

PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. XLI

DECEMBER, 1936

No. 12



“उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।”

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

GOD IN CHRIST

BY SWAMI VIVEKANANDA

WHEN WILL CHRIST COME AGAIN?

I never take much notice of these things. I have to deal with principles. I have only to preach that God comes again and again, and that He came in India as Krishna, Rama, and Buddha and that He will come again. It can almost be demonstrated that after each 500 years the world sinks, and a tremendous spiritual wave comes, and on the top of the wave is a Christ.

There is a great change now coming all over the world, and this is a cycle. Men are finding that they are losing hold of life; which way will they turn, down or up? Up, certainly. How can it be down? Plunge into the breach; fill up the breach with your body, your life. How should you allow the world to go down when you are living?

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MAN AND CHRIST

There is much difference in manifested beings. As a manifested being you will never be Christ. Out of clay, manufacture a clay elephant, out of the same clay, manufacture a clay mouse? Soak them in water they become one. As clay they are eternally one, as fashioned things they are eternally different. The Absolute is the material of both God and Man. As Absolute Omnipresent Being we are all one; and as personal beings God is the eternal master, and we are the eternal servant.

You have three things in you: (1) the body (2) the mind (3) the spirit. The spirit is intangible, the mind comes to birth and death, and so does the body. You are that spirit but often you think you are the body.

When a man says, "I am here", he thinks of the body. Then comes another moment when you are on the highest plane; you do not say, "I am here." But if a man abuses you, or curses you and you do not resent it, you are the spirit. "When I think I am the mind, I am one spark of that eternal fire which thou art, and when I feel that I am the spirit, you and I are one"—so says a devotee to the Lord. Is the mind in advance of the spirit?

God does not reason; why should you reason if you knew? It is a sign of weakness that we have to go on crawling like worms to get a few facts and build generalizations, and then the whole thing tumbles down again. The spirit is reflected in the mind and everything. It is the light of the spirit that makes the mind sensate. Everything is an expression of the spirit; the minds are so many mirrors. What you call love and fear, hatred, virtue and vice are all reflections of the spirit; only when the reflector is base the reflection is bad.

ARE CHRIST AND BUDDHA IDENTICAL?

It is my particular fancy that the same Buddha became Christ. Buddha

prophesied: "I will come again in five hundred years" and Christ came here in five hundred years. These are the two Lights of the whole human nature. Two men have been produced, Buddha and Christ; these are the two giants, huge gigantic personalities, two Gods. Between them they divide the whole world. Wherever there is the least knowledge in the world, people bow down either to Buddha or Christ. It would be very hard to produce more like them, but I hope there will be. Mahomed came five hundred years after, five hundred years after came Luther with his Protestant wave, and this is five hundred years after that again. It is a great thing in a few thousand years to produce two such men as Jesus and Buddha. Are not two such enough? Christ and Buddha were Gods, the others were prophets. Study the life of these two and see the manifestation of power in them. Calm and non-resisting, poor beggars owning nothing, without a cent in their pockets, despised all their lives, called heretic and fool, and think of the immense spiritual power they have wielded over humanity.

THE STUDY OF SANSKRIT AND ITS BENEFICENT INFLUENCE

BY THE EDITOR

I

Prof. Dr. Franklin Edgerton of Yale University brings out in clear relief some of our cherished ideas about the study of Sanskrit, namely, its widening influence and humanizing force in an article on the subject, published in the

October issue of *The Aryan Path*, Bombay. The learned professor confesses at the very outset that his estimate about the study of Sanskrit is based on his own personal experiences, and he dwells in the article upon the effects of Sanskritic studies on the indi-

vidual's mind and character rather than upon informative, practical, and professional advantages. The article claims to be only one Western Sanskritist's impression of some effects which the study of Sanskrit has had on his own mental outlook. "If I were to try to sum up that effect in a word," observes Dr. Edgerton, "I should say it was humanizing."

The writer is not one of those who are biased in favour of European civilization as the highest form of culture yet evolved by man. While soaring far above the horizon of provincialism, he reveals the fact that men remote from Westerners in time, no less than in space, were after all men, in essentials not so very different from themselves; at the same time he immensely appreciates that Westerners need to know their own cultural ancestry in order to know themselves. To the people who believe that European civilization is intrinsically superior to any other and that it should be studied not only by Europeans, but by all human beings, because it is the highest type of civilization ever witnessed by man, Prof. Edgerton frankly and honestly points out as follows: "The study of Sanskrit has led me to the conviction that this claim cannot be proved. I do not say that it can be disproved, either. It seems to me, scientifically, incapable of either proof or disproof; and therefore I think an objective scholar should leave it out of account altogether, as having no scientific meaning or value. I believe further that few other humanistic fields are so well adapted as Sanskrit to bring Europeans to this realization.

"For this purpose it has certain obvious advantages over the study of so-called 'primitive' languages and cultures. For one thing, it is historic. To Europeans, there is something

respectable about a lengthy history; and 'primitive' peoples have practically no history. But the Indian people has a long and continuous history, relatively independent of outside influences. In this respect it is rivalled only by the Chinese.

"With the exception of the Chinese again, there is no people on earth, outside of the European cultural sphere, which can show as many products of intellectual culture of the sort which Europeans consider marks of a high civilization. Perhaps it is unreasonable to set so great a value on such matters, and on length of history. Perhaps the 'primitivists' are right in suggesting that the 'savage' is as well off as civilized man, or better, and that his *mores* are as admirable, abstractly considered. The fact remains that few Europeans will be found willing to admit it. They will not respect a foreign culture unless it appears to them 'civilized'. But no one who has any real knowledge of Sanskrit literature and Indian history can doubt that the Hindus have been highly civilized for millennia, and that their intellectual products compare on the whole very favourably with those of Europe, even judged by European standards. If in modern times the technological advances of Europe have surpassed anything that India has achieved, this is a very recent development, and may be regarded as counter-balanced by other features which, in the opinion of many thoughtful Europeans, are at least as important, humanly speaking. As examples may be mentioned the religious tolerance for which India is historically famous, and on the whole justly so, in contrast with Europe, which cannot match Asoka, for instance; and the ethical principle of *Ahinsa*, the sanctity of all life, which even as an ideal can hardly be said to exist in the West, and which despite all

imperfections in its observance has been a real humanizing force in India for many centuries.”

It is gratifying to note how a cultured Occidental like Dr. Edgerton has been impressed by the human value of Indian civilization that is embedded in Sanskrit literature the study of which can, according to him, bring one to a realization of the essential oneness of mankind. The human interest of Sanskrit literature was stressed long ago by Western Orientalists like Sir William Jones, Max Müller, H. H. Wilson, Sir Monier-Williams, and a host of others in the past. In the present, the interest is growing more and more intense from day to day among Western scholars.

II

The vastness, variety, and richness of Sanskrit literature justify its greatness for all time to come. Referring to its vastness, Sir William Jones remarked, “Wherever we direct our attention to Hindu literature, the notion of infinity presents itself.” The richness of Sanskrit literature can hardly be over-estimated. No scholar can afford to pass by the inestimable materials which the *Upanishads*, the epics, the systems of philosophy, and theological treatises supply with their wealth of beauty, art, imagination, and inspiration. The memorable passage written by Max Müller regarding the richness of Sanskrit literature runs as follows: “If I were asked under what sky the human mind has most fully developed some of its choicest gifts, has most deeply pondered on the greatest problems of life, and has found solutions of some of them which well deserve the attention even of those who have studied Plato and Kant—I should point to India. And if I were to ask myself from what literature we, here in Europe, we who have been nurtured almost exclusively at the thoughts of

Greeks and Romans, and of one Semitic race, the Jewish, may draw that corrective which is most wanted in order to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, in fact more truly human, a life, not for this life only, but a transfigured and eternal life,—again I should point to India.”

Apart from the humanizing influence, the study of Sanskrit affords a striking combination of art and religion in the poetical literature of the ancient Indians. That fine sentiments of unworldliness can combine the loftiest production of literary art can be profusely found in Sanskrit poetry—a fact which is very rarely found in the modern literatures of the world. Human love portrayed in the epics of India transcends the last vestige of worldliness and sensuous attachment which forms the constant theme of European poetry. In this connection we may quote Sir Monier-Williams: “It must be admitted, however, that in exhibiting pictures of domestic life and manners, the Sanskrit epics are even more true and real than the Greek and Roman. In the delineation of women the Hindu poet throws aside all exaggerated colouring and draws from nature—Kaikeyi, Kausalyâ, Mandodari (the favourite wife of Râvana), and even the humpbacked Mantharâ are all drawn to the very life. Sitâ, Draupadi, and Damayanti engage our affections and our interest far more than Helen or even Penelope. Indeed, Hindu wives are generally perfect patterns of conjugal fidelity; can it be doubted that in these delightful portraits of the *Pativrata* or devoted wife, we have true representations of the purity and simplicity of Hindu domestic manners in early times?”

III

Considering the fact that the study of

Sanskrit opens the eyes to wider horizons, broadens the mental outlook, and brings mankind in a sympathetic bond of understanding, human feelings and sentiments, the need for the revival of Sanskrit learning with greater zeal and labour can hardly be overestimated. It should be the duty of the Hindus above all to devise ways and means to propagate the study of Sanskrit in a more organized and systematic manner. It is a pity that even a large number of the leading Hindus who have received English education have themselves yet to know the extent of the great possibilities that Sanskrit education possesses for the national good of India and that of humanity as well. It may be a very unwelcome proposition in the face of the great appreciations made by the Western Orientalists, as cited above; but it is a truth which we can hardly conceal and which we should not. Many of our educated countrymen look upon Sanskrit learning as useless for all practical purposes in remaking India in the present-day world. Some of them think it to be a mere looking into the past achievements of the Hindus without having any benefit to themselves in the living present. This is the very question which was put to Swami Vivekananda during his return from the West for the first time. What he replied can be applied even today: "Many times have I been told that looking into the past only degenerates and leads to nothing, and that we should look to the future. That is true. But out of the past is built the future. Look back, therefore, as far as you can, drink deep of the eternal fountains that are behind, and after that, look forward, march forward and make India brighter, greater, much higher than she ever was. Our ancestors were great. We must first recall that. We must learn the elements of our being, the blood that

coarsens in our veins; we must have faith in that blood, and what it did in the past; and out of that faith, and consciousness of past greatness, we must build an India yet greater than she has been. There have been periods of decay and degradation. I do not attach much importance to them; we all know that. Such periods have been necessary. A mighty tree produces a beautiful ripe fruit. That fruit falls on the ground, it decays and rots, and out of that decay springs the root and the future tree, perhaps mightier than the first one. This period of decay through which we have passed was all the more necessary. Out of this decay is coming the India of the future; it is sprouting, its first leaves are already out, and a mighty gigantic tree, the *Urdhwamulam* is here, already beginning to appear, and it is about that that I am going to speak to you."

IV

Sanskrit education has a great place in the social life of India. The so-called depressed classes can rise again and march shoulder to shoulder with the higher castes; provided they can learn Sanskrit and imbibe the cultural virtues of their common ancestors. The study of Sanskrit alone can, to a great extent, remove from Hindu society the baneful effects of caste inequalities, caste animosities on one hand, and exclusive claims, privileges, and social oppressions on the other. Swami Vivekananda pointing to the non-Brâhman castes said long ago: "Instead of wasting your energies in vain discussions and quarrels in the newspapers, instead of fighting and quarrelling in your own homes,—which is sinful,—use all your energies in acquiring the culture which the Brâhmana has, and the thing is done. Why do you not become Sanskrit scholars? Why do you not

spend millions to bring Sanskrit education to all the castes of India? That is the question. The moment you do these things, you are equal to the Brâhman. That is the secret of power in India. Sanskrit and prestige go together in India. As soon as you have that, none dares say anything against you. That is the secret; take that up."

It is now the duty of the higher castes to work for the amelioration of the wretched condition of their brethren. Those who deprived the so-called lower castes of learning the *Vedas* and other sacred books of ancient wisdom must now carry the treasures to the doors of the suppressed classes of Hindu society. The accumulated culture of ages must be thrown broadcast throughout the entire Hindu society. Instead of running thirsty for social philosophies to improve the condition of the masses of India in Western literature, let the people of India first seek it in the constantly flowing river of their own Sanskrit literature.

V

In these days we often hear about the revival of Indian culture and its traditions. But unless the study of Sanskrit be made popular, there can hardly be any advancement in that direction. India and Sanskrit literature are organically related, so the revival of any aspect of Indian culture must have its inspiration from the literature. "India, though it has, as we have seen," observes Sir Monier-Williams in one of his books, "more than five hundred spoken dialects, has only one sacred language and only one sacred literature, accepted and revered by all adherents of Hinduism alike, however diverse in race, dialect, rank, and creed. That language is Sanskrit, and that literature is Sanskrit literature

—the only repository of the Veda or 'Knowledge' in its widest sense, the only vehicle of Hindu theology, philosophy, law, and mythology; the only mirror in which all creeds, opinions, customs, and usages of the Hindus are faithfully reflected; and (if we may be allowed to use a fourth metaphor) the only quarry whence the requisite materials may be obtained for improving the vernaculars, or for expressing important religious and scientific ideas."

Those who think that the Hindus are a dying race should all the more pay heed to the revival of Sanskrit learning. Besides, the Hindus who are said to be the oldest race in the world in the sense that they built up its earliest civilization, now form a population exceeding 250 millions and can very well claim to be a race that is not dying at least numerically. Considering the numerical strength, the Hindus can stand as a nation by themselves and need to revive their ancient learning not only to save their own country and culture but also to preach a gospel of equality and freedom to all the races and nations in the present distracted world of ours. In the last Hindu Youth Conference held in Lahore, Dr. Radhakumud Mookerjea observes in his Presidential Address: "You must never forget that it is the Hindus who have built up India through the ages since the dawn of civilization and have won for themselves a place under the sun in India with a single-minded devotion and patriotism which refused to cultivate any extra-Indian affiliations or distractions. There has been no doubt in earlier times an expansion of Hindu India, a sort of a greater India, beyond the boundaries of India proper. But this expansion was only an expansion of ideals, an empire of thought, and not of territory or political control."

This is a statement which should dispel the darkness of doubt or suspicion in the minds of those who smell of any communal bias in the efforts of the Hindus for popularizing the study of Sanskrit and thereby creating a humanizing force in the modern world. The *Upanishads*, the *Gitā*, and other treasures of Sanskrit literature preach in unequivocal terms an all-tolerant, an all-comprehensive, and an all-absorbing message to all sects, creeds, races, and nationalities; hence the cultural revival of the Hindus is no source of danger to other cultures and to the traditions of the races of small minorities in India. The cultural history of India can justify such a unique claim of the Hindus and it can be best expressed in the words of a great Indologist like the late lamented Dr. Sylvain Levi:

“The multiplicity of the manifestations of the Indian genius as well as their fundamental unity gives India the right to figure on the first rank in the history of civilized nations. Her civilization, spontaneous and original, unrolls itself in a continuous time across at least thirty centuries, without interruption, without deviation. Ceaselessly in contact with foreign elements which threatened to strangle her, she persevered victoriously in absorbing them, assimilating them and enriching herself with them. Thus she has seen the Greeks, the Scythians, the Afghans, the Mongols to pass before her eyes in succession and is regarding with indifference the Englishmen—confident to pursue under the accident of the surface the normal course of her high destiny.”

TALKS OF SWAMI BRAHMANANDA

AT THE ALAMBAZAR MATH
1ST JUNE, 1897

Question: Maharaj! Tell us something about Master. How did he use to look upon all?

Answer: He used to look upon all as God. One day Swamiji asked him, “You love us so much, will you finally turn out to be a second Jada Bharata?” He replied: “One turns out to be a Jada Bharata by musing on inert objects but I dwell on Consciousness! The day I shall feel attached to you, I shall drive you all away.”

One day Master did not speak to Swamiji for some reason. On finding the latter putting up with it without any difference and without a cheerless countenance he remarked, “He is a great vessel.” Again another day as Keshab Sen showered praises on

Swamiji he said, “Do not praise him so much; he has yet to blossom out.”

“What one’s love for God should be like?” he used to say: “One should be restless even like a dog with an ulcer in the head, which runs about here and there mad with pain.”

Master never allowed anybody to stay with him for more than two or three days. Some felt annoyed at a youth’s staying long with him and complained that he taught renunciation. To that he replied: “Let him take up a worldly life. Am I dissuading him from it? But let him have knowledge first and then enter the world. Do I preach the renunciation of lust and wealth to everybody? I preach to them alone who need only a little stoking up.” He used to say to the rest, “Go and enjoy the hog-plum pickle; come here for medicine when you have colic.”

“Can you account for this idiosyncrasy of mine?” Master often used to ask all: “What makes me go to them so often, who cannot buy me a pice worth of puffed sugar cakes, and who have not means even to offer a torn mat to sit upon?” He himself used to explain afterwards: “I find that they will be easily successful, it is very difficult for the rest—the latter are, as it were, pots for curd. One cannot keep milk in them.” He used to say to them, “I pray for you so that you can realize God quickly.”

One day when the topic of the Kartâbhajâs came up in the course of conversation, Girish Babu sarcastically remarked that he would write a drama about them. On hearing Girish Babu talk in that vein, Master looked grave and said, “You see, there have been many persons of realization even among them. This too is a path.”

Talking about Master, Maharaj said that Master used to forbid them to take food at Srâddha ceremonies, marriage celebrations and other like occasions observed by householders. He would also ask us to take the name of Hari (Lord) before sitting for meditation.

One day Swami Turiyananda asked Master how lust could be got rid of. “Why should it be got rid of?” he replied, “Turn it to another direction.” He said the same thing about anger, greed, infatuation, and other things. He felt very much lifted up in spirits on hearing it.

He used to say: “He reveals Himself more where there is great eagerness.”

He used to say to some, “Have love for this (pointing to himself), that will do.” Oh, the wonderful things that have happened!

MORAL PROBLEMS OF THE PRESENT AGE

BY VICTOR LOGA

THE PROBLEM OF AN OBJECTIVE MORAL STANDARD ARISING ESPECIALLY AT THE IMPORTANT MOMENTS IN OUR LIFE

Can we set up an objective moral standard?

This question can be put in our everyday life.

It arose to my mind in its gravest significance thrice during my life of adventures and experiences.

The first time was in Russia in the darkest years of the War and revolution 1914-1920.

I witnessed the innumerable scenes of human misery, of famine, epidemic, of the ravages of fire and sword. . .

I witnessed the innumerable atrocities, slaughter of men and women,

and common crimes committed in the name of liberty upon a deluded people.

Ten years passed by. . .

From the plains of the mighty river Volga, from the icy waters of lake Baikal in Siberia I stood in September, 1930 in the wonderful Richelieu Hall of the Sorbone, in Paris, among the other 250 delegates of 82 nationalities assembled at the International Moral Education Congress for discussing this same problem of the objective moral standard.

And then, thirdly, this question advanced by the Scandinavian moralists, must be, if not resolved, at least meditated upon, by every conscious human being in this year of 1936, when

a people of undeniably great civilization annexes, by war, the territory of another free people, in the name of the "necessity of its own expansion," in spite of all moral standards of Christianity, and the solemn Pacts of the League of Nations.

We will not discuss here the moral problems of wars and revolutions; such historical events cannot be isolated and examined as separate links of the chain of human activity and tragedy.

THE INTERNATIONAL MORAL EDUCATION CONGRESS IN PARIS, 1930

But an assembly such as the International Moral Education Congress was a separate and distinct fact in itself, and it is interesting to remember that there were gathered together moralists, philosophers, and pedagogues from the whole world, who stood helpless before the question of an objective moral standard.

The world's greatest brains searched vainly for a foundation on which to raise the edifice of scientific moral education.

The rôle of history and sociology in moral education was discussed.

It was said, not without malice, that morality has need, perhaps, of historical experience, but that history lives very easily without morality. And those last 6 years of the League's activity proved it throughout.

Sociology as a comparatively new branch of human knowledge is itself in need of a scientific base for sanction.

Some timid voices suggested religion as the base of the moral education.

But this point of view, being subjective, did not find "the good atmosphere". It led, moreover, to another question: which of the many religions can serve for this purpose the whole of Humanity?

The Congress discussed discipline and

autonomy in education, and finished by adopting the "motto" proposed by the venerable English pedagogue, Mr. Gould:

"There is but one child."

That means, the love for the child is universal in all peoples, without difference of race and creed.

It should bring us, in consequence, to the constructive ideal of one goal in education—the evolution of the dormant potential energies and spiritual capacities of the human being, approached by various ways, in relation to the geographical, social and economic situation in which it is to develop.

The problem of an objective base for moral development has not, therefore, been solved by strictly scientific methods, outside of man.

The Congress had to acknowledge the value of a common feeling abiding in each human heart.

In the universal love of the child we presume a better form of life in time to come, a future brotherhood of men, a mutual comprehension and solidarity of peoples.

That must be the adamant stone of the whole building of human solidarity.

Similarly, we conceive the ideal of an objective moral standard of life.

Does it exist? On what can it be based?

Greatest truths are at the same time the simplest.

It is not necessary to use dialectical tricks to discover them.

Humanity has acknowledged them during the ages, from the dawn of history. They lie implicit in our consciousness, they abide in our Soul as the very core of its existence.

Thousands of years ago, it was discovered by our ancestors and about 40 years ago it was wonderfully expressed by one of the greatest synthetic brains

of Humanity, the Hindu philosopher and moralist Swami Vivekananda.¹

“The rational West is earnestly bent upon seeking out the ‘raison d’être’ of its philosophy and its ethics.

And you know well that ethics cannot be derived from the mere sanction of any personage, however great and divine he may have been, of one who having been born but yesterday has had to die a short time after.

Such an explanation of the authority of ethics no more appeals to the highest of the world’s thinkers.

They want something more than human sanction for ethical and moral codes to be binding, they want some eternal principle of truth as the sanction of ethics!

And where is that eternal sanction to be found except in the only reality that exists, in you, in me, in all, in the “Self”, in the Soul?

The infinite oneness of the Soul is the eternal sanction of all morality.”

THE SANCTION OF ALL MORALITY

This oneness is the “rationale” of all ethics and all spirituality: Europe wants it today just as much as the down-trodden masses of the East.

The moral standard can be based on the belief in ourselves, in the human Soul.

“Believe first in yourselves and then believe in anything else.”

Is it objectively true? Is it only, perhaps, a subjective reasoning or a mystic dream?

We have to analyse the word “objective”.

OBJECTIVE KNOWLEDGE

Science is “objective” if based upon measure. The physical phenomena can

¹ See *Indian Lectures* by Swami Vivekananda.

be measured by grammes, centimetres and seconds and expressed in these units.

But as it is proved by the Theory of Relativity these units are not independent, unchangeable.

The only “objective” witness is there in our human Soul.

But you perceive the world’s phenomena in one way, and I see them otherwise. We come, then, to antinomies or chaotic opinions and all understanding not only in moral but also in scientific matters becomes impossible.

Nevertheless, we are progressing in something which we call “science,” “humanitarianism” and so on.

“Objective,” then, we will call all knowledge, all experience which can be lived, proved, repeated anywhere, at any time, by anyone.

The love for the child cannot be measured; nevertheless all peoples, in all countries, at any time, believe or simply are aware of it.

This universal feeling, then, exists; its existence is an “objective” one.

THE HUMAN SOUL, ITS ETERNAL NATURE

Does the human Soul exist?

We develop continuously, from childhood to the latest days of our life. Our body changes, our brain changes, our mind changes too, but something remains as witness of that, is always the same, immutable, like the banks of a river relative to the running waters.

That “something” we call “Soul,” “ego,” the eternal “I” or “Self”.

Life in the ordinary sense of activity is but the series of experiences of the “Ego”.

Bad or good, agreeable or not, they serve us as stimuli for our Self-knowledge, which is the only goal of our evolution.

Individuals stand in different degrees of development. Nowadays, as adults,

we have more experience than in our childhood.

One individual has more than another, because he has been born in other circumstances than his fellow.

Hence, we see everywhere the objective inequality of bodies, brains, temperaments and . . . ethics.

HIERARCHY AND AUTHORITY

Thence is derived also the hierarchy of men, a differentiation which means only different degrees of experience.

For cannibals it would be progress to become meat-eaters. In future, we shall all, perhaps, be vegetarians.

Yet, in spite of this variety of individuals, the belief in the unity, in the inner brotherhood of men is innate—inherent.

If our Self is unchangeable—it is eternal. If it be eternal—it is omnipresent, omniscient, and it can be *only One*, expressing and manifesting Itself in various ways, in various forms, in various bodies.

My brother can be older than myself. He has more experience. I believe in what he tells me.

But I tell myself that all is true that I can examine and verify, at any time.

Thus authority appears.

The authority of Columbus and of millions of other sailors enables me to believe in the existence of America, without having seen it or visited it.

The authority of Newton, Gallileo, Kepler, Copernicus enables us to believe in many mathematical or astronomical facts.

As H. Poincaré said² the scientific progress of humanity could not be conceived unless we believe in the authority of certain enlightened men, as we believe in ourselves.

We come then in such a way, to universal laws and universal knowledge.

.. ² *La valeur de la science* by H. Poincaré.

The same must be true in moral questions. Man has realized that the misery of his fellows makes him, at once or later on, unhappy too, and he expresses that in the law of neighbourly love.

His subjective experience becomes universal, and therefore objective.

The Russian revolution might appear not to have concerned other peoples. But is not the misery of this unhappy nation, isolated from the rest of Humanity, the source of even material disturbances for Europe?

THE SOLIDARITY OF ALL MEN

Almost all religions, all moral sciences, all international laws, ethics and pacts are based upon the fact of the interdependence of all men.

The earthquake in Japan, the famine in China or India must have, later on, their repercussion, even though it be invisible, in Europe. Their sufferings must be ours.

From the solidarity of mankind one step farther leads us to the community and inter-relationship of all beings, as it was preached 24 centuries ago by the Enlightened One.

The commandment of Jesus to love our neighbour, this transcendental oneness of all of Gautama Buddha and Sankarâchârya, or the organic relation of all physical phenomena found by scientists like W. Ostwald, R. Mach, H. Poincaré and A. Einstein, this unity of matter and energy emphasized by workers from Lavoisier and Robert Mayer to Curie-Sklodowska—all that unity in plurality is the base of our modern knowledge, nay, it must be the *base of our moral knowledge* of the new era.

No doubt, the political facts seem to contest this truth. Revolutions, competition, the struggle for life, wars of the past or of to-morrow may shake

our belief in solidarity but only superficially.

CIVILIZATION AND CULTURE. DIFFERENCES IN CULTURE AND THE RELATIVITY OF MORAL STANDARDS

As among individuals, nations are also in different degrees of moral development.

It must be remembered, too, that civilization and culture are different things.

A nation can be civilized, having all the marks of a very high material, intellectual or artistic culture, but be, permanently or temporarily, on a low level of morality.

Hence, the relativity of moral standards in modern societies derives from the difference of moral culture, which changes according to the religious, national and other ideas of the epoch.

Polygamy is immoral in the West. In the East it can be moral.

To kill is sin. During war it is "a patriotic action".

Stealing is punished everywhere. Committed by "the state" it is called only "contribution," "expropriation," "devaluation" and so on.

As long as we are progressing at different speeds, as individuals or nations, so long will we have different personal or national experiences and religious ideals: moral standards will change, too, and mutual comprehension in moral affairs will be very difficult.

Nevertheless, the time seems to have come for us to seek in this chaotic state of creeds, morality, political and social conduct for one universal criterion of morality, unless we would see our civilization crumbling.

It is absolutely true that "the latest craze for utilitarian morality has developed into a relativity which is accused of leading to a general moral nihilism."

On the contrary, it is untrue that "bolshevism" or materialistic communism are the only causes and reasons for this state of affairs.

They are rather the consequence of the lack of positive ideals. They can live only as parasites of amoral societies, like worms on rotten trees.

Let them have light and air, give them the sound food of humanity, and all these moral diseases will disappear, will fall from the human tree.

That must inevitably come, because everywhere there is apparent a craving for universal moral rules.

Universal morality will come with the spreading of a universal religion reconciled with science.³ Universal religion does not contradict any existing creeds. It is only the fulfilment of all and the reconciliation of all.

³ See *La vie de Ramakrishna, la vie de Vivekananda* par Romain Rolland. Paris.

Universal religion exists, too, as long as mankind has done.

It has not been revealed only by some one historical person but is the result of the spiritual and moral experience of all pioneers, guides and sages of Humanity, known to us by name or absolutely unknown.

Universal religion does not contradict reason. It can be called "the absolute knowledge".

Sri Ramakrishna, the latest Hindu religious mystic, realized practically the inner unity of all religions and expressed the truth of the universal religion:

"There is but one God but endless are His names."

"Diverse are the ways and means to approach God."

"Every religion in the world is one of the ways to reach Him."

Swami Vivekananda says:

"Each soul is potentially divine. The goal is to manifest this divinity within by controlling nature, external and internal.

Do this either by work, or worship, or psychic control, or philosophy, by one or more, or all of them, and be free.

This is the whole of religion. Doctrines, or dogmas, or ritual, or books, or temples, or forms are but secondary details. Teach yourselves, teach everyone his real nature. Power will come, glory will come, goodness will come, purity will come."

Science and religion, reason and feeling become one in the universal religion which teaches the divinity of the human Soul.

Man has to choose one of the two alternatives. When he looks upon himself as one of the innumerable creatures of nature, as a phenomenon, all his actions will appear to be governed by the law of necessity.

Societies will be governed, too, by the struggle for life, and the only morality will be the morality of force and cunning.

When he feels he is not a slave of nature, and can take the responsibility for his own development because of his inherent consciousness of freedom, he looks upon himself as a moral and spiritual being, and his consciousness of eternity makes him bound with his fellows, society and Humanity, where he finds his natural extension.

THE IDEAL OF AN OBJECTIVE MORAL STANDARD IS IN EXISTENCE AND NEEDS ONLY TO BE REALIZED

We come, then, to the definitive answer to the definitive question:

Can an objective moral standard be set up in the present age? If so, on what can it be based?

And we reply:

—Yes, as an ideal. . .

Among the varieties of moral codes and moral standards due to the diversity of creeds, religions and moral cultures, some unity appears as well.

It exists already, as it has been explained above. It needs only to be remembered and realized.

The most advanced ideas of the divinity of the Soul, the inter-dependence of all, or the Oneness of all, preached by all sages of all ages and races, can serve as the base for moral rules of lasting value, giving liberty to

accommodate the changeable forms to permanent, eternal principles.

The universal Truth of the integrity and liberty of the Soul, the possibility of its eternal development as the "conditio sine qua non" of all morality is the prize of all Humanity.

Nobody can say: "This divine man has solved the "question." He is the only saviour of Mankind."

From this derived national gods which became idols, and thus there came about the separability and sects.

The Indian Upanishads are the oldest scriptures containing the ideas of "Oneness."

But we might mention many names of prophets, sages, moralists of all races of old, as well as the names of philosophers and moralists of later centuries and ages in the West and East: Kant, Schopenhauer, J. J. Rousseau, Swedenborg, Nietzsche, Tolstoi, Hœne-Wronski, Gandhi, Rabindranath Tagore and many other giants of Humanity.

Universal Truth is eternal and must live in the living guides of Mankind.

The ideal of an objective morality already exists. That is love, sympathy, and kindness to all that lives, based upon the religious, philosophical and scientific Oneness of all.

It is not necessary to emphasize that this formula contains the love of neighbours too.

But it goes deeper.

Can you imagine a good and moral man loving his fellow but torturing animals?

Can you imagine a good and moral man not fond of plants, flowers, forests, mountains and seas?

The ideal of a moral, noble man or woman implies a loving being, sympathetic, kind to all creatures, seeking for and creating or trying to create anywhere, and in any circumstances, peace and harmony. . .

The standard for an objective morality can be set up in its general outlines as follows:

Each thought, desire, action or line of conduct that brings us co-operation, friendship, tolerance and leads to Harmony and Oneness—is moral.

It means love and evolution.

Each thought, desire, action and line of conduct leading to discrimination, separativeness, selfishness, hatred, competition, exclusiveness—is immoral from the universal moral point of view.

It means Disharmony and Chaos.

We live, indeed in a most important era of great changes. It is plain that the old-established values seem to be crumbling.

What are we preparing instead?

Teach the masses the integrity of the individual in the sense of the Soul and not only as body and brain.

Teach Humanity as an organic whole!

The individuals are cells, the peoples are organs. All have some function to be executed:

But mark it, *the cell is the base of all organization*. That is what must be repeatedly cried to the doctrinaires of today, whose experiments with society-building are accompanied by tyranny over the individual.

Mankind is on the march. The way is long. Not all can yet see the spiritual oneness and the necessity of co-operation instead of jealousy, competition, hatred and war.

Let men and women have more experience if they do not believe in authority. They will come from the subjective belief to the universal, objective truth.

All pioneers of Humanity, Hindu rishis or seers, Christian mystics, Mahomedan sufis, great thinkers of all nations and times have realized the Unity in Diversity, and as has been proved by the latest Hindu prophet

Sri Ramakrishna, this realization is to be attained by all, in all religions, if we are only sincere, pure in heart and unselfish.

The truth of this Oneness and Unity cannot be taught by dialectics.

The sages taught saying: we have realized Unity, and you can too.

The "summum bonum" of all moralists of all ages is based upon the truth of the inter-dependence of all, the relationship of all phenomena, as well on the material as on the spiritual plane.

And neighbourly love and universal love derive therefrom.

It is to be remarked that not only the prophets or thinkers were aware of this.

In some degree many poets and musicians have had visions and anticipated in their works the new form of existence, the harmony of the Universe.

Beethoven and Wagner were of these.

The hierarchy is the core of progressive humanity and does not contradict the ideal of equality and fraternity in spirit, as the love of the family does not deny the liberty of the individual.

The universal solidarity must draw its force up from the unique divine source of the integral, immortal value of the human Soul.

No morality can be based on material collectivism. The materialistic theories and communism denying the spiritual source of life make men brutes, turning back the cheated people to the animal necessities of life, instead of bringing the promised Heaven on earth.

VIVEKANANDA'S TEACHINGS ON THE OBJECTIVE STANDARD OF MORALITY

Vivekananda, the above-mentioned Hindu moralist and philosopher, in his inspired teachings in India, America

and Europe, said of the base of morality:

“Advaita, the philosophy of Oneness of all or the spiritual monism alone gives the sanction for morality.

All religions preach that the essence of morality is to be good unto others, and to be unselfish.

But why? . . .

Because some scriptures have so enjoined it? Let them, that is nothing to me.

Each one for himself and . . . somebody take the hindermost, that is all morality in the world, at least with many.

What is the reason why I should be moral? You cannot explain it except when you come to know the principle laid down in the ‘Bhagavat Gitâ.

‘He who sees everyone is himself, and himself in everyone, thus seeing the same God living equally in all, the sage, for such is he, no more kills the Self by the Self’. Know through Advaita that if you hurt anyone you hurt yourself.

Herein is the basis of all morality. The others teach it, but cannot give you reason.

And what will you gain for knowing this Unity? Strength and illumination. Know that all sins and all evils can be summed up into that one word:—weakness.

It is weakness that makes men do that they ought not to do. Send not out thoughts and words of weakness unto yourselves or to humanity.

Let them all know that they are spirit.

Let them suck it with their mother’s milk—the idea of Strength of Spirit. And then let them think of it, and out of that thought will proceed works such as the world has never seen.

You shall have to believe that you are immortal spirit, if you want to be

great in the material plane also.

I may be a little bubble, and you a mountain-high wave, but we must know that for both of us the infinite ocean is the background, the infinite God our magazine of power and strength, and we can draw as much as we like, both of us, from that reservoir behind.

Believe therefore in yourselves.

Believe in yourselves first, and ~~then~~ believe in anything else.

In the history of the world, you will find that only those nations that have believed in themselves have become great and strong.

In the history of each nation, we will always find that individuals that have believed in themselves have become great and strong.”

Thus the ideal of an objective moral standard exists.

THE IDEAL OF A MORAL STANDARD MUST BE REALIZED BY INDIVIDUAL EFFORTS.

THE MASSES MUST KNOW THE POSSIBILITY OF THIS

It cannot be explained, only stated in general terms: morality derives from the inter-dependence and mutual inner-relationship of all beings.

Love, solidarity, sympathy are the only expression and manifestation of this Truth.

Nobody can learn the Truth of the Oneness of all by the ordinary ways of reasoning or dialectics even with the help of a teacher—philosopher or moralist.

THE NECESSITY OF INTROSPECTION

Only individual spiritual researches, meditations, contemplations it may be called prayer or psychological introspection would bring us to the super-consciousness called intuition, enlightenment or cosmic consciousness.

Meditation on the inner value of the Soul and on the solidarity of all beings

is the base of universal moral training.

How is it possible in the midst of our daily occupation?

Certainly the West suffers from excessive external activity.

We have no time for introspection and spirituality. Disturbed by perpetual movement and educated in the teachings of the French philosopher Descartes: *Cogito—ergo sum*, I think, therefore I am—which leads at last to the false conclusion that thought is all, the West has lost the key to true knowledge. Very rarely do the thinkers of Europe, like the philosopher Bergson, express anything about intuition above the intellect.

Nowadays, Europe and America are only beginning to understand the value of calmness, meditation and prayer.

We have recognized that for the formation of regular crystals we must keep the solution containing them potentially in an undisturbed state, but seldom do we realize that to be calm, quiet and serene are necessary to the crystallization and the development of our Soul.

Look at our educational methods.

It is nothing but movement, eternal haste, from early morning to late at night.

Every minute of the day is intended for some activity or other. This speed kills us.

It is necessary to develop our moral forces, lest we should create a new barbarism—the barbarism of mechanical organization.

It is necessary for Western peoples to learn the contemplative methods of the East. And the East has to learn from them their power of organization.

I would like to cry to my Western brothers: stop, enough of this satanic movement, this feverish activity, let us learn the power of meditation, and then we should find in the depths of our

Soul the remedy for our economic crisis as well as for our moral diseases.

Let us learn that all the various ways of worshipping God must not prevent us from seeing and feeling unity always and everywhere.

Let us understand and spread over the whole world for its regeneration these sacred Sanscrit words expressive of synthetic knowledge:

“*Ekam sat viprâh bahudhâ vadanti.*”

“What exists is one: the sages call that by various names.”

THE ACTUAL MORAL REVOLUTION

I have mentioned so often the sayings of the greatest authorities of all ages and all races, and I end with the prophetic words of that sage who realized in himself the synthetic knowledge of the East and the West:⁴

“—We are entering into a new Great Cycle of the race, and the old is being prepared for being dropped off like an old worn-out husk.

Old conventions, ideals, customs, laws, ethics, and things sociological, economical, theological, philosophical, and metaphysical have been outgrown, and are about to be shed by the race.

The great cauldron of human thought is bubbling away fiercely, and many things are rising to its surface.

—Like all great changes, the good will come only with much pain—all birth is with pain.

The race feels the pain and perpetual unrest, but knows not what is the disease nor the remedy.

Many false cases of diagnosis and prescription are even now noticeable, and will become still more in evidence as the years roll by.

Many self-styled saviours of the race, prescribers for the pain of the soul and mind, will arise and fall.

⁴ Swami Vivekananda 1868-1902.

But out of it all will come that for which the race now waits.

The change will come from the unfolding of the race-mind, the process being now under way.

Are not the signs of mental unrest and discomfort becoming more and more apparent as the days go by?

The pain is growing greater, and the race is beginning to fret and chafe and moan.

It knows not what it wants, but it knows that it feels pain and wants something to relieve that pain.

The old things are beginning to totter and ideas rendered sacred by years of observance are being brushed aside with a startling display of irreverence.

Under the surface of our civilization we may hear the straining and groaning of the ideas and principles that are striving to force their way out on the plane of manifestation.

Men are running hither and thither crying for a *leader* and saviour. They cry for satisfaction, but it eludes them. And yet all this search and disappointment is part of the Great Change, and

is preparing the race for That-which-must-come.

And yet the relief will not come from any Thing.

It will come from Within.

The world is tiring of hypocrisy and dishonesty in all human relations, and is crying aloud to be led back, some-way to Truth and Honesty in Thought and Action.

But it does not see the way out.

From the deep recesses of the race-mind are rising to the surface old passions, relics from the cave-dweller days, and all sorts of ugly mental relics of the past.

And they will continue to rise and show themselves until at last the bubbling pot will begin to quiet down, and then will come a New Peace, and the best will come to the surface—the essence of all the experience of the race. . .

During the struggle ahead of the race play well your part, doing the best you can, living each day by itself, meeting each new phase of life with confidence and courage."

SANKARA'S INTERPRETATION OF THE VEDĀNTA-SUTRAS

BY SWAMI VIRESWARANANDA

There is a strong opinion current amongst scholars today that whatever be the merit of Sankara's metaphysical doctrines considered by themselves or even as doctrines elucidating the teachings of the *Upanishads*, he is not faithful to Bâdarâyana in his interpretation of the Sutas. They hold that Bâdarâyana was ignorant of a twofold Brahman and consequently of a twofold knowledge; that he was not aware of the doctrine of Mâyâ and so did not hold

that the world was unreal, but that Brahman underwent a real change into this world-order; and that the Sutas do not hold the view of absolute identity of the individual soul and Brahman. In short their view is that the system of Bâdarâyana is a theistic system which has more affinities with the systems of Râmânûja and Nimbârka than with Sankara's pure Monism. This view is nothing new. Bhâskara at the beginning of his commentary on the Sutas

accuses Sankara of this very thing. But at the same time we can also cite Sândilya, the author of the Bhakti-Sutras, who refers to Bâdarâyana as a Monist in Sutra 80 of his work which shows that the view that Bâdarâyana was an Abhedavâdin was prevalent in ancient days.

It is not possible to deal with such a controversial subject in a short article like this. All the same we shall take some salient points connected with this discussion and try to see how far such a criticism against Sankara is justified. At the outset, however, it is fair to admit that at places Sankara's interpretations seem to be far-fetched; but this is by no means a defect of his Bhâshya alone but of all the other extant Bhâshyas as well. Moreover, in such a critical study we shall not gain much if we follow the letter of the Sutras, missing the general spirit of the work as a whole. It is possible to give a consistent interpretation of the Sutras by following the letter of the Sutras and at the same time miss the general spirit of the work as a whole.

पौर्वापर्यापरामृष्टः शब्दोऽन्याम् कुरुते मतिम् ।

“The Sruti texts give rise to a wrong view if they are not studied as one connected whole”—in other words, the letter often kills the spirit.

To start with, let us take the definition of Brahman given by Bâdarâyana in Sutra 2. Sutra 1 says that Brahman is to be inquired into, for the knowledge of It leads to Moksha (Liberation). The next Sutra defines Brahman and so naturally we have to understand that the Brahman, the knowledge of which gives Moksha is defined here. As such we get a Saguna Brahman as the subject matter of the Sâstra, and not the Nirguna Brahman of Sankara which is Existence, Knowledge, Bliss Absolute.

So it appears that the author at the very beginning of the work precludes any chance of Sankara's doctrine being read in his Sutras. But let us investigate into the matter a little and see whether it is actually so.

After the statement in Sutra 1 that Brahman is to be known, naturally the question about the nature of Brahman arises. The Sutrakâra (aphorist) here anticipates an objection that Brahman cannot be defined at all. For whatever we cognize in this world is limited and as such cannot be a characteristic of Brahman which is infinite. A limited thing cannot define an unlimited thing. Nor can any characteristic which is absolutely beyond our experience, like Reality etc., define Brahman, for it is only a well-known characteristic that defines a thing and distinguishes it from other things. Again the scriptures cannot define Brahman, for being absolutely unique It cannot be expressed in speech. Thus in the absence of any definition Brahman cannot be a thing worth inquiring into and cannot serve any human purpose. To refute all such objections the Sutrakâra defines Brahman in Sutra 2. Granted that the world we experience cannot define Brahman as being a quality of It or as being identical with It, yet the quality of being the (supposed) cause of the world may indicate It. “Birth etc.” mentioned in the Sutra define Brahman *per accidens*. Though they inhere in the world and not pertain to Brahman, the causality connected therewith pertains to Brahman, and therefore the definition holds good. This causality indicates Brahman even as the snake indicates the rope when we say that which is the snake is the rope, where the rope is indicated by the snake owing to the illusory connection between the two. This definition, therefore, actually aims at the Nirguna Brahman

and cannot be taken as a definition of the Saguna Brahman.²

Again the Sutra refers to the Taittiriya text, "That from which these beings are born," etc. and the word 'that' here refers to the Brahman defined as Existence, Knowledge, and Infinite in the immediately preceding section, the *Ānanda Valli*. Therefore from this text itself we get at the real nature of Brahman.

Yet it may be questioned why the author should give an indirect definition of Brahman instead of defining It in Its real nature as, "Existence, Knowledge, Bliss is Brahman." The answer is that the author has followed here the universally accepted principle of taking a student step by step from a lower to a higher truth, from a grosser to a subtler one. It is indeed by first pointing to the end of the branch of a tree that one points out the moon to the child. Similarly, first Brahman as the Cause is distinguished from this world of products, and finally by saying that from Bliss this universe is born, It is differentiated from other probable causes like atoms, the Pradhāna, etc. In this way finally Brahman's real nature as distinguished from everything else is described. The aspirant whose mind is turned away from the world of the senses first comprehends Brahman as the cause of the world. Though in Itself as the Inner Self Brahman is immediate, yet we have the idea that It is remote. Hence the Sruti first teaches that Brahman is the cause of the world, and then to remove this false notion or remoteness it teaches that It is one with the Inner Self. So long as this identity is not realized, It appears to be the cause of the world.

Moreover, Bliss which admits of no

difference is Brahman. In the *Chhândogya Upanishad* we have, "The Bhuman (Infinite) only is Bliss. This Infinite we must desire to understand" (7.23.1). What is this Infinite which is called Bliss? The Upanishad explains: "Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, understands nothing else, that is the Infinite. Where one sees something else, hears something else understands something else, that is the finite. The Infinite is immortal, the finite is mortal" (*Ibid.* 7. 24. 1). This non-dual Bliss is the Infinite, the Brahman defined in the *Ānanda Valli* as "Existence, Knowledge, Infinite is Brahman", and from this all creation springs—so understood Bhrigu, the son of Varuna.

Again the *Taittiriya* text, "That from which all beings are born . . . Try to know that. That is Brahman," aims at defining a non-dual Brahman as the only reality and does not define a Saguna Brahman: It defines Brahman as the efficient and also as the material cause of the universe, since It is the place of dissolution of the world. Being the material cause of everything, It is the basic reality behind everything and this gives rise to the intuition that Brahman is non-dual and that everything else is unreal. Its being the efficient cause also establishes the fact that It is non-dual, as it precludes anything else being such an efficient cause. Thus this definition, which is but one, qualifies *per accidens* the non-dual Brahman as both the efficient and material cause of the universe. This material causality of Brahman which is non-dual, immutable intelligence cannot be one of origination, as by primeval atoms by whose combination something new is created; nor can it be one of modification, as of the Pradhāna of the Sāṅkhyas. It is through Vivarta or apparent modification, through Māyā or nescience that

² *Bhāmati* and *Ratnaprabhā* on Sankara's comments on Sutra 2.

Brahman is transformed into this universe. This universe is therefore illusory. That this is in accordance with Bâdarâyana's view is made clear by the fact that he uses the word 'Sat' as a characteristic epithet to denote Brahman, which he would not have done if he had considered the Jivas and the world also real like Brahman. *Vide Sutra 2.3.9.* The word 'Sat' here is interpreted by all commentators to denote Brahman.

Thus we find that this definition is given by Bâdarâyana to indicate a Nirvishesha (absolute) Brahman and not a Saguna Brahman and he has selected a significant text from the wide range of scriptural texts for defining his Brahman.

Now let us take up the Sutras in Chapter III, Section 2 where Bâdarâyana describes the nature of Brahman. Sutras 11-20 according to Sankara deal with the reconciliation of texts which describe Brahman both as attributeless and as possessing attributes and mean that even from difference of place a twofold characteristic cannot be predicted of Brahman, because the scriptures teach throughout that Brahman is without attributes (11). If it be said that such difference is taught by the scriptures we deny it, because with respect to each form the Sruti declares just the opposite of that. The Sruti explains at every instance that the form is not true and that behind all Upâdhis there is one formless principle (*vide Brih. 2. 5. 1*) (12). Moreover, some teach thus (*vide Katha 4.11*) (13). Verily Brahman is formless, for that is the purport of the texts (14). And as formless light takes form, so does Brahman take form in connection with Upâdhis which serve the purpose of Upâsanâ (meditation) (15). It is Pure Intelligence (16). The Sruti and Smriti teach that It is attributeless (17). Therefore we have with respect

to Brahman comparisons like the images of the sun. The forms are mere reflections, they are not real (18).

Râmânuja and Nimbârka on the other hand see quite a different subject discussed in these Sutras. The topic is not whether Brahman is attributeless or possesses attributes, but whether It is polluted by imperfections owing to Its being inside everything as the Inner Ruler, even as the soul being embodied is subject to imperfections due to its states of waking, dream, and dreamless sleep described in Sutras 1-10. Therefore according to Râmânuja the Sutras mean that even on account of place such as matter and soul there is not the possibility of the Supreme Lord being contaminated by imperfections, since everywhere in the scriptures Brahman is described as having a twofold characteristic, viz. freedom from imperfections and possessing all blessed qualities (11). If it be said that since the soul also by nature possesses according to Chh. 8. 7. the twofold characteristic of Brahman and yet is subject to imperfections due to its connection with a body, the Inner Ruler will likewise be subject to such conditions owing to its connection with bodies, we deny it, for the Sruti at every place denies it by saying that Brahman is immortal and therefore free from imperfections (*vide Brih. 5. 7. 3 and 22*). The imperfections in the soul are due to Karma and the Lord who is not subject to it is therefore free from such imperfections (13). Brahman can be said to have no form, as It is the originator of name and form and therefore is not subject to Karma like the souls which being embodied are subject to it (14). To an objection that the differentiated form of Brahman is false, Sutra 15 answers thus: Even as on account of texts like, "Brahman is Existence, Knowledge, Infinite" we have to accept that intelligence constitutes the essential

nature of Brahman, so also we have to admit that It possesses a twofold characteristic, as otherwise such texts become meaningless (15). And the texts say that much only, i.e. that Brahman has intelligence for its essential nature, and does not negate the other attributes of Brahman (16). The Sruti and Smriti state thus (17). For this very reason are comparisons such as reflected images of the sun. Brahman although abiding in manifold places, ever possesses the twofold characteristic and is not contaminated even as the sun reflected in dirty water is not polluted (18).

Nimbârka also more or less follows Râmânûja's interpretation as regards Sutras 11-14. Sutras 15 and 16 he interprets in a different way, and sees in them an argument for establishing the authority of the Sruti as absolute in the matter discussed in 11-14. Sutras 17-21 he interprets like Râmânûja, though he reads 21 as a separate Sutra and not as a part of 20 as Râmânûja does.

A glance through these three commentaries on these Sutras convinces one of the superiority and reasonableness and also of the logical consistency of Sankara's interpretation. Moreover, it has the merit of dealing with the solution of an important doubt that arises in the mind of even a casual reader of the *Upanishads*, viz. the nature of Brahman—whether it is qualified or non-qualified; for the Sruti texts seem to support both views though they are contradictory. Râmânûja and Nimbârka ignore such an important subject and see a less important subject discussed in these Sutras. Secondly, they fail to bring out the force of the words of the Sutras in bold relief as Sankara does e.g. 'twofold characteristic' of Sutra 11 which refers to contradictory qualities in Sankara, but not so in the other two. They therefore seem to overlook what is actually

taught in the Sutras and bring in a subject-matter not meant by the aphorist. We shall be doing an injustice to Bâdarâyana to think with Râmânûja and Nimbârka that he had omitted to discuss such an important subject in his work meant to systematize the teachings of the Upanishads. No doubt Râmânûja broaches this subject in Sutra 15 and 16 and says that both these views are to be accepted; but his interpretation of Sutra 16 is indeed stretched and cannot be accepted, while Nimbârka does not discuss the subject at all. we cannot think with Râmânûja that Bâdarâyana disposed of such an important subject in one or two Sutras in a topic which deals with quite a different subject-matter and of less importance. Râmânûja's introducing this subject in Sutra 15 and 16 is against the spirit of the Adhikarana (topic) even according to his own interpretation. It is something which he forcibly introduces out of all relation to the context, as anybody can easily see.

In fact according to their interpretation of this Adhikarana the whole of it looks redundant after what has been stated by them in 2. 1. 18. Finally the simile of the reflections of the sun is happier according to Sankara's interpretation than according to that of the other two and the text cited by Râmânûja in Sutra 18 holds good according to Sankara's view also and more aptly.

Sutras 22-30 Sankara takes as a separate topic and interprets 22 to 24 as follows: What has been mentioned up to this (i.e. the two forms of Brahman mentioned in Brih. 2. 8. 1) is denied by the words "Not this, not this" (Brih. 2. 8. 6) and the Sruti says something more than that afterwards. It does not deny Brahman but Its forms mentioned earlier, their transcendental reality (22). The objection that Brahman is denied because It is no experienced is not

reasonable, for the Sruti says that Brahman exists, though It is not manifest on account of ignorance (23). And moreover It is realized in perfect meditation, so say the Sruti and Smriti (24). Therefore the Jiva becomes one with the Infinite when Knowledge dawns, for thus the scripture indicates (26). In the next two Sutras an objection is raised against Sutras 25 and 26: But on account of both difference and non-difference being taught by the Sruti, the relation between them is as between the serpent and its coil (27), or like that between light and its orb (28). Sutra 29 refutes this view and says: Or the relation is as given before in Sutras 25-26. And on account of the denial of everything else besides Brahman by the Sruti texts (30).

Râmânûja continues the previous topic up to 26. Sutras 22—26 according to him mean: The text (Brih. 2. 3. 6) denies the previously mentioned that-much-ness and says more than that. The two forms of Brahman (Brih. 2. 3. 1) do not exhaust Its attributes, for the text states further qualities after that. "For there is nothing higher than this 'not this'. Then comes the name, 'the Truth of truth'; for the Prânas are true and It is the truth of them." 'Prânas' here mean the souls, because they accompany the latter at death. The souls are true, because they do not undergo any change in their essential nature. The Lord is the Truth of these true souls, for these contract and expand with respect to intelligence, while He is unaffected. Thus the subsequent part of the text connects Brahman with some qualities. The clause "Not this, not this" does not deny the attributes of Brahman, but denies that Its nature is confined to these two forms only. The Sruti instruction is not unnecessary here, for though the world is seen, yet it is not known as a Prakâra or mode

of Brahman and that is what can be gathered only from the Sruti texts (22). So declares the Sruti. And Brahman's being differentiated by these two forms is realized even as Its being of the nature of intelligence is realized by repeated meditation (25). For all these reasons Brahman is regarded as Infinite, i.e. as possessing infinite attributes; for thus the attributes hold good, i.e. the two-fold characteristic of Sutra 22 (26). Sutras 27—30 are treated by Râmânûja as a separate topic. Sutras 27 and 28 give the Purvapaksha, as Sankara also says and 29 gives the Siddhânta; but the words 'as before' in the Sutra refer not to Sutras 25 and 26, but to 2. 3. 48.

Nimbârka follows Râmânûja in Sutras 22—24. The next two Sutras he interprets somewhat differently. Just as fire is manifested through the rubbing of wooden sticks, so is Brahman manifested in meditation (25). On realizing Brahman the soul becomes one with It (26). Sutras 27 and 28 he takes as the author's and not as the opponent's view. Sutra 27 describes that the relation between Brahman and the insentient world is as between the serpent and its coils (27) and the relation between the soul and Brahman is as between the orb and the light (28). But to an objection of the kind raised in Sutra 2. 1. 25 the answer is as before i.e. 2. 1. 27 (29). Moreover, the Supreme Self is not affected by the imperfection of the soul (30).

Sankara thus interprets "Not this, not this" as a denial of the two forms of Brahman mentioned in Brih. 2. 3. 1. Brahman can be described only as "Not this, not this" i.e. It is not what we see. Whatever we see is not Brahman as It is. Brahman is something different from all this manifested world. This interpretation is in keeping with scriptural teaching. Râmânûja and Nimbârka interpret that "Not this, not this"

denies only the limitation of Brahman's nature to only these two forms, in other words It has many more attributes than these two. The two forms are real and are only two of the infinite attributes of the Lord. This seems to be a total denial of the Upanishadic teaching. "Not this, not this" occurs in four different places in the Brih. Up. Even if Rāmānuja's explanation be allowed in Brih. 3. 2. 6—however strange and twisted it might seem, Brih. 4. 2. 4, 4. 4. 22 and 4. 5. 15 do not by any means yield to such an interpretation. It is true that we do find the scriptures dealing with both difference and non-difference; but with what object, is the question. It is not to establish that both are true, for they are mutually contradictory. A careful study of the scriptures convinces one that duality is taught in order to take the aspirant step by step through it to non-duality. Rāmānuja in his Bhāshya on these Sutras criticizes Sankara saying that the Sruti could not have described these two forms only to deny it later on. But that this is a process the Sruti adopts is clear from Prajāpati's instruction to Indra in the *Chhândogya* or Varuna's teaching to Bhrigu in the *Taittiriya Upanishad*. The aspirant is gradually taken to higher and higher truths. Through duality he is led up to non-duality, the goal or final truth. Duality has not been praised anywhere in the scriptures, and no fruit is ascribed to it. On the other hand it is censured (*vide* Katha 2. 1. 10-11; Brih. 4. 4. 19; Mait. 4. 2 and 6. 3), which shows that the scriptures do not intend to posit duality. But non-duality is praised and immortality is said to be achieved by the knowledge of unity. According to the Purva Mimāmsā principle, that which has no result of its own but is mentioned in connection with something else which has a result, is sub-

ordinate to the latter. Therefore duality which has no fruit of its own is subsidiary to non-duality which is the main purport of the Sruti texts.

A question, however, may arise: If everything is negated, what will be left? We shall by such a process arrive at nonentity. Not so. We cannot go on negating *ad infinitum*, but have to come finally to some basic reality, and this basic reality behind everything is the Ātman or Brahman. When we remove an object, space is left behind. Similarly, when everything we see is removed or negated, Brahman is left behind, which cannot be negated and which is the witness of everything. We cannot say that by negation we come to nonentity, for the very fact that we comprehend this nonentity shows that it is being illumined by the witnessing consciousness, the basic reality even behind this idea of nonentity. In this Sutra the Sutrakāra solves this doubt, showing that the negation concerns not Brahman, but only the two forms of it. To turn the drift of this discussion topsy turvy and establish the reality of the two forms is to ignore the spirit of scriptural teaching. Brih. 4. 2. 4, after saying, "This Self is that which has been described as "Not this, not this," says, "It is imperceptible" etc. Other texts also describe the self or Brahman as beyond comprehension. "There goes neither the eye, nor speech nor the mind; we know It not nor do we see how to teach about It. Different It is from all that is known, and is beyond the unknown as well" (Kena 1. 2-3); "Whence speech returns along with the mind without realizing It" (Taitt. 2. 9); also *Ibid* 1. 1. 6 and 3. 1. 8 and Katha 1. 3. 15. From these texts we find that nothing can be predicated of Brahman. From the Kena texts we find that we cannot say that Brahman is this and this in a positive

way. It is not what we see and therefore It can only be described as "Not this, not this" by denying everything we see in It. Again we have texts like, "The Ātman is smaller than the smallest, greater than the greatest" (Katha 1. 2. 20); neither gross nor fine," etc. which negate all duality and establish the Infinity of Brahman beyond all doubts.

Coming to the interpretation of Sutras 27—30, Sankara connects "or as before" in Sutra 29 with what immediately precedes in Sutras 25-26 and so it is happy. Rāmānuja connects it with Sutras 2. 3. 43 and so it is not so apt. Nimbārka's explanation is still far-fetched; for while Rāmānuja refers for the Siddhānta only to a previous Sutra, Nimbārka refers for an objection as well as a decision to Sutras in 2. 1. His interpretation of the whole topic thus appears to be much stretched.

That Sankara has followed the Sutrakāra faithfully in his interpretation of Sutras 11—30 will be clearer if we just try to see the reason why the latter treats of dream and deep sleep in this section which deals with the nature of Brahman. Sankara at the beginning of Chapter III, Section 1, says that the transmigration of the soul is taught in order to generate a spirit of Vairāgya (dispassion).

Sutras 1—10 of section 2 treat of the soul's states of dream and dreamless sleep. According to Sankara the very fact that the dream world does not fulfil the conditions of the time and space factors as in the waking state, shows that the dream world is illusory and therefore a creation of the soul and not of the Lord. From this he shows that the real nature of the Jiva is self-luminous and beyond all these states.

Thus Sutras 1—10 elucidate the real nature of the "Thou" in "Thou art That". Sutras 11—21 give the nature of "That" and Sutras 22—30 identify the two. Thus the place of Sutras 1—10 in this section is very significant. Rāmānuja and Nimbārka say that the creation of the dream world belongs to the Lord and not to the soul. If it were so, it should be as real as this world. Granting that it is the Lord's creation, of what significance is this subject in a section that deals with the nature of Brahman? It would have been apt in 2. 3 where creation is taught. If it be to create a spirit of Vairāgya, as Rāmānuja says at the beginning of Chapter 3, then it ought to have been included in section 1 which treats of the soul's transmigration with the same object, and thus be separated from section 2 where it is out of place.

The above analysis of Sutras 3. 2. 1—30 shows that Sankara has rightly grasped the spirit of Bādarāyana, while the other two commentators have sadly missed it.

A careful perusal of Sankara's commentary shows that he too, like the other great commentators, is justified in interpreting the Sutras in the way he has done. The fact is, Bādarāyana has systematized the philosophy of the *Upanishads* in his work and like them his Sutras also are all-comprehensive and so commentators make a mistake when they think that the Sūtras propound only their doctrine and nothing else. The *Upanishads*, the *Brahma-Sutras* and the *Gītā* recognize the principle of Adhikāribheda and that is the reason why they are universally accepted by the Hindus of all classes and denominations.

SHINTO OR THE WAY OF THE GODS

By H. OTOTSU

Shinto or Kami-no-Michi which means the Way of the Gods, is the original faith of the Japanese. This has been believed and practised by them from antiquity. It may be defined as nature-and-ancestor-worship, or religion of loyalty, or Emperor-worship. Mr. G. Kato, author of "A Study of Shinto, the Religion of the Japanese Nation", makes the observation that one of the most remarkable features of Shinto in its first and earliest stage is nature-worship (either in its simple or complex form) and adds that the ancient Japanese were surrounded on all sides by numberless divine beings, whom they called the "Eight Hundred Myriads of Gods". Although they had the belief that there were such a tremendous number of gods both in heaven and on earth, they worshipped Amaterasu-Omikami, the Sun-Goddess, with the most profound reverence. Who is this Amaterasu-Omikami? It is said in ancient history that the parents of this Goddess are the divinities known as Izanagi and Izanami, and that she presided with her two brothers over the Plain of High Heaven, the Vast Expanse of Ocean, and the Realm of Night. She made her grandson, Prince Ninigi, to come down to the earth, and to become its ruler. When he was about to leave her, she blessed him saying :

"The Luxuriant Land of Reed Plains (original name of Japan) is a country which our descendants are to inherit. Go, therefore, Our Imperial Grandson, and rule over it! And may Our Imperial lineage continue unbroken and prosperous, co-eternal with Heaven and Earth!"

When he thus descended to the top of Mount Takachiho in Kyushu, the terrestrial guardian God, Okuninushi-no-Kami of Izumo, handed over his dominions to this Heavenly Prince. The origin of the Japanese Empire and its Emperors begins from here. Our first Emperor, Jimmu, who ascended the throne in 660 B.C. was the grandson of this celestial Prince. Since then Japan has been ruled by his descendants in an unbroken succession, of whom the present Emperor is the 124th Emperor of the same lineage. This is why we look upon each Emperor as a Divine Ruler of the nation descended from our Imperial Ancestress, the Sun-Goddess. If you can but realize this orthodox tradition, you will have no difficulty in understanding how we Japanese have been revering the Emperor, in what relation we stand with Him, and why we are ever prepared to offer ourselves courageously to the State in promoting the welfare of the Imperial Throne. Now I shall go back again to early Shinto.

Early Shinto, while believing in a continued existence beyond the grave, had no system of theology or ethics. It had no code of moral duties—no clear conception of loyalty or filial piety. But it taught the innate goodness of the human heart regarding human beings as virtuous by nature. "Follow the genuine impulses of your heart" was the essence of its ethical teaching. Besides this even the name of Shinto was unknown until Confucianism (the ethical system of the Northern Chinese) and Buddhism came to Japan in the sixth century. This ethical teaching and the positive doctrines of foreign faiths had naturally

an immense influence upon primitive Shinto. Particularly, Buddhism, which was the mother of civilization of Japan, had an overwhelming influence upon Shinto, and it culminated in the creation of Ryobu or Double Aspect Shinto at the beginning of the ninth century. In this new creed Shinto Deities were regarded as partial appearances or incarnations of Buddhist divinities. For example, our Ancestral Sun-Goddess was regarded as the Dainichi Nyorai (the primordial and eternal Buddha) and our God of War, Hachiman, as a Bosatsu (Bodhisatwa). Thus it may be said that Shinto was absorbed into Buddhism.

This state of things lasted well-nigh a thousand years, but in the fifteenth century further progress was made in the systematization of Shinto theology. The name of Ichijo Kanera (1402-1484) is prominent in this connection. Shinto, according to Kanera, teaches the existence of many deities, but metaphysically speaking they are one, because each deity is but a manifestation of the universal soul in a particular aspect of its activity and all the gods are one in spirit and entity, specially in the virtue of veracity. Izawa Nagahide, another Shinto scholar of the 18th century says, "The Eight Hundred Myriads of Gods are nothing but different manifestations of one and the same Deity Kunitokotachi-no-Kami who is eternal or the Eternal Divine Being of the Earth, the Great Unity of all Things in the Universe, the Primordial Being of Heaven and Earth."

In the course of the 18th century Shinto entered on a new path and prepared for another revival. All the earlier Shinto theorists had depended much upon either Buddhism or Confucianism in interpreting Shinto ideas: now the time became ripe for purging away the alien elements to a certain

degree and restoring early Shinto by means of scholarship. This was made possible by the philological studies of the ancient records. The greatest of the philologists and the pioneer of "Pure Shinto" was Motoori Norinaga (1730-1801). His contention was that Shinto, when purged of foreign accretions and influences, represented the pure, and therefore the best, inheritance of humanity from divine ages.

There was another aspect of revival of Shinto, namely, the appearance of Shinto teachers in the first half of the 19th century. Most of them were against the feudal system which had deprived the Emperor of his administrative power since the 12th century, and they endeavoured to infuse into the people the sense of loyalty to the Emperor and of revolt against the then actual ruler, Generalissimo Tokugawa. The principles of Shinto thus revived eventually became the basis of the Meiji Restoration in 1867—this restoration of power to the Emperor is really the starting-point of present Japan.

The essential characteristic of Shinto is purity of body and mind. The idea of purity, in early Shinto, was entirely physical or material but not mental, spiritual or ethical. But in its developed stage, inner purity or purity of heart is also emphasized. Ichijo-Kaneyoshi (1402-1481), a famous Shinto Scholar says, "There are two significations of purity in Shinto: one is outer purity or bodily purity and the other inner purity of heart. If a man is truly sincere in mind he will be sure to succeed in realizing a communion with the Divine. (This is no other than inner purity of heart.)"

Senge-Takatomi, the late Shinto High Priest of the Izumo Grand Shrine, who died in 1918, teaches us the same truth:

"Sincerity the single virtue is

That binds Divinity and man in one."

And continues :—

“Action sincere, by noble-minded
man,
Reflects the very self of the Unseen.”

Thus we may say that, like the universal love in Christianity or the unconditional benevolence in Buddhism, inner purity or sincerity is the guiding ethical principle of Shinto.

There are no graven images to represent Shinto Deities. A famous Japanese historian, Ise Teijo (1715-1785), forbade worshipping Deities by means of statues or images. He says :

“Never make an image in order to represent a Deity. To worship a deity is to directly establish a felt relation of our heart to the living Divinity through sincerity or truthfulness on our part. If we, however, try to establish a relation between a Deity and us indirectly by means of an image, the image will itself stand in the way and prevent us from realizing our religious purpose to accomplish a direct communion with the Deity. So an image made by mortal hands is of no use in Shinto worship.” (Study of Shinto, the Religion of the Japanese Nation, p. 185.) There is, however, an Emblem of the Deity, which generally takes the form of a Sword, a Mirror, or a Jewel. This Emblem is not exposed to the public view. It is kept within the Shrine or Sanctuary. But we do not regard the Emblem as the Deity, nor do we believe that the Shrine embodies the Deity. We are taught to worship and pray to the Deity concerned at the shrine “in spirit and in truth”

The method of worship in Shinto consists of obeisance, offerings, and prayers. The offerings are primarily food and drink. Formerly cloth was added to these but eventually a symbolic offering known as Gohei came into use consisting of strips of paper attached to a

wand and placed on the altar. Human sacrifice seems to have been made in the remote ages. According to an old legend, there had been a certain intelligent man Koromonoko. He was ordered to offer his life to a River-God, but he thought it was not worth while to sacrifice his life to a God who might be a false one. So in order to convince himself of the genuineness of this God, he threw some dry calabashes, a kind of gourd whose hard shell is used as vessels to hold water or *saké*, to the river and cried out from its bank :—

“O, Thou River-God, if Thou dost persist in Thy desire to have me, sink these calabashes and let them not rise to the surface, then shall I know Thou art a true God and will enter the water of my accord. But if Thou canst not sink the calabashes, I shall, of course, know that Thou art a false God, for whom, why should I spend my life in vain?”

But the calabashes did not sink and consequently Koromonoko was saved. Now-a-days rice-cakes also form a part of the offerings to certain shrines. I am told that they symbolize human sacrifice.

Purification is essential before worship. The Harai or wind-purification and Misogi or water-purification are the principal forms of purification ceremonies. In the courtyard of every shrine, there is a font where the worshippers make their ablutions by washing their hands and rinsing their mouths before worship. But these are only outward purification. The most important one is the purification of the inner heart.

Shinto at present is divided into two, namely, the National Shinto Faith (or Non-Sectarian Shinto) which is symbolized by shrines from time immemorial, and Sectarian or Denominational Shinto which developed since the 18th century. The former is not treated as a religion

but it is taught in schools to the present younger generation under the name of Japanese National Ethics. The latter is officially recognized as a religion. According to the official report of 1932, there were 111,777 shrines (against 71,351 Buddhist temples), including 200 governmental and national shrines, 49,454 Prefectural and village shrines, 61,506 private shrines, and 128 soldiers' shrines. The number of private shrines has been steadily decreasing from 186,783 in 1889 to 61,500 in 1932. There were many too superstitious and barbarous ones among them and the decrease speaks of the healthy progress of the religious ideas of the people and the radical policy of the Government. The governmental and national shrines are maintained at the expense of the Treasury but those belonging to other grades are under the care of local communities and parishioners. Most of these are dedicated to Gods or Goddesses of Nature, (such as Gods or Goddesses of seas, rivers, wind, fire, mountains, etc.), Emperors, Empresses, Imperial Princes, loyal subjects or to one's ancestors who generally figure on the pages of authentic national or local history.

The Shinto priests who serve at the Shrines are rather ritualists, and it is their duty to see to all matters concerning rites and festivals and the upkeep of the respective shrines. They consider it a pride to dissociate themselves from the propagation of the Faith. But their service is requisitioned on all important occasions calling for august rites and ceremonies. In addition to this, nowadays, it has become customary for them to officiate at weddings and funerals. But I have never heard of Buddhist priests officiating at wedding ceremonies in Japan.

Now let me refer to some aspects of Shinto shrines. At first, I shall briefly touch upon the history of the most honoured and revered shrines in Japan. They are the Ise Great Shrines, consisting of the "Naiku" or Inner Shrine and the "Geku" or Outer Shrine. The Inner Shrine embodies the Sacred Mirror, one of the Three Sacred Treasures which were handed by the Sun-Goddess to Prince Ninigi when he was about to descend from Heaven to the earth. The Mirror is the most important of all, for the Sun-Goddess asked Prince Ninigi to regard it as her own Self; and so the successive Emperors kept it with them in the Palace. But in the reign of Emperor Sujin (92 B.C.) it was enshrined at Yamato near Nara with a view to enabling the people to venerate it and at the same time to avoid any possible desecration by keeping it in the Imperial Palace. And in the regime of Emperor Suinin (5 B.C.), that was about 90 years later, it was removed to its present holy abode in Ise. So, this Shrine is as old as Japan herself. At the Geku or Outer Shrine Toyouke-no-Omikami, the God of food and clothing, who accompanied Prince Ninigi to earth is enshrined. This was removed here from Manai near Kyoto by Emperor Yuraku in 478 A.D. in fulfilment of a revelation of the Sun-Goddess.

It may interest you to know that it has been the custom to raze these Shrines once in every 20 years, and to build new ones in their stead on neighbouring plots assigned for the purpose with the result that they look always new in contrast to their age-old tradition. These are constructed of Hinoki, Japanese cypress, in the archaic Japanese style which existed before the introduction of Buddhist religion and Chinese architecture.

Ise has been regarded as the holy of holies of the Japanese nation. The Emperor himself goes there in person to pay homage to these Shrines. Cabinet Ministers, Governors-General, Ambassadors, Ministers, Generals, and Admirals and Consuls themselves go there to invoke blessings on them for the satisfactory discharge of duties in their new appointments. Pilgrims from every quarter and from every class pour in every day throughout the year disregarding their respective faiths.

To illustrate one aspect of Shinto, that is, the nature-worship, I wish now to make a passing reference to the Shrine of the Wind-God in the precincts of the Outer Shrine in Ise. It was in 1293 that this God destroyed by means of a powerful hurricane the mighty flotilla sent by Kubla Khan, the Mongolian ruler of China, to invade Japan, and crushed once and for all his ambition to bring Japan under him. Since then his shrine was elevated in commemoration of his divine help which saved the country's independence.

The second national shrine is The Meiji Shrine which was completed in 1920 at Yoyogi in Tokio in dedication to Emperor Meiji the Great who passed away in 1912 after a brief illness. He was the most beloved of the Japanese nation. His demise cast such a gloom over the entire country that an English correspondent telegraphed home saying, "Japan is going into a decline with the death of her Great Emperor."

As any other great shrine, this is also built of hinoki wood in the time-honoured style. The symbolic entrance known as the "torii" is one of the largest in Japan, itself made of the same wood of about 1,700 years old brought from Mount Arisan in Formosa. Someone has said, "Torii is quite simple and yet noble and it is the symbol of the Japanese nation." The compound of

the Shrine known as the Inner Garden covers an area of about 175 acres wooded with trees of different species found in Japan. This Shrine which is an embodiment of beauty and art is a living monument of the imperishable love of the Japanese people towards this august Ruler.

Yoyogi without any exaggeration is the second Ise. Millions of worshippers throng from all the four corners of the Empire to pay their respect to this Emperor. No foreign tourist will ever miss to visit this spot.

There are many shrines which are erected to the memory of those who were intensely loyal to the Throne and led exemplary lives worthy of imitation as models. The Minoatogawa Shrine in Kobe built in honour of Kusunoki-Masashige (1294-1336) is the most prominent of these. He was a staunch Imperialist who sacrificed his life by fighting against the then Generalissimo who deprived the Emperor of his administrative power. The next in importance is the one at Akasaka in Tokio where General Nogi, who had a distinguished military career, is deified. It was this General who captured Port Arthur and effected the capitulation of General Stoessel in the Russo-Japanese war in 1905. He was so attached to Emperor Meiji that, when the Emperor died in 1912 and when the Imperial cortege was about to leave the Palace, he committed harakiri—suicide—which his devoted wife, followed. The farewell poem which he left behind was translated by an English scholar and reads as follows :

"He mingles with the Gods on High,
my Mighty Sovereign Lord :
And with intensely yearning heart I
follow Thee Heavenward."

The Shinto Pantheon will, I am sure, be further increased in the near future by erecting one or two shrines to the

late Fleet Admiral Togo (1847-1905) who died in 1905. He was the Nelson of Japan who annihilated the Russian Baltic Fleet in the Japan Sea in 1905. By the way, in a report submitted by him to Emperor Meiji, he had attributed this great victory to the grace received from Heaven owing to the glorious virtues of the Emperor. The entire nation identified itself with this belief as all were possessed of the same Shinto ideas, and offered their congratulations and thanks to the Emperor and to all Members of the Shinto Pantheon presided by the Ancestral Sun-Goddess.

It is Sectarian or Denominational Shinto that is recognized as a religion. And it is placed on the same footing as any other religion. The priests of this category interest themselves in disseminating their gospel. According to Mr. Kato, Sectarian Shinto reveals a closer aspect of universalism than Shinto of the National Faith. He says so because the former is more remotely connected with the nation than the latter. Consequently, some Shinto Sects have Kami or Gods to whom no reference is made in the history of Japan. For instance, the Kami or God whom Konko Sect worships has little or no connection with the Kojiki or the Nihonshoki, the time-honoured historical chronicles of Japan, and so far it has been a universal religion but not a national, and is fairly free from national tradition. (The God of this Sect is called Tenchi-Kane-no-Kami which means Heaven-and-Earth-Including-Deity, i.e. the Absolute Divinity, the Boundless One with Heaven and Earth within its own Divine Self. It is, therefore, quite natural that this Shinto Sect with such a universal God at its centre, is of a universal nature.) There are thirteen officially recognized Sects most of which were established since the 18th century.

(They are Fuso, Konko, Misogi, Shinshu, Shinto, Taisei, Tenri, Jikko, Kurosumi, Ontake, Shinri, Shusei-ha and Taisha.)

The number of Sectarian Shinto adherents is 17,500,000 as against 42,000,000 Buddhists and 254,000 Christians. Tenri Sect is one of the most popular one having four million followers. The God this Sect worships is called Tenrio-no-Mikoto who is believed by the adherents of this Sect to have created man and all else on the earth and to protect and help all human life to procreate and progress without a moment's pause now and for all time. According to the teachings of this Sect, our bodies are not ours, but His. We must sooner or later return our bodies to Him, which have been temporarily borrowed. This returning our bodies is not called by the term "Death". It is called "Denaori" or re-appearance. These believers do not accept the theory of life after death in connection with another world, but do believe in re-appearance in this world. The distorted working of our minds is called "Hokori" or "dust". There are eight principal kinds of "dust": Craving, grudging, self-loving, hating, envying, raging, coveting, and self-exalting. In order to live bright and healthy lives, Tenri Sect followers have to exert their utmost to sweep away the dust which is the cause of their ailments. Followers of this Sect endeavour to bring happiness not to themselves alone, but to all. As an example of this fact, I shall tell you a small story. In Shanghai there are numerous houses which are not yet connected to the sewerage system and therefore night-soil has to be disposed of by Chinese coolies. In 1931 when the Sino-Japanese incident occurred these coolies refused to remove the ordure from the area where Japanese civilians were resident with the result

that the increasing accumulation day by day proved to be a great annoyance. Then a group of Japanese men and women belonging to Tenri Sect got together and voluntarily attended to this dirty job as quietly as possible till the Chinese resumed their work in that quarter. Although this seems to be a trifling matter, I cannot help calling it a living example of "bringing happiness not to themselves alone, but to all".

However, it is no misrepresentation to say that whoever the God of each Sect is and whatever its nature may be, every Shinto Sect teaches loyalty to the Emperor in one form or other.

Shinto is the original indigenous faith of Japan. At first it was quite primitive, but in the course of the last nearly 2,600 years, it has followed its own natural course of growth side by side with the long development of the Japanese national life. It is true that Shinto has been influenced to a great extent by alien teachings such as Buddhism and Confucianism, but has never been annihilated wholesale by imported foreign creeds. On the contrary it has maintained its originality as vigorously as ever. The peculiar religious temperament of the Japanese is responsible for their conception that the Emperor is a visible deity or a God incarnate. This idea is completely in accord with the Japanese mind of the present age of enlightenment, as it has always been: and in this very idea is rooted the consciousness of the Japanese or their attitude of patriotic reverence towards the Emperor. The virtues of Shinto are simplicity, cleanliness and purity, filial piety, reverence to Ancestors, and loyalty to the Emperor.

Shinto has, indeed, been the faith of the heart and life of every Japanese whether male or female, high or low, old or young, literate or illiterate, from

time immemorial. This is, the reason that has made the State and the people to preserve and maintain such a huge number of shrines throughout the country and multitudes of pilgrims to flock in at the Ise Great Shrines, the Meiji Shrine, and so forth.

Lafcadio Hearn calls Shinto the "Religion of Loyalty," and confesses that so trite an English word as loyalty which is a dead rendering cannot cover all the connotation of the original Japanese word 'chu'. He wishes to call it the "Mystical Exaltation" or "A Sense of Uttermost Devotion to the Jinno or the Divine Ruler of the Nation." Mr. G. Kato to whom I have already referred says, "I should call Shinto a form of Emperor worship or Mikadoism, a faith in the Divine Ruler; a manifestation, coupled with religious zeal, of "Yamatodamashii," or the "Soul of Japan."

As I said before there are 13 Shinto Sects and 17 and a half million adherents. But, I may say, every Japanese, whatever Sect he may belong to or whatever his personal religion may be, is a holder of the National Shinto Faith represented by Shrines leading to Mikadoism.

In conclusion, let me give an English translation of Emperor Meiji's Rescript on Education which every Japanese knows by heart, issued on October 30th, 1890, as it contains our traditional ideas and principles connected with the National Shinto Faith. It reads as follows:

"Know ye, Our subjects!

Our Imperial Ancestors have founded Our Empire on a basis broad and everlasting and have deeply and firmly implanted virtue; Our subjects, ever united in loyalty and filial piety, have from generation to generation illustrated the beauty thereof. This is the glory of the fundamental

character of Our Empire, and herein also lies the source of our education. Ye, our subjects, be filial to your parents, affectionate to your brothers and sisters; as husbands and wives be harmonious, as friends true; bear yourselves in modesty and moderation; extend your benevolence to all; pursue learning and cultivate arts, and thereby develop your intellectual faculties and perfect your moral powers; furthermore, advance the public good and promote common interests; always respect the Constitution and observe the laws; should any emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the State; and thus

guard and maintain the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne, coeval with Heaven and earth. So shall ye not only be our good and faithful subjects, but render illustrious the best traditions of your forefathers.

“The way here set forth is indeed the teaching bequeathed by Our Imperial Ancestors, to be observed alike by Their Descendants and subjects, infallible for all ages and true in all places. It is Our wish to lay it to heart in all reverence, in common with you, Our subjects, that we may all thus attain to the same virtue.”

A LAST WISH

BY PROF. E. E. SPEIGHT

If I should go without a word
Of all my heart has seen,
Of the great secrets I have heard,
And the heavens where I have been,

Upraise no stone upon my grave,
Nor set a rail around,
But plant a woodland tree, to wave
Above with whispering sound.

That I may speak, through bole and branch,
Through bud and quivering leaf,
A mellow language that shall stanch
Some darker flow of grief.

That I may hold out shielding arms
Green with the surge of spring,
And rich in shelter from alarms
Or winter's harassing.

That deep in earth and sunward high
My fulness may assuage
All anguished creatures drawing nigh
My open harbourage.

For so have I been given ease
And speeded on my way
By friends like noble forest trees
On many a bitter day.

HISTORY OF THE VEDĀNTIC THOUGHT

BY SWAMI SATSWARUPANANDA

(Continued from the last issue)

Next comes Rāmānuja with his devastating polemics. He is the most powerful of Sankara's opponents. But the power and beauty of the logic of Rāmānuja and Madhva would remain a sealed book to those who want to learn Vedānta through English or any language other than Sanskrit. Here an attempt will be made to give a mere general outline of their system and nothing more. Rāmānuja's Reality is a concrete personality, a determinate whole, which has individual souls and matter as its body, Itself being their soul. It is differentiated into matter and individual souls but has not been wholly so. It preserves its identity and separateness from the many in the same way as the soul does from the body and the senses. It is immanent as well as transcendent. It is neither the abstract Absolute nor merely the totality of matter and individual souls. It is willing, planning, directing, loving personality, suffusing, comprehending, and transcending each and all of the universe. It is not devoid of all qualities but the possessor of infinite auspicious qualities in infinite degrees. Though the world of souls and matter derive their power and being from It, whose modes they are, they are eternally separate from It, their distinguishing qualities being essential and not adventitious. So Rāmānuja's conception of Reality is not different from that of Yādavaprakāsa and Nimbārka. It is Saguna and Savishesha i.e. with qualities and determinate, both immanent and transcendent. But while Yādava's

Reality is only Being (Sanmātra), Ramanuja's and Nimbarka's Reality possesses, being, consciousness, and above all bliss. Rāmānuja, moreover, is pronouncedly anthropomorphic—he is a theist with all his merits and defects.

While mainly agreeing with the Bhedābhedins the Rāmānujists have some grave and important differences with them. The former make a distinction between the Absolute and Isvara which the latter would not admit. According to Rāmānuja the Absolute is not something abstract. It is the same as Isvara, the creator, preserver, and destroyer of the universe—there is not the slightest distinction between the two. Then the relation subsisting between Isvara on the one hand and souls and matter on the other is not the same in the two theories. The Bhedābhedins make it one of part and the whole, whereas the Visishtādvaitins make it one of Prakāra and Prakārin, a relation that is best expressed by the example of the soul and the body. The relation between the soul and the body is not the same as the one between the part and the whole. The soul is not really affected by the affection of the body, which is not true in the case of the other relation. This relation saves God from being caught in the sorrows and miseries and imperfections of the world of matter and souls, leaving Him free, though immanent in them, to fashion, order, and guide them, through His own laws imposed on matter and through individual free will and sense

of responsibility in the individual souls in the state of bondage. Mukti or emancipation consists in the full recognition by the entire personality of the individual of his own servanthship of the Lord and of the enjoyment of the beatific vision and bliss eternal, deigned to him by an all-loving Lord. In Mukti there is no loss of personality followed by a unification with what the Râmânujists call a blank void miscalled the Absolute. Râmânuja's main difference with the Bhedâbhedins lies in the nature of the relation subsisting between God on the one hand, and matter and souls on the other. Between them the relation of Abheda or non-difference is altogether denied even in part or aspect. If we admit but once the concepts of Jiva and Jagat, individual souls and matter, we cannot with any degree of consistency establish their relation of Abheda with God or Brahman. It is all Bheda or difference from eternity to eternity, though they are by no means outside the infinite God but subsist as His body deriving their being and activity from Him, who through His real power of Mâyâ can do and undo anything according to His absolute free will. God is not spent up in His manifestations but far transcends them; and He is immanent in His creation in five distinct forms of which three are important in philosophy—as the indwelling spirit of the individual souls who are His bodies, guiding them, joining the fruits of their Karmas and attracting them to Him in diverse ways through a continuous inward pull; as the material cause of this gross manifested world, in which capacity the subtle conscious and unconscious ultimates are His bodies; and as this gross manifested world, when this gross matter and gross individuals are His bodies. But though everything, subtle or gross, is His body, He is not in any way

affected by their constant changes and favourable and unfavourable affections—throughout the processes of creation and dissolution, He remains the same unchanged Personality.

To come to a thorough-going dualism or pluralism there is but one step. That matter and souls are different from God has been preached by Râmânuja. But he is rather halting. They are eternally separate from Him but are organically connected with Him as body and senses are with the soul. So in some sense He is the world and individual souls. To the freed or emancipated souls they are God—God is peeping through them all. Still Râmânuja would not admit the Bhedâbhedin's position—so logically untenable it is to him. To make this separateness complete is the task of Madhva, who regrets Râmânuja's position in the same way as the latter regrets the position of the Bhedâbhedins. According to Madhva God, souls, and matter are completely and eternally separate, the last two depending on the first in every possible way. God is merely the efficient cause of the world and not the material cause as well, as all the other exponents of Vedânta hold. He moulds the world from an extraneous matter for the enjoyment or suffering or both of equally extraneous souls whose beginningless Karmas are responsible for their joys and sorrows. The relation between God and individual souls is one of master and servant, which does not cease even in Mukti. They are, no doubt, endowed with intelligence, but it is limited, whereas God's infinite intelligence is spread everywhere within and beyond time. Though there are so many extraneous things, with and for which God works, yet His irresistible will is not hampered by them in any way. He can do and undo anything by the mere fiat of His will. According to Madhva the world of

matter and souls is too palpably real to be denied. Its unreality would go against the Sruti passages which state that by the knowledge of the One the knowledge of all is attained. Madhva, however, has *one very queer view about the Jivas*. He condemns a class of Jivas to eternal hell and blesses another class with eternal heaven—a view, which is rather Semitic than Aryan.

In Madhva the swing of the pendulum from absolute monism to thoroughgoing pluralism is complete. There are other commentators on the *Brahma-Sutras* who came after him; but except slight modifications here and there, all the later commentaries are but echoes of one or other of the previous ones, having little of originality and force of their fore-runners. Leaving aside some of Madhva's unphilosophical statements, such as eternal perdition etc., if we take his philosophy as a whole and try to judge it aright, we cannot but give it the place which its own intrinsic worth has acquired for it, and, may be, will acquire a little more. Mādharma philosophy is a wholesome improvement on the atheistic dualism of the Sāṅkhya philosophy and as the other side of the shield of Gaudapāda-Sankara philosophy or truly speaking of the Buddhist nihilistic philosophy. But to judge this philosophy one is to take one's stand on solid ground and not fly about in the sky, one must be a geologist and not a stargazing astronomer. Here in this hard world pluralism is as true as monism. One plus one would not have been two, had there been no concept of two. One is one; it can neither produce zero, nor two, nor three. One is running through all the numbers, but there are as many numbers as well. The Many is saturated with the One, there is hardly a point where the One is not; but along with the One resides the Many, potentially

or actually, in the same moment and on the same point. The spiritual entity does not occupy space as a material thing does. Hence there is nothing illogical in the statement that the one spiritual entity resides in, through and beyond each material atom and individual soul, and pervades and transcends them all. If the Buddhist statement, "nothing abides and therefore nothing is" is true, then "the Many eternally is and therefore it is true", equally holds good. With the change of forms entity perishes—is a statement that is yet to be proved. Forms change but concepts abide, and concepts and percepts are eternally wedded. Change means manifestation and its withdrawal, with as much surety of another manifestation and withdrawal. Given infinite time and space, eternal souls, and one infinite all-intelligent, all-powerful architect nothing of the above is impossible. And what theory is there that does not admit it in some form or other? Even the monists and nihilists admit it with only one difference that it is all Mâyâ and no real reality. But Mâyâ once admitted is eternal both ways, has neither beginning nor end. And on this river of Mâyâ monists, nihilists, and pluralists of all shades sail in the same boat. After a too long age of idealism the realistic phase of Truth stood in need of emphasis and Madhva has done it with all the virility of his personality.

All these halting monists and pluralists together with the uncompromising Madhva have joined in one chorus against the Gaudapāda-Sankara school of monism. They are one in their refutation of the Mâyāvāda and the Nirguna Brahman theory—the former being the necessary deduction of the latter. From this one need not think that Sankara philosophy has been eclipsed or impaired in the least, for there have arisen all along great thinkers and writers within

the fold of Sankara, who, by their powerful dialectics, have silenced all oppositions as quickly as they arose. And because every philosophy ultimately rests on its epistemology it is on this field that all the pitched battles have been fought. Whether there is indeterminate knowledge or Nirvikalpa Jnâna and, if there is one, whether its certitude is greater than the determinate, are the questions whose answers give shape and direction to all philosophies. Sankara philosophy answers them in the positive while other schools of Vedânta answer them in the negative—seeds differing, different trees grow up. Now how to judge between the two?—there is no sure standard to judge by. The same scriptural passages from which Sankara derives his theory yield different meanings to other commentators. Experience fares no better. And these Âchâryas are all honourable men. When experience and scriptures fail to bring in a verdict, it is useless to argue about them. Thinkers are free to join either party. And yet to make the scriptural passages like “who will see, hear, etc. whom” and the like, yield a meaning different from that of Sankara and to deny the existence and superiority of Nirvikalpa Jnâna in the face of such explicit passages appear to us to be real text-torturing. And if this is once admitted there is no other alternative but to join Sankara. The later commentators were all fully aware of this; so they tried their level best to cavil at this theory of knowledge. Closely attached to this is the Nirguna Brahman theory. If Nirvikalpa Jnâna is highest, surest, and most abiding, its content must be the highest and the most abiding entity. We have advisedly used the word ‘content’, because it has become a fashion nowadays to deride Nirvikalpa Jnâna and Nirguna Brahman as ‘contentless’, blank’,

‘void’. Closer examination is bound to reveal to these critics that they are none of these—they are all content. Content does not necessarily mean division, dual or plural. Indeterminateness, as it is used in Sankara’s philosophy, is not vagueness but means a crystal-clear something, which loses much of its own-ness when duality of any sort comes in, which revolts and illudes our grasp when any attempt is made to hedge it round. Both the Sankarites and their critics use the word ‘contentless’, but with what a world of difference in meaning. We have spoken of Nirvikalpa Jnâna and Nirguna Brahman as two different things. But in reality they are not different, they are one and the same thing. What is epistemologically the Nirvikalpa Jnâna is ontologically Nirguna Brahman. And if this Nirguna Brahman is once admitted, Mâyâvâda becomes a necessity. If, truly speaking, Brahman is Nirguna and therefore Nirvisesha i.e. without difference, then these differences that we experience in our present state of consciousness must be something that is not truly real, as real as Nirguna Brahman, that is not unreal either, as unreal as a square circle or the horns of a hare. They must be somewhere in the twilight, in the blending of light and shade, in the shade of reason and in the light of experience—not of all experience but of experience of the present state of consciousness to be stultified by a higher stage testified by the experience of the Yogins and Jnânins and by some of the important scriptural passages. And this is Mâyâvâda. Nirvikalpa Jnâna, Nirguna Brahman, and Mâyâvâda are the three corner-stones of Sankara’s philosophy, round which battles have raged fiercest. Common sense tells us that these are not matters for reason but for faith, training, and experience. But when arguments are adduced against these,

the upholders have but one duty of defending them by counter-arguments. It is better to leave out Nirvikalpa Jnâna and Nirguna Brahman from our account of this wordy war for the simple reason that modern thinkers and readers are more apt to form their own opinion about these in the light of modern knowledge than to be guided by set rules of scriptural interpretations promulgated by the ancient commentators and Sutrakâras. It is more fruitful, however, to study their discussion on the Mâyâvâda.

Critical students of Sankara's commentaries on the *Brahma-Sutras* and the *Gîtâ* find two apparently contradictory accounts of Mâyâ, which, running through almost all his followers, have supplied much confusion to unwary readers and critics. The notion that one gets of it from Sankara's famous introduction to the commentary on the *Brahma-Sutras* is that it is of the nature of false knowledge, of mistaking one thing for another, that it is beginningless and endless and natural to beings, and that, as such, it resides in the Jivas or individual souls. The adjectives 'endless' and 'natural to beings' are however modified slightly by his other statements viz. that it vanishes in an individual at the dawn of true knowledge. From the commentary on the *Gîtâ* one gets the idea that it is Lord's i.e. Brahman's Sakti or power, that the power and the possessor of power are the same and not different, and that Saguna and Savishesha Brahman i.e. Brahman with attributes and differentiation is not different from Nirguna and Nirvishesha Brahman or Brahman without attributes and differentiation. So there seem to be certain contradictions between the two views; and those who see these contradictions in Sankara or say that Sankara was not very particular or precise about the

term on which hanged the whole of the system, see the repetition of these contradictions in his followers or divide them into two or more classes holding different views on Mâyâ and thus forming different schools of Sankara's Vedânta. Before examining this view of the critics, it is well to give a brief account of Mâyâ as given by some of the famous followers of Sankara.

According to Mandana or Suresvarâchârya (A.D. 800), Mâyâ is false knowledge residing in individual souls. It is neither existent nor non-existent. It produces the individual souls, who in their turn produce it. This goes on from eternity to eternity till the dawning of right knowledge, when it vanishes altogether and Brahman alone remains. Its relation with the individual souls seems to be anomalous, but it is due to its very nature which evades all definition and is therefore said to be something indescribable. So we see, it is hardly an entity, and the part it plays in the world-appearance is merely that of an instrument—it is not even recognized as its material. Sarvajnâtmanî (A.D. 900) follows Suresvara. But Padmapâdâchârya (A.D. 820) and his follower Prakâsâtman (A.D. 1200) give greater substantiality to it and make it reside in Brahman. It is not a power but an entity having powers, through which it brings about the world-appearance. It is called Sakti or power because of its dependence on Brahman. Vâchaspati Misra (A.D. 840) makes it co-existent with Brahman and gives it a somewhat great share in the creation of the world-appearance than does Suresvara, whom he follows generally. Vâchaspati has however made one very clear statement viz. that the world is not a subjective fiction but has an objective reality though its nature is something indefinable. So Vâchaspati stands in the middle between which

appear to be two extreme views of Suresvara and Padmapâda. According to Vidyâranya (A.D. 1350) Mâyâ is the Sakti of Brahman, which together with It creates the world, whose being-portion is derived from Brahman and the name-and-form-portion from Mâyâ. One Brahman looked through Mâyâ appears as many, to whom it imparts whatever orderliness there is among them. Madhusudana (A.D. 1530) speaks of Mâyâ as illusion or delusion and yet as not something negative but as a power residing in Brahman, as the source of all subsequent illusions, as the material cause of matter and mind and of all diversities. It is not something imagined hypothetically or a mere logical necessity, but something actually felt though as something incongruous, carrying its own existence as well as negation with it, persisting through and giving rise to the empirical self and its numerous objects. It is neither existent nor non-existent, it is beginningless and endless, disappearing for one who attains true knowledge of the Self or Brahman. So after hearing all these expounders of Mâyâ, those who find contradictions or vagueness about the concept in Sankara find the same in all his followers; and those who have understood Sankara aright find contradictions nowhere. Some kind of vagueness, however, there must be about Mâyâ, for, as Mandana says, its nature is something inexplicable, had it not been so, it would be an entity, which it is not.

Now, do these views really present contradictions? What are these contradictions? Is it that it is sometimes spoken of as residing in the Jivas and sometimes in Brahman? Or is it that it is sometimes reduced to a mere false knowledge and sometimes raised to omnipotence, the *de facto* creator? Let us take the last issue first and see

if there is any real contradiction in it. The question of increase or decrease of power does not come in at all. It is false knowledge, which makes the one appear as many, and thus creates the universe with all its laws and orders. True knowledge is the knowledge of Brahman, which is one; it is true because it is revealed in intuition and praised in the intuitional language of the *Vedas*. False knowledge too is of Brahman, of the Unity, for there is nothing else but It of which there can be any knowledge. But itself diversified, it makes the Unity appear as many and diversified. That false knowledge or empirical knowledge is manifold is a common experience needing no further proof. It is called false because it changes, contradicts itself, and vanishes at the dawn of intuition, because it hides the real nature of things and presents them differently. But it is not false like a square-circle, as we have said before. So this diversity, which is our universe of matter and mind, is in one sense the creation of this false knowledge or Mâyâ, and in this sense it is almost omnipotent. It is a Sakti or power, or rather *the* Sakti, for all other Saktis are derived from it. It is not non-existent, for how can non-existence make one many, or appear as many, or can itself change and bring about changes? It is something intensely positive, the source of all action, of evolution and dissolution. And yet when the intuition of Nirguna Brahman comes, it vanishes altogether, its stultification is complete. And for this reason existence cannot be predicated of it, as existence cannot go out of existence. But it should never be forgotten that here 'existence' has been taken in Sankara's sense i.e. in truly philosophical sense and not in its ordinary loose sense. Mâyâ or false knowledge exists as truly as or more truly than the sun

exists or the planets exist and as truly disappears as they and again abides in existence as truly as the stuff out of which the worlds are built. But this is not the philosophical sense in which Sankara uses it. To him, as to all true philosophers, 'existence' is that which remains the same in and beyond all times. In that sense *Mâyâ* is not, is not 'existent'. And no-one in his senses can deny this.

Next we come to the question: where does it reside, in the individual souls or in Brahman? The question itself shows that it has been asked from the empirical point of view. For, from the transcendent view-point it is non-existent and to ask where a non-existent thing is, is pure nonsense. And where can it be from the empirical view-point but in him who feels it? It must be in the individual souls. But the individual souls are its products and how can cause be in its effect when the effect is not produced? But the critics forget that from the empirical point of view i.e. from that standpoint where alone causality is possible, the Vedântins hold both cause and effect to be eternally existing—there never was a time when either of them was not. Both *Mâyâ* the cause and *Mâyâ* the effects are beginningless. Wherever there is the cause there are its effects, whether manifested or not; and wherever there is an effect, there lurks the cause, whether detected or not. Cause and effect are not two different things but one thing viewed differently and hence serving different pragmatic purposes according to manifestations. So the question, how can *Mâyâ* reside in individual souls, its products, does not arise at all, both existing from beginningless time. But does it not make Mukti or emancipation impossible? Vedântins admit it. Within *Mâyâ* or the domain of false knowledge and

hence causality there can, never be Mukti. It is when one transcends *Mâyâ*, goes beyond false knowledge, or in other words it is when true knowledge dawns, that Mukti is possible—in fact true knowledge itself is Mukti.

If this be so, if *Mâyâ* or false knowledge resides in individuals in bondage, why then does Sankara following the *Gîtâ* sometimes speak of *Mâyâ* as Lord's Sakti? Can false knowledge reside in true knowledge? This question too is asked from the empirical standpoint, for there is no false knowledge in intuition. False knowledge, as we have seen, really lies in the individuals who feel it, who are in bondage. But in every mistake there must be something to be mistaken. And this is Brahman or the Lord. He, the One, is mistaken by the individual souls as many. But *Mâyâ* is Lord's Sakti in a more positive sense. Mistaking is a function which is not innate in individual souls, for had it been so Mukti would have been impossible—the true nature of things does not change. Were false knowledge a part of the nature of individual souls, they could never go out of it; the dawning of true knowledge would have been rendered impossible. But as it is, it does not form any part of their nature. If this be so, it means it does not originally (if such a term can be used) and intrinsically lie with them. Where does it rest then, this shuttlecock between the individual souls and Brahman? The individual souls are true knowledge in essence and so is Brahman; whence is this unwelcome guest then? Brahman, which is pure being, pure knowledge, and pure bliss, has a power, which, without constituting its essence, makes for the appearance of ever-changing diversity. As a power it is *in* Brahman without being *of* it. Ever changing and causing changes it is not an entity; stultified by

intuition it is non-existent; hence duality does not come in. Within the domain of reason and experience it is and is more real than the totality of its products, which constitute the universe. As in Brahman, it is power and not false knowledge. Changing and making for appearances it cannot be given the dignity of Reality which does not change. So being neither ultimately real nor altogether unreal it is something inexpressible, it is *Mâyâ*. Hence it has been called the Lord's *Mâyâ-sakti*. In the absolute knowledge of the Absolute *i.e.* in intuition it is not; in the relative knowledge of the Absolute or Absolute made relative, or Absolute relatively grasped it comes in—in fact it is this that makes the Absolute relative. This relative absolute, this Being together with, or wedded to, Becoming is *Isvara* or the Lord of the universe. It is this wielding of *Mâyâ-sakti* which makes pure Being or Brahman *Isvara* or Being in and with Becoming, it constitutes the *Isvarahood* of Brahman. In this sense *Isvara* the possessor of *Mâyâ* is identical with *Mâyâ* (*Sakti-saktimatoh ananyatvât*). So the question of false knowledge residing in true knowledge does not come in—in *Isvara* it is not false knowledge but power. But with individual souls it is otherwise. There the true knowledge of Brahman as pure being-knowledge-bliss is obscured. There the materiality and mentality with their infinite variations are not false appearances but solid realities; the one is gone and the many reigns supreme. There it is that the Lord's *Mâyâ-sakti* is turned into false knowledge. So we find that in the essence of pure Being there is no trace of *Mâyâ*, in Being-Becoming *Mâyâ* resides as power—it being identical with Becoming, in individual souls *Mâyâ* is false knowledge. Hence it is but natural that those philosophers (e.g. the *Visishtâd-*

vaitins, *Bhedâbhedins*, etc.) whose definition of Reality includes Becoming with Being will view *Mâyâ* as the Lord's power—and as real power at that; whereas those (e.g. the *Sankarites*) whose definition does not include Becoming will not recognize *Mâyâ* as a metaphysical entity. But none of them deny its pragmatic reality. It is not a fact that *Sankarites* deny life and experience. And the reason why they keep silent when the critics impute it to them is that they do not believe in the ontological reality of *Mâyâ* and its products and as such the critics are right to that extent. Truly or absolutely speaking *Mâyâ* is not, pragmatically speaking it is. The highest end of our life being the realization of this Absolute, this view-point of the Absolute is stressed and *Mâyâ* is very often spoken of as non-existing.

One point more needs to be discussed to make *Sankara's* position clear. Why should *Sankara* object to including Becoming within the definition of Being? Why should he fail to see that the essence of things remains the same throughout infinite modifications of names and forms and pragmatic values? The answer is, *Sankara* has not failed to see it, on the contrary he has affirmed it. In his commentary on the famous *Brihadâraṇyaka Upanishad* text beginning with "*Purnamadah Purnamidam*", when meeting the *Vrittikâra* view, he has admitted this in the case of all things consisting of parts. But Brahman or pure Being is not a thing that is made up of parts. Intuitional experience is so absolutely homogeneous as to preclude all possibility of parts. And Being having no parts, it is inconceivable for us to think that one part of it abides unchanged, while changes go on in another part. Hence it is that *Sankara* finds it difficult to include

Becoming within Being. But from the empirical point of view, from which materiality and mentality, both consisting of parts, are true this inclusion of Becoming within Being is possible, and Sankara finds no difficulty in admitting that. In pure Being, however, he would not admit the slightest touch of Becoming.

These are but a few of the answers given by the Sankarites to the criticisms against Advaita Vedânta. New objections or novel re-statements of old objections there will always be, and new answers or forms of answers will likewise be made. But within the domain of reason there is no hope of coming to a finality. This is true not only of Indian philosophical systems but of all philosophies—all histories of philosophy bear it out. And yet these systems are not useless. Man in his ordinary state of consciousness has but one guide, however blind it might be. He cannot ignore reason if he wants to live and to unveil the mysteries of the outer as well as the inner world. But it gives us at best only different angles of view of truth and not the truth itself. To get absolute truth we have to transcend reason and enter the inner chamber of intuition—philosophy must yield to mysticism. This is however a stage that comes later. As rational beings we must reason. Reason asks why's of things and they must be supplied unless we choose to be unhappy. So it is good for a country, and for the whole world, which wants to thrive in and by religion, to be furnished with all possible views of truth, with a thorough catalogue of their pros and cons.

This has been done in India, as in some other countries, to a fairly satisfactory degree. Analysis of truth, one might say, is complete. Time has

come for a broad synthesis of all the available data supplied by the laborious analyses of so many centuries. Very early in pre-historic days, favourable mental and material conditions led the Indian sages to intuit the integral truth in its pristine glory. Then it was made available to the reason of man through the creation and development of a bewildering number of philosophical systems mainly classed under three broad heads viz., monism, qualified monism, and dualism or pluralism. Each of these systems has developed, what is peculiar to India, a perfect system of symbology and iconology to raise the animal man to the rational man and the latter to the man of intuition. Man's thinking, feeling, willing, and doing—all have been supplied with their own philosophies and kindergarten methods, all have been orientated to the absolute truth. Now is the time ripe for a synthesis based on reason—reason, not divorced from intuition but as its faithful interpreter. This, as we have seen, had long been done by Vyâsa. But this had been done with a scant reference to reason; and so reason had to divide itself into rival camps for a number of centuries to make explicit the implications of intuitive truth. To get at the full view of Vyâsa's synthesis we must read his epic and some of the important *Puranas*. He has however epitomized his massive intellect in his *Vedanta-Sutras*, which we understand better, if we read it after acquainting ourselves with the *Upanishads* on the one hand and the *Puranas* on the other. And the best interpreter of Vyâsa is Sankara, for we hardly find any other who, in his explanation, has not tortured the Nirguna Sruti texts to some extent. Whereas Sankara has given due place and consideration to both the Nirgunâ and Saguna Srutis;

at times we find him fighting with others for the Saguna interpretation of Srutis where that seemed to him to be right, though the Nirguna interpretation would have made his own conclusion stronger. After centuries of wranglings between the Sankarites and non-Sankarites, we understand Sankara all the better. Many things have been imputed to him which he did not mean; some of his sayings have been given prominence both by his critics and his admirers, while other state-

ments have been ignored or allowed a secondary position. These wrong interpretations and criticisms have done immense good to Advaita philosophy by pointing out where misinterpretations were possible and where finer elucidations were necessary. In the cultural history of India the position of Vyâsa and Sankara as now understood is unique; and one might venture to say that in the future cultural history of the world these two figures will occupy an equally prominent position.

(Concluded)

ATMABODHA

BY SWAMI SIDDHATMANANDA

स्वयमन्तर्बहिव्याप्य भासयन्नखिलं जगत् ।

ब्रह्म प्रकाशते वह्निप्रतप्तसपिण्डवत् ॥ ६२ ॥

ब्रह्म Brahman अन्तर्बहिव्याप्य pervading it through and through अखिलं जगत् the whole universe भासयन् illumining वह्निप्रतप्तसपिण्डवत् like a red-hot iron ball स्वयम् प्रकाशते manifests Itself (i. e. shines in Its own effulgence).

62. Brahman manifests Itself, like (fire in) a red-hot iron ball,¹ illumining the whole universe and pervading it through and through.

¹ Like (fire in) ball etc.—As fire manifests itself making the iron ball glow so Brahman manifests Itself illumining the whole universe. Iron by itself is not incandescent, it is fire that makes it so. Similarly, this whole universe is illumined by Brahman alone (*vide* Mund. Up. II. 10).

जगद्विलक्षणं ब्रह्म ब्रह्माणोऽन्यन्न किञ्चन ।

ब्रह्मान्यद्भाति चेन्मिथ्या यथा मरुमरीचिका ॥ ६३ ॥

ब्रह्म Brahman जगद्विलक्षणं (is) different from the world ब्रह्मणः अन्यत् different from Brahman किञ्चन न (अस्ति) there exists nothing ब्रह्मान्यत् भाति चेत् although something different from Brahman appears (तत् that) मिथ्या (is) false यथा मरुमरीचिका even as a mirage (is false).

63. Brahman is different from the world; nothing different from Brahman exists. Although something different from Brahman is experienced, it is false like a mirage.

दृश्यते श्रूयते यद्दयद् ब्रह्माणोऽन्यन्न तद्भवेत् ।

तस्त्वज्ञानाच्च तद् ब्रह्म सच्चिदानन्दमद्वयम् ॥ ६४ ॥

यद्यद् whatever दृश्यते is seen श्रूयते (च and) is heard तत् that ब्रह्मणः अन्वत् different from Brahman न भवेत् is not ; तत् that तत्त्वज्ञानात् through Knowledge च indeed सच्चिदानन्दम्-अद्वयम्-ब्रह्म Non-dual Brahman which is Existence, Intelligence and Bliss (भवेत् becomes).

64. Whatever is heard or seen is not different from Brahman. Indeed, through Knowledge that itself is realised as the Non-dual Brahman which is Existence, Intelligence and Bliss.

Whatever we hear or see is actually Brahman but distorted due to our ignorance even as when we see a snake in the rope ; it is actually the rope we see though it appears as the snake due to our ignorance.

सर्वगं सच्चिदानन्दं ज्ञानचक्षुर्निरीक्षते ।

अज्ञानचक्षुर्नेक्षेत भास्वन्तं भानुमन्धवत् ॥ ६५ ॥

ज्ञानचक्षुः One having the eyes of Knowledge सर्वगं all-pervading सच्चिदानन्दं Existence, Intelligence, Bliss (ब्रह्म Brahman) निरीक्षते sees ; भास्वन्तं भानुमन्धवत् as a blind man does not see the shining sun अज्ञानचक्षुः one having the eyes of ignorance (ब्रह्म Brahman) न ईक्षेत does not see.

65. One having Knowledge sees the all-pervading Brahman—the Existence, Intelligence, and Bliss. An ignorant man does not see the Brahman even as a blind man does not see the resplendent sun.

श्रवणादिभिरुद्दीप्तज्ञानाग्निपरितापितः ।

जीवः सर्वमलान्मुक्तः स्वर्णवत् द्योतते स्वयम् ॥ ६६ ॥

श्रवणादिभिरुद्दीप्तः-ज्ञानाग्निपरितापितः Purified by the fire of Knowledge kindled by Sravana etc. सर्वमलान्मुक्तः freed from all impurities जीवः jiva स्वर्णवत् like (pure) gold स्वयम् द्योतते shines by itself.

66. Purified by the fire of Knowledge kindled by Sravana etc. and being free from all imperfections, the Jiva shines by itself (i.e., manifests its real nature) even as gold shines (when bereft of all dross).

हृदाकाशोदितो ह्यात्मा बोधभानुस्तमोपहृत् ।

सर्वव्यापी सर्वधारी भाति भासयतेऽखिलम् ॥ ६७ ॥

हृदाकाशोदितः Rising in the mind (of the Jiva) सर्वव्यापी all-pervading सर्वधारी all-supporting तमोपहृत् dispeller of darkness बोधभानुः the sun of knowledge आत्मा Atman हि alone भाति shines अखिलम् the whole universe भासयते (च and) illumines.

67. The All-pervading, All-supporting Atman—the sun of knowledge, the dispeller of ignorance, rising in the mind of the Jiva, shines and illumines the whole universe.

दिग्देशकालाद्यनपेक्ष्य सर्वगं शीतादिहृन्नित्यसुखं निरञ्जनम् ।

यः स्वात्मतीर्थं भजते विनिष्क्रियः स सर्ववित् सर्वगतोऽमृतो भवेत् ॥ ६८ ॥

विनिष्क्रियः (सन्) Being free from all actions यः who दिग्देशकालाद्यनपेक्ष्य regardless of direction, space, time, etc. सर्वगं all-pervading शीतादिहृत् destroyer of heat, cold

etc. नित्यसुखं eternally blissful निरञ्जनं free from all impurities स्वात्मतीर्थं भजते resorts to one's own self सः he सर्ववित् all-knowing सर्वगतः all-pervading अमृतः immortal भवेत् becomes.

68. He who renouncing all actions and regardless of direction, space, time, etc. resorts to one's own self¹ which is all-pervading, eternally blissful, free from all impurities, and destroyer of heat, cold, etc. becomes all-knowing, all-pervading and immortal.

¹ *Resorts to self etA.*—The process of discriminating the real from the unreal and the means of attaining the Self has been expounded. This concluding verse says that an aspirant who is under all circumstances and at all times devoted to Self-knowledge, disregarding all external things, attains the highest goal of life.

(Concluded)

NOTES AND COMMENTS

IN THIS NUMBER

God in Christ by Swami Vivekananda is from some of the class talks that he gave during his second visit to America. . . . In *The Study of Sanskrit and its Beneficent Influence* we have put forward some cogent arguments in favour of the revival of Sanskritic studies. . . We have given in this issue some illuminating *Talks of Swami Brahmananda* and shall continue to do so in some subsequent issues. They are for the first time translated into English from the original Bengali and so may be of profit to the English-reading public. . . Victor Loga is a new contributor from Poland. His article on *Moral Problems of the Present Age* discusses from the Vedântic point of view how an objective moral standard can be set up at the present important moments of our life. . . . *Sankara's Interpretation of the Vedânta-Sutras* by Swami Vireswarananda is taken from the introduction to his forthcoming book the *Brahma-Sutras* with English rendering and notes. Our readers may remember our having published a few select Sutras in 1935. . . . Mr. H. Ototsu is the Imperial consul for Japan. He read this paper on *shinto or the way of the Gods*

at the Convention of Religions held at Colombo under the auspices of the Sri Ramakrishna Birth Centenary in August last. . . . *History of the Vedântic Thought* by Swami Satswarupananda is concluded in this issue with a critical estimate of the views of Râmânûja, Madhva and others. *Atmabodha* is concluded in this issue.

WHY HAS INDIA FAILED?

It is often remarked that the devotion to her high spiritual ideals has been the cause of India's undoing. India has failed miserably in the political field. Though some of her great men theoretically grasped "the importance of wealth and power to give expression to spirit" India failed to realize it practically. There are some who would perhaps demur to India's being called a failure. Political mirror they would say hardly reflects the real worth or success of a nation, and that in spite of her present degradation and suffering, "India still bears witness to the cult of spirit." There is an undeniable element of truth in the objection. But it is also true that long periods of political subjection tend to crush the very conditions of spiritual growth and

that political degeneration is itself a reflex of an unbalanced society. Even for the inward growth of a people certain outward conditions are necessary. We may go gushing about our high spiritual ideals, but that will not alter the plain fact of our political failure.

Is this failure due to an excessive attention being paid to spirit? "It is not right to complain", says Sir Radhakrishnan in the October issue of the *Hibbert Journal*, "that India has failed because she has followed after things spiritual. She has failed because she has not followed after them sufficiently. She has not learned how to make spirit entirely the master of life, but has created in recent times a gulf between spirit and life and has rested in a compromise. Some of our holy men are inclined to become creatures set apart, beings who take flight from the temporal in order to cling to the heart of the eternal. If, in our eagerness to seek after God, we ignore the interests of humanity, we may produce a few giants but we will not elevate the race. We have shown how high individuals can rise by spiritual culture and how low a race can fall by its one-sidedness. To master life, to accept it and improve it is a difficult task for the individual and more difficult for the race. Harmony of the social order is an essential aim of the spiritual man."

The learned professor's words echo what Vivekananda repeatedly emphasized forty years ago. India's plight has been due not to her loss of faith in spirit. It has been due to her failure to make the world a medium for the expression of spirit and her starving the masses of real nourishing spiritual food. Looking across the long-stretched vistas of her past history, what picture do we get of Indian society? Is it not often that our eyes greet the picture of a community where only a

handful having sufficient leisure lived in the heights of spiritual culture. The masses who drudged for a bare pittance had scarcely any opportunities to appreciate the niceties of the high culture and civilization, though tradition taught them to pay homage to spirit and to submit meekly to their lot in an attitude of almost happy resignation. While the clear water of spirit sped by they quenched their thirst for religion with the turbid water from ditches. Being spoon-fed they, in the course of time, fell victim to a debasing philosophy which congealed their activity and stunted their growth. Decay attacked the limb where the vital flow of spirit had ceased and brought the high and low to a common ruin. If the ruin is to be arrested and a new life regained we shall need more of real religion. The masses have to be quickened to a new life by the dynamic message of Vedânta. They have to be taught that religion and salvation are not for the hermit alone; the labourer and the peasant too have a right to them even in their own walks of life.

REINCARNATION

It is characteristic of the wider outlook of philosophy in the twentieth century that some of its followers have begun to address themselves to problems which were contemptuously dubbed as supernatural and therefore excluded from serious consideration by the nineteenth century philosophy, dominated as it was by scientific materialism. The changed attitude has been largely due to the shock which twentieth century physics, biology, and psychology have given to some fundamental assumptions of commonsense and science, and also to the recent interest created by some fascinating and mysterious psychic phenomena. These have helped to create a new interest in religion and

mysticism among men of scientific attitude of mind. The new interest has demanded that the old religious beliefs and ideas should be re-interpreted and re-stated in a way which would square with the findings of science. The fact of religious experience is indubitable; nonetheless it is true that it has often found different and devious expressions according to the varying intellectual abilities and outlooks of numerous religious persons. Moreover, such facts of religious experience have been interpreted in terms of the contemporary knowledge of the world. There is need, therefore, that they should be always explained and restated in terms of an expanding outlook and a widening knowledge of the visible universe.

One such problem is that which concerns reincarnation. Modern science seems to raise many difficulties from different standpoints in the way of accepting it. Some time ago there was an interesting discussion about it by Profs. C. E. M. Joad and M. Hiri-yanna in the pages of the *Aryan Path*. Prof. Joad examined it as he understood the doctrine from McTaggart's theory of plurality of lives. Apart from detailed criticism he dismissed such a theory on two main grounds. Prof. Joad's first objection is that we have no memory of our past lives. The second one draws attention to the fact that character depends on the physical body. To be more precise, it is determined by the secretions of ductless glands. So with the destruction of a physical body, the character dependent on it disappears. In such a case, even if the ego survives bodily destruction and lives through different lives, it cannot be said that it is the same through all the bodies, for different bodies will sustain different and discontinuous personalities. Prof. Hiri-yanna's answers from the Indian standpoint are able and

sufficient. To deny pre-existence to self on the ground that our psychical history fails to penetrate the veil of the present life is to confound a thing with the consciousness of it. As regards the second objection which holds that the personality of a self is indissolubly tied up with the body and that no self can in any imaginable sense be said to transmigrate without the body itself transmigrating, it is replied that the Indian standpoint has been overlooked. The personality of the self is indeed looked upon as linked up with the body in the Indian systems. But then, it is the Sukshma Sarira, a sort of psychic vesture for the soul, which is the depository of all the tendencies of a particular self and which transmigrates into a grosser body. Certain tendencies in an individual, the Indian writers point out, are inexplicable with the help of environment and heredity alone. They inevitably point back to an earlier existence. But the most important argument is furnished by the conception of Moksha or eternal freedom, once it is accepted. Immortality proves pre-existence, for it is difficult to conceive how a thing which has no end can have a beginning. A single life is palpably inadequate to the attainment of Moksha. Therefore, the poverty of man's present spiritual life taken along with the ultimate greatness of his destiny explains the belief in a plurality of lives.

A few more considerations could have been urged as pointing to reincarnation. It is not true that our knowledge of psychical history is necessarily limited to the present life. There have been men who have claimed to have recollected their past lives vividly. Such evidence cannot be lightly dismissed. Destruction of the physical body entails so great a change of environment that the chain of mental history seems to suffer an irreparable break. Such an

occurrence is not unoften the case in the case of this present life. Admitting the dependence of character on the physical body may it not be said that a self with a particular bent fashions out and inhabits a suitable body for its proper outward expression? Because our brain-cells move when we think, it is naïve to say that thinking is an effect

of such movement. Besides recent psychical investigations carried out by reputed scientists show that not only is the personality not destroyed with the destruction of the physical body, but that the mind and character can function and continue without the assistance of the gross physical vehicle.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

NICHOLAS ROERICH. BY K. P. PADMANABHAN TAMPY, B.A. *Published by The Travancore Humanitarian Co-operative Society, Ltd., No. 1934. Trivandrum. Pp. 108.*

Nicholas Roerich is one of those rare, living individuals who have tried to open out the glorious vision of a new world of beauty, harmony, and human fellowship to the groping humanity. First and foremost an artist, his versatile genius has won laurels in diverse fields. He has not only been classed among the representatives of Modernism but has also been acclaimed as the founder of a new school of art. His suggestive and symbolical art which seeks to capture the spirit of the eternal in the media of the fleeting has made his reputation world-wide. The greatness of the appeal of his art is shown by the tribute which the most famous of the cultural centres of the world have paid to his works by setting apart numerous museums and art galleries for the preservation and exhibition of his paintings. But Roerich is more than an artist. He is a messenger of peace and culture, a humanitarian, an educationist and a literary figure of no mean order and an explorer of no small reputation. The Roerich Pact will remain an enduring monument to his love of culture and humanitarianism. His *Heart of Asia* and the *Altai Himalayas* have been read with interest by lay readers and men of science alike.

The monograph under review is no biography of the great artist; it is only an appreciation of the varied phases of his versatile genius prefaced by the barest account of his life and travels. It would also not be proper to turn to it for a detailed examination and evaluation of Roerich's art and

literary output. The pages acquaint one only with the broad outlines of his work and personality. The work abounds with quotations from renowned art-critics, artists and savants, which show the regard and esteem in which his name is held by men of culture of different lands. The author writes almost with a spirit of adoration. He would, however, have sacrificed nothing from the greatness, force, and dignity of the character of his hero if he wrote with more moderation and restraint of language.

ALLAHABAD UNIVERSITY STUDIES VOL. XII (ARTS AND SCIENCE). EDITED BY THE VICE-CHANCELLOR AND THE HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS. SENATE HOUSE, ALLAHABAD, 1936. Pp. 299+188. Price Rs. 7-8.

The studies cover a wide range of subjects in both Arts and Science. There are altogether 23 of them, 8 being devoted to the Arts Section and the rest to Science. The Science Section includes articles on Chemistry, Botany, and Zoology, and the Arts Section those on English, Sanskrit, Philosophy, Economics and Urdu. Among those included in the latter we have found the articles on *Universities in India during the Hindu Period* by Prof. P. K. Acharya and *The Rôle of Reasoning in Advaita Philosophy* by A. C. Mukherji to be interesting and instructive.

MESSAGE OF SRIMAD-BHAGVAD-GITA.

BY R. V. SHAH. *Published by Ramanlal Vadilal Shah. Kapasia Bazâr, Dalal Bldg., Ahmedabad. Pp. 75. Price Re. 1/- or S. 1/6 nett.*

The book records the author's musings on the *Gîtâ*, a fairly large portion of it being a mere paraphrasing of some of the verses of the *Gîtâ*. Neither the ideas nor the presentation strike as novel and well-ordered, while the style as a whole is affected to a degree.

NEWS AND REPORTS

SWAMI DHIRANANDA

Swami Dhirananda (Krishnalal Maharaj), a senior monk of the Ramakrishna Mission and a disciple of Swami Brahmananda passed away at 0-50 a.m. on Monday, the 23rd November, after suffering from facial carbuncle for about a month.

Krishnalal Maharaj hailed from the district of 24 Perganas and joined the Math at Alumbazar about 40 years ago. He had the unique privilege of rendering personal services to the Holy Mother, Swami Vivekananda, Swami Yogananda and some other disciples of Sri Ramakrishna, and as such could give valuable information about the lives of those great personalities. Krishnalal Maharaj was held in high esteem by all the devotees of the Ramakrishna Order for his great spirituality, which won praise even from the Holy Mother, Swami Brahmananda and others fit to talk authoritatively on the subject. He had a very sympathetic heart, and was kindness itself to one and all. Everybody could be sure of his help under all circumstances and in times of all difficulties. It was a unique sight to observe how spontaneous he was in giving help to the poor and the needy. His childlike simplicity and unostentatious behaviour disarmed all fears and anybody could mix with him very freely. But yet he had a dignity in him for which whoever approached him could not but think only of the higher ideals of life.

He was a devout soul, and very rigid about his spiritual practices till the last days of his life. The proper management of the Pujas and the Utsavas at the Belur Math owed not a little to his keen interest and untiring energy.

He held an important position in the Order, being a trustee of the Belur Math and a member of the Governing Body of the Ramakrishna Mission. For some years he was also the treasurer of the Mission. His death is a very great loss to the Ramakrishna Order. Many are the persons who will sadly miss his inspiring presence, and no less will be the number of those who will lovingly and gratefully cherish his memory for what he had done for them.

SWAMI KAMALESHWARANANDA

Swami Kamaleshwarananda, head of the Gadadhar Ashrama and Sri Ramakrishna Veda Vidyâlaya, Bhowanipur, passed away on the night of 24th October. He was a disciple of Swami Brahmananda and joined the Ramakrishna Order about twenty-two years ago. He was of a devotional temperament and learned in the Scriptures, and all were charmed by his lucid exposition of the *Upanishads*, the *Gîtâ*, *Srimad Bhâgavatam*, *Yoga Vâsistha* and other works. He started the Ramakrishna Veda Vidyâlaya, Bhowanipur, for the spread of Vedic learning. The Swami was only 44 years old when he passed away. His passing away has come rather as a great shock to all his friends, whose number was pretty large, to whom he had endeared himself by his qualities of head and heart.

VEDANTA SOCIETY, PROVIDENCE, U. S. A.

REPORT FOR 1935-36

Throughout the season lectures were conducted as usual on Sundays. Tuesday classes studied the *Upanishads*, and Friday classes were devoted to practical lessons in meditation and to the study of the *Gîtâ*. Toward the end of the season, Friday classes were changed to Thursdays so that the Swami might give weekly lectures in Philadelphia. Regular interviews were as always given to the students as well as to the Press.

This year the radio station WPRO asked the Swami to speak regularly twice a week instead of once a week because the talks were much liked. At intervals of one and a half to two months, the Swami also alternates with ministers in speaking over WJAR and WEAN for the morning devotions. All these talks continue throughout the year.

In October of 1935, Swami Akhilananda visited the cities of Cleveland, Philadelphia and St. Louis giving in each a series of three lectures on religion and psychology. Appreciative response was shown in all the three places, especially in Philadelphia and in St. Louis.

The lectures in Philadelphia were given in an exclusive club called the Art Alliance,

and drew people from the best social and educated circles as well as from others. There appeared to be such a promising future that the Swami continued his lectures there monthly. In the spring, on being urged by Philadelphia friends, he began speaking there on Fridays and Saturdays every week until the end of the season.

In November and December the Metaphysical Club of Boston sent the Swami a special request to give a series of lectures there. He delivered four lectures on Sunday afternoons in each of the two months. Later, the Club as well as the friends pressed the Swami to continue these lectures again after the Christmas holiday, but he declined because of preparations for the Centenary Celebration.

The birthdays of the Holy Mother, Swami Vivekananda, and Swami Brahmananda were celebrated with Hindu worship and specially prepared dinners with music and lectures by the Swamis and prominent friends. Christmas, Good Friday, and Easter had their characteristic celebrations, as well as the birthday of Buddha and festivities of other religions. Five Swamis were entertained at various times, and gave lectures on the different occasions of their visits. In January and February there were elaborate preparations for the celebration of the Sri Ramakrishna Centenary.

The immediately noticeable result of the Celebration was a greater number of letters from unknown people to the Swami, and an increased demand for the Swami as a speaker to various religious societies and gatherings of different kinds—of ministers, of Men's and Women's Church Clubs including a Jewish women's group, of Young People's Church Societies, of Y. M. C. A. Boys groups and of Religious Conferences of all ages.

Swami Akhilananda lectured at Brown University on the contributions of Sri Ramakrishna and Swami Vivekananda to Religion and Philosophy. This year the Swami was specially invited to lecture on Sri Ramakrishna to the Ministers' Universal Club of Brown University of which he is a member and whose monthly discussions and debates he joins every year. He also spoke at other Associations of Ministers in the State, and again joined the meetings of the Union Ministers' Association. He spoke many times to Jewish groups and at different Churches and Clubs of Christ in the city and State as well as in some of the cities of Massachusetts.

THE RAMKRISHNA MISSION SEVA-SHRAMA, KANKHAL, HARDWAR

REPORT FOR 1935

The necessity of a Sevashram at a holy centre like Kankhal can hardly be overestimated. During the last 35 years of its existence the Sevashrama has been making its humble attempts to mitigate the sufferings of pilgrims and local people in various ways.

The total number of patients admitted in Sevashrama during the year was 551, belonging to all classes and castes of the society. The number of cases receiving outdoor relief was 20,979. Besides the hospital work, the Sevashrama conducts a night school with a view to imparting primary education to the children of the local depressed classes. There were 80 boys on the rolls at the end of the year. There is also a library attached to the Sevashrama, where religious books are kept for the benefit of the workers of the Ashrama. Birthday anniversary of Vivekananda was celebrated on which occasion about a thousand poor Harijans were fed by the workers of the Ashrama.

THE RAMKRISHNA MISSION, BARISAL BRANCH

REPORT FOR 1935

The Ashrama runs a Students' Home for College boys on the lines of the Brahmacharya Ashramas of old. It aims not only to help indigent and bright boys to continue their studies in college but also to develop and strengthen their moral and spiritual inclinations by providing a suitable environment. They are also trained in habits of self-reliance by being obliged to perform various sorts of household duties for themselves. At the end of the year there were 12 boys on the rolls, of whom 6 were free, 4 concession-holders and 2 paying. Of the 8 students who appeared at the different University examinations 7 came out successful. There is a small library and a free reading room attached to the Ashrama. During the year under report the Ashrama also rendered help to destitute persons in the shape of rice, clothes or money and undertook to nurse a few patients in the town. Apart from these, daily and weekly classes and discourses on the life and teachings of Sri Ramakrishna and Swami Vivekananda were held in the Mission premises. The Swamis of the Mission were also invited to deliver

lectures and hold classes at different places in and outside the town.

**THE RAMKRISHNA MISSION SEVA-
ASHRAMA, BRINDABAN**
REPORT FOR 1935

During the year under report the activities of the Sevashrama were carried under the following heads: (i) Indoor Relief. There were 24 beds in the Indoor Hospital. The total number of patients treated during the year was 334. The total number of surgical cases was 21. (ii) Outdoor Relief. Altogether 31,774 cases were treated at the Outdoor Department during the year. The total number of surgical cases was 229. (iii) Pecuniary Relief. There were nine permanent recipients of pecuniary relief and sixteen persons were given occasional help. The total expenditure incurred under this head amounted to Rs. 135-11-6. Apart from money help was also given to a few in the shape of blankets and clothings.

**RAMKRISHNA MISSION ASHRAMA AND
CHARITABLE DISPENSARY, BANKURA**
REPORT FOR 1935

The charitable dispensary connected with the Bankura Ashrama has been of immense benefit to the suffering people of the locality. This can at once be seen from the record of the number of cases treated. During the year altogether 71,380 cases were treated, of which 51,222 were repeated cases. Both Allopathic and Homoeopathic treatments were adhered to. Apart from the hospital work the Ashrama is engaged in other kinds of activities. It organized occasional relief works in flood and famine-stricken areas in Bankura. It maintained a number of students at the Ashrama, who were receiving training in Homoeopathic treatment. It also runs a free primary school which had 44 students on its rolls during the year. Several Swamis and Brahmacharis of the Ashrama delivered lectures at different places in Bankura district. Special meetings were arranged by the Ashrama on the occasion of the visits of a few distinguished visitors.

**THE RAMKRISHNA MISSION,
DELHI BRANCH**
THE THIRD GENERAL REPORT
(JANUARY, 1932—DECEMBER, 1935)

The activities of the institution fall under the following heads: (i) Religious preaching,

(ii) Library and Reading Room, (iii) Outdoor General Dispensary, (iv) Tuberculosis clinic.

(i) Preaching Work. During the period under report daily and weekly classes were held at the Ashrama on scriptures and the teachings of Sri Ramakrishna. Discourses on scriptures and Vivekananda's work were also given every week in several places outside the Ashrama. Besides these, public lectures were delivered by the Swamis of the Mission in several towns in North and West and East India. Meetings were also organized on the occasions of the visits of distinguished Swamis from other parts of India and abroad. Birthday anniversaries of Vivekananda and Ramakrishna were celebrated when the poor were fed.

(ii) The Library and the Reading Room were open to the public every day.

(iii) During the period under review 21,016 patients were treated in the Outdoor General Dispensary.

(iv) Free Tuberculosis Clinic. The clinic was started in 1933 with the object of offering patients suffering from tuberculosis treatment according to up-to-date scientific processes with the help of competent doctors who volunteered their services without pay. The total attendance of patients was 14,469, the total number of new patients being 1,038.

**THE RAMKRISHNA MISSION,
SINGAPORE**

REPORT FOR 1935

During the year under review the Singapore Branch of the Mission celebrated the centenary birthday of Sri Ramakrishna and organized special meetings on the occasions of the visits of distinguished Swamis from abroad. Religious classes were conducted regularly by the Resident Minister who also visited a number of places outside the town and delivered lectures and held discourses on religious and allied subjects. The Mission runs a school, the Vivekananda School, for boys and girls. The total number of students at the end of the year was 85, of which 20 received their tuition free. The Ashrama has a night school open to the working classes of all nationalities. During the year 126 adults comprising Tamils, Punjabees and Malayas received their tuition free. The Mission maintained a Library and a Reading Room which were open to the public.

THE RAMAKRISHNA MATH CHARITABLE DISPENSARY, MADRAS

REPORT FOR 1935

The Charitable Dispensary attached to the Ramakrishna Math, Madras, has been fulfilling a long-felt want of the poorer section of the locality. This is borne out by the enormous rise in the number of patients treated now from what it was in 1925 when it was first started. The total number of patients during 1935 amounted to 68,667, of which 41,008 were repeated cases.

RAMAKRISHNA MISSION SEVASHRAMA, MIDNAPORE

REPORT FOR 1933-35

During the period under report the Sevashrama ran two free primary schools for boys, conducted several religious classes and offered medical help to a large number of needy persons. It also undertook various kinds of relief operations in connection with the small-pox epidemic in the town in 1935. There is a dispensary attached to the Sevashrama. During the period the indoor department admitted 208 persons altogether, while the outdoor department administered Homœopathic treatment to over 100,000 persons.

SRI RAMAKRISHNA ASHRAMA, MYSORE

REPORT FOR 1935

During the year the Swamis of the Ashrama held weekly classes on general religious and moral subjects at seven different institutions in the city. A class was also held every Sunday at the Ashrama, which was always well attended. Birthday celebrations of Ramakrishna and several other saints were held, during which lectures by distinguished persons were organized. The Ashrama has also a Students' Home which had 16 boys at the end of the year under review. The boys receive their board and lodging at concession rates except one who is free. The study circle which was started some years ago had three Sannyasins and one Brahmacharin. The Ashrama library was enlarged during the year by the addition of a number of books. The Ashrama also undertook some welfare work at Padukarahali in co-operation with a number of local persons.

THE RAMAKRISHNA MISSION STUDENTS' HOME, CALCUTTA

REPORT FOR 1935

The Ramakrishna Mission Students' Home, Calcutta, which steps into the eighteenth year of its useful existence in 1936 was started mainly with the idea of supplementing the one-sided character of our University education with some training in character-building and in the elements of our national culture. The Home is a college students' hostel licensed by the Calcutta University, and run on the lines of a Brahmacharya Ashrama. It is intended specially for poor and meritorious students who are helped through their college course with free board, lodging, fees, books and also other necessaries as far as possible. It also receives a number of paying students who want to have the benefit of Home-training. The main features of the Home-training fall under three heads, namely, (1) spiritual, (2) intellectual, and (3) practical. Along with the holding of regular classes on the scriptures various *utsavs* or religious festivals are celebrated which help both to develop spiritual aspirations among the boys and to provide a healthy recreation for them. The Home runs a manuscript magazine and holds Saturday classes for the discussion of socio-religious topics. Apart from performing all household duties the students also work in kitchen and flower gardens.

At the end of the year there were 88 students in the Home, of whom 22 were free, 2 concession-holders and 9 paying. 18 students sat for different University examinations. Of these one passed the M. A., three graduated in Arts, one in Science, four got through the Intermediate Examination and one passed the P. Sc. M. B. Examination.

Total receipts and disbursements during the year were Rs. 13,161-10-3 and Rs. 7,876-8 respectively.

The immediate needs of the Home are funds for reclaiming a marshy land and for putting up a few structures, namely, a prayer-hall, a library building, a dining hall, a medical ward and a few cottages for workers.

RAMAKRISHNA MISSION, DACCA

REPORT FOR 1934 AND 1935

The activities of the Dacca Branch of Ramakrishna Mission which has completed its thirty-sixth year of existence in 1935, are

carried under three heads, namely, (i) charitable, (ii) educational, and (iii) missionary.

During the period under report its charitable activities were as follows. Its outdoor Homeopathic Charitable Dispensary with an attached Allopathic section served altogether 12,875 cases. Besides, the Mission undertook a number of cases for out-door nursing. It also collected funds, rice and clothes for distribution among the needy.

The educational activities of the centre included the running of four free schools, two for girls, one M. E. school for boys and one for boys and girls of the backward community, the conducting of two libraries, a reading room and the rendering of pecuniary help to needy students.

The missionary activities consisted of the holding of regular scriptural classes, organising of public lectures and the celebration of anniversaries of saints and prophets.

THE RAMKRISHNA MISSION INDUSTRIAL HOME AND SCHOOL, BELUR MATH, HOWRAH

REPORT FOR 1935

The Industrial School at Belur was started fifteen years ago as a humble experiment in tackling, however, mildly, the severe problem of widespread unemployment among the boys and youths of our country. During its brief existence it has succeeded in getting a number of boys started on an independent career of earning their livelihood. Its steady expansion has betokened the measure of its success.

The course of studies are (1) Cabinet-making, (2) Weaving, and Dyeing, and (3) Tailoring. The number of students at the end of the year was 40, of which 24 were inmates of the Home, the rest being day-scholars. Of the 16 students who appeared for the final examination of the school 13 came out successful.

Apart from industrial and technical training in the school the residents of the Home receive instructions in general knowledge, training in household management and also in religious and moral subjects. The boys also take part in a number of recreative and social activities which keep up their mental and physical health. Devotional

songs are taught to boys who are also encouraged to take regular physical exercises.

THE RAMKRISHNA MISSION'S RELIEF WORK

We beg to announce that the Famine and Flood relief work started by the Ramkrishna Mission in the different districts of Bengal and Burma have been closed by the second week of November, 1936. We gratefully thank all donors and sympathisers whose kind co-operation enabled us to bring the above work to a successful termination.

A Cyclone relief work has just been started in the Chirala Taluq of the Guntur district, and is being conducted by the Madras branch of the Mission. Contributions for this work will be thankfully received either by the President, Ramkrishna Mission, Belur Math, Howrah, or by the Hony. Secretary, Ramkrishna Mission, Mylapore, Madras.

SWAMI MADHAVANANDA,

Acting Secretary, Ramkrishna Mission.

15th November, 1936.

SARADESWARI ASHRAMA AND FREE SCHOOL FOR HINDU GIRLS

The Saradeswari Ashrama situated at 26, Maharani Hemanta Kumari Street, Calcutta, was started by Sannyasini Gauri Mâtâji, a direct disciple of Sri Ramakrishna, in 1895 with a view to providing a real education to the women of the country on a national, religious and useful basis. Though the institution does not belong to the Ramakrishna Mission, it is run on the same lines. It is a Home for housing and training girls and widows of the respectable classes of the Hindu society and leading them to a career of usefulness. It sends up students for the University and Sanskrit Title Examinations. At present the inmates number about 50, and most of them are maintained by the Ashrama from its Fund created by public charity. There is an attached free day school with about 300 girls on its rolls. The Institution has been steadily growing for the last ten years which has demanded the provision for increased accommodation. A new site for the erection of a suitable house has been obtained and the management is in need of funds for the construction of the building.