PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. LXII *JUNE 1957* NO. 6

"उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत।"

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

MARK OF REAL BLESSEDNESS

WHAT speciality is there in being born as a member of the highest class? What if one possesses learning that includes enquiry into all the sciences?

IN all the three worlds who else is more blessed than the person whose heart is always steeped in loving devotion to the Supreme Lord?

BRAHMASAMHITĀ

Kiṁ janmanā sakala-varṇa-janottamena?
Kiṁ vidyayā sakala-śāstra-vicāravatyā?
Yasyāsti cetasi sadā Parameśa-bhaktiḥ,
Ko'nyas - tatas - tribhuvane, puruṣo'sti dhanyaḥ?

DIVINE LOVE*

By Swami Vivekananda

[LOVE may be symbolized by a triangle (*Complete Works* of Vivekananda, VI, 109). The first angle is,] love questions not. It is not a beggar. . . . Beggar's love is no love at all. The first sign of love is when love asks nothing, [when it] gives everything. This is the real spiritual worship, the worship through love. Whether God is merciful is no longer questioned. He is God; He is my love. Whether God is omnipotent and almighty, limited or unlimited, is no longer questioned. If He distributes good, all right; if He brings evil, what does it matter? All other attributes vanish except that one—infinite love.

There was an old Indian emperor who on a hunting expedition came across a great sage in the forest. He was so pleased with this sage that he insisted that the latter come to the capital to receive some presents. [At first] the sage refused. [But] the emperor insisted, and at last the sage consented. When he arrived [at the palace], he was announced to the emperor who said, "Wait a minute until I finish my prayer." The emperor prayed, "Lord, give me more wealth, more [land, more health], more children. The sage stood up and began to walk out of the room. The emperor said, "You have not received my presents." The sage replied, "I do not beg from beggars. All this time you have been praying for more land, [for] more money, for this and that. What can you give me? First satisfy your own wants!"

Love never asks; it always gives. . . When a young man goes to see his sweetheart, . . . there is no business relationship between them; theirs is a relationship of love, and love is no beggar. [In the same way], we understand that the beginning of real spiritual worship means no begging. We have finished all begging: "Lord, give me this and that." Then will religion begin.

The second [angle of the triangle of love] is that love knows no fear. You may cut me to pieces and I [will] still love you. Suppose one of you mothers, a weak woman, sees a tiger in the street snatching your child. I know where you will be: you will face the tiger. Another time a dog appears in the street, and you will fly. But you jump at the mouth of the tiger and snatch your child away. Love knows no fear. It conquers all evil. The fear of God is the beginning of religion, but the love of God is the end of religion. All fear has died out.

The third [angle of the love-triangle is that] love is its own end. It can never be the means. The man who says, "I love you for such and such a thing," does not love. Love can never be the means; it must be the perfect end. What is the end and aim of love? To love God, that is all. Why should one love God? [There is] no why, because it is not the means. When one can love, that is salvation, that is perfection, that is heaven. What more? What else can be the end? What can you have higher than love?

I am not talking about what every one of us means by love. Little namby-pamby love is lovely. Man falls in love with woman, and woman goes to die for man. The chances are that in five minutes John kicks Jane and Jane kicks John. This is a materialism and no love at all. If John could really love Jane, he would be perfect that moment. [His true] nature is love; he is perfect in himself. John will get all the powers of yoga simply by loving Jane, [although] he may not know a word about religion, psychology, or theology. I believe that if a man and woman can really love, [they can acquire] all the powers the

* Reprinted from *Vedanta and the West* with the kind permission of the Publishers, Vedanta Place, Hollywood 28, California.

yogis claim to have, for love itself is God. That God is omnipresent, and [therefore] you have that love, whether you know it or not.

I saw a boy waiting for a girl the other evening. . . . I thought it a good experiment to study this boy. He developed clairvoyance and clairaudience through the intensity of his love. Sixty or seventy times he never made a mistake, and the girl was two hundred miles away. [He would say], "She is dressed this way." [Or], "There she goes." I have seen that with my own eyes.

This is the question: Is not your husband God, your child God? If you can love your wife, you have all the religion in the world. Yon have the whole secret of religion and yoga in you. But can you love? That is the question. You say, "I love. . . Oh Mary, I die for you!" [But if you] see Mary kissiug another man, you want to cut his throat. If Mary sees John talking to another girl she cannot sleep at night and she makes life hell for John. This is not love. This is barter and sale in sex. It is blasphemy to talk of it as love. The world talks day and night of God and religion—so of love. Making a sham of everything, that is what you are doing! Everybody talks of love, [yet in the] columns in the newspapers [we read] of divorces every day. When you love John, do you love John for his sake or for your sake? [If you love him for your sake], you expect something from John. [If you love him for his sake] you do not want anything from John. He can do anything he likes, [and] you [will] love him just the same.

These are the three points, the three angles that constitute the triangle [of love]. Unless there is love, philosophy becomes dry bones, psychology becomes a sort of [theory], and work becomes mere labor. [If there is love], philosophy becomes poetry, psychology becomes [mysticism], and work the most delicious thing in creation. [By merely] reading books [one] becomes barren. Who becomes learned? He who can feel even one drop of love. God is love and love is God. And God is everywhere. After seeing that God is love and God is everywhere, one does not know whether one stands on one's head or [on one's] feet—like a man who gets a bottle of wine and does not know where he stands. . . . If we weep ten minutes for God, we will not know where we are for the the next two months. ... We will not remember the times for meals. We will not know what we are eating. [How can] you love God and always be so nice and businesslike? . . . The . . . all-conquering, omnipotent power of love —how can it come? . . .

Judge people not. They are all mad. Children are [mad] after their games, the young after the young, the old [are] chewing the cud of their past years; some are mad after gold. Why not some after God? Go crazy over the love of God as you go crazy over Johns and Janes. Who are they? [People] say, "Shall I give up this? Shall I give up that?" One asked "Shall I give up marriage?" Do not give up anything! Things will give you up. Wait, and you will forget them.

[To be completely] turned into love of God —there is the real worship! You have a glimpse of that now and then in the Roman Catholic Church—some of those wonderful monks and nuns going mad with marvelous love. Such love you ought to have! Such should be the love of God—without asking anything, without seeking anything. . . .

The question was asked how to worship. Worship Him as dearer than all your possessions, dearer than all your relatives, [dearer than] your children. [Worship Him as] the one you love as Love itself. There is one whose name is infinite Love. That is the only definition of God. Do not care if this . . . universe is destroyed. What do we care as long as He is infinite love? [Do you] see what worship means? All other thoughts must go. Everything must vanish except God. The love the father or mother has for the child, [the love] the wife [has] for the husband, the husband for the wife, the friend for the friend —all these loves concentrated into one must be given to God. Now, if the woman loves the

man, she cannot love another man. If the man loves the woman, he cannot love another [woman]. Such is the nature of love.

My old master used to say, "Suppose there is a bag of gold in this room, and in the next room there is a robber. The robber is well aware that there is a bag of gold. Would the robber be able to sleep? Certainly not. All the time he would be crazy thinking how to reach the gold." . . . [Similarly], if a man loves God, how can he love anything else? How can anything else stand before that mighty love of God? Everything else vanishes [before it]. How can the mind stop without going crazy to find [that love], to realize, to feel, to live in that?

This is how we are to love God: "I do not want wealth, nor [friends, nor beauty], nor possessions, nor learning, nor even salvation. If it be Thy will, send me a thousand deaths. Grant me this—that I may love Thee and that for love's sake. That love which materialistic persons have for their worldly possessions, may that strong love come into my heart, but only for the Beautiful. Praise to God! Praise to God the Lover!" God is nothing else than that. He does not care for the wonderful things many yogis can do. Little magicians do little tricks. God is the big magician; he does all the tricks. Who cares how many worlds [there are]? . . .

There is another [way. It is to] conquer everything, [to] subdue everything—to conquer the body [and] the mind. . . "What is the use of conquering everything? My business is with God!" [says the devotee.]

There was one yogi, a great lover. He was dying of cancer of the throat. He [was] visited [by] another yogi, who was a philosopher. [The latter] said, "Look here, my friend, why don't you concentrate your mind on that sore of yours and get it cured?" The third time this question was asked [this great yogi] said, "Do you think it possible that the [mind] which I have given entirely to the Lord [can be fixed upon this cage of flesh and blood]?" Christ refused to bring legions of angels to his aid. Is this little body so great that I should bring twenty thousand angels to keep it two or three days more?

[From the worldly standpoint], my all is this body. My world is this body. My God is this body. I am the body. If you pinch me, I am pinched . I forget God the moment I have a headache. I am the body! God and everything must come down for this highest goal—the body. From this standpoint, when Christ died on the cross and did not bring angels [to his aid], he was a fool. He ought to have brought down angels and gotten himself off the cross! But from the standpoint of the lover, to whom this body is nothing, who cares for this nonsense? Why bother thinking about this body that comes and goes? There is no more to it than the piece of cloth the Roman soldiers cast lots for.

There is a whole gamut of difference between [the worldly standpoint] and the lover's standpoint. Go on loving. If a man is angry, there is no reason why you should be angry; if he degrades himself, that is no reason why you should degrade yourself. . . . "Why should I become angry just because another man has made a fool of himself? Do thou resist not evil!" That is what the lovers of God say. Whatever the world does, wherever it goes, has no influence [on them].

One yogi had attained supernatural powers. He said, "See my power! See the sky; I will cover it with clouds." It began to rain. [Someone] said, "My lord, you are wonderful. But teach me that knowing which I shall not ask for anything else." . . . To get rid even of power, to have nothing, not to want power! [What this means] cannot be understood simply by intellect. . . . You cannot understand by reading thousands of books. . . . When we begin to understand, the whole world opens before us. . . . The girl is playing with her dolls, getting new husbands all the time, but when her real husband comes all the dolls will be put away [forever]. . . So [with] all these goings-on here. [When] the sun of love rises, all these play-suns of power and these [cravings] all pass [away]. What shall we do with power? Thank God if you can get rid of the

power that you have. Begin to love. Power must go. Nothing must stand between me and God except love. God is only love and nothing else—love first, love in the middle, and love at the end.

[There is the] story of a queen preaching [the love of God] in the streets. Her enraged husband persecuted her, and she was hunted up and down the country. She used to sing songs describing her [love]. Her songs have been sung everywhere. "With tears in my eyes I [nourished the everlasting creeper] of love. . . ." This is the last, the great [goal]. What else is there? [People] want this and that. They all want to have and possess. That is why so few understand [love], so few come to it. Wake them and tell them! They will get a few more hints.

Love itself is the eternal, endless sacrifice. You will have to give up everything. You cannot take possession of anything. Finding love, you will never [want] anything [else] . . . "Only be Thou my love forever!" That is what love wants. "My love, one kiss of those lips! [For him] who has been kissed by Thee, all sorrows vanish. Once kissed by Thee, man becomes happy and forgets love of everything else. He praises Thee alone and he sees Thee alone." In the nature of human love even, [there lurk divine elements. In] the first moment of intense love the whole world seems in tune with your own heart. Every bird in the universe sings your love; the flowers bloom for you. It is infinite, eternal love itself that [human] love comes from.

Why should the lover of God fear anything —fear robbers, fear distress, fear even for his life? . . . The lover [may] go to the utmost hell, but would it be hell? We all have to give up these ideas of heaven [and hell] and get greater [love]. . . .Hundreds there are seeking this madness of love before which everything [but God vanishes].

At last, love, lover, and beloved become one. That is the goal. . . . Why is there any separation between soul and man, between soul and God? . . . Just to have this enjoyment of love. He wanted to love Himself, so He split Himself into many. . . . "This is the whole reason for creation," says the lover. "We are all one. 'I and my Father are one'. Just now I am separate in order to love God. . . . .Which is better—to become sugar or to eat sugar? To become sugar, what fun is that? To eat sugar —that is infinite enjoyment of love."

All the ideals of love—[God] as [our] father, mother, friend, child—[are conceived in order to strengthen devotion in us, and make us feel nearer and dearer to God (*Complete Works*, VI, 364)]. The intensest love is that between the sexes. God must be loved with that sort of love. The woman loves her father; she loves her mother, she loves her child; she loves her friend. But she cannot express herself all to the father, nor to the mother, nor to the child, nor to the friend. There is only one person from whom she does not hide anything. So with the man. . . . The [husband]-wife relationship is the all-round relationship. The relationship of the sexes [has] all the other loves concentrated into one. In the husband, the woman has the father, the friend, the child. In the wife, the husband has the mother, daughter, and something else. That tremendous complete love of the sexes must come [for God]—that same love with which a woman opens herself to a man without any bond of blood—perfectly, fearlessly, and shamelessly. No darkness! She would no more hide anything from her lover than she would from her own self. That very love must come [for God]. These things are hard and difficult to understand. You will begin to understand by and by, and all idea of sex will fall away. "Like the water drop on the sand of the river bank on a summer day, even so is this life and all its relations."

All these ideas [like] "He is the creator," are ideas fit for children. He is my love, my life itself—that must be the cry of my heart!

"I have one hope. They call Thee the Lord of the world, and—good or evil, great or small—I am part of the world, and Thou art also my love. My body, my mind, and my soul are all at the altar. Love, refuse these gifts not!"

INTENTION'S PENETRATIVE POWER

By the Editor

"There is only one thing which we see as many." "God is neither outside nature nor inside nature, but God and nature and soul and universe are all convertible terms. You never see two things; it is your metaphysical worlds that have deluded you."

"Whomsoever you hurt, you hurt yourself; they are all you. Whether you know it or not, through all hands you work, through all feet you move, you are the king enjoying in the palace, you are the beggar leading that miserable existence in the street; you are in the ignorant as well as in the learned; you are in the man who is weak and you are in the strong; know this and be sympathetic."

*Swami Vivekananda**

I

It is interesting to stand back, as it were, and watch the drama of what we call 'attention'. In a way it is difficult, as the object of our observation seems to slip out before we can take a good 'look' at it. It is formless and we get only various 'forms' where we expect to find it. These forms consist of our thoughts or concepts. They may also be described as a continuous registration of sensations and emotions, pleasant or unpleasant. What we can sum up after a study of a few minntes is that we witnessed a flux, a succession of internal 'waves' sometimes coinciding with external events. How can we express its implications to ourselves? In two ways to begin with: We can look upon attention as a point of awareness *running* along, or being directed to, a number of objects, gross or subtle; or we may look upon it as a highly sensitive point remaining *steady* while, by a strange process involving the use of special instruments, phenomena are unrolled before it. Often we say we want to *draw* the attention of others to important facts, and our hearers act in accordance with that concept of 'motion'. At other times we say, "I suddenly remembered a song I learned as a boy; it *thrust itself* upon my attention.' In the latter case we speak as if attention was steady, and ideas or memories flitted before it. Whether we imagine it to be steady or moving—two simple, ordinary categories—we can learn useful lessons by taking further 'looks' at it from different angles. The very oscillation of thought between two (similar or opposing) concepts implies a distinction between a 'field' and its 'observer'. Even this recognition means a heaving or swinging between concepts!

Though attention by itself is beyond direct observation, its sensitive character is indisputable. When we see this quality, we also notice the presence of a 'field' and the possibility of various motions within that field. Such is the main design of our internal structure. It does not become the cause of pain any more than the external arrangement that makes our leg bend at the knee joint or places the eye-ball within a bony framework. Pain comes only when we employ our limbs, external or internal, for some purpose for which they were not originally meant, and which, therefore, puts undue strain on them or actually damages them. Wisdom comes by a twofold process: by an intellectual understanding of the benefits we can derive from proper use of our limbs, and by learning to carry out in actual practice all the adjustments needed to make those benefits flow into daily life.

II

There are some who hastily read a few printed books and form incorrect opinions about the scope of mental discipline. They argue as follows: The methods advocated in

**Complete Works*, III, 'The Vedānta'.

these books want us to stop all mental 'waves', all movements, even tremors. The aim seems to be to create a thoroughly homogeneous condition, eliminate the 'field' altogether, and imagine that the observing principle is thereby 'isolated', kept 'unrelated', and made 'pure' and 'free'. It is hoped that the very possibility of pain (or joy) which exists only in the field, can thus be ended once for all. Surely this is an attempt to upset the internal arrangement that nature has given us. What else is this but sheer pessimism and a misguided retreat from life? It shows utter irreverence to the All-wise Creator of the human personality!

We have put the position of the critics as briefly and clearly as possible. It is not necessary for our present purpose to go into a detailed examination of what is meant by the control of 'modifications' of the mind-stuff mentioned by Patañjali. A few facts, however, stand beyond dispute. Every system current in India lays down that its technical portions,—concerning theory and practice—must be learned from a competent teacher. The student was, and is in a way even now, expected to 'stay' with the teacher and duly 'serve' him. Insistence on service is not a condition imposed by the teacher for his personal convenience. It is meant to create favourable opportunities for the student to increase his alertness and receptivity. We are living immersed, as it were, in an ocean of higher meanings and values. Our inability to perceive them and adequately respond to them is because our attention is centred on unworthy objects of the sensual world. These objects and, indeed, the entire department of the ego dealing with them, can be tuned out by the heightened feeling of sacredness associated with the service of the teacher. The first positive gain is the development of the faculty to pass easily from the teacher's looks, words, and movements to the principles that guide his thoughts and judgements.

By making his own attention run along these principles and their appropriate expressions in his teacher in different contexts, the student gradually implants in himself an ever-ready standard of reference for understanding the real significance of the philosophical terms employed in formal teaching and of the mental exercises prescribed to him in a graded series.

We can look at it in this way: The teacher is a perfect person. He eats and sleeps, talks and discusses, chants and meditates. He is sweet and compassionate. If there is a need, he does not hesitate to correct or admonish. But whatever he does, his whole personality swings into action at a moment's notice. Ease and poise mark his concentration as well as his detachment. We ask him to tell us his theory. He says that the Self is only the observer and that all movements are in the 'field'. What is the goal of disciplines? He answers that they lead to the unique experience showing that the Self was not 'related' to nature. It did not 'evolve' as a result of the changes occurring in her. Just the opposite was true; she evolved because of the perfection of the Self. Thus the question of any *action* to *detach* the Self or to *be free* does not arise. We question him again: "When we see you eating, talking, meditating and sleeping by turns, is not your consciousness modified? Does it not 'move' from one object or activity to another? And you have been speaking of the control of modifications!" His answer is a smile, or an attempt to translate his indescribable inward illumination into bare words such as: 'Consciousness does not go from object to object. It does not really move. Therein is its uniqueness. Experiences are shown to it. It is ever pure and infinite. Realize this within yourself'.[1]

What remains is the need on our part to learn the art of rotating our concept-coils in our 'own field' in such a manner that the spark of illumination may appear and harmonize our values and emotions once for all.

We do not ordinarily run out to *stop* the

[1] citi-śaktir-apariṇāminī, apratisaṁkramā, darśita-viṣayā, śuddhā ca anantā. Vyāsa on *Yoga Sūtra* 1.2.

moving branch of a tree on a windy day. For we are convinced that we are *not* the branch. Likewise the teacher too is convinced that the little area of nature which *we* mark out as *his* trained personality is in reality *not* he. It has been stamped by the perfection of the Self, and we may use it as we like. If we wish to learn from it, it will make a spontaneous movement to teach us the truth. If we strike it down 'on a bed of arrows' and again go to it for instruction, it will discourse to us, as Bhīṣma did. Or if we nail it to the cross, it will forgive us and bless us from that cross and even from beyond, like the Son of Man. Consciousness is immutable, and the teacher has seen that he is That.

Without a living teacher as a standard of reference, we are likely to miss the true implications of the technical terms of the different systems, and move our internal limbs in most unprofitable if not harmful ways.

III

When one object occupies the centre of attention, others automatically go out of focus. Nature arranges some form of 'forgetting' when a shift takes place. What we can achieve by conscious effort is to learn to observe more things in quick succession within a given time, or to keep the same thing within the field of observation for a longer time. But whether the contact of attention with the chosen object is brief or sustained one alone stands in full view at a time; others have to wait for their own turn. What nature thus keeps aside, or 'hides' from view, we can, however, bring back before the power of attention by memory. Whereas in reading or listening we gather records and send them 'in', in meditation we acquire the skill of remembering the selected idea before it can fade away, or nature make it disappear.

Forgetting can cause serious troubles. A military man who forgets the orders issued to him ruins himself and often his country too. But the principle of forgetting, in its higher reaches, confers remarkable benefits. When a mental process, like the one connected with the study of mathematics or music, is sufficiently repeated with quiet determination, we form a 'habit' in due course. In other words, we acquire a habitual clarity in those departments of knowledge. The forces that delayed mastery are then shut out once for all. The detailed records of the daily anxieties, struggles, and little gains, which marked the period of preparation, of our *sādhanā,* are, as it were, bundled and stowed away in nature's 'hold' as luggage not needed for daily use in life's cabin. The mental 'waves' related to them may be said to have 'fulfilled their duty.' They have become *caritādhikāra* in yogic terminology. Controlled waves have achieved the task intended for them; they have removed the coverings to knowledge. They can never rise up again with *that purpose;* and we are *released* from the compulsion to *depend* upon them. The 'knower' is to this extent *isolated* and *established* in his own immutable glory. What has disappeared is not nature as such, but that aspect of hers which we previously could experience only as *kleśa,* resistance, or as *avidyā,* relative ignorance. Nature hereafter does not *add* anything further to that knowledge, but faithfully *manifests* it wherever other forces require her to do so. We know our own name and place of birth; we repeat them not to add to our knowledge, but only because some one else wants to know them. Nature, in such a condition, becomes a second violin player,—playing the song of knowledge suited to different contexts. If we insist on counting she certainly forms a *second* 'unit', but in respect of the notes played there is only harmony and probably an increase in gross volume, not the gap and divergence which duality involves.

It is when nature drops the 'hiding' curtain that we experience deep sleep. While in the waking state, objects of the external and internal worlds could get into the focus of attention, although only in strict succession, one after another, that order and the very possibility of the entrance of any one seem to be suspended altogether during deep

sleep. But the power of attention must have remained intact even then; for on waking, everyone invariably feels that he slept well and that nothing disturbed him. If attention and its field were really inseparable, deep sleep would have been an impossibility, and the disappearance of the familiar duality of subject and object should have caused trouble like the absence of an important limb. Experience, however, shows just the opposite. While hiding the world of duality, nature evidently kept herself busy doing us some positive good; for on waking we always feel fully refreshed in body and mind.

In dream the essential facts of the sensual world continue to be hidden, as in deep sleep. What is new is an extra mind-made drama, carrying with it the sense of reality and certainty ordinarily associated with the conscious movement of physical limbs. It seems to be a matter of indifference to attention if the objects presented to it are drawn solely from what the waking ego calls an exclusively mental field, or even if they too are dropped and none sent to replace them. During the arrival season, anyone from anywhere is free to enter, but only one at a time, the rest being ever forced to go behind the screen. Since, thus, there is a constant disappearance of all except the single object presented to view, nothing unusual happens, from the standpoint of attention, if even that bare one is eliminated, and further interviews end. Such is attention, apparently 'related' to anything that may come to bask in its steady rays, but perfectly detached, immutable, and peaceful even if,—as waking concepts go—duality vanishes, leaving it 'alone' and 'isolated'! And this attention is the most valuable characteristic of our personal existence. It is the witness of our sense of smallness and of our struggles. It is bound to shed on us its assuring light when we reach our Goal, or Grace descends.

IV

Air, as we know it, acts as a carrier. It brings to us a certain degree of heat or varying amounts of water vapour. It can convey to us smells and sounds too from a great distance if there is a favourable wind. Out of the two views regarding attention, if we accept the 'moving' concept, and grant that it is a force that can be 'directed', we have to concede also that it can carry our meanings and intentions with it. If, on the other hand, we attribute 'steadiness' to it, we have to imagine that meanings or intentions can be 'presented' to it till, by the strength of repetition, a habit is formed, and they are shunted out of focus, as already stated. As habits, again, they continue to influence the mental field, altering its movements into the 'expressive' instead of the 'adding' pattern,—as the mastery of mathematics, music or any other subject shows.

Religions teach us that if we habitually 'seek' righteousness, other things will be added unto us. This means that if our intentions are pure and unwavering, nature (or God's grace) so arranges matters that we shall get not only bare food and drink to support our life but also a proper teacher and other aids for our spiritual pursuit as occasions arise. Aspiration matures into the realization of the Divine Hand behind the movements of heavenly bodies and even in the fall of a sparrow on earth. With this all 'resistances' cease, and the personality becomes a fit vehicle for the transmission of perfection. Whatever thoughts arise in the mind afterwards can only be for 'the good of the many, for the happiness of the many'. There is nothing to prevent them from penetrating into the plane of matter if someone with faith requires it for his further progress. A centurion's faith may thus very well create a condition for a mere word from Jesus, standing in one place, to cure a servant lying far away and out of sight.

It was this same penetrative power of habitual holiness and faith built on direct vision that Sri Ramakrishna meant when he said that bees come of their own accord as soon as the flower opens. In his own case, when his yearning reached its peak during

his days of *sādhanā,* adepts in different disciplines came to him without his going in search of them, and without even his cherishing a desire to get help from anyone. It is recorded in his 'Life' that once he wished to put up a fence round the Panchavati since "the plants planted by him were cropped by cattle". Shortly afterwards, says the biographer, "there was a high tide in the Gangā and all the articles necessary to make that fence,—some mangrove posts, coir-rope, with even a chopper came floating and ran aground just near the spot, and he put up the fencing with the help of the gardener of the Kāli temple." This is probably an extreme case, but it shows how the principle acts. In the case of his disciples, however, he actually 'yearned' and 'called them' till they came and he recognized and received them.[2]

Our thoughts are mere feeble ticklings of the mental field. They are not well directed or sustained. So they lack penetrating power. But when they do penetrate, they are often ill conceived and harmful, without our being aware of it. The hiding introduced by nature into our internal set-up is needed for the forward movement of thought. But when we resort to hiding, we deliberately intend to put others on a wrong track. The entire world of movement is a single unit at its bottom. A hiding pull started in any area must have its continuation in other areas related to it. Just imagine the consequences of not only our enemies but also our friends and children too imitating us, and, for what appears to them an immediate personal advantage, pulling down nature's hiding curtain at the ends within their easy reach! Sooner or later there is bound to be a total hiding of the truth, causing severe suffering till the very shocks each receives makes him pray for light and try to get the curtain lifted up! We know that the terror of a nightmare marks the limit of straying from the waking reality. On the breaking of the dream we find ourselves back in the 'assuring' condition that was all along there, hidden in the midst of unchecked imagination. This principle of falling back on a more stable position holds good also when excessive pain compels us to drop the hiding formula, and makes us, at least for a time, push up our virtues which we ignored till then. Cultivated virtues act as the solid ground on which we can safely stand when the evil wave passes off.

[2] *Sri Ramakrishna the Great Master* (Madras, 1952 edition), p. 375.

V

Students of the *Mahābhārata* will remember how the virtuous king, Yudhiṣṭhira, had to suffer the consequences of the little hiding, *alpam jihmam,* he practised on his teacher, Droṇa, in the battlefield. Finding it impossible to overthrow this redoubtable commander of the Kaurava forces, it was decided that his self-control should be shaken by telling him that his son had been slain. Since Yudhiṣṭhira was the only person whose words in such a context would carry conviction to Droṇa, the king had to tell him this falsehood,—which, of course, as expected, made Droṇa lay down his arms and meet his doom. Because of this intentional straying from the truth, Yudhiṣṭhira experienced 'hell' from which arose cries for help from his brothers, wife, and friends who had led noble lives on earth. When thus his sin was expiated, the lord of the celestials greeted him and explained to him how this was the result of his having cheated his teacher who wanted to know what had really happened to his son.[3]

Even popular dramas like *Śākuntalam* convey the same lessons although without a direct statement of the connecting links. Readers of *Śākuntalam* will easily see the chain of hidings it portrays.

King Duṣyanta started the game by hiding

[3] Vyājena hi tvayā Droṇa upacīrṇas-sutam prati;
Vyājena iva tato Rājan! darśitaṁ narakam tava.
Yena tvaṁ tathā Bhīmas-tathā Pārtho yamau tathā,
Tathaiva Draupadī Kṛṣṇā vyājena narakam gatāḥ.
Svargārohaṇa Parvan, iii.

the truth from Mādhavya, the jester, by telling him: "I have no particular fancy for the hermit's daughter. I am going to the hermitage solely out of respect for the ascetics. Please do not take seriously what I have told in jest." Behind this outer expression was the cold calculation: "This Brahmin youth is a chatterbox. He will probably betray my loving approach to Śakuntalā and spread confusion among the ladies of the seraglio. Therefore I will speak to him thus."[4]

In their own little ways Śakuntalā and her friends too hid the truth. The king joined them. When they first stared at him in surprise after seeing his name on the ring he held out playfully as 'fee' on Śakuntalā's account, he tried to throw them off the scent by the remark: "Don't suspect me; it is a royal gift." No wonder, in due course, this very ring went into hiding to set the chain of sorrows moving! Later, when Gautamī, the elderly lady, approached the bower where the lovers were staying, the truth was hidden from her by the friends who shouted a warning: "O bride of the *cakravāka* bird! Night is come, bid farewell to your companion!" Śakuntalā too, taking the hint, made the king hide himself behind the branches of neighbouring trees.[5] Durvāsa's curse was only a cosmic stress in advance, indicating the coming of total darkness, in which it would be difficult for anyone to find out the truth. A few gentle pulls more completed the fall of the hiding curtain. Out of various considerations, the girl companions hid the story of Durvāsa's curse from sage Kaṇva as well as Śakuntalā, and from Gautamī who joined the escorting party. No doubt they cautioned Śakuntalā a little by saying: "If perchance the royal sage be slow to recognize you, then show him this ring marked with his own name." Śakuntalā shuddered at their misgivings. But instead of explaining everythiug and thereby making everyone keep the ring safe at all times, they explained away their caution with the words: "Excessive affection is apt to suspect evil"![6] All these little hidings culminated, as every student knows, in the loss of the ring and all repudiation of Śakuntalā by the king whose mind remained in a cloud of forgetfulness till the ring was put into his hands by the police officer. By that time she had left!

Such is Intention's 'creative' role.

[4] Capalo'yam vaṭuḥ. Kadācit-asmad-prārthanām antaḥ-purebhyaḥ kathayet. Bhavatu, enam-evam vakṣye: 'Vayasya! ṛṣi-gauravād-āśramaṁ gacchāmi. Na khalu satyameva tāpasa-kanyakāyām mamābhilāṣaḥ.'

[5] 'Alam asmān-anyathā sambhāvya. Rājñaḥ pratigraho'yam.' . . . 'Cakravāka-vadhūke! Āmantrayasva sahacaram; upasthitā rajanī.' 'Tāvat viṭapāntarito bhava!'

[6] 'Yadi nāma sa rājarṣiḥ pratyabhijñana-mantharo bhavet, tadā tasmai idam ātma-nāmadheyāṅkitam-angulīyakam darśaya' . . . 'Anena sandehena vām ākampitāsmi' . . . 'Mā bibhīhi; atisnehaḥ pāpaśaṅkī,'

THE MYSTIC IN ṚGVEDA

By Dr. P. S. Sastri

The hymn 10.71 is epigrammatical and deals with the problem of knowledge and the concept of Creation. The entire empirical universe is distinguished by form and name. "Speech or Logos gave the names to the objects or phenomena; and the excellent and the spotless was disclosed through affection." This is the secret or mystery of the universe which is to be realized only through Love (preṇā). Only mystic concentration, otherwise

known as Love, discloses Reality. "Like men sifting the flour in a winnowing basket, the wise have fashioned prayer, with spirit. Only the companions in worship (Sakhāyaḥ) apprehend the communion or friendship (Sakhyāni)" (10.71.4). The nature of prayer is spiritual. Besides, it must embody pure and lofty thoughts. It is effective when it is recognized as having both the individual and social values. "The nature of prayer is apprehended after a struggle. It reposes in the seers, whence it is manifested everywhere." Then the seer proceeds to give out the mysterious potency of prayer and of knowledge. "Though he sees, he does not see Vāk; though he can hear, he never hears her. Only to one does she unravel, unmask, her beauty like a well-dressed loving wife" (10.71.5). This paradox brings forth the distinction between an ignoramus and a wise one. In the language of Dīrghatamas, it is the difference between two types of knowledge; as the Upaniṣads have happily conceived it, it is the distinction between 'parā vidyā' and 'aparā vidyā'. The person who has no inkling of the higher knowledge, the joyful spiritual wisdom, can be said to have neither eyes nor ears. Such a one will not find the universe to be a spiritual whole. The other directly apprehends the immanent Reality. The person who has only the empirical knowledge is a laggard, stupid in friendship, and unfit for any heroism. He roams in a valueless illusion, the sacred Truth yields to him neither fruit, nor flower. He is friendless and never knows the path of righteous action. Consequently it follows that though all human beings are endowed with the same eyes and ears, yet their mental comprehension is not the same. Therefore there are two sets of human beings. One group is like a tank where a happy bath is impossible. The other is like a beautiful pool fit to bathe in. The latter alone can sacrifice; they have the impulse and spirit which fashions out the prayer. The former approach prayer in a sinful way and spin out their threads in ignorance like spinsters. This is the highest tribute that can ever be paid to prayer and to knowledge.

The next hymn, 10.72, is primarily concerned with the act of Creation. The seer declares the mystery of Creation confidently, so that the people of a future age can comprehend the same and verify it spiritually (10.72.1). This verification can be possible only if Creation is, as Pringle-pattison would have it, an eternal act of the will. The relation of God to Creation primarily suggests the idea of causation. The seer observes that, "as a smith blows up the fire and melts the material, so did Bṛhaspati bring forth the existent universe from non-existence" (10.72.2). The analogy must not be carried too far. Bṛhaspati is the Lord of prayer, or the deity conceived as prayer. The deity created the universe, not from the existent matter, but from His will and by an act of His will. Since nothing or non-existence (*Asat*) cannot bring forth something, it is to be supposed that the theory outlined here has certain assumptions: first, matter has no independent existence apart from Mind, secondly, Creation is an act of God's will. The seer proceeds to say that Space or Extension was the first thing to appear. This implies Time; for, without the manifestation of Time, activity cannot take place. The empirical universe in the space-time form sprang from the Transcendent.

The hymn 10.81 also is preoccupied with the creation of the world and its relation to the deity. God is pictured here as the generator and architect of the world. The world came to exist as an orderly cosmos like a work of Art. The order at the core of the universe compels the seer to speculate a perfect First Cause. There is a touch of anthropomorphism in such a description. God is said to be all-eyed, all-faced, all-armed, and all-legged. He is the only Reality, who generated the Heaven and the Earth. The seer longs to know the material out of which the universe has been fashioned: "What is that tree and that wood in which that tree arose, from which were carved out skilfully both Heaven and Earth?" (10.81.4). We find

an answer in *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa,* where the tree and the wood are named Brahman or the Absolute. The universe is the work of a Sculptor, an Artist. James Ward in his second Gifford Lectures—'Realm of Ends'—arrives at this conclusion after an interesting discussion on the concept of creation. The material of the Artist is always in his Mind, and even before he composes the work of Art it remains in a latent state in his mind. It has no independent objective existence. It is latent in imagination, inspiration, or will, or urge to create a work of Art. In such wise can the act of creation be explained.

Next the seer desires to know the station or position of Reality. 'Where is Reality? Is it in the universe or outside it? Is it immanent or transcendent? What is its locus? What is its nature?' No positive answer is given to these formidable questions. But the seer exhorts the thoughtful to find answers for these questions in their souls. It is the religious consciousness that has the final say in such problems. The hymn concludes with a beautiful prayer to Reality, requesting God Himself to teach mortals how to worship, for worship holds the key to the mystery.

The next hymn, 10.82, is a continuation of the same theme. Reality is addressed as Father. The holy Father, wise in spirit, has created both the worlds. He is the Father of the eye, for he is the giver of Light. He is mighty both in Mind and Power. He is Dhātā, Vidhātā, and Paramā samdṛk (10.82.2). The souls of the blessed realize everything beyond the visible phenomena. All the wise are in this Reality. He knows all the existing phenomena, and all the gods too are his own manifestations. All the beings search him for knowledge. This universe has its centre of gravity in the navel of the Unborn, in the One wherein abide all things. It is impossible to comprehend such a Reality with the finite intellect: "It is impossible to find Him out, who has created everything. There is between Him and ourselves a great gulf made up of a different thing. We wander in the world being enveloped by mist (Nīhāra); and with prattling voices we move about flattering, for we are fond of our lives" (10.82.7). Reality cannot be comprehended because the human beings attach too much significance to their bodies to the detriment of the spiritual values. Besides, they follow false values of life. All this is the result of *Nīhāra* that envelops us. This is the same as *Māyā* or *Avidyā* in its *Āvaraṇa-Śakti.* It disables us from knowing the Real. For the first time in the Vedic thought, we come across the enunciation of Māyā as a profound solution for certain ultimate philosophic doubts. The hymn 10.121 deals with the supremacy of the one Real, and the dependence of all finite things on it. Here God is conceived as Hiraṇyagarbha, the golden germ. That is, Reality is the valuable inner principle, activity, and source of the universe. Reality is One and Eternal. Hiraṇyagarbha is not only immanent as the name itself suggests, but also transcendent for He alone is the Lord of all created things. He existed even before the universe sprang into existence. He alone is the giver of souls to the beings, and all worship Him. Immortality and mortality are His shadows. He is the sole monarch of the universe that breathes and winks, because He is inherently or potentially great. Not only did He create everything, but it is even said that space can be pictured as the hands of God; that is, space too is dependent on Him. He is the God of the gods, and is the only Reality.

The hymn 10.114 is important for its symbolic representation of Reality as the "Sun". The Sun, says the seer, is in a high position surveying the worlds. He is the bird that is ever active. Though Reality is one people call Him in many ways: 'Suparṇam viprāḥ kavayo vacobhir-ekam santam bahudhā kalpayanti". He is the only One-Existent (10.114.5).

FOUNDATIONS OF BRADLEY'S PHILOSOPHY

By Sri S. Subhash Chandra

The philosophy of F. H. Bradley has always been appraised as one of the most original and most profound contributions to contemporary philosophy. "England's most renowned thinker of recent times," observes H. Hoffding, "is undoubtedly Francis Herbert Bradley." Bernard Bosanquet, himself a great thinker, considers Bradley "an effective pioneer of that English philosophy which we hope for, a philosophy distinct and national, not through ignorance of foreign thought but by characteristic appropriation of the world's intellectual inheritance."[1] Lord Haldane does not exaggerate when he declares: "He (Bradley) has done the work of the great metaphysicians over again in a fashion which is unparalleled in recent times for its thoroughness and acuteness, and he stands at the very head of the philosophical world."[2] Edward Caird has pronounced, with ample justification, Bradley's *Appearance and Reality* as "the greatest thing since Kant", while Hastings Rashdall, the illustrious author of *The Theory of Good and Evil,* as early as 1911, in a paper read before the British Academy, goes so far as to say that there has been nothing greater than the *Appearance and Reality*. Prof. J. H. Muirhead all his life was an ardent admirer of Bradley and considered him as "the foremost figure in British philosophy . . . for the last generation."[3] To Prof. Muirhead the *Appearance and Reality* was the greatest work since Hume's *Treatise*. "Like Hume's work it roused men of all schools from their dogmatic slumber."[4] Prof. W. R. Sorley speaks of the *Appearance and Reality* as follows: "This remarkable book has probably exerted more influence upon metaphysical thinking in English-speaking countries than any other treatise of the last thirty years."[5] William James, Bradley's most stubborn adversary, though critical of the *Appearance and Reality,* characterized Bradley's *Logic* as "epoch-making". He writes: "I have just read, with infinite zest and stimulation, Bradley's *Logic*. . . . It is surely epoch-making in English philosophy. Both Empiricists and Rationalists must settle their accounts with it. It breaks up all the traditional lines."[6] Rudolph Metz esteems Bradley as "one of the few great builders of system, and one of the boldest and most original and speculative thinkers that Britain has ever produced."[7] R. G. Collingwood in his *Autobiography* acclaims Bradley as the most critical mind since David Hume.

In 1883 came the first of Bradley's academic honours, the LL.D. of Glasgow University. In 1921 he was made a member of the Royal Danish Academy; in 1922, of the Accademia dei lincei; in 1923, of the Reale Instituto lombardo at Milan. At the initiative of his friend Bosanquet, Bradley was elected an Honorary Fellow of the British Academy. Shortly before his demise in 1924, Bradley was awarded the Order of Merit, which he was the first philosopher to receive. His contemporary philosophers honoured him by dedicating the second volume of *Contemporary British Philosophy*—"To F. H. Bradley, O.M., to whom British philosophy owed the impulse that gave it new life in our time."

Bradley begins his enquiry by challenging the validity of the very basic tenets of all the

[1] B. Bosanquet, *"Knowledge and Reality,"* pp. VI ff.

[2] *Pathway to Reality,* Vol. II, p. 74.

[3] *Contemporary British Philosophy,* p. 9.

[4] J. H. Muirhead, *The Platonic Tradition in Anglo-Saxon Philosophy,* p. 274.

[5] *A History of English Philosophy,* by W. R. Sorley, p. 291.

[6] Letters of William James, Vol. I p. 258.

[7] *A Hundred Years of British Philosophy,* by R. Metz, p. 322.

preceding philosophies. He subjects, one by one, the concepts of the primary and secondary qualities, of the substantive and adjective, of the relation and quality, of space and time, of motion and change, of the meaning and reality of self, and of the things and things-in-themselves to a devastating criticism and exposes the contradictions inherent in them. It is neither possible nor necessary for us to provide an account of Bradley's criticism of all these fundamental metaphysical concepts. We shall, however, consider briefly his criticisms of some of them.

The concepts of primary and secondary qualities play a pivotal role in the history of British Empiricism. They repose at the very root of the philosophy of Locke. Bradley by laying bare their self-discrepant character deals a fatal blow to British Empiricism. Primary qualities are those aspects of things which we feel or perceive. In other words, the qualities of number, extension, figure, and motion comprise the primary qualities. Secondary qualities, on the other hand, are those of colour, taste, smell, and sound. Primary qualities, maintained Locke, belong actually to things, whereas secondary qualities are derivative and transient and do not exist independent of their relation to our organs of sense. Primary qualities, in short, are real, but the secondary qualities are mere appearance. Bradley questions the reality of the primary qualities on four grounds. Firstly, how the primary qualities stand to the relations which have to subsist between them. We shall see hereafter how Bradley uncovers the self-discrepant nature of all relations, and thereby uproots the concept of primary qualities. Secondly, the appearances (secondary qualities) have to fall somewhere. If they belong to reality, they are bound to infect reality with their own unreal character. But if they do not belong to reality, they are not related to it, and are therefore not derivative and unreal. Thirdly, the so-called primary qualities depend as much on our sense-organs as the secondary qualities, and are therefore equally unreal. "The extended comes to us only by relation to an organ; and, whether the organ is touch or is sight or muscle-feeling—or whatever else it may be—makes no difference to the argument."[8] Lastly, "without secondary quality extension is not conceivable, and no one can bring it, as existing, before his mind if he keeps it quite pure." The distinction between primary and secondary qualities, concludes Bradley, is gratuitous.

Bradley does not consider the time-honoured distinction between things and their qualities, or between the substantive and adjective as tenable. A thing is not a mere aggregate of qualities. But if we endeavour to find out what a thing is beside its qualities, we are hopelessly perplexed. Sugar, for instance, is not mere whiteness, mere sweetness, and mere hardness. But, then, what else is sugar beside these qualities? If it is maintained that sugar is a unity of these three qualities not taken severally but in relation, then we are immediately confronted with a grave difficulty. For, what are qualities apart from relations? Rightly has Prof. Hiralal Haldar observed: "Take away from qualities the relations in which they stand to each other and there is nothing."[9] We also cannot resolve qualities into mere relations, because relations must relate something, otherwise they make no sense. If we pursue this enquiry further the inherent discrepancies become luculent. We have seen that we need a relation, say C, to relate qualities A and B, for qualities without being related are abstract and meaningless terms. But this relation C, in turn, needs to be related to qualities A and B, because it must be something to A and B, and must somehow affect them. If C is nothing to A and B, then they are not related at all; and, if not related, then they cease to be qualities. So we require a relation D to relate C to A and B. But relation D will require another relation E to relate it to A, B, and C, and so on *ad infinitum*. One cannot escape from this unpalatable conclusion by treating the relation as the adjective of *one*

[8] *Appearance and Reality*, pp. 12-13.
[9] *Neo-Hegelianism*, by Hiralal Haldar, p. 218.

term, because then it cannot relate two or more terms, since it has no connection whatsoever with the other terms. For the same reason the relation cannot be envisaged as the adjective of each term taken apart, because then again there is no relation between them. It is also not possible to treat the relations as the common property of the terms related, for then what holds them apart? To sum up with Bradley: "A relational way of thought... must give appearance, and not truth. It is a makeshift, a device, a mere practical compromise, most necessary, but in the end most indefensible."[10]

Space and time are also mere appearance and not reality. Space is not solely a relation. Because any space must evidently consist of extended parts. In other words, space must be a collection of spaces. And these spaces are solid parts and not relations. This constrains us to conclude that space is nothing but a relation of spaces. Needless to add that such a proposition is self-discrepant. Despite this inconsistency, when considered from another side, space is nothing but a relation. For, as we have seen, it must comprise of extended parts, and these parts must, in turn, consist of parts, and these again of further parts, and so on *ad infinitum*. Now, these parts need to be conjoined and related if they are to extend, for "anything extended is a collection; a relation of extendeds, which again are relations of extendeds, and so on indefinitely." Therefore, space is primarily a relation which disappears into an unending concatenation of relations. But if space is taken as a unit, we fare no better. For space as a unit only defines its finitude, and points to something outside itself; and, what else but a more extended space can reside outside space? But this more extended space, in turn, will need a still more extended space to inhabit what lies beyond the area it circumscribes, and so on *ad infinitum*. In the light of these cogent considerations Bradley conclndes: "Space has neither any solid parts, nor, when taken as one, is it more than the relation of itself to a new self. As it stands it is *not* space; and, in trying to find space beyond it, we can find only that which passes away into a relation. Space is a relation between terms, which can never be found."[11]

Bradley applies similar arguments to time and reveals its self-discordant character. Bradley also successfully shows that the concepts of motion and change, and of causation and activity are also incoherent and disharmonious, and are, therefore, appearance and not reality. But Bradley does not rest content with these iconoclastic attacks on the citadels of all preceding philosophies. With the ruthlessness of a heretic, he subjects our most fondly cherished belief in the reality of self to a severe and relentless criticism, and renders the inconsistencies dwelling in it all too palpable.

We see then that, according to Bradley, the manifold diversity of the world is appearance and not reality. All phenomena are infected with relativity, and all facets of existence are riddled with inexplicable contradictions. Self-consistency, opines Bradley, is the hall-mark of reality. Truth cannot be discordant. As Bradley has succinctly put it: "Ultimate reality is such that it does not contradict itself; here is an absolute criterion."[12] It may be objected that such a criterion can, at best, serve as a negative standard. Bradley promptly disarms the protest by declaring: "Our standard denies inconsistency, and therefore asserts consistency."

We have seen Bradley annihilating, one by one, what formerly were exalted as the corner-stones of all metaphysical enquiry. No other thinker, except Kant, has so rudely shaken the philosophical trends of his day as Bradley has done. Rightly has Dr. Lofthouse, in his valuable book on Bradley, noted: "Kant had been called the 'Alles-Zermalmende', crushing to bits everything that be-

[10] *Ibid*, p. 28.

[11] *Ibid*, p. 32.

[12] *Ibid*, p. 120.

fore him had seemed solid; Bradley's criticism, to many of his contemporaries, seemed equally devastating."[13] But Bradley was not a fanatic iconoclast; he was a constructive thinker as well. When Prof. A. W. Benn cynically suggests that the title of the *Appearance and Reality* be altered to "The Disappearance of Reality" he is unquestionably unjust to Bradley. For, to Bradley the world is an appearance, but not an illusion. Beyond appearance we have Reality. Bradley is never weary of reiterating: "Whatever is rejected as appearance is, for that very reason, no mere nonentity. It cannot bodily be shelved and merely got rid of, and, therefore, since it must fall somewhere, it must belong to reality. To take it as existing somehow and somewhere in the unreal, would surely be meaningless."[14]

What, then, is this Reality? Reality cannot be plural, because plurality connotes relations, and all relations, in themselves contradictory, point to a higher unity which transcends them. Bradley calls this supreme Reality the Absolute. C. D. Broad once wrote: "Hegel was the prophet of the Absolute, Bradley its chivalrous knight; and McTaggart the devoted and extremely able family solicitor."[15] Let us see what this chivalrous knight has to say about the Absolute. The Absolute, as we have seen, is One. It is a unity; and the content of this unity is Experience. "'I hold that the Universe is such as not to contradict itself," writes Bradley, "and further I hold that, even in a fuller sense, Reality is One, and is throughout nothing but Experience."[16] For, if we deplete the existence of experience we have nothing left. But this Experience, or Absolute, is all-embracing and all-containing. In it all contradictions are transmuted into a higher, or rather the highest, harmony. "There is plainly not anything which can fall outside of the Real. . . . It has a superabundance in which all partial discrepancies are resolved and remain as higher concord."[17] In the Absolute there is no clash or collision. The Absolute is the Harmony which assimilates all disharmonies, unites all inconsistencies, and transforms all discrepancies. In the Absolute a complete transvaluation of all values is attained. We shall see in the sequel the explanation which Bradley offers for evil and error, sorrow and suffering. It will suffice here to note that in the Absolute all these defects and deformities are transmuted.

In the Absolute nothing is lost, and nothing is eliminated. Everything finds its culmination in the Absolute. To adduce Bradley: "In the Absolute no appearance can be lost. Each one contributes and is essential to the unity of the whole. . . . Deprived of any one aspect or element the Absolute may be called worthless."[18] The One is richer than the Many, and the multiplicity is a poor show when compared with the Unity. But the affirmation of the Absolute is not the negation of the relative. The variety is not abrogated in the Harmony; it, as a matter of fact, is indispensable to the Harmony. "What we discover rather is a whole in which distinctions can be made, but in which divisions do not exist."[19] It is necessary to stress here, if Bradley is not to be gravely misunderstood, that the Absolute is not a mere aggregate of the multifold appearance. For a collection of appearances can only provide us a unity, which itself would be an appearance and not a reality. In the Absolute, the appearances are harmonized and transmuted. In the words of Bradley: "The Absolute, we may say in general, has no assets beyond appearances; and again, with appearances alone to its credit, the Absolute would be bankrupt. All of these are worthless alike apart from transmutation."[20]

We have referred to Bradley's view that

[13] *F. H. Bradley,* by W. F. Lofthouse, p. 12.
[14] *Appearance and Reality,* p. 119.
[15] See the Proceedings of the British Academy, 1917-1918.
[16] The *Principles of Logic,* by Bradley, Vol. II. p. 678.
[17] *Appearance and Reality,* p. 213.
[18] *Ibid,* p. 404.
[19] *Ibid,* p. 128.
[20] *Ibid,* p. 433.

the Absolute is Experience. But this Experience is not merely my experience, or your experience. It is a unity of all experience, but a unity of all experience must clearly be an Experience. In the words of Dr. Lofthouse: "If the Absolute is the sum of all experience, it will include the experience of nature in its entirety; of the nature, that is to say, not only of the poet or the artist, but of all finite centres; and of nature, too, not as composed of primary qualities only, but of secondary qualities as well."[21] This total unity of experience cannot, as such, be directly verified. We have an imperfect idea of this unity, yet this idea is sufficient to serve as a positive ground.

Can we ascribe any personality to the Absolute? Since the Absolute includes everything in the world, it of course has a personality. But the Absolute is much more than what it includes. Hence Bradley observes: "If the term personal is to bear anything like its ordinary sense, assuredly the Absolute is not merely personal. It is not personal, because it is personal and more. It is, in a word, super-personal."[22]

One may be curious to know, whether the Absolute is better or worse at one time than at another. In other words, does the Absolute make progress, or suffer a retrogress? Bradley answers in the negative. The world no doubt makes progress and encounters setbacks and relapses. But the same cannot be said of the Absolute. Because, "the Absolute has no history of its own, though it contains histories without number. . . . For nothing perfect, nothing genuinely real, can move. The Absolute has no seasons, but all at once bears its leaves, fruit, and blossoms. Like our globe it always, and it never, has summer and winter."[23]

But can we have a complete knowledge of the Absolute? Bradley holds that we can have a knowledge, certain and genuine, though inadequate and incomplete, of the Absolute. It is not possible for any man to know the Absolute absolutely. "When I speak of absolute truth," declares Bradley, "I do not, of course, mean that any man can know everything. . . Again, I agree that no experience of mine, as I either have it, or could possibly have it, is just the same as the Reality. ... And yet, on the other hand and with all this, I cannot think that my account leaves out any aspect of the universe. From such imperfect experience as I possess, I not only can but I must conclude to an Experience perfect and complete, which, though still Experience, includes and is all that is real."[24]

Now we may turn to that part of Bradley's philosophy, which he regarded as the keystone of his system, namely, the doctrine of the degrees of truth and reality. The foundation of this doctrine rests on the view that there cannot be any rigid and absolute distinction between truths and falsehoods. This doctrine proposes a hierarchy of truths and falsehoods. Of course, this principle is not applicable to the Absolute. The concept of the degrees of truth and reality makes sense only in the realm of appearance. Some truths are more valid and the others are less valid. Some truths have a wide field of application, while the others have a more curtailed field in which they are valid. "Truth is one aspect of experience," maintains Bradley, "and is therefore made imperfect and limited by what it fails to include."[25] The truths which are more consistent, or less discrepant, are higher than the truths which possess lesser consistency and greater discrepancy. This is so, because the Absolute is absolutely consistent and harmonious, and more consistent the truth, the greater is the extent to which it partakes of the essence of the Absolute. More self-sufficient and more inclusive the truth, the nearer is it to the Real, and vice versa. "Hence to be more or less true, and to be more or less real, is to be separated by an interval, smaller or greater, from

[21] *F. H. Bradley*, by W. F. Lofthouse, p. 183.
[22] *Appearance and Reality*, p. 471.
[23] *Ibid*, p. 442.
[24] *The Principles of Logic*, Vol. II, p. 683.
[25] *Ibid*, p. 483.

all-inclusiveness or self-consistency."[26] And nearer the truth is to the Real, lesser is the degree of transmutation it must undergo to become completely true. Besides, higher the truth, greater is its value. For Bradley writes: "The Absolute is there to secure that everywhere the highest counts most and the lowest counts least."[27] Bradley utilizes this doctrine of the degrees of truth and reality in explaining the nature of error as well. He believes that error is nothing but partial truth. It is partial because it is incomplete.

We shall now briefly consider the explanation which Bradley offers for the presence of evil in the world, and how he reconciles it with the perfection of the Absolute. Bradley makes a concerted attack on the problem of evil from three fronts. Firstly, he takes up evil as pain. It is futile to deny the existence of pain, which is all too palpable. But Bradley points out that the presence of pleasure neutralizes the pangs of pain, and in a composite state of pleasure and pain, the resultant effect is, without question, pleasant. Bradley was also convinced that in the world, pleasure is preponderant over pain. Secondly, we have evil as waste, failure, and confusion. It is pointed out that the world seems to be a meaningless play resulting from a mere accident, and that the nature scatters hundred seeds, but only one is fertilized. Bradley feels that this apparent dissipation furthers a wider scheme, which our narrow and one-sided view of the world cannot apprehend. Lastly, Bradley confronts the more formidable difficulty of accounting for moral evil. Here Bradley alludes to the paradoxical nature of morality. "Morality itself, which makes evil, desires in evil to remove a condition of its own being. It labours essentially to pass into a super-moral and therefore a non-moral sphere." Besides, even moral evil can advance a wider arrangement by its presence. Evil factors often turn to be blessings in disguise, because " 'Heaven's design', if we may speak so, can realize itself as effectively in 'Catiline or Borgia' as in the scrupulous or innocent."[28]

This, in brief, is the philosophy of Bradley. Bradley's philosophy, we hope our readers will concur with us, is perhaps the most impressive and sustained endeavour to apprehend the essential nature of Reality in recent times. Bradley himself, like all great thinkers, was a very modest man. He did not claim to found a 'Weltanschauung' of any type. "I will remind the reader once more that I make no pretence to the possession of a perfect system."[29] In the preface to the *Appearance and Reality,* he characterizes this 'Magnum Opus' of his as "a critical discussion of first principles, and its object is to stimulate inquiry and doubt. To originality in any other sense it makes no claim." Quite contrary to Bradley's submission, the *Appearance and Reality,* has become an original contribution of a very high order today.

Prof. Leon Roth, a contemporary thinker, has characterized British philosophy in our day as "a little less than a snort, a little more than a sneeze."[30] We hope it will not be considered an instance of wishful fancying, if we suggest that the deplorable indifference shown to Bradley's philosophy today is one of the potent causes of the decline and fall of British philosophy.

[26] *Ibid,* p. 322.
[27] *Essays on Truth and Reality,* by Bradley, p. 348.
[28] *Appearance and Reality,* p. 178.
[29] *The Principles of Logic,* Vol. II, p. 680.
[30] *Philosophy,* Vol. XXX, p. 303.

'As we cannot know except through effects that we have eyes, so we cannot see the Self except by Its effects. It cannot be brought down to the low plane of sense perception. It is the condition of everything in the universe, though Itself unconditioned.'

—*Swami Vivekananda*

CASTE AND ITS CHALLENGE

AN ANALYSIS

By Sri G. K. Kripalani

Society is a living organism. Like all living organisms it is subject to laws of growth and decay. Similar is the condition of social institutions. When the fundamental premises on which the superstructure of a social institution is constructed change, the institution develops internal stresses and strains. The *raison d'etre* of a social institution is to subserve the needs of man in a particular set of environmental factors. With a change in these factors the needs of man undergo a related change. The social institutions which previously answered in an adequate manner the needs of an earlier situation no longer remain satisfactory in the altered set-up. Often the forces responsible for the environmental change are incompatible with the existing institutional set-up with the result that they impede the movement and the progress of each other.

Like all other human institutions, the institution of caste evolved out of a particular set of conditions obtaining at a specific point of Hindu civilization. A civilization in a state of flux will ever need the social institutions themselves capable of a large degree of flexibility and change. But when a civilization comes to a point of progress at which it tends towards stability, the then existing social institutions also tend to acquire a measure of rigidity which, with passage of time and due to forces of inertia, become resistant to any change. Social institutions in this state of stagnation thus withdraw themselves into a hard shell resisting all change including that minimum amount of adjustmental activity which is indispensable for the health of an organism. In such a state, vested interests develop within the community, interests which are likely to suffer from any change in the institutional pattern. The longer the period of inertia or stagnation the stronger is normally the resistance to change.

Institutions that have been stabilized for any length of time become embedded in routine and are unable to meet fresh challenges. Minor alterations here and there in the institutional set-up will generally fail to meet adequately the demands of the radical changes in environment and basic premises. A patchwork of reforms has a tendency to follow inflexible institutional forms as they often have to work within a more and more obsolete frame of reference. Stability and security pursued for their own sake result in a caste division of labour and in a denial of any changes that would upset an increasingly sessile routine; forms and precedents would supplant human needs and the very attributes of life, its capacity for adjustment, would be forfeited by these ill-conceived efforts to guard the status quo.

An environmental change by its very nature will always in the short run adversely affect certain sections of the community. It is these sections whose immediate interests are best served by the status quo, and who therefore oppose change. But when basic environmental factors alter while the social institutions due to their inertia and rigidity fail to respond to the new situation or to adjust themselves to conform to the modified conditions, the gap between what is and what must be widens. With every widening of this gap, the tensions within the community develop and grow in an ever-increasing proportion. The process of change thus comes into a head-on collision with the forces of inertia which tend to retard and oppose the new forces holding the social field,—forces that are con-

ditioning the ideas and thoughts of men and women.

In India, there was no caste in the Ṛgvedic times. It was a development in a later period when Indian society attained a certain level of a maximum efficiency in its organizational and technical set-up and could not go further. In these circumstances with severely restricted potentialities for expansion and growth, the scope for mobility and change in nature and place of work approached null point, and vocations tended to become hereditary. The son continued the vocation of the father, there being no attraction from other vocations or walks of life. A state of all round stagnation, with almost no scope for expansion in any sector, resulted in general immobility everywhere and this high degree of social inflexibility served as the basic condition for social rigidity.

The history of many an ancient nation like that of the Hindus has seen ups and downs in its march through time. A period of social and economic stagnation contains within itself germs of accelerated change and likewise periods of high civilization have tended towards stability. India has herself known definite movements against the rigidity of caste when the historic under-currents called for a faster pace of economic development and social change than an inflexible caste system would permit. The earliest movement started nearly 2500 years ago and lasted nearly five centuries. The literature of the time furnishes evidence that it was a movement of criticism and reform. It did cause a certain amount of loosening of castes and a general stirring within the community itself. The age produced Buddha and the shift away from caste in the succeeding centuries resulted in the growth of political strength and economic prosperity.

At the new level of social efficiency the society again tended to stabilize itself. While the caste system underwent a certain degree of transformation and loosening to meet the demands of the new times, the modified institutional structure came under the impact of altogether new environmental factors arising out of the foreign invasions of the country towards the closing centuries of the first millennium of our era. The new crisis threatened not only the institutional set-up in the country but the basis of national life itself. The political and religious persecutions coupled with ever-increasing dislocation of economic life and conditions of personal and property insecurity all conspired to bring about a situation in which the society had to shrink and withdraw itself into a shell like protective covering and to stick steadfastly to its social institutions as the outward symbolic manifestations of its religious philosophy and beliefs now under attack from alien authority. This excessive rigidity in social institutions and clinging to outward forms of social arrangements have thus to be evaluated not in relation to any empirical standards but rather in the context of a threatening and all-devouring situation against which the society had to contend itself. The issues that then confronted the society were not one of form but of national life itself. The shell which the society developed in its life and death struggle was designed to serve it in an emergent situation, and if a correct view were taken of these great struggles of the last one thousand years, keeping in view the tremendous odds at certain times—odds that almost certainly could have meant national extinction the Hindu social institutional set-up may not be said to have not answered well the needs of these historic centuries.

It would be uncharitable therefore to criticize the Hindu institution of caste in a vacuum without reference to these special circumstances which induced rigidity and but for which it would not have perhaps survived or surmounted the crisis that engulfed it. Every social institution has to answer certain specific needs of the times. When social needs change, the institution needs a change too. For every social institution has to subserve the human person. A social institution may be valid in a certain set of environmental and human factors; the same institu-

tion may be unvalid in an altogether different social situation. The present shape of the institution of caste, whose very shrinkage and rigidity performed a very valuable function in the preservation of the national heritage against alien attacks, is admittedly no longer adequate to meet the demands of the present times.

A free India has to forge ahead in all sectors all along the line but most important of all in social and economic spheres. The advance of moderu technology and communications coupled with the basic need of the emergence of a strong unified Indian nation clearly indicate the indispensability of a tremendous change in our social institutional set-up. The caste system with its different valuations depending upon the nature of work and its ridigity of social divisions can no longer subserve the ends of the social and economic revolution we are already in. Western ideas, apart from their intrinsic merit or otherwise, are a real force striking against the caste system. The trend towards urbanisation in the wake of industrialization and the attractions of greatly expanded employment opportunities in big cities are powerful factors that are working against caste. A new system of work valuation is rising, a valuation which is giving rise to a new social order not based on birth but on merit generally in all fields of activity.

The institution of caste as we now know it, is *prima facie* no longer equipped to meet the demands of the new age. Under the tremendous impact of the new situation the institutional structure has already shown signs of breaking up. 'Caste is immobile class; class is mobile caste.' It is this character of mobility that differentiates a class from a caste. When social conditions warrant greater mobility the society or civilization moves from caste to class. This movement is almost always inspired by the demand of justice and equality which enlarged socio-economic opportunities make possible.

An essential prerequisite for India's rapid economic development is a high level of social mobility. This would mean a considerable loosening of the caste system. While structural changes in the institutional set-up may take place progressively under the influence of historic and economic forces, a certain limited field exists where State policy may accelerate the processes of change or adjustment. Apart from its tendency to oppose or retard social change, an important problem which caste poses is the group loyalties which it engenders, nay, fosters. Its menacing consequences are narrow localism with its distorted outlook on national affairs and nepotism and favouritism in those endowed with authority. These weaken national unity and impair organizational efficiency.

It will be realized that very powerful influences are already at work against the immobility of the caste system. These influences will gather momentum with increase in industrialization and urbanisation, advance in education and improvement in standards of living and, above all, a realization that the rigidity in the institution of caste will impede the pace of economic and social development we have undertaken, and that the distinctions of caste and its consequent social divisions are serious impediments in the early emergence of a unified and strong Indian Nationalism. While all these factors will contribute towards a progressive loosening of the caste system, an urgent need will still remain for a social movement against the out-moded character of the caste and its utter irrelevancy in the new tasks facing the resnrgent Indian nation.

Forces, powerful forces indeed, are already at work undermining the structure of caste. These forces will work themselves out in due course of time, but in the meantime certain measures may accelerate the pace of disintegration of caste as we know it. State policy in social and economic fields may remove all traces of discrimination based on caste. In fact in early stages, a limited encouragement may be given to economically lower sections of the community. All this will help in inducing increasing mobility and flexibility

where at present immobility, rigidity, and inflexibility obtain.

The essesntial nature of the present crisis in caste is, however, spiritual. There is only one place where immediate renewal must take place and that is within the hearts and minds of men. A remoulding of the self is an inescapable preliminary to the great changes that must be made throughout every community, in every part of the country. Each one of us must realize the basic *sameness* of life and brotherhood of *all* men *everywhere*. This spiritual resurgence will not only tackle the problem of caste but would constitute an essential condition for ever-widening areas of co-operation between peoples of the various countries. Each one of us, within his or her own field of action must carry into his normal work a *changed attitude* toward *all* his functions and obligations. We must rise above narrow caste considerations and widen our sympathies to cover the whole nation, nay the entire humanity. Many of our best plans will otherwise miscarry because they will be handled by men who have not undergone *inner growth*. Shrunken personalities, in themselves the products of a rigid caste system, are equally unsuitable to carry on the new tasks as the institution itself.

There is no easy formula for bringing about this renewal in man himself. The task ahead is indeed not one of organization but reorientation, a change in *direction* and *attitude*: a change that offers to the community and the nation what was earlier reserved for caste. Man must expand and enlarge his sphere of sympathy if he is to serve wider areas of co-operation. He must bring to every activity and every plan a new criterion of judgement and valuation: how far it seeks to further the larger interests of the nation and how much respect it pays to the needs of the whole community. The new person will judge every new economic and political measure not in terms of his caste but in terms of how it works for expansion and co-operation over wider areas. Every industrial and social achievement will be viewed in terms of the larger national good which it brings irrespective of the local regions or group it benefits. The individual life-plan must make for an integrated national society, in which all the institutions will serve equally well all the elements of the community, and where its arts, sciences and religion—in fact the entire heritage of the nation—shall enrich the whole community. Our public life-plans will make for the fulfilment of the nation's mission in a way that they will bear fruit in an abundaut life for *all*. Such a life-plan will contain potentialities for its expansion of the field of co-operation beyond the national frontiers and cover the entire mankind.

The human person must expand in *all directions*: he must widen areas of his co-operative effort: he must enlarge the sphere of his sympathies. In time he shall create institutions and a system of values that are essential to the development of an expanded person and the balanced community, and to the fullest utilization of the vast possibilities of economic progress and social harmony. But an important step is a personal and human one: a reorientation in attitudes and enlargement of areas of sympathies. The heart of the human person is the place of this change. Without this change, no enduring betterment will take place in the social order. Without this spiritual rejuvenation, the breaking-up of the institution of caste may even be attended by all round misery, social atomization and the rise of a new barbarism like the fascism we saw in Italy and Germany. But if the above change occurs, everything will be within the limits of practical possibility.

'Caste is good. . . . Men must form themselves into groups . . . Wherever you go there will be caste. But that does not mean that there should be these privileges. They should be knocked on the head.'

-Swami Vivekananda

PHILOSOPHICAL SECTIONS IN MANUSMṚTI*

A NEW INTERPRETATION

By Dr. Rameshchandra Sunderji Betai

Interesting though the philosophical sections in the Manusmṛti are, it is not a surprise that they have not attracted due attention from scholars, as they occur in a work that is hardly philosophical in the Indian sense of the term, and they occur as a part of a vast sociological discussion that Manu has undertaken. Still, even from the point of view of philosophy, the discussion is of no mean value, and an attempt at a new explanation of Manu's philosophy will not be less interesting.

Manu's philosophy discusses three important points as follows:—

(i) Nature of the Supreme Being,[1] (ii) Manu's Theory of Creation[2] and (iii) His Doctrine of Karma.[3]

The six commentators on the Manusmṛti, giving their own theories and ideas, much later than the Manusmṛti, and interpreting Manu on the basis of the later theories, are greatly at variance with each other with regard to the interpretation of almost all the verses and on almost all the crucial points in the philosophical discussion of Manu.[4] All except Rāghavānanda opine that the theory of Manu follows the Sāṁkhya doctrines but they are not at all agreed with regard to the details, while Rāghavānanda thinks that the Creation that is talked of in the first chapter is in accordance with the Vedānta doctrine. Buhler and Jha agree more or less with the majority of the commentators and Keith[5] seeks a midway when he states that the theory follows the Vedānta and has also close affinities with the Sāṁkhya. Rādhākrishnan[6] goes a step further and states that the theory given here follows Sāṁkhya, Vedānta, Purāṇas, Mahābhārata, etc. All this difference of opinion is not surprising because, as we will presently see, the theory is not in complete accord with the Sāṁkhya and again, at several places, we see, the influence not only of the Vedānta and the Purāṇas but also of Yoga, the epics, etc. Again, some of the verses are highly ambiguous and complicated enough to give scope to the scholars for speculation.

Nature of the Supreme Being

The highest principle or the Supreme Being, described as the Self-existent Being, is both Sākāra and Nirākāra. In I.6, He is said to be manifesting Himself,[7] and in I.8. His Śarīra is referred to; while in I.7, He is described as subtle, non-manifest, and incomprehensible etc. He is again, Saguṇa and Nirguṇa both. As I.11 and 14 etc. describe, He is of the nature of existence and non-existence both; while in several other references, His Saguṇatva and Nirguṇatva are referred to.[8] He is, again, the root cause of the whole universal Creation, and He has created it by His own thought or Supreme Meditation as I would explain the word *Abhidhyāya*.[9] The first creation of God, Brahma, is only a manifestation of God Himself and the same Brahma is known as Nārāyaṇa on account of his creation from the celestial waters. His *Moorti* ('form'), comprising of the *Cetanarūpa Ava-*

[1] & [2] Manu-I. 1 to 80.
[3] Spread up throughout the 12th chapter.
[4] Buhler on I. 5.
[5] Vide 'The Sāṁkhya System'. p. 44.
[6] Vide 'Indian Philosophy,' Vol. II.

* Extract from the writer's Ph.D. Thesis approved by the Gujarat University.

[7] अव्यक्तो व्यञ्जयन्निदम्
[8] I. 7 and 9.
[9] I. 8. सोऽभिध्याय शरीरात् etc.

yavas[10] is the Prakṛti of the Sāṁkhya. Prior to His determination to create, the state of the universe was of darkness, imperception, lack of distinctive marks, immersion into deep sleep etc. It was in the midst of this that God created Brahma, known to the Upaniṣads as Hiraṇyagarbha and to Manu as Brahma or Nārāyana, naturally in accordance with the Purāṇas.

With this information about the nature of God, it will now be easy to proceed with Manu's study of the nature of Creation and that will naturally give to us a better idea about his conception of God.

Nature of Creation

Verse I.6 refers to the creation of Prakṛti, described as the one making the world discernible, working His creative power in the elements.[11] Actually we are told that God appeared as the dispeller of all darkness. The confused verse I.6,[12] should be explained on the basis of I.7. Here, he states that of His own accord, the Supreme Being, the subtle and indiscernible highest principle, appeared in the form of Prakṛti. I.6 will then tell us that God appeared as the dispeller of all darkness, had in Him the lustre of the great elements and it is He who has made all this.

Thus, according to Manu, the first creation is Prakṛti, the principle. We are next told that He then thought to Himself and He created the celestial waters and placed therein the seed. This may justly be known as the seed of Creation because in it, Brahma was born and Brahma brought into being the whole Creation. I.11 tells that God, of the nature of *Sat* and *Asat* both, was the source from which was born the Puruṣa, known to the world as Brahma. The *Sat* aspect of God seems to refer to God Himself and *Asat* to Prakṛti, and it should be noted that Prakṛti is *Asat* with reference to God. This will help in explaining the words *manaḥ sadasad-ātmakam* as 'the thoughts of God that made Himself manifest as *Sat* and *Asat*.'

Thus, God in His capacity as the creator is Puruṣa or *Sat,* and His creation is Prakṛti or *Asat* as compared to Him. Brahma is the next creation of both. Brahma is different from Puruṣa and Prakṛti, known as *Sat* and *Asat,* in so far as the latter two are the creation or the manifestation resulting from the mind of God, while the former is a creation or manifestation that had the concrete support of the Prakṛti elements. From this developed the Golden Egg, from which the original Father of the Beings came out. This Brahma was only the Creative principle that was a manifestation of God Himself, who stayed in the Golden Egg and came out as Brahma himself breaking the Egg into two. It was upto this that the *Dhyāna* or Divine Meditation continued.

So far, the whole process of Creation comes to this: God as the creator, Prakṛti, and Brahma.

Proceeding, we see that the two parts of the broken Egg became *Svarga* and *Bhūmi* in the midst of which came the sky, the eight quarters and the space that was the eternal abode of the waters.

The real confusion comes with the verses I.14 and 15. Commentators give two important views of which one is rightly dismissed as inadmissible by Buhler and the other is wrongly accepted by him as likely to be correct. We take the verses thus. We have in a figurative way explained the words *manaḥ sadasad-ātmakam* as the peculiar mental process of God, who is finally Nirākāra and Incomprehensible. We have known these two as God in His capacity as the creator and Prakṛti. Ahamkāra may then mean the Creation of Brahma on the famous principle *Eko'ham Bahu-syām.* The same one is then known as Mahān Ātmā, the words *abhimantāramīśwaram* etc. are in continuation applying to one Brahma. The *Tri-guṇas* will then

[10] यन्मूर्त्यवयवाः सूक्ष्माः etc.

[11] आसीदिदं तमोभूतमप्रज्ञातमलक्षणम् ।
अप्रतर्क्यमविज्ञेयं प्रसुप्तमिव सर्वतः ॥

[12] ततः स्वयंभूर्भगवानव्यक्तो व्यञ्जयन् इदं ।
महाभूतादिवृत्तौजाः प्रादुरासीत्तमोनुदः ॥

mean Mahat, Ahamkāra and Manas. Mahat is also known as Ātmā later on.

The mention of the six *avayavas* in the verse I.16[13] creates further confusions. The commentators give varying opinions here. Nandana's opinion is the most natural.[14] But, on the basis of our explanations, we state that the six are Mahān Ātmā or Brahma, Mahat or Ātmā, Ahamkāra, Manas, Five Tanmātras and Five Karmendriyas.

The next difficulty comes with the verse I.19,[15] and five remarkable opinions are offered here. From our whole discussion so far, it will be reasonable to state that the writer is here recapitulating all those principles that are directly associated with Creation, he is summarizing the whole so far. Thus, naturally the seven principles or Puruṣas will be, Prakṛti, Mahān Ātmā, Mahat, Ahamkāra, Manas, five Tanmātras and five Karmendriyas. Our new interpretation will meet the difficulties in the verses the best. The interpretation will also be supported by verse I.20, where it is stated that every following element comprised of the qualities of each preceding one, besides of course, its own individual ones. The order of the elements in the process of Creation will naturally remind us of the order almost strictly following Sāṁkhya in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*.[16]

Then follow the various verses that add several other things in the process of Creation, as Gods, Sādhyas and eternal sacrifices in I.22, the three Vedas in I.23, periods of time, lunar mansions, planets and rivers etc. in I.24 and Tapas in I.25.

Theory of the Pairs of Opposites and its Consequences

We next come to the interesting theory of the pairs of opposites. God has endowed human beings with opposite qualities like pain and pleasure, desire and anger, etc. This is naturally peculiar to human life and nature and we are next told that the course of action, Destiny, that each one has to follow, is fixed. Here again we accept the interpretations of neither Kulluka nor Medhātithi but state that in the births that man gets, the past deeds of man must be taken into account. What the course of action in each life depends upon, according to Manu, is to be fixed up according to the original Creation as the 30th verse will go to suggest.

Being an ethical Code as also a work on sociology, it is natural that the Smṛti should glorify custom and convention at the same time. It is therefore natural of Manu to refer to the creation of the *Varṇas* in his scheme of the Creation. We come to the creation of the four *Varṇas* from four different parts of the body of Brahma. The idea is found in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas and it can also be traced to the *Puruṣa Sūkta* of the *Ṛgveda*. The distinction in sex with the creation of the Virāṭ is a Purāṇik version added to that of the Sāṁkhya etc. here. We are told that the same Virāṭ produced Manu, who created the sages and they are the lords of the created beings.[17] An important statement is to be had in I.51 where it is stated that once He brought into being this creation, God disappeared. Thus, He left the created beings and the Prakṛti to their natural course and their peculiar origination. As Adhyāya XII mentions the theory of Karma and Transmigration, we should presume that at this stage, i.e., after God had disappeared[18], there came a stage when the theory of Karma and Transmigration came into operation. Though beings, when reborn, get the very actions again and again with which they were created, it only means that the actions and functions of every kind continue to be the same. As for example, the actions of the cow and the lion do not change; they remain the same throughout the ages as God fixed them. But,

[13] तेषां त्ववयवान्सूक्ष्मान्षण्णामप्यमितौजसाम्।
सन्निवेश्यात्ममात्रासु सर्वभूतानि निर्ममे॥

[14] The ones described in the previous two verses.

[15] तेषामिदं तु सप्तानां पुरुषाणां महौजसाम्।
सूक्ष्माभ्यो मूर्तिमात्राभ्यः संभवत्यव्ययाद् व्ययम्॥

[16] Kaṭh.III.10-11.

[17] I.33 to 36.

[18] I.51.

as soon as those beings, men included, forget that their actions are fixed by God, the theory of Karma and Transmigration would operate. As soon as man began to believe that his actions are his, he began to be responsible for his actions and that led to his birth and rebirth.

In I.75-78, Bhṛgu gives another theory of Creation, in which the sleep and the waking state of Brahma, Kalpa etc. are brought in. All the process of thinking etc. of the Supreme Being is now endowed to Brahma. Mind is therefore the first creation, exactly as we suggest and as the *Chāndogya* and the *Taittirīya Upaniṣads* imply. The five rudimentary elements are the outcome of Manas. Their order of creation now in the universe is: Ākāśa, Vāyu, Tejas, Āpas, and Pṛthvi. These are the elements that constitute the human body, whose description follows in the verses 87 onwards. It is likely that Manu gives this second theory of Creation, referring to the five rudimentary elements, only to give to us a clear idea about man's position in this order and system of the universe, because, in the whole work, it is man whose life is referred to. Thus it is not an interpolation as Buhler contends.

The Doctrine of Karma

Before entering into discussion proper about Manu's theory of Karma, we would take a note of some of the outstanding statements of Manu in the matter.

We are told that Karma is threefold, of mind, speech and body.[19] This leads to three different conditions, the highest, the middling, and the lowest. It is again, totally of ten types, threefold of mind, fourfold of speech and threefold of the body.[20] All the ten here mentioned are the actions of the bad type, and so, those that will lead to bad fruit. With this idea, the necessity of properly controlling mind, speech, and body is laid down. When all the three are controlled by the awakened consciousness as I would translate the word *Buddhi*, man is called a *Tri-daṇḍī*.[21] The application of the word *Tri-daṇḍī* can be extended to the householders also because the man who has controlled passions, anger, etc. becomes a *Tri-daṇḍī* and Manu has expected the householder to become a real Brahmacārin in married life.[22]

The words *Kṣetrajña* and *Bhūtātmā*[23] have created interesting controversies. They are variously interpreted as 'the body', 'the gross visible body', 'the earth', and 'the Self that has the form of the non-sentinent', 'the Jīva', etc. The context demands that the words should be clearly and separately understood. It also demands that a proper philosophical explanation should be given to them. It would be better to interpret the words as 'the individual Soul' and 'the Jīva,' as that would help to get over all remarkable controversies. This Jīva is the acting or the impelling force in the body that makes the individual soul subject to pleasure and pain, and, as a consequence, to the Law of Karma. Now, the individual soul is only the Supreme Soul as most of the *Upaniṣads* lay down. So, when the individual soul becomes subject to pleasure and pain on coming into contact with the elements of the body by the impelling force of the Jīva, we state that the Ātmā is subjected to pain and pleasure. In XII.14,[24] we take the words *Mahān* and *Kṣetrajña* in the sense of 'the Supreme Soul' and 'the individual soul', and we know that the individual soul pervades the Jīva and is overcome by its Karma.[25] It can be seen that the author is explaining the theory of Transmigration of the Soul and so, we state that, when the individual soul leaves the body, it is burdened by the ill effects of the actions in the present life, and being unable to fly away to reunite with Brahman, it has to take to another body in hell, suffer the severe pangs of the world of

[19] XII.3.
[20] XII.5-7.
[21] XII.10.
[22] III.50.
[23] XII.12.
[24] तावुभौ भूतसंपृक्तौ महान् क्षेत्रज्ञ एव च।
उच्चावचेषु भूतेषु स्थितं तं व्याप्य तिष्ठतः।
[25] XII.15.

Yama, and once more become dissolved in those very five elements according to the actions and the punishment. This is rebirth.[26] Once more we see how the influence of the Vedānta, the Purāṇas, the Mahābhārata, etc. come together here.

Now, Manu states that men can become free from this cycle of birth and death by the greatest accumulation of Dharma. But even the present birth of man might be the result of some past good or evil deeds, and so, in every birth it is the lot of man to lessen Adharma and accumulate Dharma. A stage will come when he will have almost no Adharma and all Dharma, when man will be promoted to the higher world of *Svarga*. The happiness in *Svarga* too is not final. The five elements of the body pervade him in *Svarga* also, and so that is not the final stage. This being the case, man should always engross himself in Dharma.

Now, Ātmā becomes subjected to three qualities known as Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. All the three pervade Ātmā as long as he is in the body.[27] That quality which almost completely pervades the body becomes the chief quality of Ātmā.[28]

The verses that follow define various types of men who are variously under the influence of these qualities. Then follow many details with which we are not required to deal under our present subject. It should however be noted that Manu has promised the highest reward of Mokṣa to a man who studies and also follows his Karma. It can be safely seen that the theory of Karma is a curious mixture of the theories in the *Upaniṣads*, the *Gītā*, the Purāṇas, the Mahābhārata, etc.

The theory of Karma that we have defined should be very much favourably compared with the same to be found in the *Gītā*. The following points of contrast should be noted:—

(1) Both Manu and the *Gītā* lay down Karma as duty and promise the highest reward as a result of the faithful performance of it. But while the *Gītā* states that attachment to both good and bad Karma and even to the fruit of Karma is bad,[29] Manu states that attachment only to bad Karma is bad.[30]

(2) The *Gītā* states that man must perform all actions as divinely ordained Karma and that only, while Manu states that the desire for the rewards of good works is not bad and it should always be desired.[31]

(3) Man's right according to the *Gītā* is chiefly for actions only,[32] while according to Manu, it is also for the reward of the good works that he does.

(4) The *Gītā* makes man a mere instrument to the divine law of Karma,[33] while Manu has again and again secured all the reward for good works, it is the reward of man's own.

(5) In the *Gītā*, man is a mere instrument to the Divine Will, with his duty to do his little in the movement of the great order of God,[34] while in Manu, man has his own specific individuality even in the great social order that he upholds.

(6) The Vedas are very highly praised and glorified by Manu, and all the Karma laid down by them is good, while the *Gītā* states that even the Vedas are subject to the three Guṇas and man should get over all the three of them.[35]

(7) The *Gītā* does not insist on man to pass through all the Āśramas of life, in order to know God, while Manu does.

(8) The *Gītā* teaches the doctrine of Desireless Action,[36] while Manu teaches the doctrine of Proper and Good Action.[37]

[26] XII.16.

[27] XII.23-24.

[28] The words have not been happily translated by Buhler when he explains them as 'goodness, activity, and darkness'. They should be better explained as 'Faith, attachment, and ignorance'.

[29] Gītā.III.7, 8, 15, 16, 18.

[30] Manu.II.4, 5, 9, XII.20.

[31] Manu.II.5, 9.

[32] कर्मण्येवाधिकारस्ते मा फलेषु कदाचन ।

[33] निमित्तमात्रं भव सव्यसाचिन् ।

[34] Gītā, III. 20,21,25.

[35] त्रैगुण्यविषयाः वेदाः निस्त्रैगुण्यो भवार्जुन ।

[36] निष्कामकर्म ।

[37] सम्यक् कर्म ।

THE SANCTITY OF ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS AND OF ST. TERESA

"TU SOLUS SANCTUS!" (YOU ALONE ARE HOLY!)

By Dr. R. Panikker

I

Only God is holy. Sanctity is God Himself. It is His very Life, His Existence, the proper Structure of His Being, if we may speak so. God bestows and communicates along with being all the constitutive attributes of being to the creatures. But He does not communicate *sanctity,* because it cannot properly be created or given along with being, for it is the very Essence of God Himself.

And yet, there are saints on earth, because the Almighty can still do one thing, namely communicate and give Himself. He can descend and dwell in the person of the saint, He can simply take possession of His creature in a personal and intimate way. Here lies the role of Christ as an ontic Mediator between God and Creation.

So, sanctity is on the one hand the absolute perfection, viz. God, and on the other hand it is the Life of this very God in some of His creatures. It is not, in consequence, primarily a moral concept, but an ontological reality: the divine reality communicating His intimate and proper Life to some of His children. The saint is thus not primarily the *humanly* perfect Man, but the divinised human person. Of course, that divinisation implies a very peculiar transformation of the saint and an ontological—and in consequence also moral—purity, but it does not require a *humanistic* perfect man.

The saint—"sanctus"—is, thus, the man God has taken specially for Him, the man He has "reserved" and "segregated". God calls everybody to be *divinely* perfect, i.e. holy. Each person receives his personal vocation to sanctity. But only the saint answers fully to that divine Call and freely accepts, wills, loves to be this living Temple of the Holy. Each saint is, in consequence, a kind of Revelation of God, he has a message to carry out, though not always with words. He is an instrument of the Divine, he is the Man and Woman in whom God, who is Love, finds not only His resting but also His acting place. True sanctity is not so much God-realization from the part of Man, as Man-realization—if we could say so—from the part of God. The saint is the ontological full human personality in spite of our rational concepts about human perfection, or notwithstanding the *objective* shortcomings in his pilgrimage towards God. We cannot forget that sanctity is a concept-limit, only attainable here on earth as far as the everlasting life of Union has already its beginnng in this life.

II

John of the Cross and Teresa of Avila

Some saints reflect the perfection of God by their hidden and silent lives; some others are leaders, some teachers, some are heroes of sacrifice and some victims of love; some have a rather weak human nature and some are real geniuses if we look at them from a human point of view. Sanctity is as manifold as Man and his nature.

There is, however, not a little difficulty in classifying the two saints, John of the Cross and Teresa of Avila. If we catalogue them as contemplative because they reached the highest degree of fruition of God and union with Him, we forget that both led an extremely active life. If we rank them among the teachers, we overlook that they were also reformers in the active field and are also poets.

(1) The Example of Their Lives

It is almost a foolish presumption to attempt to summarize the spiritual climate, the political problems and the cultural crisis of that turning point of the European history which was taking place in Spain during the XVIth century.[1] The destiny of the world, not simply in a political sense or in a superficial cultural interpretation, but in an ontologically real and spiritual meaning, was, shall we say, not precisely in the hands, but in the life, hearts and minds of a relatively small number of persons, inhabiting one of the most peculiar and poorest corners of Europe. There and then was taking place not only the birth of "modern" Europe, or the end of the "medieval" age, but also the big conflict and one of the few and most decisive encounters among several cultures, worlds, religions. The seeds were sown and the problems of a world culture appeared almost for the first time in a most universal manner.

That crisis involved the purification and reform of Religion, from inside and from outside, the new reflexion about the relation of Man to God and with the Universe, the relation of Christianity and the Christian Culture with other religions and cultures, not simply under a theoretical, but under a vital, existential point of view. Everything was in ferment and Spain was the battleground of such a historical moment, though, of course, not all the factors and ideas were Spanish.

During that time, Terese de Cepeda y Ahumada ((1515-1582) and Juan de Yepes (1542-1591) were born, both in Castilla, Central Spain.

Teresa was twenty-one when she entered the religious life and became a Carmelite nun in Avila, her native town. The aim of the Carmelite Order is to enable its members to lead a life of contemplation through a long practice of prayer (in its highest sense), preceded by detachment and penance. And, of course, this centered in a loving and not merely speculative contemplation. Two years after she entered the Convent of the Incarnation (1538), she writes: "The Lord began to be so gracious to me on this way of prayer of quiet, and occasionally even to Union.[2] But she began a life of habitual and steady contemplation only twelve years afterwards. She followed this highest life of the spirit for thirty-three years. She was of an extreme sensitiveness and also of intense awareness in spiritual things. Thus, this her second period can be divided into two different stages: one of a simple prayer of quiet, transcending all conceptual understanding and of a passing consciousness of her union with God (12 years), and another one of habitual union with God in a life of identification of will (11 years) and of spiritual marriage (10 years).

It was at forty, having attained her habitual union with God that she realized her apostolic mission of lifting up the spiritual climate and observance of her Order, and instead of relishing her spiritual perfection she started the colossal adventure of reforming the Carmel with no other means than her great love and confidence in God. She had to overcome all sorts of difficulties and misunderstandings from all sides. In spite of her continuous ill health, and without losing her most highly contemplative life and habitual union with God, she undertook the most astonishing active life of founding convents of "discalced" Carmelites all over Spain.

Perhaps one of her most striking features was her thoroughness, her wholeness. Her holiness brought her to such a close union with God as a person can have in this world and such a union really divinised her being. All the same she remained a full human personality with a sense for all little human business on earth, even with a very exquisite sense of humour. Her union with God did not separate her from her fellowmen and she remained throughout a woman with all the complexity of a feminine soul. The secret of her affirmative attitude towards life and nature was her

[1] Cf. the masterly chapter by Friedrich Heer, *Europaische Geistesgeschichte,* Stuttgart (W. Kohlhammer) 1953, pp. 280-331.

[2] *Life,* ch. *IV,* p. 23.

christocentric spirituality. Her awareness of God and her godlike life was dne to her discovery and experience of God *in* and *through* Christ, not excluding his Humanity. It is an essential feature of the Carmelite spirituality to consider Christ as the bridegroom of the soul and to find in that loving union (spiritual marriage) the most perfect transformation into God, for we should bear in mind that Christ realizes in Himself the highest unity of God and creature.

Juan de la Cruz entered the Order of the "calced" Carmelite friars at twenty-one, and when twenty-five he met Teresa who was already fifty-three. Instead of passing over to the Carthusian Order for living a more austere life of penance and contemplation as he first intended to do, he joined St. Teresa in the uoble work of reforming the Carmel among men, as Teresa had already begun among women. For the realization of that project he had to endure calumnies and persecutions of the most cruel sort. Unlike Teresa he never became the juridical Founder, but he was the inspiring soul of Carmel. He was a well trained theologian (student of Alcala and Salamanca) and became one of the greatest mystics of all times. He wrote several books, all published after his death. He is also one of the best poets of the whole Spanish literature.

(2) The Mystical Doctrine

Only a mystic can teach a mystical doctrine, and this teaching is a vital communication. If the mystics, by chance, write something, this is only a substitute and a reminder. If we try to summarize again what they have written at length, and yet as shortly as possible, because they do not use superfluous words, we surely betray their doctrine and only give the shadow of a shadow. How can we dare, in consequence, to suggest some lines of their message and point out some aspects under which they tried to express the ineffable? We may, however, make an attempt to investigate the philosophical implications of their doctrine by pointing out their metaphysical structure.

The aim and end of human life is Union with God, it is the transformation of our being and its divinisation. But the creature out of itself is no-thing, or, as our saints repeat constantly, a *nonada,* a "not-nothingness"; i.e. the creature is a pure negation of its "not-yet-being". It exists because somehow it subsists outside the nothingness—"extra nihilum"—being suspended over the abyss of pure nothingness by the creative power of God. Thus, the creature, in order to reach God and be united with Him, must abandon its own way of being i.e., its "not-yet-being", its negativity and negate its own *no*-thingness. Being cannot be destroyed. All that we annihilate is the inherent negative element of our temporal existence. In other words, this union with God is not simply one of mere knowledge, but an ontological incorporation, though our intellect is also a part of our being. It is not simply by 'knowing" God that we shall be transformed into Him, but by being fully united with Him (and our being a something more than intellect). It is by being one with Him, that we reach our ultimate destiny.[3]

Now, strictly speaking, between the "creature" as such, and God as such, there is nothing in common. If the former has to be united with God, i.e., if it has to be divinised, its character of creature has to be stripped off. Not only I cannot reach God, but *my* being cannot be united with Him as long as it remains "creature". Not because "nature" is bad, but because it is not of the order of the Divinity. But I have out of myself nothing of this order, my nature does not possess anything homogeneous with God so that it could be utilized in my union with Him.

That leads us to the famous way of absolute nothingness of our two mystics. I cannot trust my senses, nor my feelings, nor my intellect with *its* intuitions, nor my will, not even my very being. I cannot rely upon any created thing. If I see God, if I feel Him,

[3] Cf. *St. John of the Cross, The Ascent of Mount Carmel,* 1, 4, 5, (English translation by *E. Allison Peers, The Complete Works of St. John of the Cross,* London (Burns and Oates), 3 vols. I, p. 26).

even if I love Him, so far it is my love, *that* which I see, feel, love or experience is not Him, for He is beyond all my moods of apprehension and of possession.

I can only be transformed and united with Him, I can only be God, if I leave absolutely everything that I feel, like, think, and expe-rience and even that I "imagine" to be, and it is He who takes possession of me and takes me and "re-makes" me. And yet, only so our real personality is realized. That is the action of Grace within me. Here is the place of Baptism. Here the impotency of the crea-ture is substituted by the absolute power of God. The naked way of pure faith is neither a blind belief, nor a desperate effort of saving myself, but the divine and gratuitous gift divine bestowed upon me, which calls me, and transforms me. I do not rely anymore upon myself, but on God alone.[4]

"God has only spoken One Word which is His Son and He has spoken It in eternal silence", says St. John of the Cross, repeat-ing a common statement of the Fathers of the Church. In order to be incorporated in Him we must enter into that Silence, not only reduc-ing to stillness all voices, images, and thoughts about everything and even about God Himself, but reducing our very being into an ontological silence. "In order to have the All, thou must leave the all", including ourselves.

The real, the royal path to God taught by these two great contemplatives is not that of mere contemplation of God as an object, is not the purified and high contemplative gaze or experience about God; our gaze has to transcend all our powers and faculties and even our own being. "Such is the likeness between faith and God that there is no other difference save that which exists between see-ing God and believing in Him."[5] In Christian terms, it is the naked and supernatural way of pure faith as Catholic Theology understands it, i.e., as a participation of God's own Knowledge and Light as an introduction to the divine Life in us, which is supported, so to say, in us through His gifts of Faith, Hope and Charity. Or again, St. John: "This dark night is the inflowing of God into the soul."[6]

> "In order to arrive at that which thou knowest not
> Thou must go by a way that thou know-est not.
> In order to arrive at that which thou possessest not
> Thou must go by a way that thou possessest not.
> In order to arrive at that which thou art not
> Thou must go through that which thou art not."

sings St. John of the Cross in a famous verse.[7] The progress of a spiritual man towards God is rather the progress of God in him. The ascent to the mountain from the side of man corresponds to the more real descent of God into his being.

Once, St. Teresa was amorously complain-ing to God in prayer about her sufferings and trials. She heard the Lord telling her: "Teresa, so do I treat my friends!", making her understand the purification character of suffering. But Teresa, who knew it already, answered boldly: "That's why you have so few (friends)!" Some have pointed out how difficult and almost impossibile it is to follow the doctrine of our two Carmelite saints, erro-neously taken as an inhuman self-denial. If we think in terms of human courage it is true that the thorough spoliation of oneself exacted by them for the purpose of reaching the Simple One, is above human strength, and so if such spoliation is undertaken out of a selfish spiri-tual greediness it would be not only impos-sible, but also anti-natural. No human force can perform that work and walk along the path of absolute denial, by the very reason that if there is no God sustaining us even from below, nothing remains under our feet. More-over, John of the Cross repeatedly asserts that the two nights of the soul come only when

[4] Cf. *The Ascent*, II, 8, 1.

[5] *The Ascent*, II, 9. (Ed. Peers, I, 98).

[6] *Dark Night of the Soul*, II, 5.

[7] *Ascent*, I, 13, 1. (Ed. Peers, I, 62).

a person has overcome the day-light of reason and transcended the day-paths of the senses. But it is quite true that no one by mere human force can climb up the top of the mountain where dwells God. It is God and God alone who calls and gives the gifts and necessary graces to such an ascent. It is God's work in us and also through us. "It would not be a true and total transformation if the soul were not transformed in the three Persons of the Holy Trinity . . . The soul united and transformed in God breathes into God the same divine breath that God, when she is transformed in Him, breathes into her in Himself."[8]

III

The Sanctity of the Two Carmelite Saints

Manifold and wonderful is God in His saints. Some sparks of His perfections shine forth in these selected ones. Simplicity, love, obedience, spiritual power, personality, and so many other divine values are reflected in the lives of the saints. Which is the special feature of these two mystics?

Their characteristic feature, which at the same time constitutes an urgent and important message for our times, is simply that of sanctity itself. And perhaps this is also the feature of the other great saint of the Carmel of our days, St. Therese of Lisieux, the little Flower.

Obviously, by the very fact that one is a saint, he or she reflects the sanctity of God, but the colour of the divine light may be the red colour of love, or the green of hope, or the violet of penance, or the infra-red of an unsophisticated surrender, or the ultra-violet of mysticism and so on. I think that the Carmelite sanctity simply reflects the white light of uncoloured holiness.

In spite of their rich personalities and the high mystical gifts with which they were endowed, they do not insist on or preach only contemplation, mysticism, or asceticism. They do not want everybody to deny the world, neither do they make self-denial their central doctrine. They simply preach and live the holy life, that is to say, sanctity, pure and unalloyed. The rest is ultimately irrelevant and all are means for the "only one thing necessary". Their writings were either written under obedience, as in the case of Teresa, or were mainly intended to help particular souls to reach union with God, as in St. John's. And yet their books are truly universal and the examples of their lives, in spite of the particular scope of their activities, constitute a lesson for every religious soul.

The secret of this universality, in my opinion, and the reason of their everlasting appeal lie mainly in the underlying and all-pervading atmosphere of pure sanctity.

What ultimately matters is not our ideas, or our experiences, or our denying this or doing that; what matters is not such a method of prayer or such a peculiar way of life. The all-important thing, the unique and the ultimate end of man is sanctity, union with God, transformation in God, divinisation of our full being.[9]

Throughout the whole XVIth century (not to speak about our times!) Europe was suffering from a world crisis in all aspects. Everywhere problems and solutions were planned and enforced in the horizontal line. The answer of the Carmelite nun and of the Carmelite friar has only a single tune: sanctity. But not a sanctity of the nature of a secularized self-reform, not an individualistic saintliness *in order to* arrange the world and solve its problems, or to save myself, i.e., as means for . . . something else, or as first condition, bnt a true sanctity as an end in itself, because the ontological weight of a divinised soul is greater than anything else, because the meaning of life on earth—this "bad night in a bad inn" (St. Teresa)—is not to organize heaven on earth, but to move earth into heaven. "A single supernatural act of Love has much more value than thousand material universes" (St. John of the Cross). And yet, as a consequence, as something that comes from itself,

[8] *Spiritual Canticle*, Stanza, 39 (Ed. Peers, II, 396).

[9] Cf. *Ascent*, III, 16, 1

as it is the only real approach to the world according to its deep nature, only then life on earth is true human and happy and beautiful. "Is it not somehow amazing that a poor nun of St. Joseph's Cloister can reign over the whole earth and the Elements?"[10] It is the less world-denying attitude imaginable, because it sees the whole creation as an outburst of divine Love. Only then man is the king of creation and transforms everything into the real everlasting Kingdom, which is much more than this passing world.

[10] *St. Teresa, Life,* VI, 104.

Only then can man exultantly sing and realize: "The heavens are mine, the earth is mine, and the peoples are mine! Mine are the just and the sinners are mine, mine are the angels and the Mother of God is mine! All things are mine! God Himself is mine and for me, because Christ is mine and all for me!"[11] The reason is clear: I am not more mine, but it is God that is in me and I in Him. That is the Christian mystery of Christ!

[11] *St. John of the Cross, Spiritual Maximes and Sentences,* 25.

ŚRI-BHĀṢYA

By Swami Vireswarananda

(Continued from the April issue)

Topic 4

THE RULER WITHIN IS BRAHMAN

In the last topic it was taken for granted that the 'Internal Ruler' in *Bṛh,* 3.7.18 is Brahman and on that basis it was established that the person in the eye in *Ch.* 4.15.1 is Brahman. Now this section proves that the Internal Ruler is Brahman.

अन्तर्यामी, अधिदेवाधिलोकादिषु तद्धर्मव्यपदेशात्

।१।२।१९॥

19. The Ruler within of the gods, the worlds and so on (is Brahman) on account of the qualities of that (Brahman) being mentioned.

Both the Kāṇva and Mādhyandina recensions of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* read as follows: 'He who inhabits the earth but is within it, whom the earth does not know, whose body is the earth and who controls the earth from within, he is your self, the Internal Ruler, the immortal' (*Bṛh.* 3.7.3). The text further says of the existence of this Ruler within water, fire, the sky, air, heaven, the sun, quarters, the moon and the stars, ether, darkness, light, all beings, all the senses, the mind, the intellect etc., concluding each section by saying: 'He is your self, the Internal Ruler, the immortal.' The Mādhyandina text mentions, in addition, all the worlds, the Vedas and the sacrifices; and instead of the reading 'he who dwells in knowledge' they have, 'he who dwells in the self.' As the Mādhyandinas have these three extra sections, the word 'world' in the *Sūtra* is meant to include both the recensions. The Internal Ruler spoken of here is Brahman and not the individual soul, for the characteristics of Brahman are mentioned. Being one, and ruler of everything,—all the worlds, beings, gods etc. —is a characteristic of Brahman. In answer to Uddālaka's question, 'Now describe the Internal Ruler' (*Bṛh.* 3.7.2) Yājñavalkya delineates the Internal Ruler beginning with the text, 'He who inhabits the earth but is within it' etc. This quality of entering everything, the worlds, beings, gods, the Vedas, the sacri-

fices etc., controlling them from within, having everything for Its body, and being Self of everything can be true only of Brahman who is all-knowing and whose all desires are fulfilled, and not of any other. Scriptural texts like: 'He wished, may I be many, may I grow forth. Having sent forth, he entered into it. Having entered into it he became *sat* and *tyat*' (*Taitt.* 2.6) established that the qualities of ruling everything and being the Self of everything belong to Brahman alone. *Subāla Upaniṣad* which begins with, 'There was nothing at the beginning' and ends by saying, 'the inner Self of everything, free from all imperfections is the one god, Nārāyaṇa', shows that Brahman rules all, is the Self of all, and has for Its body everything. Moreover the quality of immortality is true only of Brahman. Nor does Its 'seeing' etc. depend on the senses as in the case of the individual soul but results from Its very nature, Its omniscience etc. 'He sees without eyes, hears without ears' etc. (*Śvet.* 3.19) 'Whom the earth does not know,' 'whom the self does not know' show that He rules from within without their knowing It, and as is confirmed by 'unseen but seeing' etc. (*Bṛh.* 3.7.23) And the following text, 'There is no seer but He' denies any seer of the Internal Ruler referred to in the text. The expression, 'He is your self' also distinguishes the individual soul from the Internal Ruler who is its Self.

Therefore the Internal Ruler is the Supreme Self.

न च स्मार्तम्, अतद्धर्माभिलापात्, शारीरश्च ।१।२।२०॥

20. And neither is (the Ruler within) that which is talked of in (Sāṅkhya) *Smṛti* (i.e. the *Pradhāna*), because attributes contrary to its nature are mentioned (here); nor is it the individual soul (for the same reason).

That which is talked of in the *Smṛti*, i.e. the *Pradhāna*, or the individual soul is not the Ruler within, for qualities contrary to their nature, i.e. qualities impossible to be attributed to them, are mentioned in the texts under discussion. Qualities by its very nature like being the seer of everything, ruler of everything, being the Self of everything, and immortality can never be true of the *Pradhāna*, or the individual soul.

Moreover the recensions speak of It as something different from the individual soul.

उभयेऽपि हि भेदेनैनमधीयते ।१।२।२१॥

21. For both (the recensions) read this (i.e. the individual soul) as different (from the Internal Ruler).

Again both the Mādhyandina and Kāṇva recensions which read, 'He who dwells in the self' and 'He who dwells in knowledge' respectively, show that the individual self on account of its being ruled by the Supreme Self is different from It. Therefore it is established that the Inner Ruler who is different from the individual soul and free from all imperfections is the Supreme Self, Nārāyaṇa.

Topic 5

THAT WHICH CANNOT BE SEEN IS BRAHMAN

अदृश्यत्वादिगुणको धर्मोक्तेः ।१।२।२२॥

22. The possessor of qualities like invisibility etc. (is Brahman) on account of (Its) characteristics being mentioned.

In the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* we have the following texts: 'The higher knowledge is that by which the Imperishable is known' (1.1.5); 'That which cannot be seen or seized, which is without origin of qualities, eternal, all-pervading, omnipresent, extremely subtle, Imperishable; that which the wise behold as the source of all beings' (1.1.6); 'Higher than the high Imperishable' (2.1.2). The question is whether in these texts the Imperishable which cannot be seen and the one which is higher than the high Imperishable refer to *Pradhāna* and the individual soul respectively of the Sāṅkhyas or whether both refer to Brahman.

The view held by the opponent is: In the text discussed in the last topic, qualities like 'seeing', 'hearing' which are contrary to the nature of the insentient *Pradhāna* were present, and so the Ruler within was interpreted to be the Supreme Self. In the *Muṇḍaka* texts

cited we do not find any such qualities stated which would exclude the *Pradhāna,* and in *Muṇḍ,* 2.1.2 the reference is clearly to the individual which is higher than the *Pradhāna.* So the texts refer to the individual soul and the *Pradhāna,* and not to the Supreme Soul.

The *Sūtra* refutes this view and says that it is the Supreme Self that is referred to by both the texts, for qualities like, 'He is all-knowing, all-perceiving' etc. (*Muṇḍ.* 1.1.9) are predicated of It, and these qualities are not applicable to the *Pradhāna* or the individual soul.

Muṇḍ. 1.1.5-6 declare that there is an Imperishable something possesssing the qualities of invisibility etc. from which all this is born, 'the source of all beings'. Further in *Muṇḍ.* 1.1.9 the Śruti says that this Imperishable which is the source of all beings is 'all-knowing, all-perceiving'. For all these reasons it is clear that the Supreme Self is referred to in these texts, and not the other two.

विशेषणभेदव्यपदेशाभ्यां च नेतरौ ।१।२।२३॥

23. The other two (viz. the individual soul and the *Pradhāna*) are not (referred to in the passage), because the characteristics of Brahman and the difference (of the Being which is the source of all beings from these two) are mentioned.

The *Pradhāna* is not referred to in this text, because the Śruti wants to prove in this section the proposition that 'by the knowledge of One everything is known.' This is not true in the case of *Pradhāna,* for the individual souls are not its products and so the knowledge of the *Pradhāna* will not give a knowledge of the individual soul. This 'One' is also distinguished from the individual soul by the text, 'Higher than the high Imperishable', where It is stated to be higher than the soul which is higher than the insentient *Pradhāna,* thus distinguishing It from the individual soul also.

रूपोपन्यासाच्च ।१।२।२४॥

24. And because (its) form is mentioned (the passage under discussion refers to Brahman).

'Fire is its head, its eyes the sun and the moon, the quarters its ears' etc. (*Muṇḍ.* 2.1.4) Thus it is said to have the three worlds for Its body. Hence that which is the source of all beings is none other than the Supreme Self.

(To be continued)

NOTES AND COMMENTS

TO OUR READERS

Swami Vivekananda's lecture on "Divine Love" was given on April 12, 1900. It is one of the number of previously unpublished lectures given in the San Francisco area that were noted down at the time of delivery by Ida Ansell and transcribed for publication only a short time before her death on January 31, 1955. Swamiji is reported as having spoken so arrestingly as to make any complete record of his words difficult to make. In the interest of absolute faithfulness, when transcribing them no alterations were made in the somewhat incomplete notes Ida Ansell was able to take down. Where omissions were left because of some obscurity, these in the printed version have been indicated by three dots. Any matter added for purposes of clarification has been placed in square brackets. . . .

'Reality,' says Dr. P. S. Sastri in 'The Mystic in Ṛgveda', 'cannot be comprehended' by us because we attach too much importance to our bodies 'to the detriment of spiritual values.' We follow 'false values of life. All this is the result of *Nīhāra*'—mist that envelopes us, 'the same as *Māyā* or *Avidyā* in its *Āvaraṇa-Śakti*'. 'The person that has only empirical knowledge is a laggard,

stupid in friendship, and unfit for any heroism.' He 'who has no inkling of the higher knowledge, the joyful spiritual wisdom, can be said to have neither eyes nor ears. Such a one will not find the universe to be a spiritual whole.' And that is our greatest drawback at the present day. . . . Dr. Sastri's reference 'to the mysterious potency of prayer and knowledge' is quite apt. 'The nature of prayer,' says he, 'is spiritual. . . it must embody pure and lofty thoughts. It is effective when it is recognized as having both the individual and social values. . . .

Sri Subhash Chandra, M.A., has followed up his article on Spinoza by one on Bradley this time. The first part is devoted to show that 'A relational way of thought . . . is a makeshift, a device, a mere practical compromise, most necessary but in the end most indefensible.' When the writer points out that 'Whatever is rejected as appearance is, for that reason, no mere nonentity', or that 'In the Absolute there is no clash or collision' but a Harmony that 'assimilates all disharmonies, unites all inconsistencies, and transforms all discrepancies', students who have a genuinely harmonizing bent of mind will naturally remember similar positions found in the different philosophical schools of India . . . We have previously published in these columns articles which discussed aspects of the 'doctrine of the degrees of truth and reality.' . . .

India is passing through a period of important changes. Whatever obstructs an easy adjustment or change over is bound to disappear sooner or later. Unnecessary pain and bitterness can be avoided if people are enabled to take a balanced view of old customs and institutions. It is clear that when poverty, illiteracy, disease etc., are to be eliminated, and when the nation as a whole has to rise to its full stature, petty divisions and loyalties based on caste, creed, or even language become serious hindrances to any forward movement. Patient explanations about the forces involved are necessary to re-educate the people and aid them in adjusting themselves to the altered and rapidly altering conditions. Sri G. K. Kripalani, M.Sc., B.A. (Hons) A.I.A., has approached the problem of caste from various useful angles. He has ended his interesting survey by insisting that 'The human person must expand in all directions: he must widen areas of his co-operative effort: he must enlarge the sphere of his sympathies. . . The heart of the human person is the place of this change. Without this change, no enduring betterment will take place in the social order. Without this spiritual rejuvenation, the breaking-up of the institution of caste may even be attended by all round misery, social atomization and the rise of a new barbarism.' . . .

Ancient Indian sages regarded man primarily as a soul (Ātmā), and only secondarily as a member of a family or bigger socio-economic unit. Hence Codes like those of Manu have had a philosophical background. This is not ordinarily noticed, as it should be. Dr. R. S. Betai, M.A., Ph.D., has done a great service by explaining the philosophical elements in Manusmṛti. He concludes his article by comparing the theories of Action as taught in Manusmṛti and in the *Gītā*. In these days when educated people think that their own attitude is 'dynamic' as against what they consider to have been an 'other-worldly, negative, and pessimistic attitude in our ancients, Dr. Betai's article showing that Manu stressed 'Proper and Good Action' is bound to be interesting and quite valuable . . .

Dr. R. Panikker, M.A., M.Sc., Th.L., Ph.D. rightly says that 'Sanctity is as manifold as Man and his nature.' For 'Some saints reflect the perfections of God by their hidden and silent lives; some others are leaders, some teachers, some are heroes of sacrifice and some victims of love.' Sages of India have always recognized the fact of diversity not only in respect of 'sanctity' as an attainment, but also in respect of the 'Paths' which aspirants of different tastes and temperaments are to take to reach the Goal. This Goal, too, they have taught, can be expressed in different ways,—for speech cannot adequately re-

present It at all—as man reaching God, or God 'descending' into man, or the realization of 'non-duality'. Indian religious literature is filled with stories of Brahmarṣis, Rājarṣis, poet-saints, musician-saints, as well as saints, men and women, who 'bridged the gulf' created by different creeds and philosophies. Into this group, endowed with spiritual wealth, who will not welcome the two saints whose beautiful lives Dr. Panikker has vividly portrayed? As he says, 'What ultimately matters is not our ideas, or our experiences, or our denying this or doing that; what matters is not such a method of prayer or such a peculiar way of life. The all-important thing, the unique and the ultimate end of man is sanctity, union with God, transformation in God, divinisation of our full being.' . . . This article was a paper 'for the Seminar for the Study of great Religions held at Madras last December.'

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

SECURITY FOR ALL AND FREE ENTERPRISE. By Henry I. Wachtel. *Philosophical Library, New York. Pp. 162. Price $ 3.00.*

This is a study intended to acquaint the English-speaking public with a noteworthy personality, Joseph Popper Lynkeus, a prophetic and saintly person, at the same time thoroughly modern. In this book, we get samples of this great man's writings on many important topics and social problems. What is most remarkable is his analysis of human problems. His philosophy is individualistic through and through and to him all life is sacred. His analysis of social problems is surprisingly simple and sensible. He reduces all social problems to one great problem which is essentially the human problem, to secure for each member of society the necessary means of livelihood, not dependent on the exigencies or on the will of any individual or group of persons in society. The logical corollary of such a statement of the problem is obvious. In this view the life of the individual acquires a supreme worth and the State is come to be looked upon as "no more than a utilitarian association to assure security of existence for individuals living on a common soil and to lighten the burden of their lot on this earth." He does not rest content with the diagnosis only but goes on to make his prescription also. It may be and it is very natural that after the lapse of so many years and after what the world has gone through in the meantime, these may need a little addition and alteration, here and there. But the real significance of his works lies, as Einstein points out, in his statement of aims. Today we all know the necessity and importance of a rational planning of our social life. And rational planning cannot work and succeed unless blindness of purpose is overcome and a clear view of the aims is set forth. Here the works of this author can mean much in giving clarity and direction to our thoughts and actions to that purpose. And finally when all is said and done, one thing supreme remains. That is his assertion and vindication of the worth of the individual. Indeed in this age of totalitarianism when the State tends to absorb the whole of the life of an individual and the individual as a consequence tends to become no more than a cog in the wheels of a gigantic machine, it is heartening and refreshing indeed to hear the voice of a Humanist who declares: "when some one, be he ever so humble or insignificant in the social scale, someone who never intentionally harms or jeopardises the life of another human being, loses his life without his consent or against his will, this is a more important event than all political or national events, more than all scientific, artistic or technical achievements of all peoples of all times." In other words, the world today needs to be reminded that no better guiding principle of social life has been formulated since Protagoras declared "Man is the measure of all things."

Prof. Biswanath Banerjee

SEARCH FOR PURPOSE. By Arthur E. Morgan. *Published by the Antioch Press, Yellow Springs, Ohio, U. S. A. Pp. 197. Price 3 Dollars (Rs. 15.00).*

This is indeed one of the most thought-provoking volumes on Practical Ethics we have had of late. It is based neither on the pure scholastic philosophy nor on the pure materialistic science. It is an amalgam, however, of both and founded on the experience of the author on the empirical plane. It is thus pragmatic. He admits his own biological limitation to understand or explain satisfactorily the various higher truths to which alone the springs of human action could be satisfactorily traced. The one truth he seems to have arrived at for his Purpose in Life without cloudening his gross vision into the heart of nature is an attempt of life to survive against all traditional thought, custom, and rather slavish patterns of action in pursuance of them. His basis for ethics or good conduct of both

the individual and society is the biological necessity for the survival of the fittest. The fittest are those who are both, genetically and psychologically sound, and informed with the holy motive to live and let others live, happily and felicitously. The divine states of blessedness or beatitude are out of his lexicon. Anything that offends against this virtuous attitude does not only not survive, but must not be allowed to survive in the beneficial interests of humanity. God according to him is as much human in his own limitations, and is subject to the same laws of evolution. This is the sum and substance of the volume, an autobiographical confession.

The author's honesty in the bargain is quite praiseworthy, although his convictions about India and her hoary culture (Pp. 97-98) if not ridiculous, are rather amusing. We may urge upon his notice Kauṭilya's *Artha Śāstra, Śukranīti,* Vātsyāyana's *Kāma-Sūtras,* and *Bhagavadgītā,* to name but a few, that existed long before the historical human type was evolved in the West, and assert that the Britishers' domination over India was more the result of their commercial craftiness and the political mistrust of one kingdom in the other engendered by the Moslem hordes that invaded India, rather than the Indians' own aboriginality or want of culture. A short sojourn of a month or two in India or the contact with the official world which has not yet opened its eyes fully to India's ancient cultural moorings, and with a mentality industrialized and close-wedded to biology is not enough for anyone to soar above the empirical and understand India or even Albert Schweitzer or Tennyson.

Science which is simply concerned with the tangible cause and effect cannot determine the Man and the motives of his action. Man remains still the Unknown as Alexis Carrel puts it; for

> "There are more things in heaven and earth,
> Horatio,
> Than are dreamt of in your philosophy."

But the author's honest attempt to solve some of the riddles and dilemmas of life and thus know himself, and his involuntary subscription to Pandit Nehru's Pancaśīlatva for peace and plenty to all are redeeming. They endow him with the quality of a spiritual aspirant, though he would not be labelled as such. There is a vein of Marcus Aurelius' calm acceptance of things as they are. lit up however with a robust optimism that their quality would be bettered in the course of further evolution.

The volume has a neat format but is rather costly for India.

P. Sama Rao

GEOGRAPHICAL FACTORS IN INDIAN HISTORY. By K. M. Panikkar. Published by Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Chaupatty, Bombay, 1955. Pages 100. Price Rs. 1-12-0.

As the learned author has pointed out, Geopolitics or the relation of geography with political processes is a new subject in historical and political studies, which originated with Sir Halford Mackinder's essay on the *Geographical Pivot of History.* Its newness does not detract from its importance, rather nations have paid dearly in the past for neglecting this important branch of knowledge which affects their destinies very intimately, and nowhere is it more evident as in the case of india, where Geography had been a sadly neglected subject.

There were some attempts made by Sir Alexander Cunningham, N. L. Dey, and others to give the geographical background of ancient Indian history, but they, though useful in their own way, are more in the nature of identifying places or relating them with events, rather than reflective thinking on the dynamism of geography in shaping history. Dr. B. C. Law's work on *Historical Geography of Ancient India,* published in 1954, is also of the same type. The book under review gives a graphic account of the importance of geography in world history, how its ignorance has affected the history of nations, and the geographical factors of India and their role in the development of Indian history—especially of the Himalayas in the north, and the Indian ocean in the South, to which separate chapters have been devoted. It also discusses the land and sea routes of invasion of India in the past, and how far they still constitute a danger to India's defence.

The author, a distinguished statesman, writer and historian, and a versatile scholar, both in ancient Indian lore and modern knowledge, brings into full play his great abilities and wide experience in the delineation of the influence of geographical factors on Indian history in a world-perspective. He has succeeded in compressing much valuable information—geographical, historical, racial, economic, and cultural—not merely factual, but interpretative —within the short space of 100 pages. The book makes very instructive reading of absorbing interest and enkindles thought. It is a pioneer work of its type in India and makes much original contribution. It will be read with profit both by the lay reader and the scholar, and every Indian politician, statesman, and military leader *must* read this book.

Swami Mukhyananda

NEWS AND REPORTS

READING MATERIAL (UNESCO) FOR NEW LITERATES

Production of more simplified reading material to meet the needs of the fast-growing number of new literates in Burma, Ceylon, India and Pakistan is urged in a report prepared by 16 experts from the four countries.

The report records the unanimous opinion of the meeting that "tbere is a great and urgent need for extending and improving the production of reading material ranging from elementary readers to general popular literature. . . The audience for this type of material is fast expanding and an ever-growing demand will have to be met."

The meeting strongly believed, adds the report, that, "the time has come when a major and concentrated effort by both Unesco and national governments is needed to assist in the production of this reading material."

The report emphasizes that there is need for "simplified reading material in which careful attention is given to the contents and presentation"; and "these must be related to the various reading ability levels and to the interests of the audience to be served."

The care with which the reading material for the new literate is produced will influence greatly the country's culture, the development of good citizenship, the improvement of crafts, and the proper use of leisure, says the report.

To obtain such literature, the experts agreed, encouragement of authors is of the utmost importance. The report recommends a study of author's rights in the region, with a view to assuring them a fair return; a foundation for aid to authors; an old-age fund; and awards through Unesco.

The experts recommend also that governments assist financially in the promotion of reading material by awarding prizes; by buying parts of editions of books considered to be in the national interest; and by direct subsidy of books impossible to puhlish on purely commercial terms.

RAMAKRISHNA MISSION SEVASHRAMA, VRINDABAN

Report for the year 1955

During the year 1955, the Sevashrama conducted an Indoor Hospital admitting 2,517 cases. Of these 1,845 were cured and discharged, 513 were relieved and discharged, 63 were discharged otherwise, 36 died and 60 remained under treatment at the end of the year. The total number of Surgical operations performed, including eye-operations, was 1,818. The number of cases treated in the Outdoor Dispensary during the year was 45,894 new and 95,696 were old cases. The Homœopathic Department treated 8,188 new and 24,560 old cases. In the Electro-Therapeutic Department 21 patients were treated, and in the Clinical Laboratory attached to the Sevashrama 2,174 samples of blood, urine, stool, sputum, and puncture fluids were examined. Rs. 217/- were spent on monthly and occasional pecuniary help to 15 persons. The total quantity of milk that was distributed from the Milk Canteen was 11,200 lbs. On an average 165.3 persons were given regularly 1 pound of milk per head per day for 3 months. The receipts for the year under the General Fund amounted to Rs. 97,786/2/-, and the total expenditure was Rs. 89,631/5/3-. For the construction of the hospital buildings and quarters for the doctors, workers and servants about 19 lakhs of rupees are required. The Sevashrama appeals to the generous public to contribute liberally to this noble cause.

THE HOLY MOTHER CENTENARY CELEBRATIONS, BOMBAY STATE

This report, issued by the Holy Mother Birth Centenary Committee, Khar, Bombay 21, shows that Celebrations were held not only in the Bombay Ramakrishna Mission Ashrama but also in Ahmedabad, Baroda, Broach, Godhra, Anand (Karamsad), Vallabh Vidya Nagar, Poona, Ahmednagar, Nasik, Kolhapur, Sangli, Rashin (Ahmednagar Dt), Karnatak, Dharwar and Bijapur. On those occasions there were speeches in English, Gujarathi, Hindi and Marathi. The speakers described Saradamani as an ideal of Womanhood and Motherhood and told that Her life, although uneventful, carried a lofty message of love and duty to the world at large and that Her highly unostentatious life of deep spirituality was led to illustrate the Sanatana Dharma of India. Concluding celebrations were also held in different parts of the Bombay City witb (a) a tableau exhibition of 32 scenes depicting the main events of Her life, (b) exhibitions of arts, crafts and 'Rangooli', (c) Women's Conference, (d) Students' Day, and (e) a Musical Festival. Total Receipts and Expenditure were Rs. 31,635-10-0 and Rs. 24,165-11-9 respectively leaving a Balance of Rs. 7,469-14-3 to be utilized for Her memorial construction.