

in a foot-note, he has referred to Advaita in the spelling of which he was caught within the grips of the Printers' Devil. And again "Aham-padartha" is outrageously printed though Advaita has been corrected in "Errata".

Kant's "Critique" has been "made in Germany" with especial emphasis. I wish Prof. Nikam had not echoed or re-echoed the familiar critical judgments on Kant. It will not be an exaggeration to state that a real and genuine estimate of Kant has yet to be attempted by Western philosophers themselves. Whether at all Kant ever woke up from the dogmatic slumber from which he claims to have been rudely awakened by Hume, and whether at all he has effected any Copernican revolution in philosophical outlook are some of the persistent problems of Kantian *Weltanschauung*, and though as Prof. Nikam points out (p. 21) Kant himself might not have urged or adumbrated such a claim, critics have a duty to examine the claim that the most striking contribution of Kant is transference of philosophical emphasis from the objective to the subjective. Prof. Nikam does not examine the claim in any detail.

The fact is that on the plea of an analysis of the conditions and characteristics of *a priori synthetic judgments*, Kant has really constructed an elaborate and imposing *totalitarian structure in philosophy*. Surprise, bewilderment, astonishment and admiration which have marked reaction to Kant's work are all due to the psychological dread of the unknown and the ununderstood. There are many who are likewise scared away by the style of Sankara. In the Kantian scheme of *Totalitarian Metaphysics* the

objective reality was assigned some sort of existential recognition in a patronising manner and it is this totalitarian scheme that supplied the motive-force of the subsequent totalitarian metaphysics of Nietzsche who advocated the cult of the *Urbemensch*, master-morality, slave-morality and the like. In Hitler's campaigns against Democracy and against all weaker nations, one witnesses directly the practice of the totalitarian philosophy of Kant and Nietzsche. Psycho-analysis of the Freudian brand was perfected in Germany, and there is no use fighting shy of the same psycho-analytic technique being applied to an analysis of the metaphysical mind of Kant as revealed in his "Critique".

Be that as it may, Prof. Nikam seems to view the work of Prof. Paton almost with religious awe and fervour as if biblical sacrosanctity attached to it! Prof. Paton has to be rated as an enthusiastic admirer of Kant, and like all admirers he naturally seeks to make much of Kant and his work. Paton's estimate of Kant is not after all altogether a philosophically detached one.

It is noteworthy that a citation from Omar Khayyam stands at the opening of each chapter. Prof. Nikam should therefore not blame the reviewer if he closed with the observation that after a fairly careful study of the work of Prof. Nikam, the reviewer was obliged to come out of the edifice or structure of the Kantian metaphysics by the same door as in he went!! Still, I heartily commend Prof. Nikam's neat little volume on Kant as an eminently suitable text-book for university students of the philosopher of Konigsberg.

R. NAGA RAJA SARMA.

CENTENARIES

Baskerville, Simon (1574-1641)

SIR SIMON BASKERVILLE, a British physician, was born at Exeter October 27, 1574. He joined the Exeter College, Oxford, in 1591 and was elected a fellow even before he graduated. He became M.B. in 1611 and after some practice entered the College of Physicians, London, in 1614 and became a fellow thereof in 1615.

Even when Baskerville was an undergraduate his brilliance was such that when James I visited the University, he was "chosen as a prime person to dispute before him in the philosophic art, which he performed with great applause of his majesty". In later years when

he rose to eminence as a doctor, he was appointed physician to James I and later to Charles I who knighted him in 1636.

Baskerville had such wide practice and thereby amassed so much wealth that he came to be known as "Sir Simon Baskerville the rich". He was also generous. 'He never took a fee of an orthodox minister under a dean nor of any suffering cavalier in the cause of Charles I . . . but with physick to their bodies generally gave relief to their necessities'.

Baskerville died July 5, 1641.

S. R. RANGANATHAN.

University Library,
Triplicane.