

Message from the Chief Reviewer

Namaste!

What does it mean to think from within a civilisation and not merely about it? And who decides which ideas are “academic” and which are quietly reduced to belief, myth, or culture? The second issue of the Journal of Sanātana Dharma is a similar response to an academic landscape where Indic ideas are frequently cited, cautiously admired, yet rarely trusted enough to define the terms of inquiry themselves.

For too long, Sanātana thought has been welcomed only after being stripped of its metaphysics, its methods, and its confidence. We quote it, mine it, occasionally celebrate it, but hesitate to let it think. This issue is united not by theme but by intent: a refusal to flatten Sanātana Dharma into nostalgia or theology. What follows is scholarship that argues, measures, interprets, maps, and rethinks, sometimes in agreement, sometimes in tension, but always rooted. As a chief reviewer, I would like you to read these contributions not as isolated papers, but as signs of a conversation returning home and learning, once again, to speak in its own voice.

Chandrani Chakraborty’s exploration of Śabda Brahman and the Damaru reminds us that in the Indic world, language was never an accident. Sound precedes structure, myth precedes method, and pedagogy is inseparable from metaphysics. This paper listens carefully to what modern linguistics often forgets to hear.

Shivendra Vikram Singh’s work on Jain theories of language is a lesson in epistemic humility. By foregrounding limitation rather than certainty, it challenges the modern academic obsession with final answers. Perhaps wisdom, as Jain thought suggests, lies in knowing where language must fall silent.

Dagyung Jung’s comparison of Brahman and Śūnyatā refuses the lazy binaries of tradition-versus-tradition. One and zero are not rivals here, but languages pointing to what exceeds language. The paper gently insists that disagreement in India was often methodological, not metaphysical.

In examining three Rāmāyaṇas, Bhakti Joshi and Kumuda Prasad Acharya show how tradition survives through reinterpretation, not rigidity. The Rāmāyaṇa lives because it adapts without losing its ethical grammar. This is plurality without fragmentation.

The empirical study on Bhagavad Gītā and adolescent self-esteem by Avanti Badhe and colleagues does something crucial, it measures what is usually asserted. By grounding spiritual pedagogy in observable outcomes, the paper reopens a conversation modern education prematurely closed.

M. Jayaraman's intervention on Tantrayukti quietly questions why Indian academia continues to outsource its thinking tools. This paper is not nostalgic; it is methodological. It asks a simple but unsettling question: Why ignore frameworks that already know how to think systematically?

The study on Yoga and Ayurveda as cultural diplomacy by Priyadarshini Purohit and Yukti Gupta reframes soft power as civilizational responsibility. It cautions against commodification while asserting global relevance, reminding us that wisdom travels best when it travels intact.

Abhay Kumar Sharma's reading of the Ganga as spiritual cartography turns geography into philosophy without romanticism. Liberation here is mapped, staged, and embodied. The paper demonstrates how Indic knowledge encoded transcendence into landscape itself.

Vishal Dubey's engagement with Indian and Western hermeneutics resists both rejection and submission. By arguing for dialogue without distortion, the paper protects indigenous categories while remaining intellectually porous, a balance few manage.

Ajay Sharma Chinnadurai's analysis of the epics as political theory returns governance to its ethical roots. Statecraft here is narrated, debated, and morally tested. The paper reminds political science that it once spoke through stories, not spreadsheets.

Akshay Tiwari's comparative study of Saptāṅga theory shows that Indian political thought was always systemic. Power, ethics, economy, and diplomacy were never separate silos. This is political science before it forgot the organism.

Ramaswami Subramony's critique of ideological capture in Indian academia is deliberately uncomfortable. It does not merely diagnose institutional bias; it frames the crisis as civilizational. The paper insists that neutrality without roots is not objectivity, it is amnesia.

The study of Yakshi murals by Sethulekshmi P. S. and Saraswathy Selvarajan expands what counts as text, theory, and archive. Knowledge here is visual, ritual, and embodied. The paper asks why modernity narrowed our ways of reading culture.

The exploration of Chottanikkara Temple and Tantric healing traditions by Vishaka Venkat and her collaborators shows Sanātana Dharma as lived infrastructure. Ritual, ecology, psychology, and community intersect here without abstraction. This is religion functioning, not merely believed.

Satya Narain's metallurgical reading of āyas in the Ṛgveda exemplifies disciplined interdisciplinarity. By letting textual evidence speak seriously to material science, the paper unsettles inherited chronologies without polemic.

Aakarsh Bammona's geographical study of Prabhāsa in Sanskrit texts turns Purāṇic memory into mapped knowledge. It demonstrates that sacred

texts were also records of land, movement, and observation—if we read them carefully enough.

Finally, the revival of Paramapada Soplanam by Jaya Krishna Babu and Gentela Srikruti brings pedagogy back to play. Ethics here are not preached but experienced. Perhaps this is where Sanātana Dharma was always most effective, teaching without announcing that it is teaching. Apart from this, Mayuri’s article casts light on the relationship between the co-wives in the Ramayana.

To every author whose work appears in this issue, and to those whose papers now rest with us awaiting their next moment of articulation, and to every reader who chooses to engage seriously with these pages, this is worth saying clearly: we are not filling a gap left by others; we are cultivating a field that was long left fallow. A field that requires patience, argument, disagreement, and care.

This journal is gradually becoming a space where Indic ideas do not arrive seeking validation or accommodation. They arrive trained, methodologically alert, textually grounded, and unafraid to speak in their own categories. In an academy accustomed to translating Indian thought before trusting it, that itself is a quiet but consequential achievement.



Sameer Pande
Chief Reviewer
Journal of Sanātana Dharma