. Especially under Confucian influence the Religion of Study flourished in China for many centuries almost to the exclusion of other forms of religion. Westerners, familiar with their own devotional theistic types of religion, quite often failed to recognize it as religion, labelling it 'humanism'.

THE RELIGION OF STUDY AS GENUINE RELIGION

The sketchy outline of the actual presence of the religion of study in the major traditions may suffice as backdrop for the development of the thesis, that it is this very Religion of Study that makes interreligious dialogue possible and meaningful.

What is study? What does it mean 'to study'?

We are supposed to know it; after all it is the activity we have been engaged in for as long as we can think back. However, it may be as with the nature of time, of which Augustine confessed that he knew it, if not asked, and did not know it, if asked. It is slightly ironic—and perhaps significant—that the new thirty-volume Encyclopedia Britannica does not list the word study at all, but has an entry under 'Student-aid' and some other more practical matters concerning universities.⁹

The Concise Oxford Dictionary is more helpful.¹⁰ Amongst other things, the noun 'study' means: application of the mind to the acquisition of knowledge, as by reading, investigation, or reflection; a detailed examination and analysis; zealous endeavour and assiduous effort; deep thought, reverie or a state of abstraction.

The etymology of the verb 'to study' doubtlessly leads us to the

Latin 'studere'. The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* has not yet progressed far enough to offer us the history of the use of the word. Could one venture to suggest a connection with the Sanskrit root *stu-*(to praise) and see an immediate 'religious' connotation of the word? It seems to emerge also from other affiliations. *Legere* is as closely a synonym for study as one can think of; perhaps it appears in *re-ligio* as 'intensive study, re-reading'. Could 'study' be the etymological root of 'religion'? There is more than a trace of irony in this.

Quite often the university departments of 'religious studies' are accused—rightly and wrongly—of being critical in their approach to religion to the point of becoming destructive. The majority of the teachers of religion in these departments are coming from Christian Churches for whom the equation religion=Christianity (often of one denomination!) still holds largely true. They may be in different stages of disaffection to this 'religion' but even when they 'secularize' they do it as 'Christian atheists'. Or: they try to salvage major fragments of their Church dogmatics, of Biblicism and of the socio-cultural context in which they grew up. The uneasiness is widespread and few people inside the university (fewer still: outside!) would expect from academic study of religion a genuine religious awakening.

However, the generation of the students taking courses in religion is different. Contrary to the generation of their teachers they are usually not rooted in the Christian tradition to the extent that they would identify with it (or react as violently against it!) as their teachers do or did. Their study of religion is not normally geared towards preparing them for a Christian ministry in a Church-context.

Again, they are not primarily interested in one of the many academic ways by which one can study the 'polymethodic discipline of religious studies' but in religion as such. To be more precise: they are interested in a religion that makes sense intellectually and that can give meaning to life today. For most of them it is not a matter of scholarly detachment over against a tradition in which they live (as it had been the case for the founders of our modern 'science of religion') but a real spiritual search through study. That has nothing to do with 'enlightenment' attitudes; it is far more basic, far less anti-clerical, far more urgent and far less arrogant.

Whatever understanding of reality as a whole enters into the world-picture of the present generation is coloured much more by the natural sciences than by biblical or humanistic imagery. If there should be a conflict on a point of cosmology, for instance, between the views expressed in the Bible and those held by modern natural scientists, for the present generation there is not even a question of who is right. The primary categories are those of the natural sciences today.¹¹

Without necessarily agreeing with all of the judgements in the following quote from Fred Hoyle's most recent book, it quite clearly articulates something of the religiosity of the new age and it comes pretty close to

a description of the 'Religion of Study' advocated in this essay.

Thus he writes:

Worship covers the whole gamut from the absurd to the serious, from the admirable to the not so admirable. It is not so admirable to sacrifice an animal to a god in order to secure an advantage for oneself. When the women adorn the church with flowers, this is admirable. When the first families sat down to the first Thanksgiving dinner, that too was admirable. When a scientist spends a good fraction of his life trying to discover the mathematical form of some new physical law, knowing all the while that the chance of personal success is not high, that is worship. When a government spends money on an accelerator or a telescope, that is worship. *There will never be any long-term purpose for our species other than understanding of the universe.* If this purpose does not prove sufficient for us, if we are impelled to invent all manner of nonsensical substitutes, then very likely we shall not survive as the dominant animal on the Earth for much longer. ¹²

There were several reasons for inserting this long quote at that place. First, its use of the term 'worship' seems to be indicative of a contemporary re-evaluation of religion. Then, also, the liberal use of 'admirable' or 'not-so-admirable' in connection with 'worship' results in evaluation of forms of religion: something our 'objective' science of religion would not dare to do. And third: it shows the seriousness of purpose of the 'religion of study' from the perspective of a scientist.

Modern scientific culture is one of the cultures that has to be explored in a cross-cultural religious understanding. It is a fallacy to assume that because it first developed in the West and because the Biblical religions are (still) the predominant traditional religions of the West, the two would form parts of the same culture.

The temper of the scientific culture of the present world is more readily accessible to some ancient Asian religions than to the prevalent Western interpretations of Biblical religion. What really builds a bridge between contemporary natural sciences and traditional religions is neither the acceptance of the current scientific idiom nor the attempt to read Quantum logics into ancient scriptures,¹³ but the attitude of openness and search, the seriousness of the quest, the Religion of Study.

ATTRIBUTES OF THE RELIGION OF STUDY

Towards the end of his life Heidegger's thoughts circled more and more about the idea that thinking itself is the 'piety that is waiting for the coming god'. Although he would not admit that science was 'thinking'—which it certainly does!—and although he shared the widespread, if wrong, Western prejudice that only Europe possessed the philosophy (from which alone, then, salvation must come!)—this may be a worthwhile starting point for a reflection on the attributes of the religion of study.

Classical 'study' was largely identical to 'reading': the Latin *legere* still contains the root *logos*: imminent in the word revealed itself. Study implied reverence for the transmitted word. Throughout the ages all over the world religions have taken great care to preserve the words of their inspired founders—be it orally or in writing. To be obedient to the *logos*, to be prepared to follow wherever he leads, to accept the consequences of one's 'study'—these were the essentially religious associations of study. Plato's Socrates is the great saint of this religion.¹⁴

Another tradition of the 'religion of study' is typified by the *Vedānta*. It does not identify the rational structure of the speech-world with ultimate reality and tries to get behind verbalization. It operates in a de-anthropomorphised frame of reference and thus comes much closer to the present scientific view of reality. It has much less to do with personal faith in 'an other reality' than with the opening up of the mind for states of consciousness other than the I-thou centered.

Nevertheless, the Religion of Study has a quite distinct horizon. It is not presuppositionless, and thus rootless, but defined by history and by language, by the conditions of our understanding in general.

True to the definition given above as 'concern for the wholeness of reality' it is not content with narrow specialists' usable (disposable) knowledge but is always urging on to find the way from the particular to the universal. It is disdainful also of 'religious' knowledge, if that means restriction to the particular beliefs which, in a smaller world, could pass off as universal. The parallels between the Religion of Study and other traditional forms of religion should not be pressed too hard. Of course there exists a certain similarity between traditional religious rituals of initiation and some forms of academic graduation; there is a certain measure of likeness in the sense of togetherness of a traditional religious congregation and the 'community of scholars'—but to do more than point out superficial resemblances may do more harm than good to the Religion of Study. It need not prove its worth and value by demonstrating its ability to fit into traditional patterns of religiosity. Nor by its (accidental) connection with present structures of higher learning.

In the history of mankind many religions have come and gone; of the surviving religions many have undergone drastic changes. The point is *not* to keep a certain tradition alive by all means but to have a religion which enables us to reach that state of essential freedom which all of them in their own times have professed to lead to.

There is, then, no need to establish a Scripture of the Religion of Study—all the scriptures of the past and all true search of the present and the future belong to it. Similarly, there is no need to have a parallel to the Church of the medieval or early modern Christian past; the Church in that form is accidental to true religion and not constitutive. Or to look for Sacraments and other paraphernalia of religio-cultural traditions; all these things had their time. They did not exist before a certain time; they will not exist after a certain time.

What is necessary, however, is real study and the real spirit of study: the discipline that goes with it, the openness of mind which, when convinced of truth, does not shy away from its consequences, the endeavour to go on and never be conceited into the wrong belief of 'knowing enough', the readiness to acknowledge the 'central order of things' when and where it reveals itself in some way or other.

That this Religion of Study does not pretend at any stage to be capable of knowing 'the way of all the earth' goes without saying—nor does it need emphasizing that it requires a constant preparedness to *metánoia*, a re-thinking of positions in the light of new insights, that never will it result in the feeling of 'coming home' to the place from which it had started.

APPLICATION TO CROSS-CULTURAL RELIGIOUS UNDERSTANDING

The religion of study, defined as concern for the whole, is frequently at odds with the interests of particular groups, religious or other, whose basis of agreement is consensus, faith, tradition or some other sectarian distinctiveness. The religion of study makes people aware of the incompleteness of their own religions: the very idea of 'incompleteness' would be a contradiction in terms for a believer or a theologian. The believer is interested in his own salvation—which, he believes, he is assured of, if only he maintains his 'faith'.

The theologian is interested in asserting and proving the sufficiency, if not superiority, of the tradition which he serves. If he is very generous, he may admit that those 'outside' his own tradition have some share in the fullness of his own: he may call the Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims 'anonymous Christians' (or vice-versa, depending on geography)—never will he be able to admit that his own Christianity (or whatever his tradition may be) could be 'incomplete' in terms of 'religion'.

The concern for the wholeness of Reality which motivates the Religion of Study leads it, if its point of departure (not: the *terminus ad quem!*) are the scriptures of the religions of the world, to a recognition of the very special 'reality' which emerges from the many bundles of 'revelation'. The Religion of Study is not the insensitive rationalism which its detractors want it to be, but it is also not the sentimental short-circuiting of critical reason which some of its friends make it out to be. It is an acknowledgement of the presence of a dimension of reality not encompassed by our ordinary way of dealing with the world around us; an acknowledgement that the 'religious dimension' is different from the sociological, the psychological, the aesthetic and all others—but it is also a refusal to identify it with any of the tentative articulations of this dimension in the past.

A very basic sense of 'discrimination' is of its essence: what the Indians call *viveka*, the discernment between 'the Real' and the 'un-real', an

instinct, so to speak for the Ultimate, which forbids the seeker to identify the Real with any particular being, coupled with an overwhelming certitude of the reality of the object of its search.

The Religion of Study is not only one more theory about religion—it is in itself a way. ‘Theory’ it is, but not ‘theory of’. It renders redundant the hollow verbosity of much of traditional religion—East and West. And it also takes note of the fact that our world-images change. Is it not somewhat strange to think that according to widespread Christian agreement the scientific viewpoints of a fourth-century Christian author have great religious significance—whereas the twentieth-century scientific view-point is not religiously relevant?

The Christian West has loved the metaphor of the ‘pilgrim’ as the image of both the Christian individually and the Church collectively. It has, however, doctrinally behaved, as if the pilgrim was a settler in perpetuity. Where is the pilgrim’s readiness to leave the inn, where he spent a night, and move on? To understand life as a pilgrimage, however, may be the most authentic understanding of it that we are capable of. And thus, in our age, the Religion of Study, which truly represents the religion of man on the way, may be the most authentic form of religion.

This surmise is confirmed by the role which the Religion of Study plays in cross-cultural religious understanding. The horizon common to those representatives of Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism—and, perhaps, Marxism!—who are prepared to enter into a dialogue, is the horizon that has been created by science and scholarship during the last few generations. It is in and through this horizon that we discover a deeper and more basic unity, that we are able to transcend the barriers of language, culture and the narrowness of traditional faiths.

The *raison-d’être* of the academic study of religion is the Religion of Study: to live it, to teach it, to apply it. It is no less demanding than other, traditional forms of religion. Possibly more so. But, if followed faithfully, it is no less liberation. Possibly more so.

In a world in which a considerable section of the population spends a major part of its life ‘studying’ it is a Religion of Study that is needed—a religion whose horizon is as wide and open as that of the study itself. It is through this Religion of Study that genuine religiosity must be represented and not through campus crusades for this or that, as it is through genuine physics that science must be represented on the university and not through science fiction and a bag full of tricks.

For the Religion of Study cross-cultural religious understanding comes naturally—because the Religion of Study has (at least in part) been engendered by a fore-going cross-cultural religious understanding. Since it is a concern for the wholeness of reality that motivates it, it is as much concerned for the reality of the world of the Hindu, the Buddhist, the Christian and all other traditions, as for the reality of the contemporary world—insofar as it *is* reality.

It goes without saying that advocating the Religion of Study does not

mean abrogating intellectual standards and academic rigour: on the contrary! However, it is not a simple museum of ideas and ideologies, but a critique of everything in the light of the sharpened awareness of the Real. It is not partisan, because it is true to itself only to the extent that it is concerned for the whole. It is attainable through ordinary means—it does not depend on special graces and favours tied to particular gestures and places. It is advocated here not because it is 'reasonable' (in our age partisanship and pursuit of egotistical interests pay much better also in the area of religion!) but because it would be a betrayal of the Reality, that opened up in inter-religious dialogues, not to confess it.

University of Manitoba

1. See especially W.C. Smith, *The Meaning and End of Religion: A New Approach to the Religion of Mankind* (New York, 1963), and several addresses and papers collected by W.G. Oxtoby under the title *Religious Diversity: Essays by W.C. Smith* (Harper 1976).
2. The term has been used repeatedly by W. Heisenberg in his *Der Teil und das Ganze* (Engl. translation 'Physics and Beyond', Harper, 1972).
3. See S.J. Smartha (ed.) *Dialogue between Men of Living Faiths and Living Faiths and the Ecumenical Movement* (Geneva, 1971).
4. Mishneh Torah, quoted in J. Glatzer (ed.) *The Judaic Tradition*, Beacon Press, 1972, p. 344 f.
5. In *Summa Theologica* II-II, q. 188, a.5 'Utrum sit instituenda aliqua religio ad studendum' he points out that study supports both 'active' and 'contemplative' religion: it illumines the intellect and 'it removes the dangers of contemplation'. Further it is necessary for the instruction of others and also 'valet ad vitandum carnis lasciviam'.
6. L. Gardet, *Islam*, Köln 1968, "im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert H wird die 'Lesung' des Korans zu einer 'Religions-wissenschaft' im eigentlichen Sinne des Wortes. Nach einer spezifisch muslimischen Methode, die später von der Hadith-wissenschaft ausgebaut wird, werden zur Gewähr der hochgehaltenen Tradition 'Ketten' zurverlässiger Zeugen aufgestellt. . .Später kommt der Einfluss der grammatikschulen herein. . ."
7. It was, on the other hand, one of the duties of the King to see to it that no student and no teacher would die of hunger in his realm!
8. In spite of the great stress on 'right action' Jainism maintains that the basis for *mokṣa* is *samyagdarśana!*
9. Also the many pages under 'Religion Study of' do not contain any fundamental questioning of the term 'Study' but content themselves with an enumeration of academic disciplines whose methods are supposed to cover the 'study of religion'.
10. Fourth Edition, p. 1258 f.
11. As *specimina* of this 'new attitude' (on the serious side) may be quoted: F. Capra *The Tao of Physics* (Berkeley 1975), K. Malville *A Feather for Daedalus* (Menlo Park, 1975), F. Hoyle, *Ten Faces of the Universe*, (San Francisco 1977), H.K. Schilling, *The New Consciousness in Science and Religion* (Philadelphia 1973).
12. F. Hoyle, *Ten Faces of the Universe*, p. 8 (emphasis is mine).
13. See A.T. de Nicholas 'Four Dimension Man: The Philosophical Methodology of the Rigveda', Bangalore 1971.
14. J. Dalfen: 'Gedanken zur Lektüre platonischer Dialoge' in: Zeitschrift für Philosophische Forschung 29/2 p. 169 ff: "Im Dialog Laches macht Sokrates der Vorschlag, man müsse dem *logos*, das von den Gesprächspartnern im Verlauf der Unterredung ausgesprochene Wort, tritt ihnen nun als etwas Selbständiges gegenüber, mit einem Anspruch. . ."