

PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. XLI

AUGUST, 1936

No. 8



“उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।”

“Arise ! Awake ! And stop not till the Goal is reached.”

GOD, PERSONAL AND IMPERSONAL

BY SWAMI VIVEKANANDA

My idea is that what you call a Personal God is the same as the impersonal Being, a personal and impersonal God at the same time. We are personalized impersonal beings. If you use the word in the absolute sense we are impersonal, but if you use it in a relative meaning, we are personal. Each one of you is a universal being, each one is omnipresent. It may seem staggering at first, but I am as sure of this as that I stand before you. How can the spirit help being omnipresent? It has neither length nor breadth, nor thickness, nor any material attribute whatsoever; and if we are all spirits we cannot be limited by space. Space only limits matter matter. If we were limited to this body we would be a material something. Body and soul and everything would be material, and such words as “living in the body”, “embodying the

soul” would be only words used for convenience; beyond that they would have no meaning. Many of you remember the definition I gave of the soul; that each soul is a circle whose centre is in one point and circumference nowhere. The centre is where the body is, and the activity is manifested there. You are omnipresent; only you have the consciousness of being concentrated in one point. That point has taken up particles of matter, and formed them into a machine to express itself. That through which it expresses itself is called the body. So you are everywhere; when one body or machine fails, you, the centre, move on and take up other particles of matter, finer or grosser and work through that. This is man, and what is God? God is a circle with circumference nowhere and centre everywhere. Every point in that circle is

living, conscious, active, and equally working with us limited souls, only one point is conscious, and that point moves forward and backward. As the body has a very infinitesimal existence in comparison with that of the universe, so the whole universe, in comparison with God, is nothing. When we talk of God speaking, we say He speaks through His universe; and when we speak of Him beyond all limitations of time and space, we say He is an Impersonal Being. Yet He is the same Being.

To give an illustration: We stand here and see the sun. Suppose one of you want to go towards the sun. After you get a few thousand miles nearer, you will see another sun, much bigger. Supposing you proceed much closer, you will see a much bigger sun. At last you

will see the real sun, millions and millions of miles big. Suppose you divide this journey into so many stages, and take photographs from each stage, and after you have taken the real sun, come back and compare them; they will all appear to be different, because the first view was a little red ball, and the real sun was millions of miles bigger; yet it was the same sun. It is the same with God: the Infinite Being we see from different standpoints, from different planes of mind. The lowest man sees Him as an ancestor; as his vision gets higher, as the Governor of a planet; still higher as the Governor of the universe, and the highest man sees Him as Himself. It was the same God and the different realizations were only degrees and difference of vision.

THE PROBLEM OF AN INDIAN LINGUA FRANCA

BY THE EDITOR

I

The demand for an Indian lingua franca is steadily increasing in various parts of India. The problem has already given rise to some linguistic developments in the country. One can hardly remain silent, while looking to the interests of such a nation-wide consciousness. People are found to discuss the problem more seriously nowadays than before. There are some who hold that it has been premature to make the problem a public one and that it has been wrong on the part of some of our public men to try to solve the problem in a hurry, especially at the present time when India is passing through various national turmoils. They apprehend that the movement may bring about fresh complications and difficulties

in the already troubled waters of India's communal and provincial moorings. A thoughtful article on the subject, written by Mr. M. Hamidullah and published in the last April issue of *The Calcutta Review*, drew our attention to some problems relating to the possibility of an Indian lingua franca. Before dwelling at length upon the points in favour of and against having an Indian lingua franca the writer observes at the very outset: "I think, it would have been far better in the long run if the problem of India's lingua franca had not been made a public one at this critical juncture of India's history. But in that haste, so characteristic of a rising nationalism some of our public men in their enthusiasm prematurely delivered it to the general public, who, not quite capable of realizing its

manifold difficulties and vast complications, at once brought it down to their own, comparatively low level of understanding. Very soon, the linguistic problem was given religious colouring (as, unfortunately, every important issue gets in this country). Camps were pitched, labelled, and one who ran could read communalism writ large on the newly woven linguistic canvas too. Nothing to say of canvassing that went on between camp and camp. Yet, in spite of much that is shoddy, unintelligent and unsatisfying there seems to have been born, of late, a genuine feeling among some Indian intellectuals and public men, who, while reading the present situation strongly desire that a way should be found out, the best and the least imperfect way, it being idle to expect anything like perfection, as long as imperfection continues to be an essential attribute of things."

The lingua franca movement has advanced in recent years not without a certain amount of success. The need of a lingua franca can hardly be overestimated, when the people of different provinces and communities keenly feel for a better understanding of their national and cultural relations. It is, therefore, needless to dilate on the point of the dangers and difficulties that the movement may encounter in the future. The thing that is to be carefully noticed is whether the movement was originally started by the people who were free from communal interests and were inspired by a lofty idea of bringing together the people of India in a common linguistic bond. It is unfortunate that in this country whenever any good movement is launched upon, the unthinking people who are already obsessed with communal interests begin to unfurl the banners of their own flags and thereby jeopardize the interests of the Indian nation as a whole.

It has become a habit with such people to suspect the things which cannot breed any cause of suspicion. The country is in such a peculiar set of circumstances that things often occur as aforesaid to the great disappointment of the well-wishers at home and abroad.

II

The Hindu-Urdu controversy has for long been one of the principal discussions in relation to the question of an Indian lingua franca. The controversy has already brought forth an undesirable spirit among the modern writers of both Hindi and Urdu. In modern Urdu periodicals as it has been remarked by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, some Urdu writers have imported of late absolutely unfamiliar and uncouth terms borrowed from Arabic and Persian in the place of many of the commonest Indian words. On the other hand, some Hindi writers have already strained themselves to load their vocabulary with too many Sanskritic words. In the presidential address delivered last January at the third session of the Hindustani Academy of Allahabad, Mr. Sachchidananda Sinha observed: "So far as modern Hindi writing is concerned (in newspapers, periodicals, and books) I may frankly state that I have experienced very great difficulty in understanding it, though I can appreciate the beauties of the greatest classical poets in Hindi—like Kabir, Malik Muhammad Jayasi, Abdur Rahim Khan-e-Khana, Tulsi Das, Surdas, and Behari Lal—without referring to a dictionary such as I feel constantly compelled to do when reading modern Hindi prose and poetry. I do not know if the present style of writing in Hindi has evoked any protest, either in the press or on the platform, from amongst Hindi writers or readers. But it is gratifying to note that it has already

produced some healthy reaction." Mr. Sinha quotes in course of his speech the views of two eminent modern writers, one under the well-known pen-name of "Prem Chand" and the other, a famous Muslim writer named Azim Beg Chagtai. Their remarks are valuable in this connection, so we quote them for more light on the subject. Prem Chand observes : "Neither that Urdu which is full of strange Persian and Arabic words, nor that Hindi which is laden with cumbrous Sanskrit words can ever become the national language of India. Our national language can be only that which is the common language of the people. I will not agree to discard any word because it is Persian or Arabic or Sanskrit; my only test is whether or not the word is understandable by the common people." Azim Beg Chagtai observes with special reference to writing in Urdu and his remarks are no less applicable to writing in Hindi. He writes : "The supporters of both Urdu and Hindi are full of *zid* and prejudice, and are injuring both these languages. During the last twenty years the supporters of Urdu, particularly the Mussalmans, have forced so many Arabic words into it that it has become difficult for the average Hindu to read and understand Urdu. While, on the one hand, Hindus are giving up the study of Arabic and Persian, on the other hand, the Mussalmans have not only thrust into Urdu a large number of new and unfamiliar Arabic words, but have also ejected those Indian words which had long formed part of the Urdu language, and have substituted new Arabic words for them. This has resulted in making present-day Urdu unintelligible to the vast bulk of the Hindus, since it has become a necessary condition for understanding the new Urdu that a considerable portion of one's life should

have been spent in learning Arabic and Persian. Yet, in spite of it all, the supporters of the present-day Urdu have persuaded themselves that it is the national duty of every Hindu to study and propagate this new and terrible form of Urdu. It is thus absolutely essential if Urdu is to survive that its supporters should exercise very great moderation in the use of Arabic and Persian terms, and should be vigilant and alert in tapping the indigenous Indian sources, and utilising them for making Urdu the national language of India." It is thus obvious that the problem of an Indian lingua franca has already been faced with the Hindu-Urdu controversy and it is the duty of every right-thinking Indian not to encourage the people who try to bring forth communal strifes even in the linguistic field. In order to avoid such a lamentable state of affairs some people suggest that a serious effort should be made to do away with the two different names for the two forms of speech, which have become mixed up in the controversy. Mr. Sachchidananda Sinha strongly holds this view and prefers to use the word Hindustani so that the claim for either of the words Hindi and Urdu may be stopped for ever. If both the Hindus and the Mussalmans take the word on the principle of nationality as the language of England is called English, that of France, French, and so on and so forth, then the quarrel over a particular name may cease and "Hindustani" may be the name of the Indian lingua franca. Then again, people should devise ways and means to popularize the commonest words in daily talks, periodicals, newspapers, and recent books. In this way, we may expect to have a national language for all practical and national purposes. Mr. Sinha suggests that people may inaugurate a "Hindustani Literature" series

comprising (in whole or in part) such books, classical and modern, as are neither in inflated Urdu nor in bombastic Hindi, but which being in plain and simple Hindustani, can be printed in both the Nagari and the Arabic scripts.

III

Now, what about the people whose vernaculars are neither Urdu nor Hindi? In this connection it is well to consider the linguistic position of the whole of India. Firstly, we find that there are as many as 723 languages and dialects spoken all over India and of them, over a dozen languages possess their own scripts. There is the Bengali script in Bengal, the Gurmukhi in the Punjab, the Sindhi in Sind, the Oriya in Utkal, the Gujrati in Gujarat, the Telegu in Andhradesha, the Tamil in Tamilnad, the Malayali in Kerala, the Kanarese in Karnatak, the Kaithi in Behar, and the Modi in the Deccan. Then again, if we take the figures of the numerical strength of the principal languages we find that Bengali is spoken by 53,468,469 persons; Assamese, by 1,999,057 persons; Marhati, by 20,890,658 persons; Tamil, by 20,412,652 persons; Telegu, by 26,878,727 persons; Malayalam, by 9,137,615 persons; Western Punjabi, by 8,566,051 persons; Pashtu, by 1,634,490 persons; Gujrati, by 10,849,934 persons; Punjabi, by 15,838,254 persons; Kanarese, by 11,206,380 persons; Oriya, by 11,194,265 persons; Rajasthani, by 13,897,896 persons; Hindustani (under which term the returns of both Urdu and Hindi as spoken languages have been amalgamated for census purposes), by 71,547,671 (*Western Hindi*) plus 7,867,103 (*Eastern Hindi*) plus 27,929,559 (*Behari*) persons. In this connection, it is to be noted by those

who think that English may serve the purpose of a lingua franca that only a very small educated minority of the vast Indian population speak and use the language in writing. Besides, since English is not an indigenous language of the Indian soil, it can hardly be the national language for the masses and the children of India. Mahatma Gandhi says: "As against hardly one per cent of the total population knowing English, over 60 per cent of the total population of India at the present moment understand the ordinary rustic Hindustani. For an Indian it is any day infinitely wiser to learn Hindustani than English."

The figures given above are sufficient to prove that Hindustani has the greatest advantage over the other languages in India for being the national language of the country. The other existing vernaculars will remain as they are and Hindustani is not designed to replace any of them but should be used only for inter-provincial contact and inter-communal harmony. So that the people of India may have an All-India vision, the language should be learnt by all means.

The parochial pride of the literary men belonging to the different Indian vernaculars should not prove a bar to the progress of Hindustani being adopted as the national language for India. One script will undoubtedly be a great advance forward to spread the language as lingua franca of India, but so long as the Hindu-Moslem consciousness pervades the national life of India, neither the Devanagari script nor the Arabic script will get the upper hand all over the country. Of course, there is a very strong argument for a modified Roman script to be adopted in the Indian lingua franca. The matter requires careful consideration by experts who should have an absorbing interest

in the national cause of India, the Hindu-Moslem unity, and a synthetic culture for the welfare of the different people of India.

IV

Sooner or later India will have to evolve a common language which should adopt the most familiar words and give up the obsolete and difficult terms, whether they be Sanskrit, Arabic, or Persian in their origin. The remarks of Sir William Marris while inaugurating the Hindustani Academy at Allahabad are noteworthy in this connection: "The ideal would be for every writer in Hindi to write as if he wished to find Muslim readers and *vice versa*." If this principle be followed, a steady progress may be expected in the process of evolving a common language, though for a long time the two different scripts of Devanagari and Urdu shall have to be continued. This step would again serve as a great weapon to combat the evils that rage round the Hindu-Muslim tension.

The 'Hans' movement is a step forward towards the commonwealth of literature in India. As a result of the movement, the Bhâratīya Sâhitya Parishad has been ushered into existence. It is said that a number of

Provincial Parishads which so far ran in separate grooves has given birth to this institution. Mr. K. M. Munshi observes that the 'Hans' movement is based on the one fact that in spite of provincial characteristics, the literature of every Indian language has a fundamental unity of tradition, outlook, and growth; what is now wanted is the growth of solidarity by a conscious exchange of literary forms, comments, and techniques. We are happy to learn that the movement is directed towards co-ordinating purposive efforts at enriching every provincial literature. It is hoped that all Provincial Sâhitya Parishads would leave no stone unturned in making the movement a success. The organizers of the 'Hans' movement stress the point that it would not tend to eliminate provincial languages and literatures, but would serve as an instrument for a complete exchange of the literatures and thus give birth to a common literary heritage.

If the spirit of provincialism be sacrificed for the sake of evolving an Indian lingua franca, not only the provincial languages will have a wider field to move in, and an All-India vision growing with it side by side, but a sympathetic understanding among the people of all provinces will steadily increase.

RELATION OF SELF TO KNOWLEDGE

BY PROF. G. R. MALKANI, M.A. (Bombay), M.Litt. (Cantab)

It will be generally admitted that there is something which we call our self and that this self knows. It has indeed been questioned whether there is any entity which deserves to be called the self. That we use this term significantly is not denied. But, it is argued, we do not know the self as we

should, and we cannot say definitely whether it stands for a single entity running through our mental life, or a succession of entities related in a certain way.

It is true that we do not know the self as we may be said to know other entities. Other entities are presentable.

They represent more or less definite content. The self is not presentable. It cannot be contemplated in itself. It represents no particular content. The only way to know the self is to represent it as the knower or as the subject of some mental act. It is what knows, wills etc. But although we cannot contemplate the self in itself, we cannot be said to lack knowledge of it. It is at least as evident as any particular piece of knowledge. For knowledge is not what may be called a neutral fact. It is necessarily claimed. It is knowledge on the part of a self. If then knowledge is a fact which we do not doubt, the self is doubly so.

The self may not be wholly unknown. But is our knowledge of it adequate? Can we say whether it is a single entity or a succession of entities which we somehow identify? Now we have in this connection the intuition on the part of the self of its identity in different mental acts; I who was *then* am *now*, I who was ignorant am the person knowing now, etc. This intuition however may be otherwise explained. It may be argued that there is no single entity but a succession of entities, neither of which deserves to be called a self, for neither of them persists. The question will naturally arise, how can we speak of a series of successive terms without a principle of unity that so arranges the terms and apprehends them in that relation? This question may no doubt be met by saying that that is a subjective demand only, and that terms can be in fact successive although no unity underlies them. But the terms are not only successive. One member, namely, the present self, knows its identity with some other members of the series. This apprehension of identity may indeed be taken to be false since we have postulated that the entities are really different. But how is even this false

apprehension possible? One condition is that the member that knows its identity with other members must at least know the latter. How can it know what has preceded it? Let us suppose that each preceding member communicates this knowledge to the succeeding. This form of communication is indeed not intelligible; for the two members in question are not co-present. But let us suppose that it is somehow possible.

The second condition is that the entity that apprehends the identity of two terms must be distinct from those terms. It must hold the two apart and bring them together in the required relation. To know the identity of A and B, there must be an "I" which knows A and which knows B and which brings the two together in that relation which constitutes its apprehension of their identity. This "I" is the common ground. It is the real unity. If we question this, the two terms will not be available, and there will be no consciousness of identity, true or false. We contend that the proof of the identity of the self lies not in the fact that the present self is known to be identical with the self in the past; such knowledge of identity may be false, and is in any case questionable. But we can never doubt the unchanging and self-identical character of the entity that has the apprehension of identity in question. That identity alone, the presupposition of the conscious apprehension of all identity, is unquestioned and absolute. It is the identity that properly belongs to our self.

There is one self-identical self that knows in different acts of knowledge. But, it will be argued, there is no piece of knowledge which is always there. Every piece of knowledge arises and then ceases. It may be followed by another piece of knowledge. But these pieces are quite distinct one from

another. The self cannot therefore be *always* knowing. This is also proved by the fact that there are certain lapses of consciousness when the self cannot be supposed to know anything. The self then knows, but also at times does not know.

This however is not wholly true. The knowledge of a particular object may be said to arise. But the awareness of the self cannot be said to be limited to such knowledge. It extends beyond it, inasmuch as the self is aware of the interval between one piece of knowledge and another. The self is aware that before it knew a particular thing, it did not know it. Indeed, before it knows A, it is not conscious of being ignorant of A. But the very fact that this consciousness can be elicited later on proves that the awareness of the self cannot be limited to the actual knowledge of A, but remains unimpaired even in the absence of such knowledge. The awareness of the self cannot be said to arise or to disappear. It is the presupposition of knowledge arising and disappearing.

The self may be always aware. But it appears that we must distinguish the self and its awareness. The self is aware, but it is not the same thing as its awareness. Let us suppose that this is so. But then how are the two related? Can awareness be regarded as a quality of the self? We contend that the self can have no quality.

A quality is what distinguishes a thing from other things. A quality that does not distinguish is no quality. The self however is no kind of object. All objects are objects in distinction from it. Indeed this seems to imply that the self too is distinct from objects. But that does not follow, and is not possible. If the self were distinct from objects, it would be another object, and the very objectivity of objects would be rendered

meaningless. When therefore we make the distinction of the self and the not-self, this distinction cannot be treated like any distinction between one object and another. It is not an ordinary distinction. It is really no distinction at all. For the self is no kind of object. How can it then be distinguished from anything? How can it possess a quality which distinguishes only one object from another object?

The self may have a quality. But can awareness be such a quality? Can it distinguish the self from the not-self? A distinguishing mark or quality should belong to the thing it distinguishes and should not belong to what the thing is distinguished from. If now awareness belong to the self and non-awareness to the not-self, there can be no awareness of the distinction. Awareness as the quality of one of the terms will be wholly exclusive of the other term. It cannot be the common ground. It cannot comprehend both the terms. The not-self will not at all be known; and the very distinction of the self and the not-self will be impossible of realization.

Awareness may not be a quality of the self. Let it be anything. But is there no distinction between the self and awareness? We contend that any distinction between the two is impossible. The same old objection would recur. The distinction must be capable of being known. The self must know itself to be distinct from its awareness. But how can it know this when awareness itself is the other term?

It might be said, "The self may not be able formally to present the distinction to itself. But the two are nevertheless distinct. Awareness is relative, the being of the self is not". Thus it will be said that awareness belongs to the self only in relation to something or other of which the self can be said to be

aware. If we conceive every element of the not-self to be absent, the self would not be aware, and its awareness would have ceased. The self would not have ceased on that account. It would continue to have being. But is this intelligible? Can existence of the self transcend awareness on its part? There is indeed no awareness of the self. But its existence is only assertible in so far as the self is aware. The self is self-revealed; and it is self-revealed only as it reveals other things. There is simply no question of an assertion of any existence unrelated to knowledge or awareness.

It may be said,—What if there is no object? Will the self be aware? And if it is not, will the self cease to be? But firstly, we can never point to a situation within our experience in which there is no object whatsoever of awareness. Secondly, granting that that is possible, can we deny all awareness in the self? We can only deny it on the ground that there is something which is not revealed by it. We can only think of the absence of knowledge when we think of something which exists but is not revealed by knowledge. If we really suppose that there is *nothing* to be revealed, how can we conceive the very absence of revelation? It is just like light. It lights up things. If there is nothing to be lighted up, there is nothing to show it up. That is all. If then we postulate anything, it is certainly known. But if we do not postulate, we cannot conclude from this the absence of knowledge. Thirdly, we do not deny the existence of the self when there is no object. But what are our grounds for this existence of the self? Can they exclude all awareness? We cannot escape the conclusion that when there is nothing to be known or revealed the self does not lose its aware-

ness. It remains one with awareness or as pure awareness.

It might now be argued that there is no question of the self being merely itself or being one with awareness. The self is always aware of something or other, and its existence is only to be conceived in relation to its awareness; it is what is aware. In waking life it is certainly aware of things. So also it is in dreams. It is only in deep sleep and states of unconsciousness that we might say with some plausibility that it is not aware. But even here it can be proved that it is aware. It is aware of what we might call a state of ignorance. If it were not aware, we could not possibly know on waking up that we slept or that we lost consciousness. Thus, as far as our experience goes, the self is always aware; and it is, only as it is aware.

This argument can easily be extended to include all possible conditions of being. Death itself can only be thought of on the analogy of sleep. It is generally conceived as an endless state of slumber. But to call something a *state* of being and to call it *endless* is a contradiction. If a condition of being is not conceived as ended and as alternating with other known conditions, it would not be apprehensible as a condition or a state at all. Death is significant as a possible condition of being only as it leads to life again. Without such implication it is not a possible object of our thought. The conclusion thus becomes inevitable that the self is immortal and awareness forms part of it.

This argument would appear to be quite plausible. But evidently, if it were altogether sound, it would condemn the self to an unremitting intercourse with the not-self or the world and to alternating states of knowledge and ignorance. Is it not possible to escape such a conclusion? We do not

know how it can be escaped except on one condition. That condition is that the self is never aware of anything beside itself. It never knows. It is always pure awareness. It is not that there is a time in which it will not be aware of any object, or that we can attain to a state of being in which it will not be so aware, but that it is ever so. When we say that the self is aware, we mean that it is pure awareness. Pure awareness is the only awareness there is. The other variety which *we* recognize as awareness is only so spoken of. Or in other words, what we call awareness of . . . , is really no case of awareness. Instead therefore of saying that awareness must be *of* something, we should more properly say that awareness can never be *of* a thing. Real awareness is pure awareness.

We know objects. There are different kinds of objects,—sights, sounds, smells etc. We are also said to know the different forms of knowing these objects; we distinguish them as seeing, hearing, etc. We go beyond this. Seeing, hearing etc. are all *knowing*. We cannot indeed disengage this *knowing* from its forms. But we conceive it as what is common to them. It is also what we may be said to know. It is relative to the object *in general*. But is there any real awareness in all this? The objects are mere objects. They are not awareness. Seeing, hearing etc. may be such. But take away their respective objects. What is left of seeing and hearing? Their differences are due to the differences in the object. Without the latter, the former would be abolished, and we can no longer significantly speak of seeing, hearing etc. These are only objects of another kind.

Shall we say that the awareness which is common to the different forms of knowing is real awareness? But once again take away the object as such, and

what is left of this awareness? Can we know it as awareness? Thus we find that what *we* are said to know as awareness is that awareness only in relation to the object. It cannot be thought of apart from the relation. It is only another kind of object. It is not the real awareness.

Real awareness can never be an *object* to us. It can never be reflected upon. What is reflected upon is some act of the mind, subjective in character, which is that act only with reference to some object. Real awareness is pure awareness. It is not the awareness of anything. We contend that the self has always such awareness and no other. There is no other variety of awareness. When we say that the self is aware, we should really mean that it is awareness. In any other sense, "being aware" becomes meaningless; awareness becomes only some kind of object.

This indicates a duality of points of view which is ultimate and determines our view of things. Looked at from the standpoint of objectivity, anything that is real must be objective. If awareness is real, it is only as it is the awareness of objects, and thus objective to another awareness. If the self is real, it is only as it is the knowing subject and so necessarily related to objects. Beyond this, nothing can be, and nothing is, real. Looked at from the point of view of real awareness or the self which is identical with it, there is no *other*. The moment an *other* is conceived, awareness is degraded (we can only speak of it as awareness of . . .), the self is degraded (we can only speak of it as what knows . . .); we have lost touch with reality. The real self does not know, because there can be nothing beside it which it may know. What knows is less than the self.

How do we reconcile these two points of view? We may indeed regard them

as two different standpoints equally valid and unrelated; looked at from one standpoint, reality is all of one sort; looked at from the other, it is all of the other sort. But it will be seen that we have really no such freedom in choice. The standpoint of the self is completely intelligible in itself; it has no implication. Even when the self is said to be aware, it is not aware,—it is awareness itself; there is no *other* to which its being is related; any kind of relation would contradict this being. But the other standpoint is not intelligible in itself. It has a necessary implication. The object can only be an object to a self which is no object. The reality of the former implies the reality of the latter. The objective standpoint is therefore necessarily self-contradictory. It denies the reality of that which is necessary to its own possibility. Indeed, restricting ourselves to this standpoint, we may try to prove its self-consistency. The object is to a subject. But what is this subject? Is it not related to the object? Is it not capable of being known? If it is, then it is useless to speak of a self which cannot be related. The argument can be carried a step further. The subject itself may be said to be known. It therefore implies another subject. Can this be the real self? But that would be equally fallacious. There is no implication of the so-called real self anywhere. What the object implies is a subject. This subject too may imply another subject. But there is no room in all this for an unrelated entity such as we understand the real self to be. We cannot get away from the related self and prove that the object implies any other self.

This argument and this justification of the objective standpoint involves, in our opinion, a confusion of thought. It is admitted that the object is known. But is it known by something which

is itself an object? Evidently, this is impossible. If every knower in turn could be treated as an object, it would imply some other knower, and so on *ad infinitum*. The real knower would not be available, and none of the series of objects would be those objects or would ever be known. The real knower must be object of no kind; it must not be relatable; it must be the real self in our sense of the term. *The unrelated self is the only true knower.* We cannot now turn round and say, what is this knower? Is it not related? Any such questions would be meaningless. There remains only one objection. Is it not a patent self-contradiction to say that the self does not know and in the same breath that it is the only true knower? This contradiction however would disappear when we realize that the object is never really known. We only so speak of it. Show us a case of real knowing, and we shall show you that what we speak of as object is not known in it. We can perhaps point to our actual seeing of a thing. But that seeing which we can reflect upon is not real seeing; and the thing which is said to be known in it is not the real thing. The object is object only in this reflective seeing; and seeing is seeing of an object only in it. In the real seeing, if we could get back to it, there is no object. That seeing is pure awareness. We thus come to the conclusion that not only the objective standpoint involves the other standpoint or the reality of the unrelated self, but that it is no standpoint at all; the object is never really known; and when we try to bring it to real knowledge, that knowledge cannot be spoken of as the knowledge of any object; it is seen to be nothing more or less than pure awareness. Our choice is thus eliminated and we are forced to conclude that the self is the only reality.

It is sometimes argued that if the self alone is real, what becomes of the world? We may say that it is illusory. We may also suppose that the illusory does not exist and is as a matter of fact nothing. But still when we look away from the world to the self, we seem to lose something of reality. We do not realize the world as nothing, and the problem does arise for us, does the self exclude the world and thereby lack something which is not merely nothing.

Now, on grounds of reason, there is no problem. The illusory is not. But if a problem does arise for us in spite of our better judgment, there must be a misapprehension somewhere which has not been corrected. It is the business of philosophical analysis to correct the misapprehension and free the mind from error and the consequent bondage.

The misapprehension in question is the belief that the self sees the world or that we see the world. This indeed gives us our most cogent reason for the illusoriness of the world,—a point which we cannot elaborate here. But it does not dissipate our seeing. We still seem to see the world; and because we see it, it is not nothing. There is something in it, which we shall lose if we lose our seeing or if we cease to see. It is not essential to this argument that we should regard the world as real. All that is necessary to it is the supposition that there is a seeing of a world which need not be anything apart from the seeing. Or what is the same thing, the illusory may be nothing; but the seeing of the illusory cannot be denied. As against the illusoriness of the world we have then the proposition,—the world is at least real as seen. From this, it is only a step further to suppose that the world is created.

A view is sometimes put forward that illusion is due to a confusion of subjective functions. The illusory is not

really seen but only willed or imagined. The illusion is due to taking the product of our will or imagination for a real matter of knowledge. When we disengage the subjective functions and dissipate the confusion, when we realize that the illusory is not seen at all but only willed or imagined, the illusion disappears. The illusory snake ceases to be a seen snake; it is realized as a willed snake or a snake of our creation. The world, in any sense that it is illusory, must similarly be a creation. But since no analysis of our experience exposes the illusion in our case and we do not see the world to be an illusion, we must suppose that it is not really created by us. So far as we are concerned, it is as good as really given; it is known. It is created by God who alone properly knows its non-existent and non-real character.

All theories of creation would look at the world in some such way. The world is not nothing. All that we can say is that it has no self-existence. It has the sort of reality which created things have. They have no being apart from the creative act. The act however is a real act. God has done something; and reality would be poorer without His doing.

The whole problem puts on a different complexion on our view of things. The world is not created by me. And we need not go to a distant God to create it for us. We can however see the world to be really *nothing*. And we can see this, if we ask ourselves the question,—is the world seen at all? Does the self see the world? Our answer is that real seeing is pure seeing,—it is not the seeing of anything. We can never know it or make it an object of reflection. What we reflect upon as seeing is not the real seeing. It is only an object of some kind which is spoken of as seeing. The self then does not see the

world. *The self only sees when it sees nothing beside itself.* "Seeing, it does not see. Hearing, it does not hear". What can this mean but that, if the self sees anything it sees itself, if it hears anything it hears itself, etc.? It cannot see or hear anything beside itself; for there is nothing beside itself to see or to hear. The self is pure intelligence without a second.

Does any problem about the world remain? If the self saw the world, we could also significantly speak of its not seeing the world. As it is, neither of these assertions has meaning. The self neither sees the world, nor does it not see it, nor is there any real problem about it. The problem arises as soon as we wrongly suppose that the world is actually and really known. This error leads to another. We believe that the world may not be known; and if it is not known, there is a loss of reality. In actual fact, the self is free from the limitations both of knowledge and of ignorance. These imply an *other*. The self has no *other*. It is omniscience itself in the only proper sense of that term.

We can have an idea of the freedom of the self by a reference to common experience. There we have the condition in which a particular piece of knowledge has not arisen. But so far, we

have consciousness neither of knowledge nor of non-knowledge. Indeed we suppose that there is non-knowledge or ignorance. But there is no awareness of this till knowledge has arisen. When we know, we also become aware that we were not knowing till then. This previous ignorance, this defect of knowledge on our part, this privation arises with knowledge. In real fact, self-awareness alone was there. We now think that the self was aware of ignorance (since the rise of knowledge has made past ignorance a fact of equal validity), while in fact the self itself had no such awareness and was really free. The self and its awareness cannot be denied; but any assertion of past ignorance would have to take into account factors which do not belong to the past.

We conclude that what we call knowledge is no case of real knowledge or real awareness. Real awareness is pure awareness. It has no reference to anything beyond itself or to an *other*. The self is this awareness. Any distinction of its being and its awareness would be untenable. Thus in the self alone is the true ideal of knowledge realized. If anything is known, the self alone is known. It is the beginning and the end of knowledge. There is no other knowledge.

RAMAKRISHNA AND THE SPIRIT OF SERVICE

BY MISS DOROTHY STEDE

To begin with, I am going back more than 2000 years, to the period of the *Upanishads*. Here we have the doctrine of the world-soul, which pervades the universe, and which, whether it be regarded as Brahman, the abstract cosmical principle, or as *Âtman*, the psychical principle or individual soul in man, is one and the same. Brahman,

the absolute, is manifest in all things,—plants, animals, and men; and the highest aim to be attained is the absorption of the individual soul in the world-soul, through correct knowledge.

This doctrine has vitally influenced all Indian religious and philosophical systems from that day to this, and we cannot hope to grasp the teachings of

any Indian saint, if we have no understanding of this "pantheism" (as we call it for lack of a better term), which we find to some extent in our own Western poets. Wordsworth, for example, says,

"And 'tis my faith that every flower
Enjoys the air it breathes."

And George Herbert :

"Thou art in all things one, in each
thing many ;

For Thou art infinite in one and all."

With these sentiments we may compare several passages of the *Bhagavad-Gitâ*, e.g. Krishna's

"Yo mām paçyati sarvatra sarvam ca
mayi paçyati, tasyaham na prana-
çyâmi sa ca me na pranaçyati."

("Whoso sees me everywhere, and sees
everything in me,— for him I shall not
be lost, nor will he be lost to me.")

Now let us turn to Ramakrishna. His comparatively short life of fifty years has been called an epitome of all the strivings of mankind; it was indeed, in the highest sense, a search after, and a grasping of, the Truth. During the first 17 years or so of his life, he grew up, so far as one could see, as an ordinary village boy, who was at home with Nature, and had little use for books and learning. But even as a child he sensed vague longings, undefined hankerings after something he did not understand.

At the age of 17, he was taken to Calcutta by his elder brother, and now the second stage of his life began. Soon afterwards, in 1855, he was appointed a priest in a newly-opened temple to Kâli, the Divine Mother. And now he knew what it was that he hankered after. It was God. And during the next years all the hidden psychic forces of his being were brought into play, in his passionate efforts to realize God. He became possessed by a kind of divine madness, and eventual-

ly worked himself up to such a pitch that he would remain in a trance, an ecstasy, for weeks and months at a time. The technical term for the supreme trance is Nirvikalpa Samâdhi, or absorption in the Infinite. This stage is preceded by (1) devotion to one particular God; (2) realization of God in everything; (3) Savikalpa Samâdhi, a trance in which the material world disappears, but the consciousness of bliss remains. Then comes the final stage, when there is no consciousness, only absorption. This is a state akin to death, and it is only a superhuman who can return from it to the world of form.

After years of these spiritual strivings, Ramakrishna entered upon the third period of his life. He had contacted God, or the Divine Spirit,—it does not matter what we call it—; he was now ready to diffuse his new-found knowledge among mankind. At this point we must discuss the Spirit of Service. It is interesting to note that the word *serve* comes from the same verbal root as the word *save*, and also as the Sanskrit *hr*, *harati*, which means to take or seize. We serve what we would save, or preserve; our aim should be to serve God by saving his creatures. But the idea of saving should not be a patronizing one,—he who saves, or who is the instrument of salvation, should have no sense of superiority to the saved person. Saving implies contact, whether physical (such as rescuing a man from drowning) or spiritual. So it may well have something to do with *harati*, to seize.

Ramakrishna had this power of spiritual contact. All who knew him admitted that this tact and power of understanding were marvellous; he never imposed his will on others, but always he seemed to communicate to them the ability to find their innate divinity in the inmost reaches of their soul. In the last stage of his life, when

he drew disciples to him, it is noteworthy that he never taught exactly the same process to any two of his devotees. He at least was no slave of the Western cult of standardization. His entire absence of ego-consciousness, even perhaps his lack of book-learning, made it supremely possible for the Divine to work through him. None of the stops of the flute of his psyche was clogged by self-absorption; so the Divine could work through him without obstruction. And it is surely no idle statement to say that it was this which gave him his tact and his power of adapting himself to the person with whom he was dealing. He had realized that opinions and creeds, when followed sincerely, are but different paths suited to each man's character and inclinations,—but one and all they lead to God. His extraordinary catholicity gave him sympathy, not only with the different Hindu creeds, but also with Mohammedanism and Christianity. He even went so far as to say that diversity of faiths was a good thing, for it ensured that, with a wide range to choose from, men were more likely to find a belief that suited them.

Ramakrishna's ability to adapt his methods and teaching to the individual cannot be over-emphasized. He never expected a man to attain perfection at once, and he was never dismayed at the sight of human frailty. Seeing the immanent divinity in all creatures, he was always willing to advise, and to give the necessary guidance in the successive stages of enlightenment. But he did not ask his pupils to play a sonata before they were familiar with all the scales. And, if I may use a simile from everyday life,—eliminating the idea of mental or moral progress,—I would compare Ramakrishna, in all reverence, to a 'bus conductor. If people asked him where to get off, he would tell

them; but he would not force them on their way, being willing to stop the 'bus every now and then for people to get off and on. But if they wished, and if they were willing to stand the fatigue, they were at liberty to travel the whole journey under his guidance. True service is not blind unreasoning devotion; it is necessarily tempered with discrimination. And it was from the word discrimination that Ramakrishna's foremost disciple, Vivekananda, took his name.

Let me give you one or two examples of his spirit of service. Once a young woman came to him in great distress, and confessed that when she prayed, she could not concentrate. Ramakrishna said, "What do you love best in the world?" She replied, her brother's child. He said, "Very well then, fix your thoughts upon him." She did so, and worshipped God through her love for the child. Another time, Ramakrishna was travelling with Mathur Babu, a rich patron. It happened that they passed through a country which had been ravaged by famine, and some poor stricken creatures were sitting hungry by the wayside. Ramakrishna said to Mathur Babu, "Do you feed them"; and when he protested that he could not support the whole world with his wealth, the saint sat down and wept, and vowed that he would stay with the poor creatures and share their fate. So Mathur Babu had to give in. It is said that this saint reached such heights of devotion to the divine in all things that he could not bear to trample upon the earth, for fear of hurting it.

It was not always possible for him to give material aid to the poor and the needy, but he gave richly of his store of spiritual wealth, and provided his disciples with an example of complete self-negation. Indeed, he voluntarily short-

ened his life, rather than deny anyone who came to him a jot of spiritual encouragement. For it is well known that he died of an affection of the throat which developed into cancer, but which might have been cured, had he been willing to give up speaking, and to refrain from exhausting his psychic energy. It was he who inspired his disciples, led by the great Vivekananda, to go forth into the world and serve mankind, in material as well as in spiritual ways. He set the example of what we in the West would call a two-fold service,—the service of God and the service of man. But the Vedântists teach that this two-fold service is in reality one,—the service of the Infinite which abides in all things.

Once again I should like to draw your attention to some words,—though I realize that words are but symbols, and must not obscure our vision of the Truth. Ramakrishna has often been

called the great Bhakta, or exponent of Bhakti, which is commonly translated by *devotion*. But Bhakti comes from the root *bhaj*, to partake, or share, and implies a sort of contract between God and man, whereby each associates with the other, for their mutual benefit. In this sense we can connect Bhakti, partaking, through *harati*, to take, with our word service. And since to serve is to save, and since spirit and inspiration both contain the same idea of breathing in and through, of permeation, we can say that in Ramakrishna's spirit of service we may find our inspiration for salvation.

It is not for all of us to be, like Ramakrishna, a beacon sending forth steady light to mighty ships. But we can develop within us a match which gives light in the darkness for an instant. And, as nothing is ever lost, that flickering match will glow into eternity.

FOUR CURRENTS IN INDIAN SPIRITUAL HISTORY

BY PROF. ABINASH CHANDRA BOSE, M.A.

1. FOUR TYPES OF ETHOS

The fourfold division of society in India began as a mere classification of the four types of occupation found in a civilized society—the intellectual and spiritual, the military and political, the industrial and commercial, and the menial. In course of time—and it must be measured in centuries—the broad conception of occupational types came to be transformed into the institution of castes as we know them today.

The caste system as a social organization has been studied in detail. But it does not appear to have been sufficiently recognized that side by side with the

four economic divisions of society there developed four distinct types of spiritual and moral ideals; and what is even more interesting, that while the four socio-economical groups were always living in harmony, having really substituted co-operation for competition, the four spiritual and ethical ideals were perpetually at war with one another, each trying to supersede the others. It would appear that, in fact, every ideal had its day, during which it dominated over the rest.

In the following pages I propose to view the whole spiritual and moral history of India in the light of the above theory.

As we observe the castes crystallizing into rigid groups, we find Indian society developing on four distinct lines. The Brâhmana followed knowledge, both finite and absolute, with a growing indifference to politics and worldly affairs, which it became the business of the Kshatriya to control. The Kshatriya brought valour, leadership, and skill to the task of organizing and protecting society. He gave it justice and security. The Vaisya, being devoted to trade and industry which brought him increasing wealth, accepted the spiritual knowledge of the Brâhmana and the political protection of the Kshatriya, and interested himself little in metaphysics or politics. The Sudra took up a career of service as a camp-follower of the Kshatriya or a labourer under the Vaisya.

Thus while the Brâhmana was engaged in extending the boundaries of knowledge till he included ultimate knowledge within him and he could call himself a sage, the Kshatriya made it his ideal to extend the boundaries of his realm till he touched the sea on two sides and he could describe himself as "one seated in the centre of a circle" (*chakravartin*), and the Vaisya was engaged in extending his trade to the farthest corners of the earth to which his ocean-craft could convey him and in amassing wealth that made his land fabulously rich. The Sudra's ideal was to serve his master even at the cost of his life. The Brâhmana seeking spiritual liberty and power was particularly individualistic and transcendental, the Kshatriya seeking political liberty and power was particularly collectivistic and martial, the Vaisya seeking wealth was particularly pacifistic, and the Sudra engaged in service was particularly altruistic.

Thus we find that side by side with

the four caste groups there developed four types of ethics.

That the occupational division of caste was associated with spiritual and moral qualities also was recognized quite early. The *Bhagavad-Gitâ*, proposing to describe the duties of the four castes, really describes the intrinsic virtues, though only in the case of two of them. The following is the account of the Brâhmana and Kshatriya qualities :

"Serenity, self-restraint, austerity, purity, forgiveness and also uprightness, finite knowledge, absolute knowledge, realization of the existence of God—these are the inborn duties (really, virtues) of the Brâhmana."

"Valour, fire (*Tejas*), firmness, dexterity, and not flying from battle, liberality (*Dânam*), lordliness (or leadership, in modern parlance),—these are the inborn Kshatriya duties (really virtues)."

Unfortunately the *Gitâ* does not follow up the method to describe the virtues of the Vaisya and the Sudra. (In their case it mentions the occupation.) One could perhaps describe their distinctive virtues as follows :

Pacifism, non-violence (*Ahimsâ*), amiability, (*Vinaya*), charity, faith,—these are the natural Vaisya virtues.

Service, self-surrender, self-sacrifice, devotion, belief in the word (*Nâma*), obedience to the master, secular and spiritual,—these are the natural Sudra virtues.

2. VEDIC PERIOD : KSHATRIYA ETHOS

If we divide the religious history of India into four great epochs—the Vedic, the Upanishadic, the Buddhistic and the Puranic then we can designate them as respectively the Kshatriya epoch, the Brâhmana epoch, the Vaisya epoch and the Sudra epoch.

The Kshatriya ideal dominated the Vedic period. It was a heroic age, active rather than meditative, as much material as spiritual, marked by an epic conception of life, an emphasis on will, and a determination to win victory over

every kind of opposition and to live a prosperous corporate life. "We will see for a hundred autumns," is the Vedic prayer or rather resolution.

"We will breathe for a hundred autumns, we will hear for a hundred autumns, we will speak for a hundred autumns, and we will hold our heads high (lit. be not lowly) for a hundred autumns."

"Having crossed the ways of evil," runs another prayer, "we will live for a hundred winters with all our sons."

It is significant that the Vedic Arya called his son a hero (Vira). The Vedic woman prayed to be a mother of heroes.

Having his mind fixed on the concrete rather than the abstract, the Vedic Indian felt the appeal of form, and his consciousness of the divine was coloured by a profound sense of the sublimity and beauty of the universe surrounding him. So he expressed himself in noble strains of poetry and music. With a profound joy in his soul he contemplated the Sun, the Sky, the Earth, the Fire, the loveliness of the Dawn, the vastness of the Sea, the fury of the Winds, and a Splendour beyond all description, "the wonder of all wonders" and through an easy symbolism realized the "One Existence which the sages call by many names" (*Rigveda*). He wished to live in unison with the universe.

"May that peace, which is in the sky and the firmament, on the earth and the water, in herbs and trees, in all gods and in everything, descend on my soul (lit. come to me)." (*Yajurveda*).

He wanted to be the master of the earth and prayed for power, which to him was an attribute of the Divine.

"Thou art fire (Tejas), give me fire; Thou art prowess, give me prowess; Thou art strength, give me strength; Thou art vigour, give me vigour; Thou art wrath, give me wrath; Thou art forbearance, give me forbearance." (*Yajurveda*).

He wanted to be at home on the

earth,—to live in peace and amity with the universe, free from fear.

"Let me be fearless of the known, and fearless of the unknown; fearless of the night and fearless of the day; let all the quarters be my friends." (*Atharvaveda*).

"I shall look on all beings with the eye of a friend" (*Yajurveda*), is another prayer or resolution.

Not that the Vedic Aryan was indifferent to transcendentalism. In fact it is the very theme of the *Vedas*. "Of what use are the verses of the Veda to him," so runs a verse in the very first Mandala of the *Rigveda*, "who has not through the verses known the indestructible, ultimate Being. . .?" "By knowing Him alone," it is said elsewhere, "one gets over death; there is no other way to go." In the *Veda* transcendentalism does not supersede materialism; it complements it.

3. UPANISHADIC PERIOD: BRAHMANA ETHOS

The *Upanishad* leaves the external universe for the abysmal depths of the soul of man, form for the formless, perception for a mystic intuition, poetry for metaphysics. As it leaves the world of phenomena for a noumenal world, it exchanges action for meditation, the Kshatriya outlook on life for a Brâhmana one. In the words of the modern psychologist, the introvert takes the place of the extrovert.

At the end of the Vedic period the homogeneous Indian society was getting split up into two rival sections. While the Kshatriya lived in the city engaged in administration and warfare, the Brâhmana made it his aim to migrate to the forest and live a secluded life devoted exclusively to the spiritual quest. He became indifferent to politics and economics and took metaphysics as his *metier*. Self-discipline (*Brahmacharya*) and self-realization (*Brahmajnâna*) became the twofold objects of

his pursuit. For the Kshatriya ideal of world-conquest he substituted the ideal of self-conquest; for the wealth that the Vaisya sought, he substituted spiritual knowledge, having voluntarily courted a life of poverty. He claimed to have developed a destructive power of the soul as a substitute for the physical force of the Kshatriya—the power of cursing, though ordinarily he expected the Kshatriya to protect him even in the forest.

The Upanishadic ideal was individualistic while the Vedic was collectivistic.

The *Upanishad*, claiming to be a personal realization of the truth revealed in the *Veda*, used, as a rule, a cryptic and gnomic language, that aimed at expressing the professedly inexpressible experiences of the spirit. There is little of the rich imagery or passionate eloquence of the *Veda*, in which the inspiration was derived from the perception of phenomena, and even in describing mystic experience the perceptual imagery was metaphorically or symbolically used (e.g. "The great Being, of the colour of the sun beyond darkness").

In the fourfold division of life that came to be made about this time, only one part was reserved for the pursuit of worldly affairs (*Grihastâsrama*), and three parts were given to self-discipline and self-realization. Towards the end of the Upanishadic period there developed the tendency among the extreme sections of the Brahmvâdins to proceed direct from the first to the last stage, altogether foregoing the worldly life.

By his intellectual and spiritual achievements the Brâhmana succeeded in building up a high prestige for him. In spite of his poverty he received great respect from king and people alike. The Brâhmana ideal was even weaning Kshatriyas from their military and political pursuits.

4. EPIC PERIOD : BRAHMANA-KSHATRIYA ETHOS

There came a time when the conflict between the Brâhmana and Kshatriya ideals was acutely felt. The question was asked, "Is it right for man to spend his life amid the storm and stress of affairs, fighting against the limitations of mundane existence or should one retire from the world to the solitude of the forest and the deeper solitude of his being and strive for self-possession in contact with ultimate existence? Should one live as a Brâhmana or as a Kshatriya? as an introvert, or an extrovert?" This poser confronted India during the later Upanishadic or the epic age. The *Bhagavad-Gitâ* squarely faces it and offers a remarkable solution.

It clearly enunciates both the ideals and gives independent expression to them. It voices the Vedic, Kshatriya and extroverted ideal when it says :

"Therefore stand up! win for thyself renown.

Conquer thy foes, enjoy the wealth-filled realm."

"Don't be unmanly, O Pârtha! it does not befit thee. Shake off this paltry faint-heartedness! Stand up, O conqueror of foes!"

On the other hand we find the Upanishadic Brâhmana and introverted philosophy of life in expressions like the following :

"He who is happy within, who rejoiceth within, who is illuminated within, that Yogi, becoming the Eternal goeth to the peace of the Eternal."

"He who is alike to foe and friend, to honour and insult, to cold and heat, to pleasure and pain, destitute of attachment; taking equally praise and reproach, silent, content with whatever comes, homeless, firm in mind, full of devotion, is dear to God."

Sometimes there is direct opposition to the *Veda* :

"The *Vedas* deal with the three attributes; be thou above these three attributes. . ."

"All the *Vedas* are as useful to an enlightened Brâhmana as is a tank in a place covered over with water."

Sometimes there is explicit opposition to the Brahmanical idea :

"Perform action regularly ; for action is superior to inaction."

"Between action and renunciation, action is superior."

"By worshipping Him by performing his duty a man obtains perfection."

The divine idea is sometimes conceived concretely, in the Vedic manner :

"God is the sapidity in waters, the radiance in moon and sun . . . the valour in men ; the pure fragrance of earths and the brilliance in fire."

"The supporter of all, of form unimaginable, refulgent as the sun beyond the darkness."

"That which is declared indestructible by the Veda-knowers."

"Whatever is glorious, good, beautiful, and mighty, understand thou that to go forth from a fragment of God's splendour."

Sometimes the divine idea is presented in the abstract in the manner of the *Upanishad* :

"Being beginningless and without quality, the imperishable Supreme Self, though seated in the body, works not nor is affected."

"The indestructible, the ineffable, the unmanifested, the omnipresent, and unthinkable, the unchanging, immutable, eternal . . ."

What solution does the *Gîtâ* offer for the conflict between the Brâhmana and the Kshatriya ideals? It solves the problem by saying, 'Be a Brâhmana first and a Kshatriya afterwards. Be a Brâhmana within, and a Kshatriya without. Be a *Yogi* and fight. Be a *Sannyasi* and act.' It combines the introverted and extroverted ideals. The *Gîtâ* tells the city to exploit the great discovery of the forest—spiritual harmony (*Yoga*). It tells the man of action to develop the spiritual poise within him. The man of action, the fighter, desires to increase his efficiency

and skill. The *Gîtâ* gives a clue to the highest kind of efficiency and skill : the establishment of the soul in its serenity and power. (*Yogah Karmasu Kausalam.*)

The combination of the Kshatriya ideal of militarism and the Brâhmana ideal of austerity and spiritual elevation was magnificently illustrated in the *Râmâyana*, India's first great art epic. "Know me as devoted to pure Dharma, like the Rishis," says Râma in the first section of the epic, and he discharges his Kshatriya duties in almost perfect conformity with this ideal. In the figure of Râma, wandering dauntlessly in the unexplored forests, bow and arrow in hand, and with his brother Lakshmana, fighting hordes of Râkshasas, and protecting his wife Sitâ and the sages who sought his help, we find a symbol of the very spirit of Kshatriyahood. Kshatriyahood as Varna (caste) is allied to Gârhastya (the household state), as Âsrama (civil state), hence only in a Kshatriya code of life there is a place for love and romance. And in the love of Râma and Sitâ (whom he won by the demonstration of valour) we find the romance dearest to the Indian imagination,—a romance in which the excesses of emotion have been subdued by an ascetic will. The peculiarly ascetic note is struck in the account of their forest life, where the loving couple live a celibate life.

But in spite of its austerity, the Kshatriya ideal dealing with the hard and sometimes rough task of defending the life and liberty of the people, looked rude compared to the Brâhmana ideal which, rejecting the worldly life, came to possess a serene brilliance about it. The Kshatriya had to face the tragedy of existence from which the Brâhmana escaped through his transcendentalism.

The tragic task of the Kshatriya is clearly enunciated in the *Râmâyana* :

“The (Kshatriya) protector has, in defence of his subjects, to do whatever is necessary, be it cruel or gentle, sinful or vicious.”

The *Mahâbhârata* is even more explicit. It enjoins on the Kshatriya to slay even those that are nearest and dearest, if they are found ranged against him in a battlefield.

The more the Indian mind admired the serene Brâhmana ideal, the more it shrank from the hardness of the Kshatriya view of life and the sense of reconciliation between the two came to be lost. The realities of the Kshatriya life also were considerably responsible for the general prejudice that was created against it. The ambition of every ruler to become a Chakravartin (emperor) kept the country perpetually engaged in internecine warfare, and the great fratricidal battle of Kurukshetra, on which the story of the *Mahâbhârata* was based, must have severely injured not only the numerical strength of the Kshatriya clans but also their very ideals.

5. BUDDHIST PERIOD: VAISYA ETHOS

At the end of the epic period the Kshatriya ideals received the severest blow from a scion of the Kshatriya race—Sâkyâ Sinha, who became Buddha. Lord Buddha attacked everything in Kshatriya ideology,—the ideal of heroism, the epic view of life, the conception of romance. He rejected the compromise between Kshatriya and Brâhmana ethics. He threw the weight of his magnificent personality on the side of the Brâhmana ideal.

Buddha, however, accepted the Brâhmana ideal with two reservations. Of the Brâhmana's ideal of Brahmacharya (self-discipline) and Brahmavidyâ (metaphysics), he rejected the latter and accepted only the former. “By

Brahmacharya the Devas became immortal,” said the *Veda*. “By Brahmacharya (self-discipline) man becomes perfect,” said Buddha. But he opposed the excesses of Brâhmana asceticism, which seem to have gone too far in his days. He wanted to eliminate conflict from life—conflict that was the *raison d'être* of the Kshatriya ideal. Let there be no resistance to evil, he said; meet anger by non-anger. “I shall look on all beings,” said the Rishi in the *Veda*, “with the eye of a friend.” Buddha wanted to make no reservation in the application of the ideal; all forms of life he wanted to be treated alike.

Buddha preached Brahmanism without Brahman (God). “I call him a Brâhmana,” he says in the *Dhammapada*.

“Who has laid by the rod, who does not injure or kill any animal moving or non-moving”; “who is pure as the bright moon, who is undisturbed and serene, who has given up the desire of life”; “who having forsaken desires has left his home and become a wanderer.”

Buddha built a new Brâhmanahood on the basis of this gospel—the “Aryan Path,” as he called it—by admitting into it everybody who wished to practise the ideal, irrespective of his former caste or creed. The ideal found a concrete form in the institution of the Sangha. Thus the Brâhmana ideal, shorn of its transcendentalism, had a new career under the inspiration of Lord Buddha's personality.

To the lay Buddhist, it was the Vaisya ideal of non-violence rather than the Brâhmana ideal of asceticism in his creed that made a special appeal. The Vaisya caste seems to have been particularly drawn to Buddhism, as it was drawn to the other similar creed, Jainism, contemporaneous with Buddhism. The virtue by which the Vaisya distinguished himself was not austerity; it was

liberality. The Buddhist as well as the Jain spiritual order derived much benefit from the munificent gifts of the Vaisya.

It will not be far wide of the mark to say that the Vaisya ethics dominated the Buddhist age.

6. PURANIK PERIOD : SUDRA ETHOS

The Puranik age which partly synchronized with and partly succeeded the Buddhist epoch converted the poetry of the *Veda* and the metaphysics of the *Upanishad* into mythology and legend, with a free admixture of historical material. By this time the homogeneous Aryan race had mixed itself up with the vast concourse of humanity through the length and breadth of the Indian peninsula in various degrees of intimacy and their simple spiritual culture become composite in its structure, affiliating, in various degrees of cohesion, the faiths and beliefs of the non-Aryan tribes. Sapta-Sindhu, that had widened into Aryāvarta, now widened still further into what came to be called Hindustan, through the process of Aryanization that had begun right from the times of the *Rigveda* with the exhortation, 'Aryanize the world' (Krinyantu Viswam Aryam) and received tremendous momentum in the Buddhist age, when monks carried the ideal of "Aryan Path" not only to every corner of India, but also to different parts of the world outside. But the extension of the spiritual culture of the Aryan was obtained at a considerable sacrifice of its intensity and power.

A general spirit of decadence was manifest in the religious thought of the Puranik age. The old spiritual vigour, audacity, self-confidence and joyousness had gone. The decadent mentality was in evidence in the theory of Kali Yuga, the iron age, in which high and mighty

things could not be done, and in a general spirit of pessimism and fatalism.

One very important feature of Puranik cults was the idea of personality attributed to the Divinity. Three rival conceptions of God are found in this age: God as Creator—Brahmâ, God as Destroyer—Siva, God as Supporter—Vishnu. The first stood for the Brâhmana view of life, the second for the Kshatriya, and the third for the Vaisya and Sudra. Later the Brahmâ idea was left out, and Brâhmana and Kshatriya ideals were united in the cult of Siva, which had for its rival the Vaishnava cult that steadily grew into popularity. Of the Divine Parents, Siva and Parvati, the former represented the Brâhmana ideal of austerity, and the latter the Kshatriya ideal of valour. According to the Puranik legend Pârvati as Durgâ led the Devas to victory in a battle against the Asuras. Saivism also harmonized the conception of the Divinity as Mother among the matriarchal Dravidians with the conception as Father among the patriarchal Aryans. Throughout the Puranik and Middle Ages the Kshatriya clans were followers of Saivism. Among Saivas there were even Brâhmanas who took up the military career.

The Vishnu cult emphasized peace and grace. "The steady-minded people always view the ultimate abode of Vishnu", says the *Veda*. Serene bliss emanating out of a quiet and beneficent mode of living was the aim of Vaishnava idealism.

The introduction of personality in religion resulted in the creation of great plastic arts,—architecture and sculpture. The beautiful land of India was made lovelier by fine Buddhist, Jaina, and Hindu temples, and many of these had splendid images installed in them. Architecture was reinforced by decorative sculpture and painting. Music and

even dancing came to play their part in worship.

In its early stages Vaishnavism centred in the Vedic conception. And through the Avatâr theory, great figures of national history were connected with the Vishnu idea. Râma was taken as an incarnation of Vishnu. Krishna, the powerful ally of the Pândavas, was believed to be Vishnu incarnate. Buddha himself was taken as the last Avatâr but one of Vishnu.

Later the Vaishnavas discarded the Kshatriya Krishna for the more fascinating figure of the youthful Vaisya Krishna of Vrindâvan, brought up in a milkman's family, who spent an idyllic life among the cowherds and milkmaids. The love of Krishna and the milkmaids, especially the loveliest among them, Râdhâ, was accepted by the Vaishnavas as the symbol of Divine love. Thus the epic note of Kshatriya ideology gave place to a tender lyricism; feminine grace replaced masculine vigour. The lyric tradition in Sanskrit poetry being always frankly sensual, there was no wonder that the same tendency should characterize religious lyricism as well. The aggressive eroticism of the Vaishnavas came also as a reaction against the rigid asceticism of the Buddhist and the Brâhmana, just as its extreme pacifism was in reaction to Kshatriya hardness.

A self-conscious Sudra ideology made its appearance in Vaishnavism. Religion became self-surrender, self-sacrifice, devotion. Servitude (Dâsya) was formulated as a spiritual attitude. Worship took the place of self-realization. The Guru (preceptor) instead of being a spiritual guide became a spiritual authority, and assumed, in the eyes of the disciple, the status of the Divinity Himself.

Buddhism itself was moving from the Brâhmana and Vaisya ideal to the

Sudra ideal. The practice of Dharma as laid down by Buddha was replaced by a worship of Buddha himself. The Jâtaka stories preached extreme forms of self-sacrifice (e.g. a man offering himself before a hungry tigress to appease her hunger).

When Sankarâchârya opposed Buddhism it was already in a decadent state. He restored Brahnavidyâ (metaphysics) to Buddha's ideal of exclusive Brahmacharya (self-discipline). The transition from Buddhism to Hinduism must have been extremely simple and silent. The Buddhist monks became Brâhmanas, having added metaphysics to their ascetic ideal; the lay Buddhists accepted Vaishnavism, that recognized Buddha himself as one of the incarnations of the Divinity.

Buddha had not taught Brâhmana asceticism in vain. The Brâhmana caste, which absorbed practically the whole of the reconverted monkish order, which in its turn had been recruited from all castes and races, became the most numerous caste group in India. With a large section of society following a non-secular ideal, and many of them taking up a mendicant life, it is not strange that the Purânas should insist so much on the virtue of giving charities to the Brâhmana.

It is notable that while the Brâhmana ideal had a strong champion in Sankarâchârya, the Kshatriya ideal does not appear to have had any case made for it, though it was chiefly this that came to be opposed by Buddha. Nobody is known to have pleaded for the necessity of politics and militarism and said that it was wrong for Asoka to have laid down his arms. The fact was that the pacifist ideal had come to stay. Even the national food underwent a permanent change. The large

majority of Brâhmanas and Vaisyas took to the vegetarian diet.

The Kshatriya ideal lived in the decimated Kshatriya clans, whose ranks, however, were augmented by the accession to the caste of martially employed Sudras and foreign immigrants. It also lived in the deathless verses of the *Râmâyana* and the *Mahâbhârata*, which inspired fresh epics, though of a minor order, including Kalidâsa's *The Line of Raghus*, that revived many memories of Kshatriya valour, and insisted upon purity of moral character as a royal virtue.

7. MIDDLE AGES : VAISYA-SUDRA ETHOS

Neo-Vaishnavism, based on love and lyricism, steadily gained ground among people demilitarized by Buddhism (e.g. in Bengal and Orissa) and itself demilitarized new peoples (e.g. in Gujerat).

Among medieval saints Chaitanya's life illustrated the ideal of lyric ecstasy. Tukârâm and other saints of Maharashtra gave expression to their emotion in mellifluous verses and found a large following among the Vaisya communities. But nowhere was the characteristic Vaisnava feeling of lyric love, corresponding to the love of Râdhâ for Krishna, more sweetly expressed than in the ethereal songs of the Rajputani Mirâbâi. While the work of male poets like Jaydeva and Chandidâs continued the classical Sanskrit tradition of erotic lyricism, in the poetry of Mirâ there is the burning intensity of a personal emotion, in which the longings of a youthful female heart have been sublimated into a spiritual ecstasy.

In the South philosophers rather than poets were engaged in the interpretation of the dualistic cult of Bhakti.

Historical circumstances contrived to convert an essentially Bhakti cult, Sikhism, into a militant creed. This is

the first case of the revival of the Kshatriya ideal in a credal and proselytizing form.

Those who preached Râma worship, e.g. Râmdâs in Maharashtra and Tulsi-das in the North, contributed to the maintenance of the Kshatriya spirit. (Though an incarnation of Vishnu, Râma was a Kshatriya and a warrior. In fact, Râma, the slayer of Râvana, corresponds to the Vedic Indra, the slayer of Vritra, and Hanumân was a son of Marut, the Vedic deity).* Râmdâs preached the Kshatriya and collectivistic idea and had his share of influence in the course of Maratha history.

Saivism itself was affected by the Bhakti cult, as in the Vira-Saiva sect in the South. In Bengal and elsewhere the female aspect of Saivism received special attention and led to the formation of the Sakti cult.

Though the extensive anti-martial tendencies cost India her political liberty, yet the Indian masses were guided by sufficiently sound traditions of spiritual dignity and social order to have been the only people in the world who, having yielded to Moslem rule, did not surrender their religion. It seems miraculous that while Islam made short work of the religion of conquered countries (e.g. Persia, Turkey, Egypt, Afghanistan), Hinduism survived practically intact except in certain regions, more than five hundred years of Moslem rule. And it is in India and not in the essentially Moslem countries that the finest specimens of Moslem architecture, and painting, and a noble Moslem tradition of music are to be found. It is also noteworthy that in the territories reconquered by Hindus from Moslems, no retaliatory measures were taken

* View expressed by A. A. Macdonell in his *History of Sanskrit Literature*.

against the Moslems' religion; rather the liberty of religious practice was freely allowed. When Sivaji restored a fair Moslem captive of war to her people, saying that had his mother been handsome like her, his features would have been much better (a fact recorded by a Moslem historian), he scored a spiritual triumph over the Moslem victors who had through the centuries showered indignities on women of his own religion; and he showed that he had listened to the *Râmâyana* and the *Mahâbhârata* in his early years to some good purposes, and that his worship of the Divine Mother Bhavâni had a practical side also.

8. MODERN RELIGIOUS REVIVALS

In the nineteenth century the impact of Christianity and of Western culture on Hinduism had its natural reactions, and a number of revivalist movements followed. At first Christianity and Western culture were taken as identical, little notice being taken of the fact that the latter, deriving its inspiration from pagan Greece, flourished at the expense of the former. The conflict in European life between Hellenism and Hebraism, which in a larger sense is the conflict between the Aryan and the Semetic outlook on life, was not recognized. Against the Christian ideal, which was allied to the Vaishnava, the Brâhmo Samâj placed the Brâhmana transcendentalism of the *Upanishad*, for which they found Western support in the recent German philosophy of Europe. The Theosophical movement sponsored by Europeans accepted Hinduism in a larger sense than the Brâhmos, and interpreted the spiritual significance of the Puranik sects as well. The work of European orientalists did a great deal to bring to light the vast treasures of ancient wisdom, and their interpretation of the *Vedas*, however

provisional, revealed the contents of what had remained sealed books for centuries.

For the first time since the close of the epic period, a systematic attempt was made to revive the Vedic religion and culture. It was made through the inspiration of a blind recluse, Virajanda, by Swami Dayananda, a Brâhmana Sannyasi from Gujerat, the land of Vaishnavism, though Dayananda came from a Saiva family. The detailed secular and nationalist programme of the Arya Samaj founded by him, and his revival of the long discarded proselytization, point to a Kshatriya ideology characteristic of Vedic culture. No wonder that people of a distinctly Aryan stock and Kshatriya mentality should rally round it.

Near Calcutta, the very centre of Western culture and of nineteenth century agnosticism, there came to live a saint who was faced with the task of solving the whole problem of the reality of religion and of spiritual culture. Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa not only defended religion, but inspired an enthusiasm for it which had far-reaching results. He said that spiritual realization was not only a possible theory but an actual fact of his own experience. This meant a repudiation not only of the inferiority complex induced by the impact of Western culture, but also of the inferiority complex created by the theory of Kali Yuga, in which the spiritual realization of the Vedic and Upanishadic ages was believed to be out of date. By insisting on the fundamentals of religion, Ramakrishna showed in his own life a synthesis of conflicting religious attitudes. Swami Vivekananda, who took up his teaching with a creative understanding, accepted the Vedânta philosophy as a clue to the interpretation of all religions, and

brought a Kshatriya spirit to the pursuit of his mission. The Kshatriya energy that Guru Govind applied to political regeneration, Vivekananda wished to apply to spiritual regeneration.

In more recent times Mahatma Gandhi made a remarkable effort to combine Vaisya and Sudra ideology with a Kshatriya and political programme of life. He wanted his followers at once to surrender and to resist. Quite characteristically he found support for his attitude in the *Bhagavad-Gitâ*. The poet Rabindranath Tagore, born to Upanishadic ideals and deriving his poetical inspiration from medieval Vaishnava lyrics, has been engaged in another task of reconciliation, that between Upanishadic transcendentalism and Vaishnava eroticism. He is at his finest as a poet when he combines the two into a mystic lyric expression.

All the modern revivalist movements

have emphasized the continuity of Indian spiritual culture from the Vedic times. And this wide perspective has naturally brought about a new conception of Hinduism,—that it is the corporate result of the effort of sages and saints through the centuries and includes every religious sect that originated in India. The Hindu Mahâsabhâ which represents this ideal is engaged in the task of restoring the Kshatriya attitude of organization and leadership to the enlightened section of the Hindus. The fatal tendencies of the exclusively non-secular, individualistic and introverted Brâhmana ethos and the anti-intellectual, anti-martial and anti-political Vaisya and Sudra ethos, can only be resisted by the conscious development of a collectivistic, practical and extroverted Kshatriya ethos. The ideal remains the same as was preached in the *Gitâ*. Be a Brâhmana within and a Kshatriya without, be a Yogi and act.

THE PLAYER IN THE RÔLE

BY GRACE HALL

Prelude

One slender thread of life He slowly spins,
And drops it gently, garnering as it goes
From plane, through plane, the Virtues and the Sins
Left as the Seeds, for happiness or woes.
Burdened with these, and clothed in five-fold sheath—
Through manifested space, air, sky,—to earth
(Made by Avidyâ), comes the little self
To blunder, and to learn the dross and worth
Of choice between Reality and pelf,
The mundane senses, and the Soul beneath.

Act One

Prakriti reigns !
Samsâra, Mâyâ, Vrittis, are the slaves
That bind him to the wheel of death and birth ;
And Dharma, Artha, Kâma, are the waves
That smother him, and keep him sunk to earth.

Scene II

Finding all life must end in death and pain,
 What pleasures him to gain all things that be
 In this whole world, if re-death comes again?
 He looks beyond—for Immortality.

Act Two

Never to perish !
 What? Where? How? and When
 Shall search be made to find the hidden key
 To that locked Door of Knowledge, free to men
 Who, finding Wisdom, are At One with Me?

Act Three

Indefinite, extended, multiple,
 From lives long past, the Karmic Debt unfolds ;
 Dispassionate, yet inescapable—
 The Law of Perfect Justice always holds.

Act Four

To know the Self as Ātman ! herein lies
 Through Super-consciousness, the end and aim.
 Sat, Chit, Ānanda never dies.
 Atonement reached, He never more is twain.

RELIGIONS: MAIN POINTS OF AGREEMENT

BY SWAMI GHANANANDA

Striking indeed are the results of the study of comparative religion and philosophy, which is coming more and more into vogue at the present day. When done in an impartial and constructive spirit, and not with a view to glorify any religion at the expense of other faiths, such a study reveals how great religious systems have grown in the past and what their elements are. It discloses the points of agreement and difference between religions, and also enables us to explain them. It truly lays the foundation for a better understanding between the various creeds of the world.

What indeed are the points of

similarity between the religions of the world?

When we analyse the elements of any religion, we find that it usually begins with the well-known question of the origin of the universe. We see the sublime and beautiful nature around us—the earth below and the sun and the moon and the stars above. What is the story of this wonderful creation? Every religion answers this question in its cosmological part. This question naturally leads to the second, viz., What is the First Principle? What existed before the universe came into existence? What is Its nature? The answer to this is given in the portion

of religion relating to the nature of God. Thirdly the question is asked about man himself who forms the microcosm—a part and parcel of this universe. What is man? What is the relation between man and the universe around, as well as between man and his Maker? Fourthly comes the question which concerns everyone, viz., What happens to us after death? What indeed is the difference between one who does not want religion or believe in it, and another who professes and practises it? This question is answered in the eschatological part of every religion. We thus find that the First Principle or the nature of God, Cosmology or the science of creation, the soul of man or his real nature, and Eschatology or the science of life after death, form the subject matter of every religion. This is the first great point of similarity between religions.

Secondly, every religion also recognizes that it should make its followers better and nobler; or in other words, its value consists not in its doctrines and dogmas, its theories about God, soul and salvation, but in its power to refine and mould our character. Every Teacher has laid down rules of conduct for the guidance of his followers, and these have been elaborated in the system of religion that has grown under the inspiration of his personality. The moral and ethical code of all religions contains such universal moral sentiments and ethical precepts as truthfulness, purity, temperance, justice, kindness to men and animals, patience, love, charity etc. It teaches men to strive after moral excellence. It inculcates the Golden Rule to do unto others as we would others do unto us.

It may be asked why all religions emphasize the need for the practice of moral and ethical disciplines. These are intended to purify the mind in

order that it may reflect the purity and peace within. Moral and ethical training has to go hand in hand with spiritual practices for success in religious life. Man must be pure both externally and internally to attain spiritual progress. External purity can be attained by cleansing and other processes, but internal purity which is far more essential than the external can be attained only by the observance of right rules of conduct and morality. These rules in the form of the "Do's" and "Don't's" of its moral and ethical code are enjoined by every religion.

If moral and ethical preparation is necessary for success in spiritual life, what is meant by spiritual life itself? Spiritual life is life of the spirit. It is a third common feature of all religions that they proclaim the existence of a soul beyond body and mind. They tell us that in man there is an undying part called the soul or spirit which does not die with the death of the body, but is imperishable and immortal. They tell us in different words that the soul itself is pure and perfect, but man has made himself impure and imperfect by his own actions in disobedience to spiritual laws, which some religions call God's commandments. The average man does not understand this fact, though he may believe in it; it is due to the limitations of body and mind, which cloud the soul from his vision. Man can realize his spiritual nature by transcending these limitations.

In dealing with the nature of the soul, some religious systems like the Hindu have also treated about the nature of the mind as well as the nature of knowledge. This has resulted in the growth and development of the sciences of psychology and epistemology under such religious systems.

It is worthy of note that Buddhism does not believe in any permanent value

for the soul, and the question of realizing it does not, therefore, arise in that religion. On the other hand, it preaches that man should realize its impermanence to attain the goal of life.

Though religions tell us that man has lost the original purity and perfection of his soul by violating moral and spiritual laws which are often called God's commandments, they show him the path by which he can regain his spiritual nature, and become pure and perfect again. The means and methods of attaining grace or spiritual perfection may be said to form the fourth point of agreement between religions. Now to please God, we must worship Him and live a life in obedience to His commandments. Such worship is done in a variety of ways—with or without the help of symbols, images etc. Religions like Protestantism and Islam emphatically prohibit the worship of God through images, as such extraneous help was evidently abused by men who took them for God Himself. Hence the strong hatred of these religions for what they call idolatry. But let it not be forgotten that images, symbols, and other external aids are but remembrancers of the ideal and the abstract. It is the ideal that is worshipped through the idol, and not the idol itself.

Religions recommend also the worship of Incarnations and Prophets, and saints and holy men. They enjoin on their followers pilgrimages to holy places and observance of similar means for their benefit. So universal are these that we find them enjoined even by Buddhism and Jainism which deny God.

It is also remarkable that all religions have discovered the glory and potency of sacred names or mystic formulae. Buddhism and Jainism also believe in their efficacy. Their repetition is considered a valuable practice by all systems of religions in the world.

Fifthly, religions provide man with the means and methods of purifying and more or less exercising his will, intellect and heart during the course of his spiritual evolution, by laying greater or less emphasis on one or more of these mental faculties according to his temperamental tastes and inclinations, and thus enabling him to culture them. This results in an intense expression of his personality through the growth and development of his faculties. And as education itself means the 'drawing out' of these faculties and unfoldment of the inner self, religious culture may be said to be the fulfilment of all education. True education in the real sense of the word is incomplete without spiritual culture.

Though scope has been given in every religion for the exercise of the faculties of the mind and their purification, the extent of the scope differs from one religion to another. If the emphasis is more on will, the religion becomes more active in type, and suits followers of an active temperament; if on intellect, it becomes predominantly a path of discrimination, with a highly developed system of philosophy and metaphysics, and suits those adherents who are marked by distinctly intellectual tendencies; if on emotion, it bears a strong emotional impress, and suits those votaries richly endowed with feeling.

Sixthly, every religion consists of four parts, viz., mythology and rituals, philosophy and higher spiritual disciplines. Of these the first two may be said to have been intended for the masses, just as the last two are for the enlightened and cultured minds. This does not mean that mythology and rituals are valueless for the learned; they contain nuggets of gold which require but a little polishing to bring out their lustre. They have a philosophical background and breathe a religious atmosphere. They have successfully

democratized those truths of religion and philosophy, which would otherwise have remained inaccessible to the masses. They may be called the kindergarten of religion, and it is but few that can afford to forego the benefit that can be derived from them in a greater or smaller measure. Study of mythology forms a preparation for the performance of rituals and ceremonials. If mythology is for the unsophisticated, philosophy is for the more advanced. Rituals and ceremonials form the practical part of mythology, whereas meditation and other higher spiritual exercises are intended for the realization of truths preached by philosophy. Mere study of the theoretical part of a religion, whether it be popular mythology or intricate philosophy, can never take us to the goal; unless we undergo a practical course with great steadfastness and devotion, we cannot realize God.

It may be asked, "What does the practice of religion lead us to?" The answer to this is furnished by all religions, and forms their seventh point of agreement. They all tell us that as a result of worship, prayer, and other forms of spiritual disciplines, man reaches a plane beyond this world, beyond his mind or intellect, and comes face to face, as it were, with certain facts or truths, which he could never have sensed with the senses, nor perceived with the mind or the intellect. In other words, he attains the superconscious state. What has been called revelation or inspiration, or God teaching man or speaking to him as to a beloved son, is possible only when man elevates himself to that exalted plane. The state of superconsciousness is called Samâdhi by the Hindu, Nirvâna by the Buddhist, peace that passeth all understanding by the *Bible*, and is known by other terms in other Scriptures.

Superconscious realization being the

goal of all religious practices, it is obvious that the Prophet or Teacher of every Scripture has attained it in an abundance and to a degree undreamt of by ordinary mortals. This, then, is another point of similarity between religions, viz., that superconscious realization of a high order, of a profound and extraordinary character, is the criterion of a Prophet or a Teacher, a seer or a free soul, and such realization forms the central core of every religion. When great Teachers or Prophets or a group of seers or perfected men attained the superconscious state, they had high spiritual truths revealed to them. These were taught by them and preserved by men, being transmitted by word of mouth or set down in writing. Thus came the Scriptures of every religion, which are reverently studied by its adherents, and which form its great authority.

It is, however, but natural that the followers of a religion do not understand the truths of the Scriptures as clearly as the immediate disciples of the Prophet or Teacher who originally taught them. Hence in every religion theologians and philosophers arose, who commented upon the Scriptures. A system of philosophy that has grown round the Scriptures of any religion is unlike the speculative and discursive philosophy of the West today, but highly intuitive and practical; it prepares the ground for the practice of the religion.

All religions with their systems of theology and philosophy consider the realization of God as the *summum bonum* of life and culmination of man's endeavours. Every religion, therefore, preaches that man's life should be so ordered and lived that he may ultimately reach the Divine goal. This has resulted in the growth and development of cultures and civilizations which have been influenced and moulded by

the spirit of religious teachings to a greater or less extent. Poetry, painting, music, sculpture and architecture—all these have been employed by religions as handmaids to serve a spiritual end.

Facts relating to Teachers or Prophets and the Scriptures, to theology and philosophy, and to the characteristic type of culture and civilization under every religion may be set down as the eighth common feature of religions.

We saw that the attainment of superconsciousness which comes with the realization of the Personal God or the Impersonal Absolute is the culmination of all spiritual practices. Now what is the state of the soul during realization which is the greatest theme of every religion? All systems proclaim that the soul experiences either its affinity with the Personal God or its unity with the Impersonal Absolute, in the state of superconsciousness. This, then, forms the ninth common feature of religions. In monistic religions of the Advaita Vedânta and Sufism, unity of the soul with the Godhead is boldly proclaimed. In the non-monistic systems, the soul is considered a part of God, or as existing in some sort of relationship with the Creator, like servant and Master, son and Father, and so on. It may be observed in passing that the Indian systems have a well-elaborated metaphysical literature dealing with the relation of soul with God.

Tenthly, the conception of the relation of the soul of man to his Maker has, in the case of all religions, spiritualized the conception of the relation of man to man. God being impartial, all men are equal in His eyes, despite the inequalities of life for which they alone are responsible. Every religious system, therefore, has exercised and is still exercising a potent influence on the social and collective life of its followers. They are not chance companions in the

journey of life, but spiritual sisters and brothers marching on a religious pilgrimage and bound for a divine destination. All religions preach the unity of life and solidarity of mankind, and when this doctrine is translated into practice, it results in the formation of large communities and great brotherhoods. Usually man's sense of unity and brotherhood is confined to the fold of the religion or sect to which he belongs.

Why is the sense of brotherhood limited to one's own religion or sect? A consideration of this question leads us to yet another feature common to all religions, viz. every religion preaches a definite path of its own. Every great Prophet or Incarnation has emphatically proclaimed, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." Such teachings may be considered as the positive part of a religion. But every religion has also a negative part, which speaks of hell-fire and damnation, eternal or otherwise, for the stragglers. This is intended to prevent the followers from straying into other folds. This, then, is the eleventh point of similarity.

Last, but not least, is the most interesting and to the students of comparative religion and philosophy the most instructive feature common to all religions. It is a matter for agreeable surprise that comparative religion and philosophy proves beyond doubt that every religion possesses an unmistakable element of catholicity and broad-mindedness in a greater or less degree—a generous and hospitable attitude towards other religions. The unique attitude of Hinduism has already been dealt with. The Scriptures of other religions also bear testimony to this fact.

A passage from the Buddhist Scriptures reads: "The root of religion is to reverence one's own faith and never to revile the faith of others. My doctrine

makes no distinction between high and low, rich and poor. It is like the sky; it has room for all, and like water it washes all alike." The Sutta Nipâta tells us that Buddha condemned the tendency prevalent among the religious disputants of his day to make a display of their own doctrines and damn those of others. He also held in high respect the Brâhmanas who led the truly moral life. He asks his followers to avoid all discussions which are likely to stir up discontent among the different sects. One of Asoka's rock edicts, the theme of which is religious toleration, says, "The King, beloved of the Gods, honours every form of religious faith, but considers no gift or honour so much as the increase of the substance of religion; whereof, this is the root, to reverence one's own faith and never to revile that of others. Whoever acts differently injures his own religion while he wrongs another's." "The texts of all forms of religion shall be followed under my protection." (The Twelfth Rock Edict). Commenting on these noble sentiments, Professor Radhakrishnan rightly says: "The Hindu and the Buddhist rulers of India acted up to this principle with the result that the persecuted and the refugees of all great religions found shelter in India. The Jews, the Christians, the Parsees were all allowed absolute freedom to develop on their own lines. Yuan Chwang reports that at the great festival of Prayâga, King Harsha dedicated on the first day a statue to the Buddha, another to the sun, the favourite deity of his father, on the second, and to Siva on the third. The famous Kottayam plates of Stanuravi (9th century A.D.) and the Cochin plates of Vijayaragadeva bear eloquent testimony to the fact that the Hindu kings not only tolerated Christianity but granted special concessions to the professors of that faith. Only the other day

the Hindu prince of Mysore made a gift to the re-building of the Christian Church in his state." (*The Hindu View of Life*)

Nanak, the founder of Sikhism, says: "He alone is a true Hindu whose heart is just, and he only is a good Moham-medan whose life is pure. Be true and thou shalt be free God will not ask man of what race he is, He will ask what he has done." "Love the saints of every faith. Put away your pride. Remember the essence of religion is meekness and sympathy." "To him the delusion of whose heart is gone, Hindus and Mussalmans are the same."

The Zoroastrian religion expresses a noble sentiment in the words: "Have the religions of mankind no common ground? Is there not everywhere the same enrapturing beauty? Broad indeed is the carpet which God has spread, and many are the colours which He has given it. Whatever road I take joins the highway that leads to the Divine."

Judaism also teaches the same broad-mindedness. It says: "Have we not all One Father, hath not One God created us?" (*Mat. II. 10*) "Thou shalt not vex a stranger nor oppress him, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." (*Exod. XXII. 21*). Even the Egyptians by whom the Israelites had been so mercilessly treated were to be requitted with charitable forbearance. "Thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian, because thou wast a stranger in his land" (*Deut. XXIII. 7*). The law knew no difference between the Jew and the Gentile.

In the Christian Scriptures it is written: "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that revereth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him." "He hath made of one blood all the nations of the earth."

About the diversity of religions, the *Koran* says: "To everyone we have given a law and a way. And if God had pleased, He would have made you all one people (professing one religion). But He hath done otherwise that He might try you in that which He has severally given unto you; wherefore press forward in good works. Unto God shall ye return and He will tell you that concerning which you disagree."

Says the Prophet of Islam, "There is no compulsion in religion; the right way is in itself distinguished from the wrong" (*Koran* ii. 258). "Say thou, O ye who disbelieve, I do not worship what ye worship, nor do ye worship what I worship, neither will I worship what ye worship, neither will ye worship what I worship . . . ye have your religion and I have my religion." (*Ibid* cix) "Abuse not those whom they call on beside God, for then they may abuse God openly in their ignorance." (*Ibid* vi. 108).

In fact the many points of similarity between the teachings of the world's different prophets and teachers make one inclined to think that if they were all to meet today, they would embrace one another in mutual love and respect, and pass into a state of God-consciousness in their ecstatic joy. They would certainly be shocked at the religious feuds and dissensions between their numerous followers. So striking are the points of agreement between the various religions as to suggest that in many particulars they have copied from one another. They all owe their origin to the superconscious realizations of the several prophets and teachers, and their teachings help one to reach the spiritual plane. The language of nations, their customs and manners are many; but the language of the soul which finds expression through them is but one. The difference between the religions of the world is but one of expression, ~~not~~ of substance.

CRITICAL REMARKS ON THE IDEA OF THE ABSOLUTE, AS FOUND IN HEGEL AND SANKARA

BY DRUPAD S. DESAI, M.A., LL.B.

So far,* our attempt has been to study and understand what Hegel and Sankara had to say with regard to the idea of the Absolute. Now, we may fitly pass on to review the whole thing critically .

We propose to criticize Hegel only, inasmuch as we maintain that his is a very unsatisfactory, untenable position. If we want to think out as philosophers, at all, if as philosophers,

* *Hegel's Idea of the Absolute and Sankara's Idea of the Absolute published in Prabuddha Bharata, April and June, 1936 respectively.*

we must go to the root of thoughts and things, either skepticism of the Humian type—or, of the Buddhistic Sunyavâda type,—or Absolutism, of the rigorous, unqualified type, such as Sankara has given to us, offers itself as the only legitimate conclusion for us to accept and act upon. Attempts to build such halfway houses, as found in Hegel and others, when they speak of system, Identity-in-Difference, Degrees of Reality and so on, are all attempts, we believe, to build on sandy foundations, not on the solid rock of

a genuine, thorough-going, searchingly critical philosophical insight.

Skepticism, of course, is out of question, altogether. We need not even stop here to discuss it at any more length. We may simply point out how untrue to itself it is. "A single thought, a single word, a single movement of head or heart, is sufficient to destroy absolute skepticism."

Sankara's position, therefore, we venture to hold, is, in the last analysis, the only one that is possible and tenable. Hegel, we are of opinion, has stopped short in the middle, and failed to follow out his position to its logical conclusion. Otherwise, a frank and candid thinking out of his position to its logical conclusion would lead us to no other result but the one to which Sankara has led us. If we see the universe whole, if there is a plane of experience where experience is coincident with Being, with Reality as it truly is, then, surely, Space, Time, Matter, Evil, striving and struggling—all, all must disappear, and we should see only the One, Eternal, Perfect, Unchanging, Spiritual Unity, the Brahman.

Having said this much by way of general prefatory remarks, we now proceed to criticize Hegel in some detail. In order that this detailed criticism of ours may be brief and relevant, we propose to proceed by giving, first, a résumé of the main points involved in Hegel's treatment of the problem under discussion, and then offer our criticisms on the same.

HEGEL ON THE NATURE OF THE UNITY CONSTITUTING THE ABSOLUTE

His views on this problem lay bare before us the following main points, which we shall criticize :

I. Reality is a system,

II. Reality is a graded system,

III. Reality is a system of opposites, and

IV. The Real is the Rational, and the Rational the Real.

The first three points may be said to have been already discussed, but only partially and in the form of side remarks, while dealing with Sankara's idea of the Absolute. We will not repeat those remarks here, therefore. We will add only some additional critical remarks thereon.

(I) The Absolute is a harmonious whole, a differentiated unity. The whole and the individuals into which it is differentiated are in harmony, because it is the inherent nature of both to be in such harmony. A question may be raised as against this, however, that if the correlation and parallelism are so precise and infallible, it certainly ceases to be a system of opposites at all, at any rate. How can we, then, speak of any opposition or contrast being still there?

Next, let us criticize the concept of Identity-in-Difference. The Absolute, it is said, is Identity-in-Difference. This, we believe, is a misnomer. There can be either Identity or Difference, or the Identity alone real and the Difference unreal. For we have no experience of Identity-in-Difference. It is really inconceivable that, at the same time and in the same sense, both identity and difference should co-exist in the manner in which it is supposed to do. Identity alone gives meaning to difference. Even the Law of Contradiction by itself would be meaningless and invalid, if the underlying essential unity were not there to which opposite attributes could be applied. In themselves, contradictory assertions cannot exist as true. We are able to recognize differences everywhere, because "we" that experiences those differences is the same, continuous "we", all along. But

this does not mean at all and in any sense that what we experience every moment is Identity-in-Difference. The differences are so many detached and passing experiences only, which derive their meaning and significance only from their being experienced by one and the same underlying identity. If the differences are to be taken as real in the same sense as the identity is real, philosophically we shall be thrown back upon a pluralistic position of a very naïve type.

(II) Hegel's doctrine of Degrees of Reality cannot be adequately criticized without a reference to his doctrine of Degrees of Truth.

Starting, as Hegel did, from the irreducible minimum of the Subject—Object relation in knowledge, it was just natural for him not to speak of the distinction of Truth and Falsehood, but only of Degrees of Truth. Ordinary knowledge, viz. that the object is independent of the subject, and exists by its own right, is not false, according to him, but contains only the lowest degree of truth.

We are of opinion that philosophy, as strict philosophy, should have nothing to do with such a view embodied in such a doctrine. It is the supreme task of philosophy to give us certitude or truth that is one and absolute, and admits of no doubt at any time. The Vedânta alone, we believe, has succeeded in giving us this final certitude, the certitude of the Self.

For ordinary usage, too, it would be a very loose way of talking if we were to talk in terms of degrees of truth. For, in that case, we would be using the word "truth" in different senses at different times. Even there, therefore, the way can be allowed—and is allowed mostly—as a cloak for our ignorance. Much less can it be countenanced in the field of philosophy. For, philo-

sophy is not simply common sense taken wholly on trust; it is, rather, common sense criticized and corrected, wherever necessary.

There, indeed, cannot be two senses of the word "Real" similarly, used as it suits us, and as convenience requires it.

(III) How can opposites be united into a system at all, passes comprehension. Because in being brought together to form a system, the opposites must first cease to be in the nature of opposites.

Again, Hegel here seems to think of the Absolute as a process, as a Becoming, not as a Being. As for our criticism of the position that the Absolute is a process, it has already been touched upon in our treatment of Sankarâchârya's idea of the Absolute. Here we will add some other critical remarks.

Hegel starts with the category of 'Being', no doubt; but his notion of 'Being' is such as cannot be philosophically justified, and hence he reverts to a synthesis in 'Becoming' process. He conceives of 'Being' as objective content; and, therefore, finds that Universal Being, which is Being in general, i.e. to say, without any objective content, must be equated with pure nothing. Here, however, a question may well be asked: "Does he then, mean to say that it is from our experiences of things and processes that we, by abstraction, come to the idea of Being?" If it were so, we may say that it is a wrong way of stating facts. For, even Hegel himself must admit that for this kind of abstraction to be possible, the things and processes to be experienced and compared must be posited to be there first.

Again, absolute Becoming is itself a pure abstraction. We cannot understand what innate power resides in the

two opposites of Being and Non-Being of Hegel, which compels him, or any one else who follows him, to leap forward to Becoming. In themselves and as opposites, Being and Non-Being must cancel themselves, that is all.

(IV) If the rational is the real in the sense in which Hegel takes it, it becomes impossible for us to account for the many irrationalities existing in the universe. The rationality of the Real, therefore, must be understood in this sense only that "the real can be reduced to a statement of ultimate and irreducible fact". And this is really the sense in which the Vedânta has understood the rationality of the ultimately Real.

Our conclusion is that Hegel's Idea of the Absolute and Sankara's Idea of the Absolute stand poles apart, and that Sankara's is the really satisfactory and philosophically justifiable idea.

There is, however, a tendency in some quarters* to mingle up Hegel and Sankara indiscriminately. We are not concerned with any criticism thereon here. But we would like to opine that if Hegel is to be compared to any of the Vedantic philosophers at all, he may be compared to Râmânûja only.

* We are referring here more especially to Chapter 4 of "Studies in Vedanta" by V. J. Kirtikar.

BUDDHA'S GOSPEL OF SUFFERING

BY SWAMI ASESHANANDA

The first and fundamental principle of Buddhism is the recognition of the existence of suffering. It is suffering that made Buddha renounce the world. The key-note of his lyre harps on this one tune—the misery of man. For this reason Buddha has sometimes been charged with preaching a pessimistic doctrine. No doubt, he emphatically proclaims the existence of pain. But he does not stop there. Immediately our attention is drawn to a practical point—the way of escape from misery or, in his own words, the deliverance from suffering. Buddha was not a mere visionary, nor like Heraclitus, the weeping philosopher, a man given to repentance and idle bemoaning. He was a practical idealist with a robust faith and indomitable confidence in the innate power of every soul. He viewed religion from, essentially, a pragmatic standpoint. His emphasis was mainly on life and experience than on vain

speculation. Consequently, we do not find in his teachings elaborate discussions on metaphysical entities with the discursive logic of a shrewd arguementator. He does not enlighten us on the origin of this universe or on the nature of the "First Cause". Nor does he mention the name of a Personal God—an all-compassionate Deity in whose arms we may repose for protection and seek shelter from torments and woe. He does not offer the promise of miraculous saving by an extra-cosmic Being by a single stroke of his hand. He has placed before us a simple programme. The plan of his campaign is a moral battle which man must wage alone and from which he can come out a victor if he wills. He has to depend solely on his own self and exercise his individual capacity to the fullest extent. Knowing that death is better than an idle vegetating life he must fight without trepidation or fear. But he does not ad-

vocate any extreme asceticism. The middle path is the best way. This he discovered from his own personal experience. He saw the futility of self-mortification and torture of the flesh. He did not teach any lesson which he himself had not followed. What solace can hopes of a post-mortem felicity render unto a man dying of starvation? It does not require any arguments to convince or a metaphysics to prove that "old age is suffering, sickness is suffering, and death is suffering." He fully grasped the pitiable condition of mortal beings and experimented on the ways of escape. Not for his own salvation did he discard the throne and leave the sweet shelter of an affectionate home. It was in obedience to a greater call—the alleviation of the misery of the innumerable multitude whose mortal sorrows he shared as his own, that he renounced the ordinary joys of life. Their heart-rending wails made him restless. Their cry of agony drew tears from his sympathetic eyes. But he did not lose himself in sheer repentance. The gloomy picture of ugly disease and death appeared before him in flesh and blood. In the presence of that distressing scene, like ordinary pessimists, he did not give himself up to vain despair and grew apathetic towards the concerns of life. But as a hero, he definitely entered upon the path to give a relentless fight. Alone, single-handed, he placed himself amidst the thick of the battle and valiantly stood against all oppositions—the trials and temptations of nature. After six years of hard persistent struggle he came out triumphantly victorious, and the battalions of Mâra suffered an ignominious defeat. The example of this manly enterprise cannot but inspire even a weak soul to dynamic activity. Its vitalizing influence will be a sure incentive to healthy pursuits and fruitful endeavour. That

without struggle no glory can be attained is the lesson that is clear and vibrant from every page of his life.

The obvious aim of the mighty 'Tathâgata' was to put an end to all the misery that is inextricably mixed up with the lot of man. Like an expert physician he has not only diagnosed the disease but has framed a prescription that will bring about cure. What is the treatment that he has made for the eradication of this world-malady? All sufferings spring from ignorance—from the fever of 'Tanha' or desire. It is the sublimation of desire, the annihilation of this thirst for individual life that will lead to the deliverance from pain. The craving for self-preservation and for personal happiness is at the root of all miseries which flesh is heir to. True life is a life dedicated for all. It blossoms in the mastery of ego-centric life and on the conquest of this little fleshly existence. A man who lives solely for himself can never attain to Nirvâna. Annihilation of desire is not Nirvâna as is popularly understood. It is tantamount to dry barrenness culminating in the dullness of death. By choking up the very spring of action it makes the heart dreary and void. Where there are no higher incentives, life is sure to become dark and gloomy with signs of lamentation. Nirvâna has been misinterpreted by some writers as complete extinction. They opine that Buddhism is a religion of despair which can hardly promote civilization or contribute to social progress. But if we appraise the teacher from his own words, he has never given vent to anti-social ideas. On the contrary, his remarks are pregnant with lofty emotions for universal good. "Rediscovering himself everywhere and in everything, the sage embraces the whole world in the sentiment of peace, compassion and intense

love"—This should be the motto of every follower that will enlist himself under his banner. Decidedly Buddha does not preach a cult of melancholy broodiness. A negative view of life which is barren of all instincts finds no place in his creed. The very life of the "Enlightened One" is a standing challenge against the statement and proves the utter falsity of the contention that Buddha was a pessimist and his whole philosophy was other-worldly. The sage who devoted forty years of his useful career to strenuous, untiring service and then died like a steed in harness by the side of a road while carrying his message of hope to the door of the lowly and the poor can scarcely be designated as a bloodless pessimist and a listless dreamer. In fact, the story of his life-long adventure presents only the picture of a man drunk deep in love and one who suffered crucifixion for ~~the~~ cause of agonized humanity. To stigmatize the sublime teachings of Buddha as a cult of despair which has undermined civilization and social progress is extremely undeserving, and it sounds the depth of the ignorance of the estimator. Who has seen a greater man, a man of more active and energetic habits than the saint of Kapilavastu? Any impartial student of history will testify from his eventful career of eighty summers, the glory of the Asokan empire and its vitalizing influence on China, Japan and other distant lands from sea to sea, the contribution of Buddhism to arts, painting and sculpture that a religion of despondency can never produce such benevolent deeds of human welfare and influence its civilization. More than two thousand years have rolled away in the eternal flow of time. Momentous

changes have taken place all over the world. Powerful dynasties have disappeared with their monumental towers crumbled into dust. Old cities have given place to new ones and smiling countries have been converted into sandy deserts. Great names of ruling statesmen and political magnates have sunk into oblivion. But the name of 'Bhagavân Buddha' has not yet been forgotten. Millions of the citizens of the globe feelingly remember him even today. What was the message that he delivered? What was the power behind his creed by which his missionaries could conquer so many nations on earth without shedding a drop of blood? Nor by force nor by sending armaments of human destruction Buddhism was spread far and wide from the Pacific to the Mediterranean. It was through love and sacrifice, peace and conciliation and above all an unshaking faith in the words of the Master that his ambassadors could win away the hearts of men and convert them to his consoling faith. It is told that when Buddha was on the threshold of Nirvâna he manfully retraced his steps and undertook a vow not to enter into it as long as there was a single soul, unredeemed and subject to ignominious suffering. The exhorting appeal of the teacher is still ringing clear in our ears—"Go ye Bhikkus and wander forth for the good of the many and for the welfare of the many. Hesitate not to sacrifice your own salvation for the betterment of the world. Proclaim the doctrine glorious by living a life of holiness, perfect and pure." Thrice holy is the day on which the Blessed One came and proved by his life that the service of man was the only religion, most dear to his heart.

MAYAVATI CHARITABLE DISPENSARY

REPORT FOR 1935

We have great pleasure in placing before the public the record of work done by this institution during 1935. It has been doing its humble work of service among the hill people for the last 31 years through its Outdoor and Indoor Departments. The institution is becoming more and more popular with the people with the lapse of years as the comparative chart given here shows.

Year	No. of Patients	
	Outdoor	Indoor
1925	3,162	35
1931	6,165	149
1932	7,489	149
1933	7,900	140
1934	10,494	183
1935	14,344	189

The Dispensary is within the precincts of Advaita Ashrama and is conducted with great efficiency under the charge of a monastic member of the Ashrama, whose knowledge of Medical Science qualifies him for this work. Patients come to the Dispensary from a distance of even one or two days' journey. *The Doctor also goes round the villages to render service to such patients as are not able to come to the Indoor Hospital.* Service is rendered to all irrespective of caste, creed or sex.

The total number of patients relieved during the year at the Outdoor Dispensary was 14,344, of which 10,905 were new cases and 3,439 repeated cases. Of these new cases, 4,446 were men, 2,594 women and 3,865 children. In the Indoor Hospital the total number treated was 189, of which 146 were discharged cured, 8 left treatment, 31 were relieved, and 4 died. Of these 114 were men, 53 women, and 22 children.

STATEMENT OF DISEASES

(INDOOR INCLUDED)

Dysentery	260
Enteric Fever	6
Gonococcal Infection	46
Syphilis	68
Leprosy	8
Malarial Fever	836
Influenza	415
Pneumococcal Infection	46
Pyrexia of Uncertain Origin	277
Rheumatic Fever	11
Tuberculosis of the Lungs	16
Worms	197
All Other Infective Diseases	75
Anæmia	28
Rickets	9
Other Diseases due to Disorder of Nutrition and Metabolism	24
Diseases of the Ductless or Endocrine Glands	267
All other General Diseases	420
Diseases of the Nervous System	360
Diseases of the Eye	2,987
Diseases of the Ear	209
Diseases of the Nose	70
Diseases of the Circulatory System	11
All Diseases of the Respiratory System except Pneumonia and Tuberculosis	1,023
Diseases of the Stomach	263
Diseases of the Intestine	253
Diseases of the Liver	266
All other Diseases of the Digestive System	777
Acute or Suppurative Inflammation of the Lymphatic Glands	32
Acute or Chronic Nephritis	27
Other Diseases of the Urinary System	57
Other Diseases of the Generative System	63
Diseases of the Organ of Locomotion	424
Diseases of the Areolar Tissues	60
Inflammation (Ulcerative)	453
Other Diseases of the Skin	649
All other Local Diseases	150
Injuries (Local and General)	62
TOTAL	10,905
Operations : General	65
Injections	1,118

SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTS FOR 1935

RECEIPTS			EXPENDITURE		
	Rs.	A. P.		Rs.	A. P.
Last Year's Balance	10,311	5 10	Medicine and Diet	613	10 0
Subscription and Donations	1,255	6 0	Doctor's Maintenance and Travelling	395	0 0
Building Fund	2,000	0 0	Instruments etc.	4	14 6
Interest	314	5 0	Establishment	12	0 0
			Miscellaneous including repairs, postage, etc.	78	8 9
			Building Construction (of work done till 31st Dec.)		
			Materials	846	9 3
			Ry. Freight		
			etc.	108	1 9
			Labour	352	12 0
				1,307	7 0
TOTAL	13,881	0 10	TOTAL	2,411	8 3
			BALANCE	11,469	8 7

We cordially thank all our donors, who by their continued support have made it possible for us to be of some service to humanity in these distant hills. Our thanks are specially due to Mr. P. C. Bhargava, Lahore, for a donation of Rs. 2,000 towards Building Fund. Mr. J. M. Billimoria, Bombay, and Mr. P. K. Nair, Feroke, for donations of Rs. 500 and Rs. 353 respectively towards the upkeep of the Dispensary. Our thanks are also due to Messrs. Dr. Thilo & Co., Germany; Iwaki & Co., Japan; Medical Supply Concern, Ltd., Calcutta; The Calcutta Chemical Co., Ltd., Calcutta; Sarkar Gupta & Co., Calcutta; Bengal Chemical & Pharmaceutical Works Ltd., Calcutta; Lister Antiseptics & Dressing Co., Ltd., Calcutta; The Anglo French Drug & Co., Ltd., (India), Bombay; Bengal Immunity Co., Ltd., Calcutta; Jatindra Chemical & Pharmaceutical Works, Calcutta; The Bombay Surgical Co., Bombay; E. Merck, Germany; Havero Tradings Co., Holland; Chemical Works of Gedeon Richter Ltd., Hungary; Chemische Pharmazeutische Aktiengesellschaft, Bad, Germany; C. H. Boehringer Sohn A.-G. Chemische Fabrik; Byk-Guldenwerke, Berlin; and Hadens-Gesellschaft M.B.H. for supplying us their

preparations free; to Messrs. Ranaghat Chemical Works for supplying us their preparations at half price; and also to the Editors of *The Indian Medical Journal*, Calcutta; *The Antiseptic*, Madras, *The Suchikitsa*, Calcutta, for giving us their journals free.

APPEAL

We appeal to the kind-hearted gentlemen for a Permanent Fund for the maintenance of the Dispensary and its Indoor Hospital of 8 beds. An endowment of Rs. 1,500 will meet the cost of maintaining one bed and an endowment of Rs. 10,000 the cost of maintaining the Outdoor Dispensary.

Donors, desirous of perpetuating the memory of their departed friends or relatives, may do so through this humanitarian work by bearing the costs of any of the above-mentioned wants of the Dispensary.

Any contribution, however small, for the upkeep of the Dispensary and the Indoor Hospital will be thankfully received and acknowledged by the undersigned.

(Sd.) SWAMI VIRESWARANANDA,
President, Advaita Ashrama,
P.O. Mayavati,
Dt. Almora, U.P.

ATMABODHA

By Swami Siddhatmananda

निषिध्य निखिलोपाधीन् नेति नेतीति वाक्यतः ।
विद्यादैक्यं महावाक्यैर्जीवात्मपरमात्मनोः ॥ ३० ॥

'नेति नेति' 'Not this, not this' (the gross body is not the Atman, the senses are not the Atman, etc.) इति वाक्यतः according to these sayings (in the Sruti निखिलोपाधीन् all false attributes (of the Atman) निषिध्य negating महावाक्यैः with the help of the Great Sayings (in the Sruti such as तत्त्वमसि etc.) जीवात्मपरमात्मनोः of the individual self and the Supreme Self ऐक्यं identity विद्यात् should know.

30. Negating all false attributes according to the teachings 'Not this, not this' (of the Sruti) one should realize the identity between the individual self and the Supreme Self with the help of the Great Sayings¹ (of the Sruti).

¹ Great Sayings—"तत्त्वमसि" (Thou art That), "ब्रह्माहमस्मि" (I am Brahman), "प्रज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म" (Brahman is Wisdom and Bliss) and "अयमात्मा ब्रह्म" (This self is Brahman)—these four great Vedic dicta are called Mahāvakyas as they proclaim the highest truth, viz., the identity of jiva with Brahman. One should realize this highest truth by the constant meditation of these teachings.

आविद्यकं शरीरादि दृश्यं बुद्बुदवत् क्षरम् ।
एतद्विलक्षणं विद्यादहं ब्रह्मेति निर्मलम् ॥ ३१ ॥

शरीरादि The body etc. दृश्यं visible objects आविद्यकं arising out of ignorance बुद्बुदवत् like bubbles of water क्षरम् perishable (च and) अहं I एतद्विलक्षणं different from these (body and the like) निर्मलम् pure ब्रह्म Brahman इति विद्यात् one should know this.

31. The visible objects such as the body and the like arise out of ignorance and are perishable like bubbles of water. It should be known that I am the pure Brahman different from the body, etc.

देहान्यत्वात्त मे जन्मजराकार्श्यलयादयः ।
शब्दादिविषयैः संगो निरिन्द्रियतया न च ॥ ३२ ॥

देहान्यत्वात् As (I am) different from the body जन्मजराकार्श्यलयादयः birth, old age, leanness, destruction, etc. मे न (सन्ति) I do not have निरिन्द्रियतया as (I am) without the senses शब्दादिविषयैः with the sense-objects such as sound and the like संगः contact च and न no (मे अस्ति I have).

32. As I am different from the body I have no birth, old age, leanness, destruction, etc. and as I am without the senses I have no contact with the sense-objects such as sound and the like.

अमनस्त्वान्न मे दुःखरागद्वेषभयादयः ।

अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्र इत्यादि श्रुतिशासनात् ॥ ३३ ॥

अमनस्त्वात् As (I am) without mind दुःखरागद्वेषभयादयः pain, attachment, aversion, fear, etc. मे न (सन्ति) I do not have अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्र इत्यादि 'The Atman is without vital airs and mind, and is pure', etc. श्रुतिशासनात् according to the teachings of the Sruti.

33. As I am without mind I have no pain, attachment, aversion, fear, etc. According to the teachings of the Sruti 'The Atman is without vital airs and mind, and is pure¹', etc.

¹ 'The Atman is pure'—Vide Mundaka Upa. II. 1. 3.

निर्गुणो निष्क्रियो नित्यो निर्विकल्पो निरञ्जनः ।

निर्विकारो निराकारो नित्यमुक्तोऽस्मि निर्मलः ॥ ३४ ॥

(अहं I) निर्गुणः without attributes निष्क्रियः without activity नित्यः eternal निर्विकल्पः absolute निरञ्जनः unstained निर्विकारः unchanged निराकारः formless नित्यमुक्तः eternally free निर्मलः pure अस्मि (I) am.

34. I am without any form, attributes, and activity; I am eternal, unstained, unchanged, pure, eternally free, and absolute.

अहमाकाशवत् सर्वबहिरन्तर्गतोऽच्युतः ।

सदा सर्वसमः सिद्धो निःसंगो निर्मलोऽचलः ॥ ३५ ॥

अहं I आकाशवत् like the universal space सर्वबहिरन्तर्गतः pervading everything inside and outside अच्युतः imperishable सदा सर्वसमः ever the same under all conditions सिद्धः perfected निःसंगः without any attachment निर्मलः pure अचलः immovable (अस्मि am).

35. Like the universal space I am pervading everything inside and outside. I am without any attachment, immovable, imperishable, pure, perfect, and ever the same under all conditions.

नित्यशुद्धविमुक्तैकमखण्डानन्दमद्वयम् ।

सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं यत् परं ब्रह्माहमेव तत् ॥ ३६ ॥

अहमेव Indeed I तत् that परं ब्रह्म Supreme Brahman (अस्मि am) यत् which (is) नित्यं eternal शुद्धं pure विमुक्तं free एकं one अखण्डं undivided अद्वयं without a second आनन्दं bliss सत्यं truth ज्ञानं knowledge अनन्तं infinity.

36. I am indeed the Supreme Brahman which is eternal, pure, free, one, undivided, without a second, knowledge, truth, bliss, and infinity.

एवं निरन्तरकृता ब्रह्मैवास्मीति वासना ।

हरत्यविद्याविक्षेपान् रोगानिव रसायनम् ॥ ३७ ॥

एवं Thus निरन्तरकृता meditated constantly ब्रह्मैवास्मि I am indeed Brahman इति expletive वासना idea रसायनम् रोगानिव like medicines curing diseases अविद्याविक्षेपान् all confusions arising from ignorance हरति destroys.

37. Thus the constant meditation of the idea 'I am indeed Brahman' destroys all confusions arising from ignorance just as medicines cure all diseases.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

IN THIS NUMBER

God, Personal and Impersonal is an unpublished writing of Swami Vivekananda. . . . In *The Problem of an Indian lingua franca* we have discussed some of the recent linguistic developments in the country, which are directly concerned in the matter and have considered the desirability of evolving a common language for the Indians for inter-provincial contact and inter-communal harmony. . . . Prof. G. R. Malkani belongs to the Indian Institute of Philosophy, Amalner. His article on *Relation of Self to Knowledge* convincingly proves how in the self alone the true ideal of knowledge is realized. . . . *Ramakrishna and the Spirit of Service* is the summary of a talk given by Miss Dorothy Stede at the Sri Ramakrishna Centenary Celebrations held last March in London under the auspices of the Sri Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Vedanta Society. . . . Prof. Abinash Chandra Bose describes in *Four Currents in Indian Spiritual History* how the fourfold division of society in India began as a mere classification of the four types of occupation found in a civilized society. . . . Swami Ghanananda shows in *Religions: Main Points of Agreement* how the difference between the religions of the world is but one of expression, not of substance. . . . Mr. Drupad S. Desai summarizes after his two articles on the idea of the Absolute as conceived by Hegel and Sankara, published in April and June last, his *Critical Remarks on the Idea of the Absolute as found in Hegel and Sankara*. . . . Swami Asheshananda belongs to the Ramakrishna Order and is a new con-

tributor. His article on *Buddha's Gospel of Suffering* shows how Buddha's faith was far from being based on idle bemoaning and vain speculation.

REIGN OF DOGMAS IN MODERN LIFE

Myths have profoundly shaped human history in the past. Their power is not yet dead. Multitudes still offer worship at the altars of different jealous Jehovahs. All these votaries of the competing Almighty seek to mould events according to their own lights by ironing out all other considerations. The most Jehovah-like among the modern dogmas are those of the belly and the sex, and one may perhaps add one or two more. They tolerate no rivals and rule out all the other factors in the evolution of civilization. Observant persons must have noticed great similarities between the Marxist and the Freudian doctrines. The Marxists believe in the economic man and the economic interpretation of history. Religion, art, science, literature, and ethics are expressions of the economic urge. They deny spirit and spiritual causation, personality and personal influence. The Freudians similarly almost delight in pointing out that all the prudery, primness, urhanity, philanthropy and humanism of our civilization is mostly, if not wholly, a sublimated manifestation of *libido*. Both of them refuse to set their eyes above the mundane and vulgar; they thrive particularly well in stench and filth. More than anything else they deserve to be called "the philosophy of pigs".

Such pretensions have amply been demonstrated to be hollow. At best they are part-truths. And precisely here lies their perniciousness. Both the Jewish prophets have had such profound hold upon the popular imagination because of the magnificence of their all-comprehensive generalizations resting on some sort of experimental truth. In India we are at present hearing a lot about advanced economic theories backed up with all the dogmatism of a doctrinaire. We believe that the present mechanistic civilization has come to stay and that it has made it necessary and inevitable that a far-reaching reconstruction of the social structure of humanity must take place sooner or later. It may be that justice may demand that the economic organization be changed lock, stock, and barrel. Every noble-hearted person desires to see the end of exploitation and the substitution of co-operation in place of wasteful, break-neck competition. But we pay no homage to the economic Deos. There are things deeper, higher and more important even in the matter of social reconstruction, which cannot be measured in terms of bread and butter. Economics is not the 'sole reality of the situation', nor even the most important one. We need above all a spiritual outlook, a thorough spiritualization of our economics, politics, science, and art. Only a spiritual outlook can offer a sure foundation for a healthier and better order of society. The Indians have inherited an immortal treasure from the past. Amid all the squalor and poverty, oppression and inhumanity one can still hear the faint beat of her national culture and glory. It is only her national culture which holds the promise of a brighter era amid all the darkening shadows that stalk the present world. India is slowly rising from her stupor. She must firmly fix her

gaze on the national ideal and refuse to be side-tracked from it. Economics can never be the sole reality of human life. It has its own field. It cannot stray beyond it. Itself it is incapable of bringing about a change in human instincts. Whatever India has to accept from elsewhere, she must make it racy to her soul. We do not desire the old follies of the West being re-enacted anew on her soil.

A SCIENTIST'S CLAIM

Some time back Sir C. V. Raman talked to Gandhiji about the merits of science and religion. It was not to be expected that he would shine in it. And we confess that his observations as reported in *Harijan* have been a hit of a puzzle to us. He declared that if there be any God then we must look for Him in the universe; if not, He was not worth searching for. We have not quite understood the import of the remark. Is God first to be proved somehow and then to be sought in the universe? Or is God to be discovered *within* the scheme of the universe alone and not outside it? Pending, however, the discovery of God Sir Raman preferred to remain a theist and protested against being called an atheist. And by way of offering some consolation to poor God-believers he charitably pointed out that the growing discoveries in science appeared to be further and further revelations of God. He wound up by remarking—which by the way affords a glimpse into his religiosity—that religion could not unite men and that science alone offered the best opportunity for fellowship among men. For, are not all men of science brothers?

Not long ago the Indians were treated to a peculiarly felicitous exhibition of brotherly love among the bigwigs of the Indian scientists. But, jesting apart. Nobody disputes that science

is a search after truth. We only want to converse the proposition and say that all search after truth is science. Talking of science in the ordinary sense, can its boast of making brothers of men be sustained? Science reveals truth. But what sort of truth do we get from it? It only makes some dispassionate utterances about the behaviour of phenomena. Doubtless many of its findings clear the fog of ignorance. We do not at all minimize such services. But does it talk of brotherly love, humanism, beauty, and sympathy? Has it anything to say about values? If science is impotent to create them it cannot purify human motives and re-orient human behaviour. At best it can lend plausibility to some of our deeper convictions and emotions. Cold intellectual light never warms up our hearts. Are we not in possession of enough scientific truths for bringing a better world into existence materially,—enough truths capable of providing food, shelter, comfort, peace and health for the entire mankind? What stands in the way? Why science sits powerless to bring about the change? The truth is that science is not fundamental. We apply scientific truths according to our desires. Again in so far as science can be said to have created something approaching value or rather in so far as it has fortified some of our tendencies it can be pointed out that it has more given a new lease to forms of our selfishness and brutality than subdued them. We are not talking of the benefits that science has made possible for man, for science did not supply any good or bad motive in connection with them. Similarly we leave out of consideration the engines of destruction discovered by it. We are considering those theoretical discoveries which have afforded a new basis to our propensities. So judged, it has to some extent de-

humanized some. As instances, we can only briefly refer to the doctrines of the Philosophical Radicals, the Utilitarians, the survival-of-the-fittest-biologists, and to the theories of racial purity, hereditary transmission, racial superiority with all their hideous corollaries of unbridled competition, the devil-take-the-hindmost-attitude, oppression of aliens, minorities, and individuals. Science can compel to shed some false beliefs, but it cannot broaden our sympathies. Bertrand Russell has said somewhere that if you question a scientist in his laboratory about his work, he will give the most rational answer, but if you happen to scratch him outside on some political or economic issues you are likely, in nine cases out of ten, to draw out a most dogmatic pronouncement. Recently in a great gathering of scientists in Germany there were loud talks of pure, Nordic science and vilification of Jewish and other sciences. It was even declared that no similar findings would be arrived at in identical fields by scientists of pure and impure races. Eminent scientists were found to signify their hearty approval to all the resounding nonsense. The scientific West today sits on a powder-magazine. Something more than science is needed to tone down passions. And the pity of it is that religion which only can bring salvation has been mistaken for creeds and dogmas by the vulgar as well as the learned.

SCHWEITZER AND THE INDIAN WELTANSCHAUUNG

Dr. Schweitzer's versatility has been an object of amazement to scholars. It is a pity that he has not been able to avoid the common pitfalls that beset the path of the Orientalists. In his latest publication, *The World-view of the Indian Thinkers*, he repeats some of the stock criticisms of Indian culture and

religion, which the older schools of Indologists were never tired of dining into our ears. The two commonest charges levelled were that the Indian world-view represented a 'nay' to all life and action and that morality had little, if any, place in Indian religion and philosophy. We believed that these views which had sprung into existence in the early days of Indology were by now dead. But as it appears the dust of the controversy has not yet settled. A few months ago Prof. Winternitz has, to some extent, shown the falsity of the latter view in an article contributed to this magazine. And recently, the former view has also been indicated to be utterly hollow by two German scholars themselves. Lueders and Glasenapp, as Prof. Benoy Kumar Sarkar points out in the *Calcutta Review*, May, 1936, have both opposed it. Summing up their contentions Prof. Sarkar writes :

"In reality, therefore, life-denying and life-affirming are appraised as having existed alongside of each other in India. And these two elements have been taken as constituting an 'organic unity' in Indian world-view and this is said to serve as such the metaphysical requirements as the practical life of the Indian people."

The Indian view-point has long been misunderstood both by Westerners and by a section of the Indians. It is partly without any basis, partly due to a fragmentary view and partly due to faulty interpretations of totally innocuous texts. It owes much to facile generalizations about irreconcilable differences between the East and the West. While it is true that a long

historical process has impressed each people with a speciality of its own, it is idle to make out an absolute difference as between race and race. It is only a question of distribution of emphasis. The Hindu view of life has within it a place for 'materialism'. But it has always set spirit above matter. Materialism has never been conceived to be the be-all and end-all of life. It has been the attempt from early times to mould and conduct the Hindu society in such a way as to lead up the entire people step by step to the final realization of the life's goal. A balance has always been sought to be struck between the different elements in society and the different goals of human endeavour. Often the equilibrium has been upset and too much emphasis has been put upon a certain view by the people as a whole. This has, however, been the outcome of the ill-digestion of texts. But whenever such maladjustments arose reformers appeared who helped restore the poise. It is also a curious puzzle which the West has never troubled itself to solve for over two thousand years. From early history India has been noted for her wisdom and philosophy. She has also been reputed for her prosperity and fabulous wealth. In fact she has been looked upon as an El Dorado, and there has always been a keen competition among nations to capture her trade. More often the covetous eyes of looters gloated over her riches. But how could a race of life-denying, world-forsaking, self-ruminating, passive thinkers could create the Ind of fable and fact? It seems that one who cannot worship gold above all becomes *ipso facto* a world-denier!

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

RAMAKRISHNA, THE MAN AND THE POWER. By Swami Gnaneswarananda. *Published by the Vedanta Society, 120, East Delaware Place, Chicago. Ill. Pp. 125.*

This handy volume offers in a lucid and easy manner a short, yet far from scrappy, account of the life of Ramakrishna. It has also attempted to interpret his life and message in a way that would appeal to the men of the West. The book is divided into two sections, the first dealing with his life and the second narrating the genesis, expansion, and character of the mission which has carried his message round the globe. We can hardly name a better, abler and more reliable short introduction to the life of the Master than this little work.

INSTRUCTION IN INDIAN PRIMARY SCHOOLS. *Humphrey Milford. Oxford University Press. Bombay. Pp. 134.*

This is a collection of twelve essays by several distinguished teachers and educationists on the way how the different subjects of study should be taught in the Indian Primary Schools. The book is replete with a number of useful suggestions and deserves close attention from those who are eager about the primary education in India.

ORIENTAL PHILOSOPHY—THE STORY OF THE TEACHERS OF THE EAST. By F. R. Grant, Vice-President, Roerich Museum, New York...*"Dial Press", New York.*

Under this title to the History of the great Oriental philosophy there is added another impressive, beautifully edited volume. Miss F. R. Grant is an old friend of India and has personally visited the sacred and historic places of this cradle of humanity. The eminent author declares that "Asia—the cradle of Mankind—is, even more uniquely, the Cradle of all Philosophies". The entire enchantment of Asia is revealed in the romance that lies behind the spiritual quests of India, of China, of Nippon, of Iran. The pages of the book reveal the dramatic procession of such men of the ages as Gotama Buddha, Sri Ramakrishna, Confucius, Lao Tze, Zoroaster, and others of the same Heroic-Hierarchy. In the spirit of the great Vedic formula—"Truth is one; men call It

by different names"—the author has disclosed each of the great philosophies as another Facet in the superb Crystal of Oriental Thought.

In the same benevolent tone, in deep understanding the entire volume continues. Every reader of this book will remain a friend of the philosophies of the East. Although there are many shelves in libraries filled with books on oriental philosophy, yet this work shows how an unprejudiced mind can bring a new refreshing inspiring note.

Our readers will be especially interested in the following passage: "To India, the Vedanta system has given one of its greatest modern figures—Ramakrishna, regarded as a saintly incarnation. From his youth he seemed filled with the ecstasy of a god-love. The spirit of Bhakti—or rapture for the Divine—filled all his days and illumined his person—and at his feet sat the greatest men and women of all India, to learn that which he had gathered in his moments of Samadhi or union with the Divine. In the life of modern India, he takes his place as a witness that the spirit of god-intoxication still thrives in the soil of Aryavarta."

In every chapter of the volume one finds the same reverence and friendliness to the subject. All her definitions show that the author has not merely compiled material but has, with deep feeling and enthusiasm, profoundly studied the philosophies which appeal so much to her heart.

The volume is dedicated to Prof. and Mme. de Roerich and in her introductory note to the readers, the author says: "To Nicholas and Helena Roerich, who gave me so generously from their vast knowledge of Asia: one of the beloved words of Asia is Guru, teacher; in the privilege of my association with Nicholas and Helena Roerich I have learned the beauty and deep implication of this word". In such an understanding of the concept of Guruship Miss Grant shows that she is truly Eastern in soul.

ANANDA

SRI CHIDAMBARAM RAMALINGA SWAMIJI, HIS LIFE, MISSION, AND STUDIES. By T. V. G. Chetty. *Central Co-operative Printing Works Ltd., Chinta-*

dripet, Madras. Pp. 177. Price Rs. 2/-, foreign 3s. or 1 \$.

This book is an illustration of the way in which the biography of a saint should never be written. It aims to acquaint the English-knowing public with a short sketch of the life, mission and studies of a remarkable saint of South India of the early nineteenth century, whose memory is still revered and annually celebrated by many. The author seems to be over-much concerned with miracles and occultism, which generally appeal to the ill-developed mind, but from which many are sure to turn away in disgust. This is not to say that miracles do not happen, but to point out that they do not constitute the saintliness of a person. Very few facts are given of his life. Even those that are given are disjointed. Of his early life we do not learn beyond that his birth was attended with a miracle, and that he was a precocious genius who evinced, while a mere stripling of 5 summers, a strong inclination for meditation. He also made himself famous quite early in age by his elucidation of difficult religious poems. Of his Sâdhanâ we hear scarcely anything. On the threshold of youth he set out for Chidambaram where he stayed for a number of years. Later he removed to a village a short distance away from it, where he built a Temple for Satya Gnâna Sabhâ, where annually a great festival is held in honour of the saint. A chapter is devoted to miracles, and his death is shrouded in impenetrable mystery. This is practically all that we know of his life. This, surely, leaves one disappointed, for one would like to know how he came to command the love and devotion of the villagers, to which the author refers, how he talked, loved and behaved, what his spiritual trials and practices were, how he came to exercise such an influence over those who came into contact with him, and similar other things. A story which is devoid of the human touch leaves us cold and unaffected. Mighty doings can either inspire our awe or ridicule, but they can never command our love and admiration which alone can exert a decisive influence on our lives.

It appears that this Yogi was a poet of no mean order. He has left among other works his great *Tiru-arulpa* which is a distinct acquisition to the Tamil literature. His sayings reveal a man of deep spirituality, wide culture, and liberal views. Born in an orthodox family he rose above petty distinctions. His disciples included the so-called

untouchables. He laid great stress on *Ahimsâ* as a means to realization.

A description of the poetical work is given in the present book, and a few extracts from it have also been quoted. There are a number of illustrations and a map showing the places connected with the life of the saint.

THE SHASTRAS ON UNTOUCHABILITY. By V. G. Desai. *Published by Jivanji Dahyabhai Desai at Navajivan Karyalaya, Ahmedabad. Pp. 24. Price 1 anna and 3 pies.*

This booklet is a résumé in English of the original work in Marathi by Mahâmahopâdhyâya Shridharshâstri Pathak. The learned Shâstri who had been educated in the orthodox fashion was led in later life by his study of the Shâstras to conclude that untouchability is repugnant to them. The main arguments are here summarily put forth. Gandhiji says in foreward that "No anti-untouchability worker should be without the booklet, for it will enable him to combat all the orthodox argument in so far as it has any connection with Hindu scriptures."

MARATHI

SRI BHAGWAN RAMAKRISHNA PARAMAHAMSADEVA (in two volumes). By late Mr. N. R. Paranjpe. *Published by Sri Ramakrishna Ashrama, Nagpur. Pages 347 & 394 respectively, Price Re. 1-12 per volume.*

At the very outset, the reviewer wishes to express his sincere opinion that late Mr. Paranjpe has done an inestimable service to the Marathi-knowing public in presenting it in two volumes with a most precious spiritual treasure in the form of the life of one who is 'a living embodiment of Godliness'. The value of the books is all the more enhanced as the author himself was an ardent devotee and came in contact with Srimat Swami Shivanandaji and Saradanandaji—the direct disciples of Sri Ramakrishna. The other, additional advantage which goes a great way to prove the authoritative nature of the volumes is that the author knew Bengali very well and the information he gathered was based on original books in Bengali, written by such eminent writers as Swami Saradanandji, Master Mahâsaya, Sri Ramchandra Dutt, Sureshchandra Dutt, and Saratchandra Chakravarti.

In these volumes the author has aptly

brought out the significance of the life of Sri Ramakrishna. When man observed the harmony that exists in the working of this universe, he tried to bring it on the human plane. The spirit of this harmony can be seen in the field of administration in such countries as the United States of America and the same spirit is reflected in the sublime doctrines of liberty, equality, fraternity, democracy, republicanism, and self-determination. The need of the day is that this sense of harmony which is applied to the other spheres of activity, should also be brought into reality in the domain of religion and it is in the life of Sri Ramakrishna that we find the fulfilment of this need. The quintessence of the Future Religion of the world lies enshrined in Him and time alone will unfold its truths in their utmost details. He has demonstrated both by example and precept how there is unity behind diversity and hence in him we find the "Guru" of all the main religions of the world.

The special merit of the volumes is that the author has written them, right from the beginning to the end, with a prayerful heart and reverential attitude, all the while believing that he was only an instrument in the hands of the Master. That is why a kind of holy aroma pervades the whole work. The expression is luminous and the style which is majestic creates an impression of faultless continuity. The unique feature of the volumes is that the chapters have some sayings of Sri Ramakrishna at their top and these very sayings are explained and exemplified in them, with the result that their significance is clearly brought home to the readers. This method is novel, because before reading the chapter, one becomes intensely curious to read the incidents and other related occurrences that amplify and illustrate those homely sayings. In those volumes we do not come across a mere statement of facts, but special chapters are devoted to throw light on such important and instructive topics as 'A Sâdhaka and

Sâdhanâ', 'Tantra Sâdhanâ', 'Madhurbhâva' and 'Guru and Gurubhâva'.

The author has taken immense pains to make his work perfect from all points of view and it is not at all an exaggeration, if I say that he added a jewel to the biography section of the Marathi Literature. The volumes are monumental and there is no doubt that the Maharashtrians will derive immeasurable benefit from them.

The typography is excellent and the general get-up simple but attractive. The pages are interspersed with beautiful illustrations that lend an additional charm to the volumes.

SRI RAMAKRISHNA VÂKSUDHÂ. Translated by Mr. A. M. Shembekar. *Published by Sri Ramakrishna Ashrama, Nagpur. Pp. 119. Price 5 annas.*

This small volume is the translation of the sayings of Sri Ramakrishna, compiled by Srimat Swami Brahmanandaji Maharaj—a most beloved disciple of Sri Ramakrishna. The translation is in simple Marathi and will be useful as a supplement to the life of Sri Ramakrishna, written by late Mr. Paranjpe. The independent reading is also very interesting as the book contains sayings, relating to the different spheres of life.

SRI BHAGAVAN RAMAKRISHNA PARAMAHAMSADEVA. By S. B. Thombre, M.A., *Published by Sri Ramakrishna Ashrama, Nagpur. Pp. 30. Price 6 pice.*

This is an abridged edition, mainly based on the life written by late Mr. Paranjpe. The book is meant for the Marathi-knowing masses and hence the language and style are very simple.

The peculiarity of the book is that within a short compass prominent phases of the Master's life are delineated with a deft hand and the price being very low, the masses at large will be able to avail themselves of it. Thus it will bring even an average man in touch with the ideals of the Great Avatâra.

SADASHIV B. NAGRE

NEWS AND REPORTS

SRI RAMAKRISHNA BIRTH CENTENARY CELEBRATIONS

DARBHANGA

A special feature of the celebration of the birth Centenary of Sri Ramakrishna, that

was held at Darbhanga and Laheria Sarai, was the participation in it of a large number of Indian Christians and Moslems. The European Christian missionaries residing at Darbhanga and Laheria Sarai also attended the functions held in connection with the

celebration which began on the 5th of May and closed on the 10th. A conference of religions which was attended by people of all faiths and denominations, was held at both the places. Swami Megheswarananda who has been here in the course of his tour in this province, spoke at both the meetings on the life and teachings of Sri Ramakrishna. On the first day of the celebration, a big procession was organized at Darbhanga in which people of all classes participated. A life-size photo of Sri Ramakrishna was seated on the back of a caparisoned elephant which was led by the processionists parading all important streets and thoroughfares.

WARDHA

The literary society of the Wasudeo Arts College, celebrated the Sri Ramakrishna Centenary in May last. A meeting was held in the Town Hall with Rai Bahadur Chhotelal Varma, Deputy Commissioner, in the chair. Dr. Londhe, Principal, gave a very nice and critical appreciation of the Prophet. Pandit Brijlal Sarrat spoke on the significance of Sri Ramakrishna's life. The president in his remarks specifically encouraged the idea of students to hold Jayantis and anniversaries of such great saints.

MIDNAPORE

Sri Ramakrishna Centenary was celebrated in May last for five days at the Garbeta Sri Ramakrishna Ashrama. Swami Apurvananda and Brahmachari Kanai of the Belur Math came here on special invitation to participate in the celebration.

On the first day of the celebration there were special puja, homa, readings from scriptures and devotional music. On the second day, a religious conference was held at which Swami Japananda, among others, spoke on the life and teachings of Sri Ramakrishna. On the third day, another largely attended meeting was held under the presidency of Swami Maheswarananda. On the fourth day, about 4,000 poor were sumptuously fed. On the fifth or concluding day, Swami Tapananda spoke on the Vedânta Dharma at a meeting held at the local H. E. School.

Thousands of booklets on the life and teachings of Sri Ramakrishna were freely distributed among the people on all the days of the celebration.

BURDWAN

Sj. Hemendra Prosad Ghose, Editor of the "Dainik Basumati", who came here in con-

nection with the flood relief work, presided over the third monthly meeting of the Sri Ramakrishna Centenary Celebrations Committee which was held on May 24. Poems and articles on the Paramahansa Deva were read at the meeting by some members of the Centenary Committee and speakers including Sj. Narendra Nath Seth of Calcutta dwelt on the life and teachings of Sri Ramakrishna. The President in a neat little speech said that service to the poor was most dear to Ramakrishna Deva's heart and Burdwan people would honour the great prophet by serving the famine-stricken people of this district.

Sj. Kumar Nath Mukherjee, an old man who had the fortune of seeing Ramakrishna Deva, described the occasion of his meeting Ramakrishna Deva and of his seeing his charming personality.

KATI HAR

The people of Katihar celebrated the birth Centenary of Sri Ramakrishna on the 13th, 14th, and 15th of June last, in a manner quite befitting the occasion. The function began with the feeding of the poor on the first day.

A public meeting, which was held on the 14th at 6 P.M., with Mr. A. Mukherjee, I.C.S., District and Sessions Judge, Purnea, in the chair, formed the main feature of the second day's programme. Many distinguished citizens of Purnea, Dinajpur, Malda, Kishanganj and other places around Katihar were present in the meeting. After an opening song, the message of Swami Vivekananda on Sri Ramakrishna as well as that of the President of the Ramakrishna Math and Mission were read. The Secretary of the Ramakrishna Mission, Katihar, read the report of the local Mission activities.

Swami Sambhuddhananda, Mahâmahopâdhyâya Pandit Bidhu Sekhar Shastri, Moulavi Amiruddin B.L., Sjt. Krishna Chandra Karmakar, B.A., Swamis Girijananda and Manishananda addressed the meeting.

The President in his eloquent address remarked that Sri Ramakrishna was one of the greatest of world teachers of all times. This age of ours, he added, requires a religion of head and heart and Sri Ramakrishna being born with the head of Sankara and wide heart of Chaitanya preached a universal religion which could not but appeal to the whole of the humanity at large. He was indeed the spirit of the *Upanishads* embodied. With

a vote of thanks to the chair the meeting terminated.

On the 3rd day a meeting of the ladies of Katihar was held with Mrs. Lila Basu, B.A., in the chair. After an opening song a small paper on Sri Ramakrishna was read by Miss. Savitri Mazumdar. Prizes in connection with sports and essay competitions were awarded. Swami Sampurnananda delivered an eloquent address on the ideal of motherhood as illustrated by the great women of our race. Swami Sambuddhananda also gave a very interesting speech befitting the occasion. The ladies of the locality appreciated the lectures. The meeting was brought to a close with a vote of thanks to the chair.

ASSAM

A series of meetings and conferences were organized in May last under the auspices of the Sri Ramakrishna Centenary Celebration Committee in connection with the visit of Swami Suddhatmananda of Sylhet Ramakrishna Ashram, Swami Japananda and Swami Chandikananda at Nowgong, Assam.

Khan Bahadur Nuruddin, M.L.C. presided at one of these meetings and spoke on the essential unity of all religions. The Swamis, who spoke next, referred to the Centenary movement that has now spread all the world over and said that it was a movement for bringing about religions and cultural unity among all nations and races. Sri Ramakrishna was a prophet of synthesis and it was a happy idea that his birth centenary should be chosen as an occasion for making a serious attempt to establish world unity which was the dream of all prophets and sages.

At a ladies' meeting held at the Brahma Mandir Hall, the Swamiji spoke on Sri Ramakrishna's conception of womanhood. By claiming equal status with men, they said, our women were claiming a position which was much inferior to that which was theirs by right. They were mothers, and it was ridiculous for mothers to claim equality with their own children.

MOTIHARI

The Centenary was celebrated with great solemnity and devotion under the Presidency of Rai Bahadur Thakur Ram Dhari Sinha when a big representative gathering of élites of the town, representing the main important religious views (Hindu, Moslem and Christian) joined in the function.

On the 12th June last a big procession

with bands, elephants, motor cars etc. started at 4 P.M. from the Middleton Park and after passing through the Main Road terminated at the said Park at 6 P.M.

At 7 P.M. on the same day a religious conference took place. Babu Ganesh Prasad Sahu, the Municipal Chairman and President of the District Hindu Sabha, read the message of the President of the Ramakrishna Mission and Babu Sukhdeo Prasad, Secretary District Hindu Sabha read the message of Swami Vivekananda. Swami Megheshwarananda of the Ramakrishna Mission delivered his inaugural speech.

The Rev. E. W. Oliver read a portion of the "Sermon on the Mount" and Rev. S. W. Law spoke on Christianity. Moulavi Abdul Majid, B.L. represented Islam. Babu Sukhdeo Prasad and Swami Megheshwarananda dwelt on Sanatan Dharma. The meeting terminated at 9-20 P.M.

On the 13th June speeches were made from 7 P.M. to 9-30 P.M. on the life and teachings of Sri Ramakrishna by various speakers.

The President spoke a few words in appreciation of the different speakers and the patient hearing of the audience. The function terminated after the distribution of Prasad.

DIBRUGARH

Swami Japananda of the Belur Math who came here in connection with the work of the Sri Ramakrishna Centenary, addressed in June last three public meetings here, of which one was of ladies.

The first meeting was organized at the local India Club at which Swamiji spoke on the life and teachings of Sri Ramakrishna. The second meeting which was of ladies, was held at the premises of the local M. E. School. It was a great success being attended by more than 400 ladies. Swamiji, who himself presided over that meeting, spoke on the "Ideal of womanhood". The speech was greatly appreciated by the audience. On the same day in the evening, Swamiji addressed another public meeting held at the Ramakrishna Seva Samiti hall, which was attended by about two thousand people.

MALDA

The Sri Ramakrishna Centenary was inaugurated here on the 6th of June last with a week-long programme of celebration, with an opening speech by Mr. B. R. Sen, I.C.S., District Magistrate, who, referring to the

spread of the movement all the world over, wished it all success at Malda. Swami Ramananda of the Belur Math then sang a beautiful song which was greatly appreciated by the audience.

The second day's programme opened with a religious conference held under the Presidency of Mahamahopādhyāya Pandit Bidhu Sekhar Sastri who opined that modern India owed a great deal for the moral and national uplift to Ramakrishna-Vivekananda. Prof. Benoy Kumar Sarkar also spoke on the same subject. Swami Sambuddhananda who followed, spoke on the life and teachings of Sri Ramakrishna. With Swami Bagalananda then announcing the next five day's programme, the function of the day came to a close.

THE RAMKRISHNA MISSION FAMINE AND FLOOD RELIEF WORK

In connection with the famine relief work of the Mission in the districts of Khulna and Bankura, we beg to announce that our workers in the Khulna district have almost completed inspection and enrolment in Union 7 of Shyamnagar Thana. As a result, relief operations have also increased greatly. The Mission started work in 14 villages with a distribution of 28 mds. 33 srs. of rice among 508 recipients, and in the last weekly distribution the figures have gone up to 31 villages, 1,648 recipients and 83 mds. 26 srs. of rice. The area will be further extended, which will raise the total amount of rice distribution to 100 mds. In the Bankura district, where the work has recently been undertaken, the third weekly distribution of 6 mds. 5 srs. was made from Jayrambati amongst 188 recipients belonging to 7 villages. Here also the work will have to be extended.

To continue the work already undertaken, the Mission will require at least Rs. 500 weekly. Our funds at present are insuffi-

cient, and the continuation of the work depends entirely on the generous public. We therefore appeal again for liberal contributions, so that thousands may be saved from starvation and death. We cannot over-estimate the seriousness of the situation, and we believe our appeal will reach every philanthropic heart in the country and find a ready response for this great cause.

ARAKAN FLOOD RELIEF

Our flood relief work in South Arakan is also going on smoothly. Here also the work has been extended. Besides distribution of 940 mds. of rice among 13,207 recipients for the week ending 4th July, from four centres, the Mission workers have also been giving temporary medical relief, and distributing building materials and clothing among the most deserving cases.

We beg to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the following noteworthy contributions for our famine relief fund:

	Rs.	A.
A friend, Poona	...	800 0
Raja Radharaman, Pilibhit	...	300 12
Screen Corporation, Ltd., Calcutta (Rupavani Charity Show)	...	253 4
Minoo Shapurji Todywalla, Esq., Bombay	...	121 0
Mr. Dayaram of Messrs. Dayaram & Co., Calcutta	...	100 0
P. C. Kar, Esq., Calcutta	...	100 0
Dr. Peter Boike, Calcutta	...	100 0

Contributions for this fund may kindly be sent to the following addresses:

(1) The President, The Ramkrishna Mission, Belur Math, P.O. Howrah.

(2) The Manager, Advaita Ashrama, 4, Wellington Lane, Calcutta.

SD. SWAMI MADHAVANANDA,

Acting Secretary.

16th July, 1936.

A CORRECTION

The pages of the Prabuddha Bharata for June and July, to our great regret, were wrongly numbered, the additional pages of the February issue, which was larger in size this year, not being taken into account. In the present issue we have put the number, after correcting the mistake.