

Prabuddha Bharata

JUNE, 1930

Volume XXXV



Number 6

“उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।”

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

DISCOURSES ON JNANA YOGA

BY SWAMI VIVEKANANDA

Thought is all important, for “what we think we become.” There was once a Sannyâsin, a holy man, who sat under a tree and taught the people. He drank milk and ate only fruit, and made endless “prânâyâmas,” and felt himself to be very holy. In the same village lived an evil woman. Every day the Sannyâsin went and warned her that her wickedness would lead her to hell. The poor woman, unable to change her method of life which was her only means of livelihood, was still much moved by the terrible future depicted by the Sannyâsin. She wept and prayed to the Lord, begging Him to forgive her because she could not help herself. By and by both the holy man and the evil woman died. The angels came and bore her to heaven, while the demons claimed the soul of the Sannyâsin. “Why is this !” he exclaimed, “have I not lived a most holy life, and preached holiness to everybody? Why should I be taken to hell while this wicked woman is taken to heaven?” “Because,” answered the demons, “while she was forced to commit unholy acts, her mind was always fixed on the Lord and she sought deliverance, which has now come to her.

But you, on the contrary, while you performed only holy acts, had your mind always fixed on the wickedness of others. You saw only sin, and thought only of sin, so now you have to go to that place where only sin is.” The moral of the story is obvious : the outer life avails little. The heart must be pure and the pure heart sees only good, never evil. We should never try to be guardians of mankind, or to stand on a pedestal as saints reforming sinners. Let us rather purify ourselves, and the result must be that in so doing we shall help others.

Physics is bounded on both sides by metaphysics. So it is with reason,—it starts from non-reason and ends with non-reason. If we push inquiry far enough in the world of perception, we must reach a plane beyond perception. Reason is really stored up and classified perception, preserved by memory. We can never imagine or reason beyond our sense-perceptions. Nothing beyond reason can be an object of sense-knowledge. We feel the limited character of reason, yet it does bring us to a plane where we get a glimpse of something beyond. The question then arises : “Has man an in-

strument that transcends reason?" It is very probable that in man there is a power to reach beyond reason, in fact the saints in all ages assert the existence of this power in themselves. But it is impossible in the very nature of things to translate spiritual ideas and perceptions into the language of reason, and these same saints have each and all declared their inability to make known their spiritual experiences. Language can, of course, supply no words for them, so that it can only be asserted that these are actual experiences and can be had by all. Only in that way can they become known, but they can never be described. Religion is the science which learns the transcendental in nature through the transcendental in man. We know as yet but little of man, consequently but little of the universe. When we know more of man, we shall probably know more of the universe. Man is the epitome of all things and all knowledge is in him. Only for that infinitesimal portion of the universe, which comes into sense-perception, are we able to find a reason, never can we give the reason for any fundamental principle. Giving a reason for a thing is simply to classify it and put it in a pigeon-hole of the mind. When we meet a new fact, we at once strive to put it in some existing category and the attempt to do this is to reason. When we succeed in placing the fact, it gives a certain amount of satisfaction, but we can never go beyond the physical plane in this classification. That man can transcend the limits of the senses, is the emphatic testimony of all past ages. The Upanishads told 5,000 years ago that the realization of God could never be had through the senses. So far, modern agnosticism agrees, but the Vedas go further than the negative side and assert in the plainest terms that man can and does transcend this sense-bound, frozen universe. He can as it were find a hole in the ice, through which he can pass and reach the whole ocean of life. Only by so transcending the world of sense, can

he reach his true self, and realize what he really is.

Jnâna is never sense-knowledge. We cannot *know* Brahman, but we *are* Brahman, the whole of It, not a piece. The unextended never can be divided. The apparent variety is but the reflection seen in time and space, as we see the sun reflected in a million dew-drops, though we know that the sun itself is one and not many. In Jnâna we have to lose sight of the variety and see only the Unity. Here there is no subject, no object, no knowing, no thou or he or I, only the one, absolute Unity. We *are* this all the time; once free, ever free. Man is *not* bound by the law of causation. Pain and misery are not in man, they are but as the passing cloud throwing its shadow over the sun, but the cloud passes, the sun is unchanged, and so it is with man. He is not born, he does not die, he is not in time and space. These ideas are mere reflections of the mind, but we mistake them for the reality and so lose sight of the glorious truth they obscure. Time is but the method of our thinking, but we are the eternally present tense. Good and evil have existence only in relation to us. One cannot be had without the other, because neither has meaning or existence apart from the other. As long as we recognize duality, or separate God and man, so long we must see good *and* evil. Only by going to the centre, by unifying ourselves with God, can we escape the delusions of the senses. When we let go the eternal fever of desire, the endless thirst that gives us no rest, when we have forever quenched desire, we shall escape both good and evil, because we shall have transcended both. The satisfaction of desire only increases it, as oil poured on fire but makes it burn more fiercely. The farther from the centre, the faster goes the wheel, the less the rest. Draw near the centre, check desire, stamp it out, let the false self go, then our vision will clear and we shall see God. Only through renunciation of this life and of all life to come (heaven), can

we reach the point where we stand firmly on the true Self. While we hope for anything, desire still rules us. Be for one moment really hopeless and the mist will clear. For what to hope when one is the all of existence? The secret

of Jnâna is to give up all and be sufficient unto ourselves. Say "not", and you become "not"; say "is", and you become "is". Worship the Self within, naught else exists, all that blinds us is Mâyâ—delusion.

A BRINJAL-SELLER APPRAISES A DIAMOND

BY THE EDITOR

V

Mr. Ghosh complains that Sri Ramakrishna did not truly understand the significance of Brahmo worship (*Arâdhanâ*). It may be that he did not know the fine distinctions that Brahmos make between *Arâdhanâ*, *Dhyâna*, Prayer, etc., as parts of their spiritual exercise. But he was not concerned with these distinctions. He noted the mental attitude of the Brahmo devotees when they spoke of God's glories, and he found that such recounting of God's glories kept their mind far away from true devotion to Him. Therefore he asked them to desist from it. Anyone can understand that his exhortations in this respect were not to the worldly-minded among the Brahmos, those who had no earnestness for God-realisation, but to those whom he found devout. He thought that if one dwelt so much on God's creation, his mind would be too externalised. One must think of God Himself and not of His doings. Mr. Ghosh accuses Sri Ramakrishna of self-contradiction in this. He quotes passages from the *Gospel*, in which Sri Ramakrishna himself says that he sings the name and praise of God and advises others to do so; and he adds: "So he had no valid reasons for condemning *Brahma Aradhana* which also according to him, meant 'singing God's praise.'" Emphatically it did not mean the same thing. Here Mr. Ghosh misleads himself and his readers. Singing God's praise did not, according to Sri Ramakrishna, mean that one should catalogue all the big things God has done,—the sun, moon, stars, etc., but

dwelling on His attributes, His infiniteness, eternity, mercy, love, etc., especially the latter attributes, which constitute His *Mâdhurya*, sweetness. There are ample evidences that Mr. Ghosh has taken great pains to compare the English version with the original Bengali edition of the *Gospel*. He has quoted Sri Ramakrishna as singing God's name and praise and advising it to others. He has quoted from the English version. Did it not occur to him to seek the original of the phrase? If he had done so, he would have found that the original is: *Nâma-guna-gâna* or *kirtana*, which is quite different from the Brahmos' retailing of God's works which are God's *Aishvarya*. In page 48, *Gospel*, Vol. II (1st edition) we find Sri Ramakrishna saying to Pandit Sivanath Sastri: "So I say, a man seeks the person whom he delights in; what is the use of knowing his whereabouts or the number of his houses, gardens and his servants? When I see Narendra, I forget everything else: never have I even unwittingly asked him where he lived, or who was his parent or how many brothers he had. *Be immersed in the sweetness of His bliss! Infinite is His creation and infinite His glory! What is the use of our knowing all these?*" [Mr. Ghosh also has quoted from the same page. But how is it that he omits these significant sentences italicised by us?] There is a world of difference between God's *Mâdhurya* and *Aishvarya*. Sri Ramakrishna said again and again that the thought of God's *Aishvarya* keeps the devotee's mind away from God, it makes it outgoing, and one finds it difficult to love Him.

What Sri Ramakrishna wanted was that Brahmos should dwell on God's *Mâdhurya* and not His *Aishvarya*. When he prescribed the singing of God's *guna* he meant His *Mâdhurya*. In replying to Swami Nikhilananda's rejoinder in the April *Modern Review*, Mr. Ghosh says: "Attributes and their manifestations are concomitants. We know attributes through their manifestations." Here he avoids the main point. We want to know God and love Him and not His attributes. We dwell on the attributes in order to know Him. But if we have also to dwell on the manifestations of the attributes, we recede one step further from God. And that is what is objected to by Sri Ramakrishna. Does Mr. Ghosh maintain that we cannot think of God through His essential attributes without dwelling on the manifestations of the attributes also? It is indeed psychologically impossible to perceive the concrete world and God at the same time. And he himself says in another place: "But in higher stages the description and analysis of an attribute are not necessary. The mentioning of that attribute is enough, and you need not mention that attribute more than once; no repetition is necessary. Utter an attribute, say the word *Satyam* and the whole soul of the devotee will be aroused. He will feel His presence and he will feel himself united with Him." Mr. Ghosh very facilely observes that the Brahmos do not make any distinction between the Garden and the Lord of the Garden. It may be so, but only immature minds would consider the obliteration of this distinction possible for the average Brahmo for whom also the *Arâdhanâ* is meant. And what is the way to realising God in His creation? To quote the famous logical argument which Mr. Ghosh produced to refute the validity of Sri Ramakrishna's God-visions, one cannot know that A is B, until one has known A first and seen it to become transformed into B. Yes, one must first learn to love God with his whole heart and soul, as He is in Him-

self. Only then would one see Him in His creation. The mind must be purged of its present distorted vision of reality. Only then the true vision of the creation as Divinity would be possible.

Mr. Ghosh is nothing if not ingenious. He emphasizes Sri Ramakrishna's words *gardener* and *garden*. He takes them in their literal sense and argues hard to prove that a gardener cannot exist without a garden, and therefore one must think of the garden also, if he is to think of the gardener. Good logic. But Sri Ramakrishna was not speaking these things to logicians and in a logical mood. His meaning was clear and simple: Yes, God has created the universe; but forget the universe, and think of Him alone. What he wanted is that Brahmos should think of God and not of His creation. But Mr. Ghosh's logic prevents him from understanding this simple meaning. He cannot say that God cannot be thought of without thinking of His creation at the same time. For as we have seen, he himself implies that one can contemplate on God without thinking of His creation and he considers it a higher form of spiritual practice.

We cannot forego the pleasure of quoting here a fine reasoning of Mr. Ghosh: "The gardener without the garden and the garden without the gardener—both are meaningless abstractions. One cannot exist without the other. Many will impatiently ask—would then God be extinct, if there were no world? The answer is—There will still remain God; . . . There will still be an entity, but . . . it is an empty entity." What beautiful reasoning! Entity, but 'empty' entity, as if emptiness can constitute an entity! And that empty entity, mind you, is no less than God—"There will still remain God"! What kind of God is that which is an empty entity? Evidently Mr. Ghosh thinks that when God is deprived of His creation, He becomes like a perforated balloon, shrunken to nothingness. It is such mentality of

the Brahmos, which considers the creation as the essence of God, as was disapproved by Sri Ramakrishna. Such mental attitude could not produce also right *Dhyâna*. One may be interested to know what Sri Ramakrishna thought of the *Dhyâna* of the average Brahmos. He said: "The leader said: 'Let us commune with Him.' I thought: 'They will now go into the inner world and stay a long time.' Hardly had a few minutes passed when they all opened their eyes. I was astonished. Can anyone find Him after so slight a meditation? After it was all over, when we were alone, I spoke to Keshab about it: 'I watched all your congregation communing with their eyes shut. Do you know what it reminds me of? Sometimes at Dakshineswar I have seen under the trees a flock of monkeys sitting stiff and looking the very picture of innocence. . . . They were thinking and planning their campaign of robbing certain gardens of fruits, roots, and other edibles . . . in a few moments. The communing that your followers did with God to-day is not more serious.' " (See Swami Saradananda : *Divyabhâva*, 1st edition, p. 13).

Sri Ramakrishna could certainly judge what was genuine meditation.

VI

Mr. Ghosh says that "Paramahansa's divine worship consisted primarily in (1) Nama-japa, repeating God's name and (2) singing His praise." It is a most incorrect and ignorant characterisation of Sri Ramakrishna's divine worship. *Nâma-japa* and *Kirtana* were only two of the many and various ways in which he performed divine worship, and Mr. Ghosh evidently knows that, for he has referred in course of his article to *Lilâprasanga*, *Sâdhakabhâva*, in which all his *Sâdhanâs* are described. In his after life also, when all his *Sâdhanâs* had been over, he did not dwell on *Nâma-japa* and *Kirtana* alone. He lived in varied moods, enjoying Divine Communion in various ways, and instructed his disciples also variously.

Anyhow it is interesting to note what Mr. Ghosh has to say of Sri Ramakrishna's *Nâma-japa*. He begins with the misleading and careless statement: "He accepted the popular view of the worth of *Nama* (name) . . . The popular belief is that the 'nama' of God has some inherent inscrutable mystic power." The opposite, however, is the fact. A Ramakrishna discovers by his own experience the worth of God's name and people believe in his affirmation. Sri Ramakrishna had not to accept a popular belief. The sages found the mysterious powers of God's names by their *Sâdhanâ* and communicated the truth to the people who therefore believed. We specially take note of this, for we want to emphasise that in spite of Mr. Ghosh and his modernism, the proof of these things lies in the experience of sages and not in the syllogisms of logicians arguing from imperfect premises.

Mr. Ghosh says in the April *Modern Review* that Sri Ramakrishna believed in the "magical and mystical power of particular names." By this Mr. Ghosh implies that Sri Ramakrishna thought that simply a few repetitions of God's names could produce some magical and mystical effect. This is, to say the least, an ignorant description of Sri Ramakrishna's attitude. Sri Ramakrishna never believed in the magical effect of *Nâma-japa*, though he believed in its mystical effect *under certain conditions*. Mr. Ghosh has quoted from pages 138, 185 and 196 of the 2nd Vol. of *Gospel* to indicate Sri Ramakrishna's attitude towards *Nâma-japa*. He quotes some casual utterances, but omits the more serious ones. He ought to have reproduced the passage in pages 105—107 (1st edition), 2nd Vol., which is decidedly more representative:

"Sri R : Well, what do you say,—what is the way?

"Goswami : His Name alone will do. The Holy Name is very effective in Kali Yuga.

"Sri R : Yes, no doubt the Holy Name is very effective; but is it suffi-

cient without love?—The soul must hunger for God! Or what will it avail that I repeat His name, if my mind is attached to *Kâmini-Kâñchana*? . . .

“*Goswami*: What about Ajamil then? Ajamil was a great sinner, there was no sin he did not commit. But only because in his dying hour, he called his son by his name of ‘Nârâyana’, he was saved.

“*Sri R*: Perchance he had accumulated great merit in his previous birth. Besides it is said that he practised penance afterwards.

“‘You may also explain it thus: Those were Ajamil’s last moments. An elephant besmears his body with dust and mud immediately after his bath. But the elephant remains clean, if after bath, his keeper puts him into the stall at once!

“‘Man becomes purged of his sins for once by uttering His name. But the next moment he takes to various sinful acts,—he has not enough strength of mind to vow that he will never more commit any sin. . . .

“‘Therefore take always the name of the Lord, but pray to Him at the same time that you may earn love for him, and that your attachment for money, fame and physical comforts that are but transient, may grow less and less!’ ”

This passage fully represents Sri Ramakrishna’s view of *Nâma-japa*. He believed that for the *Nâma-japa* to be effective, there must be earnestness and eagerness for God-realisation, and one must be rid of worldly attachments. Without these it will not produce any effective result. Similar other passages can be cited from the *Gospel* in confirmation. Sri Ramakrishna did not maintain that a mechanical repetition will grant God-vision.

But he certainly held that the repetition would produce some result. It is axiomatic that every action has some effect. The repetition of God’s name cannot be without it. Once two devotees were conversing among themselves about the effect of repeating

God’s name. One maintained that it was not always effective. But the other said that it was like the seed of a banyan tree, it contained immense potentialities; and though it might not sprout at once, it would do so one day. On hearing them Sri Ramakrishna said: “Yes, it becomes effective after a long time.” (*Kathâmrta*, Vol. III, second edition, page 66). Here no *magical* effect of unconscious or mechanical repetition of God’s name is maintained. In the conversation we have quoted above, we find Sri Ramakrishna saying that the utterance of the name of God purifies a man, but that his bad deeds overwhelm him again. Here also no *magical* effect of Divine names is suggested. As will be apparent from the conversation quoted, Sri Ramakrishna did not endorse the main point of that story of Ajamil, that even an unconscious taking of God’s name can grant salvation. But he certainly held that a conscious repetition of God’s name has a sanctifying effect, however transient. The reason is not far to seek. Even a fleeting remembrance of God is purifying. With the man of God, however, the repetition of God’s name may certainly show results which are apparently magical. A single utterance of the name of God can transport him to God-consciousness. Our critic also admits that a single utterance of a significant name of God may produce such a result. This is not however to say that God’s name has no mystical effect. What is ‘mystical’? That which is too deep for the normal mind, which is not comprehended by the ordinary reason. Certainly the names of God have relations and implications, which are too deep to be comprehended by the normal and rational mind.

Mr. Ghosh says: “To modernists the name has no intrinsic worth. It has no mystic power. It is simply a sound. Its value is the value of a symbol or a logical concept.” Mr. Ghosh says that the verbal symbols are man-made creations. That means that whatever words have passed as names of God, must re-

mind one of God alone when one repeats them. So it is not inevitable that new names should be coined for *Nâma-japa*. A name etymologically may mean anything. But if through long usage, it suggests the idea of God, it is enough for our purpose. Therefore, whether one believed in the mystic power of God's name or not, one derives the same result from its repetition as any modernist by repeating newly-coined names. But Mr. Ghosh soon shifts his ground: He began with the *symbolical* significance of name, now he upholds the *etymological* significance. He says: "If you wish to be immersed in Divine Love, the name must signify that God is Love. The terrific aspect of God cannot inspire the emotion of Love." Evidently he here means such names as Kali etc. If, however, it is said that the repetitions of such names produced God-consciousness, he says: "Some mistake the vacuity of mind for immersion in and union with God. Such vacuity may be induced by thinking on any sound or symbol. Such condition may be compared to artificial sleep and is present even in non-theistic Yoga or Samadhi. It is non-spiritual." A more responsible man would have hesitated to write the above. Not only our critic knows all the secrets of the realisation of Kali or similar Divine aspects, but he also knows the secrets of Yogic achievements, and confidently declares that these are all induced states of mental vacuity, nothing else. His ignorance is his strongest proof. Where is the proof that the terrific aspect of God cannot inspire the emotion of Love? It may be that it cannot inspire love in him or his modernist friends. But what proof has he to deny the testimony of hundreds and thousands of *Shâkta Sâdhakas* and *Siddhas*? A Ramprasad or a Ramakrishna does not prove to him the falsity of his idea; on the contrary, his ignorance proves a Ramprasad or Ramakrishna to be false! Such strange reasoning may be enough to delude oneself, but not to ascertain truth.

He holds up before us the big stick of 'modernism' and tells us to disown belief in the mystic power of name. What if many saints and sages have declared otherwise? We would like to know of Mr. Ghosh who are those whom he calls modernists. Are all modern thinkers modernists? Are they all agreed on the conventional, man-made origin of language? Fortunately for India even all Western thinkers do not consider that words are mere conventional symbols of ideas. These were not deliberately coined by men. The relation of word and meaning goes much deeper than the conscious mind of man. It is conceivable, therefore, that the effect of the repetition of certain words would be much deeper than warranted by superficial logic. Logic is not enough to estimate the psychological effect of anything, much less of a word-symbol. Only deep introspection and, more than that, personal experience can reveal the true effect of *Nâma-japa*. Let Mr. Ghosh practise *Nâma-japa* in the orthodox style for a sufficient time, having fulfilled the conditions precedent, he will know. It is through mystical experience that we can know what effects are produced by what words. An arbitrary choice will not do. Mr. Ghosh is expected to know the Indian doctrine of *Nâda-Brahman*, of *Sphota*. He must refute it properly before he can scout the 'popular' idea of the mystical effect of *Nâma-japa*. Sri Ramakrishna's attitude was quite in accordance with this doctrine confirmed by his own experience.

Mr. Ghosh has good words to say about Sri Ramakrishna's catholicism. He asks all to be tolerant and catholic. But the following quotation is illustrative of his peculiar catholicism: "Many will ask—Are we to tolerate idol-worship? Yes, every form of worship is to be tolerated. Another point may be considered here. What is called 'idol-worship' is not the worship of an idol. No one can psychologically worship an idol as idol, a stone as stone. What they worship is a spirit or a power which

is believed to reside in or to come, on a particular occasion, to a particular object. We know, their belief is wrong, but that does not make them sinful. The days of Imperialistic Religions are gone. There now arises no question of honouring or insulting God. The idea of dishonouring God by idol worship is now antiquated and foolish. So even the so-called idol-worship is to be tolerated."

VII

Such is the learned writer's estimation of Sri Ramakrishna. He was deluded to worship Kali,—fortunately he was afterwards disillusioned; his *Samâdhi* was not really union with God, for *Samâdhi* is nothing but concentration of mind; his visions were really nothing Divine, but only projections of his own thoughts,—there was no truth in them; he was only a *Bhakta*; his idea of *Nâma-japa* was wrong, in fact his repetition of the name of Kali did not produce any spiritual condition but only a vacuity of mind; and his conception of Brahmo worship was wrong. This is the character of Sri Ramakrishna that has emerged from the clever review of Mr. Ghosh. We do not wonder at the result. What amazes us is how he could preface his criticism with such remarks as these about Sri Ramakrishna: "He was a 'god-intoxicated' man. He was an incarnation of the spirit of Chaitanya. His ecstatic devotion (*Bhakti*) was alone sufficient to attract devotees to his side or to his feet." How does he reconcile his critical estimate with these prefatory remarks? A God-intoxicated man certainly cannot be deluded about his own spiritual practices. He cannot be subject to hallucinations and consider them to be spiritual visions. He was deluded in almost everything, yet he was God-intoxicated! Perhaps one of the strange conclusions of 'modernism' is that it considers a man spiritually deluded and yet God-intoxicated! We cannot reconcile these two aspects. We think that to be so exalted and God-intoxicated as Sri Ramakrishna

was even in our critic's view, one must be above hallucination and seeing visions as a result of his attachment for earthly companions; he cannot be a neurotic; he must be full of truth; his visions must be true; his enunciation of spiritual truths must be correct; he must radiate a great spiritual power; he must be above all fear; his mind must be absolutely pure and free from error. Mr. Ghosh says: "It is the personality of the man (and not his philosophy or theology) that attracts us." Such a distinction is unreal in the case of a man like Sri Ramakrishna, for the theological and philosophical 'defects' that the critic has discovered in Sri Ramakrishna, were vital to his spiritual existence. There may be theological views which are merely views and not vital to our spiritual life. One may be mistaken in them. But a Sri Ramakrishna is nothing if his fundamental theological or philosophical views do not tally with or come out of his own intimate experience. An ordinary man may hold a theological view which might have nothing to do with his life, but not Sri Ramakrishna. Either he is not spiritual enough, or his views must be the outcome of his own experience.

The fact is, persons like the present critic have always found it hard to accept Sri Ramakrishna. They cannot ignore him. They cannot accept him also, because their prejudice and ignorance stand between, and because they have not the courage to accept the challenge of his life. The attempt of Mr. Ghosh is only an expression of that uncomfortable attitude. He is not content with merely denuding Sri Ramakrishna of his true character and greatness, he also hits at his disciples. He categorically states that "he made no disciples, yet many devotees accepted him as their *Guru*." He quotes a few passages from the *Gospel* to substantiate his view. But if he had not been blinded by preconceived notions, he would have found ample proof in the *Gospel* itself to the contrary. Mr. Ghosh totally mis-

understands the attitude of Sri Ramakrishna in this respect. He did not make disciples, yet he made disciples. Certainly he did not make any one a disciple in the way an ordinary *Guru* does,—with a set purpose and in the egoistic spirit. He always repudiated this egoistic spirit. Yet whoever has read his life, knows that for some persons he felt a deep attraction and that he instructed them in every way to realise God. After his *Sâdhanâ* was over, he had a vision of the disciples who would come to him, and every evening he used to cry for them to come to him; and in course of time they actually came. Mr. Ghosh may say that though he helped them spiritually, they were not recognised by him as his disciples. We have already said that his was not the outlook of an ordinary *Guru*; on the other hand, he used to look upon them as the embodiments of God Himself. But what is the sign of the relationship of *Guru* and disciple? The *Guru* must give the disciples initiation and should feel himself responsible for the spiritual welfare of the disciples, he must even take upon himself the burden of their sins, and the disciples should receive a power, or *mantram* or instructions, each or all of them, from the *Guru*. Did Sri Ramakrishna initiate anyone? *He did*. The initiation with Sri Ramakrishna often took different forms—awakening of spiritual consciousness by touch, look, or word, writing sacred words on the tongues of disciples, or imparting a sacred *mantram* by word of mouth. All these various processes are recognised in the *Tantras* as *Deekshâ* or initiation. Sri Ramakrishna felt himself responsible for the disciples' welfare; he always looked after their spiritual condition, removed the obstructions on their way, and even took their *Karma* upon himself. He also consciously and openly recognised himself as their *Guru*. Once one of his disciples, while coming in a row-boat from Calcutta to Dakshineswar, heard some of his fellow-passengers reviling Sri Ramakrishna. He,

however, calmly bore the insult to his Master. When Sri Ramakrishna learnt this, he rebuked him and said: "It is enjoined in the *Shâstras* that if any one abuses your *Guru*, you must either cut off his head or leave the place. And you did not even protest against the slander!" (*Lilâprasanga, Divyabhâva*, Chapter VII). The disciples also felt that he was their *Guru*. What more proof is needed to know that Sri Ramakrishna considered himself as their *Guru*? Mr. Ghosh may have some other idea of *Guruship*. But it must be a peculiar one. A very cogent reply to Mr. Ghosh's doubts on this point will be found in the third chapter of Swami Saradananda's *Gurubhâva*, 1st volume. Space forbids us to reproduce it here.

VIII

Sri Ramakrishna not only initiated the disciples but he actually granted salvation. Mr. Ghosh says: "His followers tried to convince themselves as well as others that he was a special incarnation of God. But he repudiated the idea," and he quotes from the *Gospel* to support his statement. But this also, as usual with Mr. Ghosh, is an one-sided quotation. In the *Gospel* itself there are many passages in which Sri Ramakrishna himself declares his Avatarahood. We ourselves translated a very significant portion in the last November number of *Prabuddha Bharata*. It is quite true that he did not proclaim himself as an Avatar from the house-top. But to his select disciples, he did proclaim himself as such. We give a few instances: Narendranath (Swami Vivekananda), though the most intimate disciple of the Master, would not accept him as an incarnation of God. A free thinker and a rationalist, he did not understand how God could possibly appear as a human being. A couple of days before Sri Ramakrishna's final *Samâdhi*, he was alone with the Master standing by his bedside. Then the disciple thought:

"Many people accept him as an incarnation of God. He also has given enough indication of that. But I never believed him to be so. I will accept him as such, only if now, in the midst of his death agony, he declares to me that he is an Incarnation." It was only a passing thought in his mind. But instantly came the unmistakable reply through the dying lips: "Well, Naren, He who was born in previous ages as Rama and Krishna, is now before you as Ramakrishna,—though not from your Vedantic standpoint." Again on another occasion he said to M.: "There are no outsiders here. One day Harish was with me and I saw *Sachchidānanda* come out from this body. It said: 'I am born as an Incarnation from time to time.'" He added later on: ". . . I find this time there is the fullest manifestation, though with an excess of *Sattva*." Another day he said to Narendra and others: "I see everything is from this (his body)." Then he asked Narendra to explain its meaning. Narendra said: "All created things have emanated from you." Sri Ramakrishna with evident satisfaction said to Rakhal: "Just see!" On still another occasion he said to a devotee: "It is enough for these boys who have come here if they know two things. They need not undergo much spiritual austerities. First, they should know who I am, and secondly, who they are. Many of the boys belong to the inner circle." This is enough confession from him to convince even the sceptics that he is an incarnation of God. Once it was reported to him that Girish Babu, the great dramatist, and Ram Babu, another disciple, were preaching him as an *Avatāra*; whereupon he retorted: "What do they know about Avatara-hood? One of them is a dramatist and the other a chemist. Long ago, men of vast learning like Padmalochan, Narayan Shastri and others talked and talked of this body (*meaning himself*) being an *Avatāra* till I was sick of it." We would also request Mr. Ghosh to

peruse an article by Swami Saradananda (*How Sri Ramakrishna Tested His Disciples*) which appeared in March *Prabuddha Bharata*. Therein he will find that Sri Ramakrishna indeed asked many of his disciples to look upon him as their *Ista* (Chosen Deity). In the face of all these facts, to say that he never claimed to be an Incarnation, would be a deliberate misstatement.

Mr. Ghosh says: "'An Avatar is,' according to Ramakrishna, 'one who grants salvation.' But he never exercised nor claimed such a privilege or power. He would not accept the role of even a Guru. On the other hand, he was himself afraid of contamination and avoided sinners and the deformed." This is as false a statement as can be. He *did* grant salvation. Mr. Ghosh must acquaint himself with all the facts before he makes such daring statements. Sri Ramakrishna had the power to grant God-vision and release one from the bondage of *Karma*. Many disciples have left their testimonies to that effect. Let Mr. Ghosh read at least the autobiographical essays of Girish Ch. Ghosh. He would know how Sri Ramakrishna asked him to give him the 'power of attorney', and how he was saved. It is all wrong to say that he was *afraid* of contamination. Even the least trace of impurity was indeed painful to him. But he had no *fear*. For he deliberately purified many sinners by his holy touch, though he suffered in consequence. We shall cite a relevant incident here: "While staying at Shyampukur undergoing treatment for cancer, Sri Ramakrishna once saw his subtle body coming out of himself and roaming about the room. 'Its back was full of ulcers,' he said afterwards to us. 'I was wondering why it was so, when Mother showed me that the ulcers were caused by my taking upon myself the sins of others. People come with all their sins and touch me. Their plight excites my compassion and I cannot help taking those sins upon myself. This indeed is the origin of

this cancer. I have never committed any sin myself,—why should I suffer on my own account?" (See *Gurubhâva*, 1st Vol., 1st chapter). Once he cured a leper by touching him, and as a result suffered excruciating burning pain all over his body.

To-day Mr. Ghosh says that Sri Ramakrishna was afraid of contamination. But it is strange that in the early days Sri Ramakrishna's very disregard of the fear of contamination was a charge brought against him by such veteran Brahmo leaders as Pratap Ch. Mozoomdar and Pandit Sivanath Sastri. Mr. Mozoomdar had written to Prof. Max Müller in order to acquaint him with another side of Sri Ramakrishna's character, which was "not edifying." To quote Swami Vivekananda: "Again another charge put forward is, that 'he did not show sufficient moral abhorrence of prostitutes',—to them, the Professor's rejoinder is very, very sweet indeed; he says that, in this charge, Ramakrishna 'does not stand quite alone among the founders of religion!' Ah! How sweet are these words,—they remind one of the prostitute Ambapali, the object of Lord Buddha's divine grace, and of the Samaritan woman, who won the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ."

Says Pandit Sivanath Sastri in his *Men I Have Seen*. "During the last few years of the saint's life, my visits became less frequent than they were before. Two causes contributed to produce that result. First, latterly, through his childlike simplicity he was drawn away by some of his new disciples, into encouraging by his visits and friendship, many objectionable characters such as the actors of the Indian theatres. I did not like to be associated with such men."

What does Mr. Ghosh think now of Sri Ramakrishna's fear of contamination and his avoidance of sinners?

IX

Mr. Ghosh ends his review with a Note in which he points out a few dis-

crepancies between the original Bengali and the English translation of the *Gospel*. The discrepancies are all shown from the *Gospel*, Vol. I. Mr. Ghosh calls them deliberate additions and interpolations. This volume was prepared by the author, M., himself and was first published in 1907. The second volume of the *Gospel* first appeared in 1922. In the preparation of the first volume, the author's attempt was to make it as representative of the teachings of the Master as possible. He thus transposed a few passages from one place to another. And in order to make explicit the ideas of Sri Ramakrishna he sometimes amplified a few passages. If he added any new sentences, that was to draw out the implications of preceding sentences. Mr. Ghosh complains of omissions of passages also. That was absolutely necessary. For certain expressions may pass in Bengali, but may not in English. Mr. Ghosh must admit this difficulty in the translation from one language to another. This is the real explanation of the additions and omissions that we find in the English translation. But we admit that some of these could be done in a more technically correct form. We, however, do not see how he can characterise them in the way he has done. He says: "The materials of the English version have been drawn from the Bengali edition. But unfortunately there are omissions, additions and alterations in the English edition. These seem to be an afterthought. When there is found even one purposive interpolation, the genuineness of the writings of the author and his scrupulosity regarding historical accuracy become doubtful. In fact the belief is current in many quarters that the Ramakrishna as depicted by 'M' (Babu Mahendranath Gupta) is not the real Ramakrishna but the Ramakrishna of 'M'—a revised, modified, expurgated and magnified version of the real Ramakrishna." Anyone with even a little common sense would have thought that if M.'s purpose were to present a revised view

of Sri Ramakrishna, he would have followed the same process in both the English and Bengali versions. But that M. has not done. His motive was not, therefore, to mislead people. Mr. Ghosh must prove dishonest intention on the part of the author before he can characterise M. as an interpolator. Mr. Ghosh says: "In fact the belief is current in many quarters that the Ramakrishna as depicted by 'M' is not the real Ramakrishna but the Ramakrishna of 'M'." We do not see anything wrong in this. Even of an ordinary man, various persons form various opinions. It is no wonder that of Sri Ramakrishna, the different disciples should form different ideas. But we strongly repudiate what Mr. Ghosh adds: "a revised, modified, expurgated and magnified version of the real Ramakrishna." "The belief is current in many quarters," he says. What are those quarters? The quarters from which the reviewer comes? To ascribe deliberate dishonesty to a gentleman without sufficient proof is, to say the least, ungentlemanly. Mr. Ghosh says that because there have been additions and alterations (very trifling, and adding nothing new) in a volume of translation, therefore his Bengali version is also to be doubted. But how does Mr. Ghosh know that, except those trifling changes, everything is not literally correct? To accuse, mere doubt is not enough. *Positive* proof is necessary. Mr. Ghosh talks of a real Ramakrishna. What is that? That which Mr. Ghosh and his friends think of him? Well, when Prof. Max Müller wrote his article (*A Real Mahatman*) on Sri Ramakrishna in *The Nineteenth Century*, a certain section of Bengalees raised a hue and cry. They eagerly wrote to the Professor to acquaint him with a "not edifying side" of Sri Ramakrishna. [The same game seems to be afoot again.] They did their best at that time to portray the "real" Ramakrishna for his benefit. The world can read the indictment and the Professor's reply to it in his book, *Ramakrishna*:

His Life and Sayings. Can Mr. Ghosh discover a more 'real' Ramakrishna? We have, on the other hand, the testimony of Swami Vivekananda and several other disciples that the presentation of Sri Ramakrishna in the *Kathâmrta* is quite correct. Swami Vivekananda wrote to M.: "The move is quite original, and never was the life of a great teacher brought before the public untarnished by the writer's mind as you are doing. . . . I cannot express in adequate terms how I have enjoyed them. I am really in a transport when I read them."

We have attempted in the foregoing pages to show the blunders Mr. Ghosh has made in forming conclusions about Sri Ramakrishna, and we have also produced sufficient authorities to substantiate our points. We hope Mr. Ghosh will now see how flimsy was the basis on which he reared up his imaginary structure. But perhaps we should not hope so. For has not Mr. Ghosh shown in his reply to Swami Nikhilananda's rejoinder how he treats everything that does not suit his purpose? The disciples of Sri Ramakrishna who lived for years intimately with him, are "unauthentic." *The Gospel of Sri Ramakrishna* or the *Kathâmrta* are unauthentic. The *Lilâprasanga* also, we dare say, he will call unauthentic. The reason perhaps is that the disciples were *disciples* of Sri Ramakrishna. You cannot be relied upon as regards a person whom you love and revere. Hate him or be indifferent to him—then you are reliable, e.g., the celebrated witness of Mr. Ghosh,—Trailokya Nath Deb.

In conclusion, we shall present Mr. Ghosh with a little poem by an unknown *Bâul*:

"A goldsmith, methinks, has come into
the flower garden.

He would appraise the lotus, forsooth,
By rubbing it on his touchstone."

Mr. Ghosh is a great scholar. But we believe he also can learn a real lesson from this song of an unlettered villager. Intellectualism may be good

within certain limits. But in things spiritual, book-learning avails little. One must have wide sympathies,

spiritual vision, purity of mind and love of God. Without these, intellectualism is a snare and a danger.

(Concluded)

THE DIARY OF A DISCIPLE

OCTOBER 12, 1919.

It was 4 p.m. Swami Turiyananda was sitting in his room in the Ramakrishna Mission Home of Service at Benares. A few *Sannyâsins* and lay devotees were present. A conversation was going on on Sir John Woodroffe's *Is India Civilised?*, the second edition of which had come out much enlarged. [When the first edition appeared, many Europeans criticised his views. Sir John answered them strongly in the second edition.]

Disciple : "A copy of the Annual Report of the Dacca Ramakrishna Mission was sent to him with a request to provide the Institution with a set of his works. He not only presented all his books published up to the time, but also ordered his publishers to supply his future works as soon as they appeared in print. He has deep regard for India; he can thus at once know who are really working for her."

A : "He is a Justice of the Calcutta High Court. He has to try cases, write judgments and perform other strenuous works connected with his office. Over and above, he has written so many books. How can he make time?"

Disciple : "There is an advantage in writing work. You can make steady progress. If you write one hour every day, you will find at the end of the year that much has been written. But with spiritual practice the case is different. You may practise meditation and *japa* two or three hours a day and continue it for ten long years, yet you won't notice any appreciable progress. It is as though you are just where you were in the beginning."

Swami : "What do you say? Who says that spiritual practice produces no

effect? Surely it does. There is not a shade of doubt about it.

"People of the world give you wages, if you work for them. Is God so unkind that He will not requite the works done for Him? But you must work in the right spirit. Working haphazardly will not do. A mad man lived near a distillery. Every noon he would go where the rejected earthen pots used in distilling wine were thrown and break them one by one with a stick, and perspiring heavily he would cry out : 'Oh, I can work no more.' He would then take a little rest and begin again !

"It will not do if you toil this way. You may irrigate the field all day, but it would be all in vain, if there is a hole in the field. When you will go to the field in the evening, you will find that not a drop of water has remained in the field, all has run out through the hole. Attachment to sense-objects is the hole."

Disciple : "What shall we do, *Mahârâj*, if we cannot find out the hole? It all depends on the grace of the *Guru*. Sri Ramakrishna said : 'If anyone intends to make a pilgrimage to the temple of Jagannath and travels in a wrong direction through mistake, someone will surely point him out the right direction sooner or later.' A seeker of God may adopt a wrong course, but it is certain that his object is the attainment of God. Why then should his labours prove fruitless?"

Swami : "No, they would not, if he really be in quest of God. Such a man is sure to receive a glimpse of His grace some day. 'If anyone advances one step towards God, He comes nearer by a hundred steps.' This is no idle talk. Whoever has made even a little effort

to earn His grace has realised this. (Turning to A.) What do you say?"

A : "Yes, Sir. Certainly he does."

Swami : "Truthfulness, obedience and looking upon all women as mother, if these do not lead one to Hari, then Tulsi is responsible for him.' Few, alas, speak the truth. What is obedience? It is full resignation. And one must look upon another's wife as one's mother. Whoever will have these, will reach God; Tulsi stands security for him.

"He who constantly steals others' property may perform great charities, still he does none. He who always depends on others, may live long, yet he lives not. He who always slanders others may repeat the holy name, yet he does it not,' so said Kavir.

"What will it avail if one makes charity with money stolen from others? To live long on the charity of others is as good as death. It is useless for a slanderer to repeat the name of God. This is why Jesus said : 'Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.' "

Disciple : "It is pleasant to hear all these, *Mahârâj*. But it costs one's life to carry them out. Theoretically it is easy to understand them, but to practise them is extremely difficult."

Swami : "But even an intellectual grasp is not nothing. It is possible only in this country. A great many souls were born here, who realised *Brahman* and the influence of their experiences has entered into the very marrow of the country. That is how men and women, old and young, all can easily understand these truths."

A : "No other people has perhaps been able to realise the personal and the impersonal aspects of God at the same time?"

Swami : "No. Only the *Rishis* (seers) of this country realised the *Nirguna Brahman*. One Mussulman is

said to have attained the consciousness, 'I am Brahman, I am He'. But when he declared this, the Mollahs were much enraged with him. They being the descendants of Ali were the priests of the Muhammadans. They were all dualists. Once the Caliph's daughter fell dangerously ill. No physician could cure her. Then some one suggested that that saint should be called in. 'He possesses wonderful powers,' he said, 'surely he can cure her.' So he was called in. He said to the Caliph's daughter : 'In the name of God, I declare you cured. Therefore get up.' But the words produced no effect. Then he exclaimed : 'I say that you are recovered. Therefore get up.' And she was at once cured. The Caliph was highly pleased. But the Mollahs cried out : 'Did you see how he said he was more powerful than Allah?' He was therefore put on trial and flayed alive. In that terrible state he went from door to door begging for food. But all closed their doors against him. Only a butcher threw a bit of flesh to him and shut the door. Next he begged for fire to roast the meat, but was refused by all. Then he held it towards the sun and the sun in order to give more heat came lower down. So it is said that the sun is much nearer at Multan."

A *Brahmachâri* : "When did it happen?"

Swami : "About the fifteenth century."

Brahmachâri : "Jesus also said : 'I and my father are one.' "

Swami : "He answered very carefully in the court. 'Art thou the king of the Jews?' 'Thou sayst it,' he answered. The priests were all enraged with him because of his powers, for his influence affected their income, as people obeyed him implicitly. Jesus said : 'Come ye after me, and I will make you become fishers of men.' And at once Simon and his brother forsook their nets and followed him. One of his disciples came and said : 'Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father.' But Jesus said to him :

'Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead'. When the priests saw that he was bringing about their ruin they sued him in the court. But the governor found no guilt in him. He was ready to release him. But the multi-

tudes insisted on his being sentenced to death, so he delivered him up to them to be crucified, saying: 'I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it.' "

PHASES OF IMMEDIATE EXPERIENCE

BY DR. MAHENDRANATH SIRCAR, M.A., PH.D.

(Continued from the last issue)

REVELATION AND INTUITION

Revelation transcends the subjectivism of psychism as it puts us in relation to a super-mind and implies free reception of ideas and knowledge lying deep in the supra-sensuous reality. It is indeed an objective knowledge since it is not an expression of the finite mind. The finite consciousness becomes the recipient of such revelations in a high receptive concentration. Such revealed knowledge is indeed the highest that the finite can get, highest in value and greatest in accuracy; the latter, because it proceeds from a source which cannot deceive, the former because it is the inmost knowledge of existence received in a state of super-consciousness. Such revelation is to be distinguished from the sensuous intuition produced by the heightening of the lower mind, the sensibility. These are subjective experiences consequent on the fine activity of our sensuous nature and, therefore, should not be confounded with more objective receptions of the higher mind in revelation. Revelation is possible and within access when the supra-sensuous mind becomes active in us.

Revelation, unlike empiric intuition, has an objective source. And the knowledge is direct. But it is no directness of sensuous intuition. This directness gives it a superior claim to reason, for reason works out a system, revelation gives illumination.

The reference to an objective source heightens its value; at the same time it does not suffer because of this refer-

ence. Revelation has been, therefore, regarded as a source of knowledge superior to reason by its directness and infallibility and to empiric intuition by its objectivity. Directness, infallibility and objectivity mark out revelation as a sure source of knowledge.

Revelation is to be distinguished from transcendent intuition. Revelation is a possibility in concrete consciousness, intuition in transcendent. In revelation the super-mind is active, in intuition the super-mind has no play. Revelation is a process, intuition is no process and denies the conditions of concrete consciousness. Intuition is then no psychological process nor a faculty. It is supra-logical, supra-psychological; it is the summit of being.

Intuition is no process in time, revelation is a process in time. In one sense both of them are timeless, and the ardent souls speak of the timelessness of mysticism, because the truths of revelation are eternal and uniform, time has no influence upon them, and as such the mystics claim uniform perceptions which deny the wear and tear of time. But timelessness has two senses:

- (1) Uniform durability through time;
- (2) Transcendence of time.

The one does not deny an expression through time, the other denies it. The timelessness of revelation is of the first kind. Revelations are always of the same kind since they proceed not from the surface mentality, but from the source of all light and knowledge. Revelation cannot transcend the time

element in Isvara and is uniform because it manifests what obtains in the causal being of Isvara. The effectual order and the causal order are orders in time, the events in both the orders are temporal events. But the events in the effectual order are events which has a short history, whereas the events in the causal order has an eternal history. Revelation is an event in the effectual order, it is the expression of the causal in the effectual, and as such it is a short time event but its truth is enduring. The truth of revelation is of the causal order, the event of revelation is of the effectual order. The event dies, the truth lasts forever. The time-series in the effectual order has a past, a present and a future. The time-series in the causal order has no past or future. It is ever-present. The intuition of duration in the finite mind is different from the intuition of time in the infinite; in the finite mind duration has a history, a beginning and a setting; and the finite life is a series of such beginnings and settings. The empiric intuition of time is the intuition of duration, not in its continuous but in its successive flow, and the division of past, future and present is natural for the empiric intuition. It has not the capacity of receiving duration in its ever present continuity. The infinite only can perceive time in eternal continuity without the idea of succession. The soul of time is duration, but duration is not necessarily succession; the logical intellect cannot rise above the distinction of the present, the past and the future, and its understanding of time is necessarily defective; logically time is identified with succession but this is not true. The understanding of time is not possible, as Bergson has truly pointed out, by intellect or symbolic thinking. Its apprehension is more intuitive than intellectual, and the intuitive apprehension of time is an unceasing and continuous flow of duration without the intellectual grafting of the divisions of past, present and future. Time is Life.

The Indian thinkers draw a distinction between the Khanda and the Akhanda Kâla, the divided and the undivided time. The former one is the understanding of time through succession. The understanding of time as eternal duration is Isvara, the dynamic Divine. Revelation is the impress of the dynamic Divine upon the logical intellect, which reveals a timeless intuition as an event in time. Revelation is then strictly the footprint of the eternal upon the sands of time. It is the reflection through the camera of the intellect. Intuition is timelessness in its strict sense. It transcends even duration. Intuition is timeless expression. Revelation is expression in time. The former is static, the latter dynamic.

At this point divergence arises between commentators of Vedanta. Samkara regards intuition as a *fait accompli*, Ramanuja regards intuition as intuitive. In Samkara intuition transcends all distinctions and concreteness, in Ramanuja intuition is concrete; intuition intuites.

It appears then that Ramanuja has drawn no clear distinction between revelation and intuition, and to him the highest intuitions are revelations. And revelation is the highest source of knowledge. It is higher than Yoga, for Yoga is subjective penetration, revelation, objective reception.

But still it has a limitation of a reference, intuition has no such reference.

The fundamental difference between revelation and intuition as a psychological process and as a transcendent existence is often lost upon us and is the source of a confusion between the function and the fact of intuition.

This phase of intuition is a new element in Samkara's philosophy, which gives it a form or a shape fundamentally different from the logical bent. Samkara accepts the possibility of revelation. It is a theological attitude of consciousness. The theological attitude is possible in concrete consciousness or self-consciousness, but is not possible in the transcendent. The transcendent is

unique and cannot be compared to anything else.

When Samkara accepts both intuition and revelation, laying at the same time more stress upon the former, he welcomes the theological source and at the same time is anxious to go beyond, for he clearly feels the limitation of revelation as obtaining in immanent consciousness and therefore capable of communicating the truths of the relative order, but incapable of further penetration. The theological revelation is, therefore, the highest source of the deep mysteries of the dynamic Divine, but surely can bear no comparison to absolute intuition.

Though revelation is to be distinguished from intuition, still the truth of absolute intuition as the final illumination and the highest existence, is a truth of revelation. In the actual realisation of the identity of the subject and the object the very ground of revelation is denied. Intuition is, therefore, a kind of knowledge quite unique and is possible in a plane of existence which transcends the plane of revelation.

The absolute intuition as existence and as truth is the same fact appearing in the different levels of consciousness. As existence, it is the final reality. *Tattvamasi* is not a judgment. As truth it is supra-mental revelation indicative of an existence which is real in a different plane of consciousness. The limitation of relativity is still active, and therefore, the truth of identity can be indicated in the plane of revelation, but cannot be felt. And therefore, even in revelation it remains as a form of knowledge otherwise unobtainable. The absolute intuition is, therefore, the Fact-in-itself. Its truth is given by revelation, but it is realised as the undivided intuition.

Tattvamasi is, therefore, the highest philosophic fact, given out in revelation. Just as the symbol of Om carries an amount of sacredness with it because of its revelation, similarly the axiom

of Identity has in it a touch of holiness in it, as it is a truth that can be possibly obtained in revelation, for nothing can prove it. In this way the orthodox opinion establishes the truth of intuition (as transcendent existence). *Tattvamasi* is not, therefore, an affirmation of intellect, it stands on the sure footing of the divine knowledge. It brings to the fore the truth of the absolute Identity. Revelation here becomes the source of the knowledge of the highest intuition which transcends it. But the knowledge which revelation can give of the Identity is only indirect, it can point to the Absolute behind the eternal duration, but it is not qualified to completely grasp it. Revelation is possibly direct of the contents of eternal duration as centred in Isvara but it is indirect of the absolute Identity. Its truth it can communicate, though in actual realisation its very being is denied.

This is the inevitable consequence of Samkara's philosophy, though the theists fight shy of such a conclusion. And naturally so, for revelation is, according to them, the highest source of knowledge. So it is with the transcendentalists; but the transcendentalists are bold enough to accept the conclusion of Identity even at the cost of the ultimate denial of the revelation of Sruti.

It appears then that they are having such a unique experience that the common sources of knowledge including revelation cannot by the nature of the case be adequate enough to cover it, for revelation is possible in concrete consciousness, and not in the absolute. The framework of revelation is the same with the ordinary knowledge, they belong to the same order, notwithstanding the fineness and infallibility of the one and the grossness and fallibility of the other; but the transcendent intuition is fundamentally different from the both in this that it denies the very hold of concrete knowledge, and as such philosophic boldness cannot hesitate to deny even revelation in this sphere.

Philosophically speaking, absolute intuition introduces an element which is deeply significant, because it gives an experience which is otherwise impossible. The ordinary polarity of consciousness is denied and a unique experience is felt, for consciousness cannot in normal state break the polarity of subject and object. As such it is an intuition which exists severely alone. It completely changes the whole outlook and adaptation of life. And it is, therefore, psychologically a great fact which cannot be minimised.

Intuition in the Upanisads has this sense of transcendent existence in which the highest revelation becomes the highest existence. In it the psychological penetration becomes identified with metaphysical truth and it is, therefore, the identity of being and consciousness. The realistic logic has no place here, and the duality of being and knowledge, natural to relativistic consciousness, completely drops here.

It may indeed sound strange that intuition and being are completely one and it is this knowledge which characterises the supreme existence. It is called liberation, in the sense that the division of consciousness and reality is displaced by the identity of them. They are one and the same; theoretically the two do not exist. The same reality appears at one point as being, at another point as consciousness. This is *avidyâ*; *vidyâ* dismisses this original knowledge and native tendency and takes away the distinction of being and knowledge and finally understands their identity.

Nothing on this side of the polarisation of subject and object can give an adequate idea of this transcendence of existence. It is, therefore, in a sense unknown, though it is illumination.

Intuition is not then notion or thought in the Hegelian sense, nor even *Nous* in the sense in which Plotinus uses the term. The Hegelian notion is in essence logical reason which sees through the relations. The Hegelian thought is dynamic and as such Hegel goes beyond

the intellectualists who conceive the relative in a static background, but still the Hegelian notion sustains itself through relations. It transcends and synthesises relations. And the Absolute in Hegel is the synthesis of the infinite relations. It is the universal reason at the bottom of the connective links.

Plotinus does not exalt the discursive reason to the highest place. In itself, as Aristotle says, it moves nothing. For this reason, its world is not wholly real. But *Nous* beholds all things in their true relations without the need of this process.

Nous is then a form of supra-rational faculty akin to synthetic intuition, for it gives the synoptic view of reality.

But this should be distinguished from transcendent intuition, for in the one the relations are apprehended, in the other nothing is apprehended, neither existence nor relations. The synoptic view of things is possible up to the dynamic Divine, but not beyond it.

MYSTICAL SENSE : INTUITION AND REASON

Is there a special mystical sense or faculty? Are mystical visions a gift of a special faculty of soul? Is it common to all or the peculiar mark of an esoteric fraternity? The question raises important psychological issues inasmuch as it discusses threadbare whether the mystics are the special specimens of humanity or they are the full fruition of human endeavours and evolution. And again, if there is a mystical sense, in what relations does it stand to the ordinary faculties of human mind?

The Upanisads certainly make rich references regarding the mystic sense. *Vide* Katha Upanisad I, ii, 12; II, vi, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17; I, iii, 6, 7; I, ii, 12; I, ii, 22, 23. *Vide* Prasna Upanisad III, 6. *Vide* Mundaka Upanisad II, ii, 7; III, i, 5, 8, 9; III, ii, 3. *Vide* Aitareya Upanisad VI, 5, 3.

The above texts tell us that the mystical apprehension is not possible

in the ordinary way. The Atman to be recognised requires a special faculty or power, but this special faculty is not different from the ordinary intelligence. It is its full fruition. Intelligence in its ordinary functioning (specially in empiric intuition) works in collaboration with the mind and the senses, and naturally it cannot claim that immediacy which is its special privilege when it works in independence of the senses. Buddhi is the logical as well as the mystical faculty.

The Upanisadic teachers do not seem to have lent their support to a special faculty as suggested by the Greek teachers different from the common faculties, intellect or reason. Miss Underhill following the great Greeks suggests that the mystical faculty is different from the normal faculties of the mind, but it is in touch with them: "Heart, reason, will are there in full action, drawing their energy, not from the shadow show of sense but from the depths of true being, where a lamp is lit and a consciousness awoke of which the sleepy crowd remains unconscious."

William James draws a distinction between a non-mystical consciousness or a rational consciousness and the mystical consciousness which gives a direct perception of the invisible. F. H. Bradley thinks somewhat in the same strain. The Absolute cannot be known by the abstract categories of a relational kind. These relations involve self-contradiction. The ultimate reality cannot contradict itself, and in one significant passage he says: "We can form a general idea of an absolute intuition in which phenomenal distinctions are merged." "A whole becomes immediate at a higher stage without losing any richness." Again, "Thought can form the idea of apprehension, something like *feeling in directness*."

Spinoza's distinction of ratiocination and *scientia intuitiva* is well known and "from this the third kind of knowledge arises the highest possible peace of mind." A host of other writers can be quoted in favour of the distinction be-

tween reason and intuition. Bradley makes a significant departure from the Neo-Hegelians who make reason the oracle of truth.

This distinction between reason and intuition is made absolute, probably because of the usual identification of reason with logical faculty, the faculty of discrimination and synthesis; and since the immediacy of perception is a felt necessity, the *scientia intuitiva* is discovered as a distinct faculty of knowledge having a distinct order of its own.

Max Müller conceives a *facultas occulta*. There is, according to him, in men both individually and generally (ontogenetically and phylogenetically) something that develops into perception, conception and faith, using the last word as meaning the apprehension of the infinite. He defines religion as "the mental faculty or disposition which independent of, nay in spite of sense and reason, enables a man to apprehend the infinite under different names and under varying disguises. Without that faculty no religion, not even the lowest worship of the idols and fetishes would be possible; and if we but listen attentively we can hear in all religions a groaning of the spirit, a struggle to conceive the inconceivable, to utter the unutterable, a longing after the infinite, a love of God."

"If then we openly admit a *third* function of our consciousness for the apprehension of what is infinite, that function need not be more mysterious than those of sense and reason."

Schliermacher defines religion as "the sense and *test* for the infinite" (Oman's translation quoted in Watt's *Intuition of God*). The sense and the test have in them a directness akin to feeling. The sense of vastness and expanse, the feeling of unrestricted overflow of being are elements of our experience not covered by the normal feeling. They lie deep in psychic being and become active occasionally. The psychological method lays special stress upon a *facultas occulta* as oracle of transcendental truth. This appeal to special

faculty helps the writers of the psychological school of mysticism to prove the timelessness of it. It raises mysticism to a plane where life is not affected by history and environment, and which helps to lend to mysticism an objective or transcendental touch that lies deep in human nature and is not affected by the influences of time and civilisation. The timelessness of mysticism is the great appeal of the psychological method.

The Upanisadic teachers are quite alive to the timelessness of mysticism, thinking as they do that truth is not affected by time. And there must be in man some such penetration, for the doubts and perplexities natural to a ratiocinative mind must be set aside, and the soul naked of ordinary logical or metaphysical presuppositions must be able to embrace the truth. Psychological penetration is the method of the mystics, conviction comes when mists of doubts have been cleared off from the mental horizon by the shining light of intuition. The surface mind is overweighed by the disability of the short-sightedness and by the 'antinomies' of reason. The sense of stiffness so natural to the surface mind and the persistent demand of a conclusion, both help to strike the depth of our being, from which the final illumination comes. The intellectual paralysis is soon followed by the higher awakening of spiritual life; the intellect which is the most powerful organ of the positive mind, must understand its own limitations before the new path can be sought. The King of the Dead, Yama, rightly tells Nachiketa that the truth cannot be attained by discursive intellect. "The wise can see it in spiritual intuition and seeing it cross death." (*Vide* Katha Upanisad).

But however impressed the ancient teachers are about the futility of the intellect as the oracle of truth, they do not go to the extreme of supposing that the mystical sense is completely unique and different from the normal faculties of the mind. Yama expresses clearly that Atman can be seen by the pene-

trating intelligence. It is seen by the wise with their superior intellect.

The Upanisadic teachers referred the logical and mystical faculty to the same organ, intelligence, which has as if a double function. It has been truly pointed out by Hermann: "That there are deeper levels of consciousness of which the man who lives only in his discursive understanding little dreams and that a sudden awakening or the gentle or persisting knocking of the 'dweller in the innermost' may throw open a door into a new and larger world, is a sound mystical doctrine, but that this implies a double consciousness or that the consciousness ceases to be rational when it becomes mystical, is a gratuitous assumption which has done more than any other to invalidate the message of message." (*Vide* Herman's *The Meaning and Value of Mysticism*, p. 272). The Indian thinkers are uniform in their opinion on this point. Though they draw a distinction between reason and immediate knowledge, still they refer both of them to the same organ of intelligence which functions differently.

The Mundaka has it: "The wise perceive it by knowledge (gnosis) which gleams forth as blissful immortality." "This Atman is obtainable by austerity, by proper knowledge, by the constant practice of chastity." "The meditative, pure in being, sees the partless by the bliss of knowledge."

We have been told that the Atman can be realised in Adhyâtma Yoga and by Jnâna-prasâda. The former is spiritual intuition, the latter is the peace of knowledge. Again it is said that Atman is indicated by Neti Neti. It is apparent, therefore, that the teachers recognise the faculty of immediate apprehension of truth. This faculty is intelligence. It must be chastened and purified before it can vouchsafe the superior wisdom. Parâ-vidyâ (superior or esoteric wisdom) gives us the knowledge of Aksara (the indestructible). The Parâ-vidyâ is a special capacity of intelligence to apprehend truth. Intelligence

has wide functions. It is the faculty of mediate as well as of immediate knowledge. Even in normal perception intelligence plays an important part. The senses make report to the intelligence whence the direct perception comes. The mystical perception differs from the sense-perception in this that in it no reference is necessary to the senses. Intelligence works quite independently of the instrumental media of the senses. The mystical sense, therefore, is nothing uncommon, though it can be present in those that rear up the faculty of intuitive apprehension. The reference to the pure being in the Mundaka Upanisad is significant, for the purity of being can wake up the sleeping powers of intelligence and can endow it with the rare vision and uncommon powers. It starts the fine psychism and evokes the subtle dynamism of our being and brings with them the knowledge of the unseen and uncommon. Psychism, in Indian philosophy, is not the ordinary function of intelligence (Buddhi), for besides the normal powers, the Buddhi has in it esoteric powers which become evident and manifest when the psychism of Buddhi has been developed by discipline.

The fine psychism develops the cosmic powers inherent in Buddhi; Buddhi in its causal aspect can receive inspiration from the cosmic dynamism working in and through it. The more the intelligence gets purified, the more it becomes subtle, the more it moves with the expansive vision and cosmic sympathy. Indeed there is no limit to the potentiality of Buddhi, and if our mental dynamism be freed from the obstructions of the gross elements and unresolved collision implied in them, the cosmic intuitions and powers inherent in Buddhi can be clearly felt. Buddhi is then no longer the logical faculty which discerns the consistency and squares the contradictions of ideas, it is also the mystical faculty which gives intuitions of the subtle move of life and consciousness.

The fine psychism should not be confounded with the apprehension of truth. The fine psychism can give us lofty vision and fine powers. It may penetrate into the mysteries of immanent life, it can reveal the hidden truths of instinctive and supra-instinctive urges. It is competent to do so, for it is endowed with the luminosity of Sattva. The luminosity of Sattva cannot leave any part of our mental and supramental dynamism hidden to us. It is more luminous than the X-rays. It can penetrate into the subtle and causal aspect of our being.

If the Sattvic intelligence is competent to reveal the hidden mysteries of life, it is no less competent to go deeper and feel the self-luminous Atman. The luminosity of Buddhi is the luminosity of Sattva, and the luminosity of Self is the luminosity of consciousness. The two differ. Since the transcendent intuition denies all relations, it certainly cannot be intuited by the luminosity of Buddhi. On the other hand, the luminosity of Buddhi is clearly felt to be the borrowed light of the self-luminous Self. This luminous Buddhi feels the transcendence of Atman for the final emancipation from the world of manifoldness. The final illumination comes with the unique experience of the immediacy where the psychic dynamism can have no play. And therefore, this experience is quite new and clearly unanalysable. The immediacy of revelation in psychic dynamism is different from this kind of immediacy in which psychism plays no part. The former is the immediacy of knowledge imparted by the highly strung Buddhi, the latter is the immediacy of Atman. The one is supersensuous but still empiric, the other is quite transcendental.

The latter is, therefore, a change in the mode of apprehension. It is quite different from normal apprehension. The moment intelligence has a foreshadow of this apprehension, it dies a natural death, and the whole outlook of the mystic life changes from the *vita-con-*

templativa to *vita-negativa*. The subtle joys of life are lost in the timeless focus of existence. The truths of relative existence and supra-mental revelations vanish. The *vita-contemplativa* gives positive delight of an elastic psyche with its new promises and vistas of refined delights. The *vita-negativa* silences the dynamism gross or refined, and gives the unique feeling of an intuition which denies the framework of experience. The knower vanishes here with the known, and the supposed timelessness of the mystic life in transcending the gross and the physical is replaced by the real timelessness of the absolute silence. The previous experience completely changes here and a new realm is presented demanding a novel mental adaptation to receive and welcome it. Just as a line cannot be perpendicular to intersecting lines on the same plane—it being possible on a different plane of existence, similarly, however far-reaching and penetrating the psychic vision may be, in the dynamic spiritual life, it can throw no light upon the absolute point where the subject-object experiences completely die away and a new form of immediacy is presented. Hence, the Yogic psychism cannot appreciate the Absolute which denies all dimensions of existence. The finest intelligence can indicate this existence by *vita-negativa*—not this, not this.

The denial of empiric intuitions, sensuous or super-sensuous, including the fine experiences of dynamic psychism, is the sure indication of the fixation in the Absolute. The cosmic drama with its hopes and illusions must have its scenes closed before the awakening in transcendence can take place. Intelligence with its illumination must cease to function before the liberation can be reached. The finer illumination of the intelligence takes away all the promises of life, the meanings of values, and prepares the mental being for a new outlook filling it with the new meaning of emancipation from the divided outlook of life, from the personal hold of conscious-

ness, from the beauteous experiences of the endless perspectives of life and for the installation of "naked" consciousness in its silent dignity and sublimity. The final illumination of intelligence, therefore, sounds its death knell for good; but even in this, intelligence yields a self-offering allegiance, not that the final end appears to it as destruction but that it appears to it as the consummation.

The *vita-negativa* and the *vita-contemplativa* are strictly speaking two forms of the functioning of psychic intelligence. The *vita-contemplativa* gives an access into subtler forces and powers. The *vita-negativa* gives an access into transcendence. The fine psychism of Buddhi in *vita-negativa* recoils from the reception of forces and powers, for it works in a quite different way. A new light shines before it, a new form of thinking takes place in it. It becomes the faculty of transcendental apperception. Buddhi becomes free from the natural and spiritual urges however fine and however graceful. It becomes active in its discriminative function. The discrimination presents before it the timelessness of being as distinguished from the expressions in time. And the more the timelessness of being becomes clear to it, the more it surrenders its functions. Buddhi is informative of every form of existence, and the moment it becomes informative of the timeless being, it has the natural withdrawal from its normal functioning, and the drama of life is brought to a close. The timeless Absolute is so marked a contrast to the sensuous and super-sensuous experiences, that intelligence can see no longer any value in sticking to their professions and charms. It has a natural recoil from their activities.

The transcendent philosophic intuition fosters a kind of consciousness different from the empiric or psychic intuition. It sets up a new psychosis, which breaks the spell of life, its stir and stress. The transcendental apperception of identity has strictly the unique psychosis about it, but the

psychosis of identity is to be distinguished from the being of identity. The psychosis sets up a new vision which has the immediate effect of removing the crude or fine mental complexes; this identity psychosis ultimately comes to the breaking or melting point of all inherited or acquired convictions. The distinctions of space, time and space-time events completely die out, and it may be said that identity psychosis is the last space-time event denying the order of space-time events. The sense of an "I" is the hold of the space-time order, and the more the cosmic sense of Buddhi is established, the more the space-time events lose their distinctions and histories; the whole existence becomes one total space-time event. This is the experience of the Cosmic Purusa (or Isvara). But this experience is in space-time order and beyond it. But the particular psychosis of identity is different from the experience of the total space-time event in this that it

denies the total space-time event or at least its reflection in a particular centre. It is, therefore, the denial of common experience in space-time and may be called the intimation of transcendent identity. Indeed it is so unique an experience that it cannot bear comparison to ordinary experiences however subtle. *Vita-negativa* is, therefore, the final illumination of Buddhi, the exercise of its transcendent functioning. This transcendental apperception is then in the beginning a space-time event, but in the end it is the denial of itself as well as the manifold of experience. The identity psychosis brings to the fore the truth of the Absolute, and after its informative function, it dies away completely. *Vita-negativa* in the Vedanta has this significance and meaning. The Upanisad presents both the contemplative and the negative method, since it presents two forms of immediate knowledge of the Cosmic Purusa and of the Absolute.

(Concluded)

SWAMI BRAHMANANDA THE SPIRITUAL SON OF SRI RAMAKRISHNA

By SWAMI SATPRAKASHANANDA

The true history of a mystic's life is wrapped up in mystery. He lives and moves in a plane which is different from ours. His struggles, aspirations, fears, joys, experiences and achievements belong to a realm which is beyond the ken of ordinary men. It is a life of inward march. It has little to do with those gigantic undertakings, daring enterprises and glorious performances of the objective world, which create sensation and win applause. A mystic, on the other hand, wrests himself away from all the attractions of the sensuous world, dives deep within himself and removes all dirt and dross that cling to his self with superhuman courage, fortitude and industry to explore what treasures lie buried in the inmost recesses of the soul. Oftentimes he

leads a secluded life which hardly comes under the public gaze. Even if he lives in society, he rarely asserts himself. He denies all claim to distinction or superiority. So complete is his self-effacement that he hardly thinks it worth while to record the incidents of his life or recount them to others. We can, therefore, know very little of his visions, strivings and realisations. Even if he relates his experiences, we cannot always apprehend them. What manifests itself in their extraordinary purity, wisdom, power, love, blissfulness and humility, is only a fringe of the real life which is for the most part unseen and incomprehensible. Even those who make active efforts for the good of others, usually bring into play the inner forces of their spiritual being

to work upon the minds of men so as to influence their lives as a whole. These act so smoothly and silently that most people can hardly be aware of their existence at the time. They afterwards guess their nature and value from their far-reaching effects. Of this type of mystics, only those whose conduct is marked by glaring deeds and attainments in the practical life, become prominent in the public eye. The rest, though great, are likely to pass as indistinct shadowy figures.

Of all the mystics the greatest are those who come with a world-message, whose sole mission in life is the upliftment of mankind, who set in a new order of things fulfilling the old. All great races and religions of the world have at their heads such prophets and Incarnations. But these God-men, man-Gods or *Avatâras* as people choose to call them, hardly come alone. They come with a chosen group of comrades who are the instruments of their powers, the champions of their cause. The greatest religious systems of the world, though named after these prophets or Incarnations, were not actually founded by them. But they left behind them sufficient seed-forces to be developed into mighty movements through the activity of their apostles.

The greatest prophet of the Modern Age is Sri Ramakrishna. Like all other prophets he, too, had his chosen ones. The greatest of the group was Swami Vivekananda, who carried his message from one end of the globe to the other, and established a new system of religious thought and life. But what he left in an infant stage was reared into full form under the fostering care of his brother-disciple Swami Brahmananda, whose transcendental spiritual characteristics had installed him in the sonship of Sri Ramakrishna. The institution created by Swami Vivekananda was consolidated and developed by Swami Brahmananda. Swami Vivekananda laid the foundation, Swami Brahmananda built the edifice. Swami Vivekananda with his dynamic, aggres-

sive personality fought against materialism, agnosticism and atheism and made religion acceptable to all. Swami Brahmananda with his characteristic quietness set to mould the lives of those who, in response to Swami Vivekananda's call, gathered round Sri Ramakrishna's name and ideal. His gentle personality shining beside the flaming figure of Swami Vivekananda may lose its conspicuity, but not its greatness and glory. The world has heard much about Swami Vivekananda. In the following pages we shall attempt a short sketch of the life and character of Swami Brahmananda as far as we have been able to know about them.

Even when Sri Ramakrishna dwelt in the plane of external consciousness, long after the realisation of the Absolute, he was in a mood so transcendently spiritual, that he could not associate with men and things having no expression of Divinity in them. One day a gentle wish passed over his mind that he might have always with him a devout young boy of unsullied purity, a born devotee of God. So he prayed to the Mother: "O Mother, I shall have no son, so I wish that a young boy, a true devotee of Yours, should be always with me. Just give me a boy like that." Some time after, he was one day seated at the *Panchavati*, when the Divine Mother appeared to him with a fine young boy. "This is your son," said She, as She gently placed the boy on his lap. "What does it mean?" thought Sri Ramakrishna with a shudder, "I am a *Sannyâsin*. How can I have a son?" But the Mother allayed his fears by saying that the boy was not a son in the ordinary worldly sense, but a spiritual son appointed by Her to perpetuate his Mission on earth. A few days after, he had another vision, in the same banyan grove, which revealed to him the spiritual identity of the boy. He saw that the Lord Krishna was standing in the guise of the cowherd of Vraja on a full-blown lotus with the same boy by his side as

his playmate. He realised from this that the boy was one of those divine companions who had been incarnated on earth with Sri Krishna at Brindaban.

Not long after, there came to Dakshineswar a fine lad of nineteen, Rakhal by name, and Sri Ramakrishna at once recognised him to be the same boy whom the Divine Mother had presented to him in his vision. Sri Ramakrishna had many other visions before and after this meeting, which fully disclosed to him the transcendent spiritual nature of the boy. It was not in the case of Rakhal alone that such revelations were made to Sri Ramakrishna. He saw many visions at different times indicating the types of spiritual character represented by his disciples.

Of Sri Ramakrishna's chosen group of monastic disciples Rakhal was the first to meet him. He saw him for the first time early in 1881, some four or five months before the coming of Narendranath (Swami Vivekananda). Both of them lived in Calcutta and had been great friends, even before they came to Sri Ramakrishna. They were almost of the same age, Rakhal being older than Narendranath by less than a year. They had well-grown stalwart physiques and used to take wrestling exercises in the same gymnasium. Both had become members of the Sadharan Brahmo Samaj by signing the declaration of membership to the effect that they would have faith in One Formless God without a second and observe the pure mode of worshipping Him in spirit. After two or three visits, when Narendranath saw that his friend Rakhal had already been acquainted with Sri Ramakrishna, he was naturally overjoyed. But shortly after he noticed to his grief and surprise that Rakhal, a sworn member of the Brahmo Samaj, entered the temple of Goddess Kali with Sri Ramakrishna and bowed before the image. So he took him to task reminding him of his oath to the Samaj. Rakhal was much embarrassed. But Sri Ramakrishna came to his relief and pacified Narendranath with

these words : "Rakhal has now acquired a faith in God with form, so he cannot but respect and adore Him as such. How can he act otherwise? So please do not trouble him any more." At this Narendranath ceased to find fault with Rakhal any longer.

Rakhal was born in January, 1862, at Sikra, an ancient village of Bengal, in the Sub-division of Basirhat in the District of 24-Perganas. His father, Ananda Mohan Ghosh, commanded much respect and influence as a Zemindar and prosperous man. Besides holding an extensive landed property, he carried on a vast and flourishing trade in salt and mustard. The family traced its descent from Makaranda Ghosh, one of the five *Kâyastha* attendants of the five vedic Brahmins, who came to Bengal from Kanouj in the eighth century A.D. at the invitation of King Adisur. Rakhal's charming face and healthy well-formed body endeared him to all in the family, and they entertained high hopes of his future even in his childhood.

Rakhal lost his mother at the early age of five. His father married a second time. A tutor was engaged to educate the boy, but shortly after he was placed in the village school established through his father's efforts for the education of his son and the poor village boys. Rakhal was very attentive to his studies. His intelligence and graceful behaviour soon made him a favourite with the stern village schoolmaster, whose ruling rod was always withheld from him. Rakhal had great interest in the manly sports of the village, in which his play-fellows could hardly cope with him. He had no compeer in physical strength.

From his early boyhood Rakhal evinced great devotion to Gods and Goddesses. At Sikra there was an old sanctuary dedicated to the Goddess Kali. Rakhal used to go there very often and pass long hours in the contemplation of the Goddess. His father was a *Shákta* by religious faith. The

annual *Pujâ* of the Goddess Durga was performed with great eclat in the enormous sanctum of their mansion. At the time of the *Pujâ* Rakhal would take his seat behind the priest and watch the function in the meditative posture of a *Yogi*. In the evening he used to stand before the Goddess in great devotion and wistfully observe the Vesper Service (*Arati*). One of his favourite games of boyhood was to make a clay-model of the Goddess Kali and worship Her with the help of his play-mates.

He took great delight in music and could sing fairly well. In an open field to the south of the village there was an elevated spot with a cluster of trees sacred to the Muhammadans. Rakhal often repaired to this lonely, lovely place with his associates, and sitting under the trees sang songs in praise of the Mother Kali in rapturous moods. The devotional chants and the beauty of the surrounding nature so worked up his imagination and feeling that at times he would forget the world being lost in the consciousness of the Divine Mother.

From these sweet and sacred associations of early life he was removed to Calcutta at the age of twelve. He was admitted into the Training Academy for English education. For some reason or other his education did not proceed further than the Entrance standard. As far as we know, this was not due to lack of interest on his own part. Perhaps he was called away by his father to assist him in the management of his property. He was also married about this time to a sister of Babu Manomohan Mitra, a staunch devotee of Sri Ramakrishna. It was from him perhaps that he first heard of the Great Master.

From the very first meeting Rakhal was deeply drawn towards Sri Ramakrishna. He at once knew him to be his own kith and kin. He used to come to Dakshineswar as often as he could. Sometimes as he met Sri Ramakrishna he would forget all about his father and

his house and remain with him for days together. His father at first raised objections and came personally to Dakshineswar to enquire about him. Sri Ramakrishna received him with due honour and praised his son to him wishing that he might be allowed to stay with him. When Rakhal's father saw that the place was frequented by men of light and leading and that his son was taken proper care of and was quite comfortable there, he no more objected to his staying there occasionally.

As Sri Ramakrishna treated Rakhal as his son, Rakhal also loved him very dearly and behaved with him like a child of four or five. The sweet and loving relationship that grew up between the two was afterwards recounted by Sri Ramakrishna himself to his devotees. It was in fact as strange and engaging as a romance. Whenever Rakhal met Sri Ramakrishna, he would be in a childlike mood and beside himself with joy. He would not leave his side even for a moment or think of returning home. As he moved about him in a playful mood, he would run to him from time to time and sit on his lap. Every one was struck with wonder and delight at this childlike behaviour of his. Sri Ramakrishna also fondled him as a little boy, fed him with delicacies and even mounted him on his shoulders. But Rakhal would not feel any delicacy about it. Whenever Rakhal was ill, Sri Ramakrishna would become as anxious as a mother and ask of his devotees remedies for his cure.

Rakhal used to sleep in the same room with Sri Ramakrishna. One night Sri Ramakrishna was thirsty and asked Rakhal to bring him water. Rakhal had already gone to bed and was sleepy. He simply refused. Sri Ramakrishna was all the more pleased at this, as he felt that Rakhal really looked upon him as his father, otherwise he could not be so free with him. Sri Ramakrishna was afraid lest Rakhal's father should object to his stay at Dakshineswar. So he insisted on his going home now and

then and prevailed upon him with much difficulty. Sri Ramakrishna would rebuke him like a child if he did anything wrong. One day Rakhal partook of the sacramental food without being asked by him. Sri Ramakrishna chastised him for his greediness, at which Rakhal began to weep. He was also jealous like a child. If Sri Ramakrishna loved any one else, he could not bear it. His pride was wounded. Referring to this feeling of his, he once said in after life : "In the beginning I envied others who came to him. But through his grace, I soon learnt that my teacher was the world-teacher. He has come not for a few like us, but for all."

As a matter of fact, the love between Sri Ramakrishna and Rakhal, far from being a sentimental outgrowth, was grounded on the mutual apprehension of each other's spiritual eminence. Sri Ramakrishna never failed to see in Rakhal a most distinctive manifestation of the Divinity. All his dealings with him was suffused with this consciousness. He recognised him as a *Nitya-siddha*, an ever free soul who came to the world for the good of others, whose spiritual struggle in this birth was intended simply to reawaken the spiritual consciousness previously attained. He mentioned him as an *Ishvara-koti*, a man of God. Once he asked Babu Balaram Bose, a most favourite lay disciple of Sri Ramakrishna and an ardent Vaishnava, to invite Narendra and Rakhal to a dinner at his house. "They are born perfect," said he, "and have come to the world to fulfil a divine mission. It is an act of merit to feed them." To him Rakhal was the veritable *râkhâl* (cowboy) of Vraja, a companion of Sri Krishna. Sometimes he fondled him in the mood of Yashoda, Sri Krishna's mother. At other times he passed into trance on simply looking at him. One day Hazra, a resident of the temple and a co-villager of Sri Ramakrishna, took him to task, saying : "Why do you think so much of Narendra and Rakhal? Why do you not dwell constantly in God?" "See how

I dwell in Him," said Sri Ramakrishna and at once plunged into *Samâdhi*. His beard and hair on the head and the body stood on end, and he remained in this state for an hour. Ramlal, Sri Ramakrishna's nephew and a priest of the temple, recited the names of God in his ears and gradually brought him down to the normal state. Then Sri Ramakrishna said to Ramlal : "Did you see what is meant by dwelling in God? That is why I keep my mind down by thinking of and loving Narendra, Rakhal and others. I look upon them as veritable Narayanas." Ramlal said : "It is best you live in your own way."

Towards the close of 1884, more than three years after his first visit to Dakshineswar, Rakhal went to Brindaban with Balaram Bose. The natural beauty and sanctity of the place had a great charm for him. He found its holy and quiet atmosphere very congenial to spiritual practice. He lived there cheerfully for three or four months. But the sojourn, notwithstanding its shortness, left a deep impression on his mind, and as we shall see later on, he went there several times more for the practice of *tapasyâ* and meditation. A considerable portion of his itinerant life he spent at Brindaban. During his first visit to that holy place he was unwell for some time. When the news of his illness reached Sri Ramakrishna, it made him very anxious. He thought that as Rakhal had been once incarnated as the companion of Sri Krishna at Brindaban, he must have a natural attraction for the place and his old memories being revived by intimate association with the place, he might give up his present body and resort to his true spiritual self. Sri Ramakrishna prayed to the Mother for his recovery.

Behind the childlike attitude of Rakhal a deep spiritual mood was always to be noticed, which prevailed more and more with the passing of days. His dormant spiritual consciousness was soon awakened at the divine touch of Sri Ramakrishna. He lost all zest for

worldly pleasures. He could not live in the company of worldly men. Regarding this early development of his mind, Sri Ramakrishna observed: "Rakhal has now attained true discrimination. He will no longer be attached to the world. He can live unconcerned anywhere, even in the family, though he has got a young wife of fourteen." Rakhal's spiritual nature rapidly asserted itself. He became more and more absorbed in God. Even while sitting with Sri Ramakrishna's audience, he could be noticed mentally repeating the name of God. When attending sacred chants, he was often found to be in an ecstatic mood. He passed into a trance for the first time while listening to the exposition of the *Bhāgavata* sitting at the feet of Sri Ramakrishna. He entered into the same beatific state once again at Balaram Babu's house in Calcutta. On that occasion he lost all hold upon himself and lay down on the floor. Whenever Rakhal had a trance, Sri Ramakrishna would place his hand on his chest and utter the sacred name of God, which would bring him back to normal consciousness. But Sri Ramakrishna would also often raise his mind from the ordinary plane and make him realise the transcendental joy. One day Sri Ramakrishna touched him on the chest in a mood of divine inspiration (*bhāva*), and Rakhal forthwith had a glorious vision. The ecstasy of this vision, he said in after life, lasted several days. Of his fellow-disciples, Rakhal perhaps lived most in the company of Sri Ramakrishna. He was also most intimate with him. When Sri Ramakrishna visited any of his devotees' houses in Calcutta or attended any religious function there, Rakhal would invariably go with him. Rakhal also attended on him as a disciple. When Sri Ramakrishna wanted water, Rakhal would carry the water-jug to him. If Sri Ramakrishna went out at nights, Rakhal would follow him with a lantern. But sometimes Rakhal's spiritual mood would so prevail over him that he could not serve

Sri Ramakrishna, on the other hand he had to be looked after by the Master. Rakhal underwent hard spiritual discipline at the same time. Sri Ramakrishna had initiated him into regular spiritual practice appropriate to his individual nature. Rakhal pursued it with utmost zeal and earnestness. Sri Ramakrishna watched him most intently and helped him off and on with necessary instructions. Whenever he had any trouble or difficulty, Sri Ramakrishna came to his relief, settled his doubts and chased all fears away. In every possible way the Master trained the disciple for his future mission. Among other things he acquainted him with the habits and nature of men and taught him how to deal with them under different circumstances. He trained him particularly in the art of knowing their tendencies and peculiarities by the study of physiognomy, so that in after life he might prescribe spiritual courses, according to the individuality of each aspirant.

We can have a few glimpses of these days of discipleship from the very words of Rakhal said in after life in reply to occasional enquiries by devotees:

"One day I was meditating in the Kali temple. I could not concentrate my mind. This made me very sad. I thought of returning home. I came to the Master. I bowed down to him. But as I stood up, he said: 'As you were returning from the shrine, I found that your mind was, as it were, enmeshed.' I said: 'You know everything. Yes, my mind has been really like that.' He then wrote something on my tongue and at once all my previous feelings vanished from my mind. I was overwhelmed with an inexpressible joy.

"Once I did a wrong thing and became extremely penitent. I went to confess it to him. He asked me to follow him with his water-jug. While returning, he said: 'You did this last night. Never do so any more.' I was dumb with wonder. How could he know? Another day, when I returned from Calcutta, he said: 'Why can I not look at you? Have you done any-

thing wrong?" "No," I replied. I had forgotten that I had told a fib. "Did you tell a lie?" he asked me. Then I remembered that I had.

"On one occasion, I said to him: 'Sir, I cannot get rid of lust. What shall I do?' He touched me in the heart, muttering certain indistinct words. All lust vanished from me for ever. I never felt its existence henceforth.

"Once I was meditating at *Panchavati* at midday, when the Master was holding a discourse on *Shabda-Brahman* and other cognate subjects. My attention was drawn to his words. As I was listening to him, methought I heard that the very birds on the trees were singing the Vedic hymns.

"Ah, how joyfully we lived with the Master at Dakshineswar! Sometimes we would be convulsed with side-splitting laughter by his witty talks. What we now cannot realise by meditation, we then attained automatically. If my mind went wrong by even a little, he would understand it from my appearance; he would pass his hands over my chest and set it right. And how free was I not with him! One day I was rubbing oil on his body in the semi-circular western porch. For some reason I got angry with him. I threw away the bottle of oil and strode off with the intention of never returning to him. I went out of the temple garden and came near Jadu Mallick's garden-house. And then I could not proceed farther. I sat down. Meanwhile he had sent Ramlal to call me back. When I came, he said: 'Did you see? Could you go?'

"So long as I lived with him, I used to have spontaneous recollection and contemplation of God. An ecstatic joy used to fill me always."

It is worth while to observe that in those days of spiritual absorption Rakhal did not neglect the call of the outside world. The following incident narrated by himself in after life in course of a familiar talk, throws an interesting light on the early character of

the future head of an organisation which has combined the ideal of service with the highest spirituality. It reveals at the same time another distinguishing mark of his nature—the development of psychical powers. To quote his own words:

"While I was at Dakshineswar with the Master, a man at the Temple fell very ill. There was no one to look after him, so I nursed him for a few days. One night as I was sitting near him, his suffering became intense. I did not know how to mitigate it. So I thought I would repeat the Lord's name for his relief. After I had made *japa* for some time, a kind of slumber came upon me and I saw a vision. A girl about twelve years old came and stood near me. I asked her: 'Will he get cured?' She nodded and replied: 'Yes,' and vanished. The very next day the patient began to recover."

In the mean time the other chosen disciples of Sri Ramakrishna had come to him one by one. He trained each of them according to his character and temperament, so that he might realise the truth in his own way and play his particular part in the fulfilment of the Divine Mission for which he was born. The chosen group of monastic disciples was perhaps complete by August of 1885, just a year before the Master's passing away. Narendranath was accorded by Sri Ramakrishna the foremost place among his disciples. His stupendous spiritual personality and his majestic and commanding disposition won the spontaneous allegiance of his *gurubhâis* (brother-disciples). They automatically followed his lead and placed him at their head. But though Narendranath was their natural leader, Rakhal was their chosen King. His most intimate relation with the Master, his profound spirituality, his sober and magnanimous nature made them pay the most willing homage to him. One day Narendranath said to his *guru-bhâis*: "Let us call Rakhal Rajah (the King)." They all agreed. Naren-

dranath went to the Master and said :
 "We have made Rakhal our King."
 Sri Ramakrishna was much pleased.
 Henceforth Rakhal was looked upon as
 King and called "Rajah" by his guru-

bhâis. The followers and admirers of
 Sri Ramakrishna subsequently chose to
 call him "the Maharaj" (the great
 King) out of reverence and did not
 usually mention him by name.

(To be continued)

REVIVAL OF CULTURAL SWARAJ: NON-POLITICAL OBJECTIONS

BY PRAMATHA NATH BOSE, B.Sc. (London)

I

I have elsewhere* tried to meet objections to the establishment of a Society for the revival of our cultural Swaraj suggested by me from my politically-minded compatriots. The following letter from an eminent educationist, Sir Devaprasad Sarvadhikary will give some idea of objections from a non-political view-point :

"In reply to your circular regarding cultural Swaraj, I am entirely of your opinion, that all the three elements referred to in your paper are worthy of revival and conservation. At the same time, I do not agree that the system of Western culture that has come to stay within a limited circle, can or should be dispensed with. It has done much to enlighten and expand views, and you yourself and the late Mr. R. C. Dutt are two glorious results of such culture. The reaction that has set in in favour of Indian culture should be helpful in bringing Western culture into line with Indian culture and the combination ought to be conducive to good results for the country. Considering that Western culture is limited to and influences a very small fraction of our people there is a large residuary field for cultivation of Indian culture among our people. This neglect is of our own, and can be attributed to no one else. Growth and expansion in kinds and

types of educational institutions which you mention are desirable no doubt, but not at the expense of the very few institutions for Western culture which we have. There is more than room for both, and no one need sink in order that the other may swim. The one ought to influence the other for mutual good. We have long outlived the time of absolute and detached isolation, even in regard to culture.

"Your opinions are always entitled to the highest respect. I am, therefore, sorry to have to differ from you in this particular matter. You remember how you and I strove to push the national education ideal, and how and why we failed."

With due deference to Sir Devaprasad, I venture to think, that he has not given sufficient consideration to the distinction, (a) between Indian and Western culture, and (b) between culture and education or rather instruction such as is usually imparted in our schools and colleges.

The key-note of the modern culture of the West (or briefly Western culture) was struck by Bacon whose motto, "Man is the servant and interpreter of Nature," has been the motto of the intellectual development of modern Europe during the last two centuries. Natural science, or briefly, science, is the intellectual foundation of Western culture as mental science, or briefly, philosophy, is that of ancient culture (including Greek culture) of which Indian cul-

**Amrita Bazar Patrika*, December 30, 1929.

ture is a variety. Not that the ancients neglected science, or that the moderns of the West ignore philosophy. The former, for instance, made considerable advance in Astronomy, Chemistry, Medicine and Mineralogy. In fact three centuries ago the stock of knowledge which the Western world possessed of these sciences was not greater than that of the ancients, and was at least partly derived from India through the Saracens. But the ancients subordinated science to philosophy. The moderns of the West, on the other hand, elevate science above philosophy. The Western scientists would usually resolve all knowledge into sensations, would not admit anything which is not susceptible of experimental demonstration and scrupulous verification, would exclude the ultra-sensual region from their purview altogether, and any scientist like Oliver Lodge or Russell Wallace, who ventures to pry into it, is hooted as a renegade. The ancient philosophers, especially of India, on the other hand, not only did not exclude this ultra-sensual region from the scope of their inquiry, but invested it with an importance far above that of the sensual universe. To them knowledge was not confined to what is derived through the agency of the senses alone. They valued it, but they valued the knowledge of the domain within, which lies beyond the world of sense-perception, still more. To them, especially to the Hindus, the highest knowledge is that which leads to the salvation of the soul. Problems which engaged their attention most—the great problems of whence, what, and whither—are problems, which engage the attention of Western scientists the least. In short, spirit was the sovereign of ancient culture as matter is that of Western culture.

This basic difference between ancient and modern culture has led to wide divergence between them until within the last two or three generations, one has become almost the antithesis, the negation of the other. In the first place, the masters of modern culture

not only do not generally recognise the existence of an active Supreme Being, but also as generally ignore the existence of the soul as well. There were agnostics and monists among the modern scientists, but the former, in India, at least, almost without exception, believed in a spiritual entity apart from the physical; not only believed in it, but considered it to be more important than the physical. In the whole range of Hindu philosophy there was none who was a more uncompromising agnostic than Kapila. He would not admit anything which could not be proved by the three kinds of evidence recognised by him. Like the modern agnostics he would not admit the existence of an active Supreme Being, as it could not be proved by such evidence. But unlike the present-day agnostics he firmly believed in the existence of the soul and its immortality, so firmly, indeed, that the avowed object of his philosophy was to liberate the soul from its physical bondage. There is no very serious difference between the conception of the Brahman—the Absolute Spirit—of out-and-out Vedantists like Samkaracharya and that of the Unknown and Unknowable of some modern scientists like Herbert Spencer. But where they differ, and differ most markedly, is in their idea of the individual soul and its relation to the Universal Soul. Such phrases as "*Jiva Brahmaiva*," "*Aham Brahmâsmi*," "*Tattwamasi*," which are pregnant with deep meaning to the Vedantists, would be meaningless jargon to the modern monists.

The close investigation of psychical phenomena developed in the ancient thinkers a mental vision, an introspective capacity, which made them "Seers," that is, enabled them to penetrate into the heart of things, and extract from them that quintessence of culture called wisdom. The Hindus, for instance, lighted upon the doctrine of Evolution which is considered to be one of the greatest triumphs of modern science, but they did so more by their

mental vision than by the laborious colligation and observation of physical phenomena. The same inner vision enabled them to perceive unity in diversity of life, the Undivided One in the divided many, and to base upon this firm foundation that principle of all-embracing altruism which is the most valuable product of Hindu wisdom. On the other hand, we have, in the West, an overwhelming mass of literature bearing upon evolution and an infinity of other topics, but there is a sad dearth of such penetrating mental vision as would sift the "chaff from the wheat," and extract a few grains of wisdom out of it. The votaries of Natural Science have built up a gigantic labyrinth—an admirable, wonderful labyrinth no doubt, but a labyrinth, in the intricate and bewildering mazes of which one is apt to get lost altogether, without any illumination as to the goal of his life and how he is to attain it.

The prevailing tendency of the cultivation of philosophy among the ancients was towards idealism and other-worldliness, as that of the cultivation of Natural Science is towards materialism and this-worldliness. Plato, for instance, valued Mathematics only because it "habituates the mind to the contemplation of pure truth and raises us above the material universe." He remonstrated with his friend Archytas who had invented powerful machines on mathematical principles, and declared "this was to degrade a noble intellectual exercise into a low craft fit only for carpenters and wheel-wrights." Archimedes was half ashamed of his inventions which were the wonders of his age. The cultured classes among the ancients kept aloof from industrialism and militarism as those among the moderns are steeped in them. Visvâ-mitra, the divine patron of arts in India, receives worship only from artisans, and he was in no way superior to Maya, the Dânava patron of arts. Sukrâchârya, the greatest Indian inventor of ancient times, of whom we

have any traditions, was a professor of the Daityas. From remote antiquity, the profession of the soldier in China was looked down upon. He was placed last in her scale of social usefulness. She like India has never made a hero of any man whose sole title to distinction is success in warfare. The emperor of China was probably the only ruler of the world, who never wore a sword.

The spiritual character of his culture has made the Hindu exalt humanitarianism above patriotism, renunciation above sensual enjoyment, and altruism above egoism, as the materialism of his culture has made the Occidental exalt patriotism over humanitarianism, enjoyment above renunciation, egoism above altruism. The Hindus sought happiness by self-denial, not by self-indulgence, by curtailing the wants of animal life rather than by multiplying them, by suppressing desires rather than by gratifying them. Their object has been to secure the good or well-being of humanity by the development of the inner life for which more or less of abstention from sensual gratification, a life of more or less of ascetic simplicity, is requisite. In this respect Hindu culture is at one with the Roman or Greek culture. No Hindu teacher could have exhorted his disciples to be independent of external circumstances more forcibly or more earnestly than did the Socratic or the Stoic sage. Even Epicurus with whom pleasure was the sole ultimate good, maintained the immense superiority of the pleasures of the mind over those of the body, and the Epicurean sage, no less than the Vedantic or the Stoic, sought for happiness and tranquillity from within rather than from without. The basic principle of the modern culture of the West, on the other hand, is to secure the well-being of man by perpetually provoking and feeding his sensual desires and by eternally inventing means and appliances for gratifying them. The goal of invention to-day becomes its starting point to-morrow.

II

Thus the two cultures are so diametrically opposed that their satisfactory combination is impossible. When Sir Devaprasad talks of combination, I think he means combination of Western education* and Indian culture. The West has within the last century made most remarkable advances in various branches of knowledge especially of Natural Science, and we have much to learn from it; and there is not the shadow of a doubt that English education "has done much to enlighten and expand views." It has relaxed the restraints of authority and of conventionalities sanctioned by immemorial usage. Literary ambition has a freer scope and has been soaring into regions hitherto unknown in India. The Indian intellect has ventured out of the well-beaten paths of theology and metaphysics. The medical and mathematical sciences which yielded such notable results to the ancient Hindus, are now being cultivated on the improved methods of the West. Biography, novel (in its modern forms), archaeology, and the different branches of Natural Science are subjects almost entirely new in modern Indian literature.

But these beneficent results have been overwhelmingly counteracted by the effects of a strong bias in favour of Western culture, created, fostered and propagated by the present system of education. It cannot be gainsaid that a rise to a higher standard of living is the necessary concomitant of advance in civilization. Such a rise took place in the case of the Indians as they advanced in civilization some two thousand years ago, and until recently they kept to the standard of decency, comfort, and luxury, which they then attained, and which is suited to their physical and economic conditions. The so-called "rise" which is now taking place under the influence of a highly materialistic culture like the Western, is only an

*By "education" is here meant instruction in various branches of knowledge.

exchange of this indigenous standard for an exotic one suited to quite different physical, economic and social conditions. The exchange instead of benefiting our community is, on the whole, doing endless mischief. For instance, in a climate where the minimum of clothing, consistent with the indigenous idea of decency, is conducive to health and comfort, the swathing of the body in a multiplicity of cumbersome apparel from head to foot in accordance with the Western idea of decency produces discomfort, injures health and drains the purse without any equivalent advantage. The quantity of clothing now needed in a middle class household is treble, quadruple or more of what would have been sufficient two or three generations ago. The feet must be shod with boots and shoes of Western shape and style, which are much more expensive and much less comfortable than indigenous shoes and sandals. The *Hookah* has been replaced by the much more injurious and the much more costly cigarette. Cheap native toys no longer amuse our children. Our young men no longer find pleasure in native games and athletic exercises which cost nothing, but must have foot-ball, tennis, badminton, cricket, billiards, etc., which cost a great deal. Indigenous amusements and entertainments for which the great majority had to pay nothing, have been superseded by theatres, circuses, cinemas, etc., in the Western fashion, which everybody must pay for. House-keeping in the old style which utilised the resources of the country to the fullest possible advantage, recognised the tending of the cow as one of its most important duties, and turned out highly palatable delicacies and artistic utilities out of inexpensive material, is a vanishing art in New India. In the dietary of New India, such simple and wholesome articles of refreshment as *Chirâ*, *Muri*, *Khoi*, cocoanut, gram, *Chhânâ*, *Gur*, etc., are being superseded by much more expensive and generally much less salutary

chops, cutlets, biscuits, refined sugar, pastry, etc., and *Sharbat* has been replaced by the highly deleterious tea.

This approximation of the standard of living of one of the poorest communities of the world to that of one of the richest has in various ways proved a veritable social menace. Impoverishment is a comparative term. If one having comparatively more money than before, has yet less for his wants, he is certainly poorer. I do not think I am exaggerating when I say, that the great majority of our middle class have been impoverished in this sense. The candle burns at both ends. Their resources are exhausted on the one hand by the inordinate enhancement of the prices of indigenous necessities, and on the other, by the so-called "elevation" of the standard of living which is enlarging their wants. Even incomes which formerly would have been regarded as opulence, are now hardly deemed to be bare competence. While milk and the various preparations of milk which form our principal articles of nutrition suited to the climate, have become so very dear that the great majority of our middle class cannot afford to get them in sufficient quantity for bare subsistence, they have to spend large amounts upon the gratification of the new tastes for an infinity of inutilities, futilities, fatuities and superfluities, which have sprung up among them. The enormously increased stringency of struggle for existence has proved to be a potent cause for our recent physical and moral degeneration. There is but little doubt that one of the main causes of the cult of bomb and revolver, which for sometime past has been masquerading in the guise of patriotism among some of our young men, is economic. Then, again, the pursuit of the *ignis fatuus* of political Swaraj on the Western model, which is a result of the strong Neo-Indian bias for Western culture, has caused the destruction of genuine village self-government and of communal concord which were two of the

main bulwarks of our cultural Swaraj, and has led a good number of the flower of Indian youth into the dangerous and demoralising path of revolutionary conspiracies. Further, obsessed by pro-Western prepossessions, there has sprung up a band of aggressive, iconoclastic reformers who are doing incalculable mischief by endeavouring to bring Indian Society into line with the Western.*

The baneful consequences of Western culture are not confined to India. But as I have shown elsewhere,† they have more or less affected the whole of humanity. However magnificent, imposing and fascinating it appears from the spectacular point of view, it is, in reality, founded upon falsehood and is bolstered up by fraud. Its basic principle is to secure the well-being of man by the propagation of the cult of "wanting more wants". A principle more false and fallacious could hardly be conceived. Its falsehood was exemplified in the life of Bacon who first lucidly enunciated it, and who was unquestionably the greatest prophet of modern civilization. The world has not witnessed a more towering and a more wonderful intellectual giant, and a more miserable and a more contemptible moral pigmy.

A culture with foundation so unreal and insecure has necessitated its maintenance by deception, by the scientific exploitation of the weak under various ingenious pretences, by make-believe democratic institutions, by the propagation of illusory hopes of peace and prosperity, and of notions of sham equality, liberty and fraternity. The great majority of mankind are credulous, and the pursuit of Will-o-the-Wisps has always a special fascination for them. The

* The writer has dealt with these subjects in his *Swaraj, Cultural and Political*; *Some Present-day Superstitions*, and *Survival of Hindu Civilization*, Part I, "Impoverishment of India and its Remedy," and Part 2, "Physical Degeneration, its Causes and Remedies."

† *Epochs of Civilization; Degeneration, a World Problem; An Eastern View of Western Progress.*

tendency of civilization from remote antiquity has always been towards luxury—a tendency which has received immense impetus from the modern industrial civilization of the West. And, now, more than ever, there is no truer gospel for civilized man than that of renunciation, one of the fundamental principles of Indian culture, which promotes the growth of genuine altruism.

It is true that Western culture is directly “limited to and influences a small fraction of our people.” But they are the most vocal and influential of our community; and, as we have seen above, the pernicious influence of their action and example has permeated down to its lowest strata. I am strongly inclined to think that when Sir Devaprasad upholds the cause of the “institutions of Western culture,” he has in his mind “Western knowledge.” We should not only not shut it out, but should heartily welcome the remarkable advances which the West has made in various branches of learning, especially Natural Sciences. And, so far as I am aware, such learning is included in the curricula of institutions

which have been started for the revival of Indian culture. And some of them at least like the Brahmacharya Vidyâlaya of Ranchi, having regard to our existing environment train their pupils so that if they desire they may study for University degrees. The Arts side of the National Council of Education in Bengal failed, because it ignored this environment, but its Technical side is flourishing, because it recognises it. It would be unwise to blink the fact that, under existing conditions, however one may deplore them, the avenues of employment are closed to a large number of our middle-class people who have not the hall-mark of a University degree. What the proposed society for the revival of Indian culture will endeavour to do is to give such a training to our youth as would enable them to resist the sinister, though often insidious, influence of institutions which serve to foster and propagate Western culture. Thus the objection to its establishment raised by educationists like Sir Devaprasad Sarvadhikary appears to me to be based upon a misunderstanding which, it is to be hoped, this article will remove.

MAYA AND THE MARCH OF FREEDOM*

BY ROMAIN ROLLAND

It is no part of my present intention to enter into an argument about the thought of the two great Indians, whose lives I have just related. The material of Vivekananda's ideas, no more than those of Ramakrishna, was not their personal conquest. It belongs to the deepest thought inherent in Hinduism. The simple and modest Ramakrishna made no pretensions to the honour of founding a metaphysical school. And Vivekananda, though more intellectual

and therefore more conscious of his doctrine, knew and maintained that in it was nothing new. On the contrary he would have been inclined to defend them on the strength of their exalted spiritual ancestry.

“I am Sankara!” he said.

They would both have smiled at the illusion, so general in the age, that makes a man believe himself the inventor or proprietor of some form of thought. We know that the thoughts of mankind move within a narrow circle, and that, while they alternately appear and disappear, they are always there. Moreover, those which seem to us the newest are often in reality the most

*All rights reserved. This article may not be reproduced or translated, in part or whole, either in India or abroad, without the special permission of the author.—Ed.

ancient; it is simply that they have been longer absent from the world.

So I am not prepared to embark upon the vast and profitless task of discussing the Hinduism of the Paramahansa and his great disciple; for if I wished to probe to the depths of the question, I would be unable to confine myself to Hinduism. The essential part of their experience and mystic conception, as well as the metaphysical constructions of which these are at the same time the foundation and the keystone, far from being peculiar to India as she has the tendency to believe, are held by her in common with the two great religious metaphysics of the West, the Hellenic and the Christian. The Divine Infinity, the Absolute God, immanent and transcendent, who is poured out in the constant flood of the *Natura Rerum*, and yet is concentrated in the most minute of its particles,—the Divine Revelation, diffused throughout the universe and yet inscribed in the centre of each soul,—the great paths of reunion with the Infinite Force, in particular that of total Negation,—the “deification” of the enlightened soul, after its identification with Unity—these are all explained by Plotinus of Alexandria and by the early masters of Christian mysticism, with an ordered power and beauty, which need fear no comparison with the monumental structure of India. On the other hand Indian mystics would do very well to study it.¹

But obviously within the limits of this work, I cannot give even a bird’s-eye view of the historic variations that have taken place in the conception of the Divine Infinity and in the great science of union with the Absolute. It would require a history of the whole world; for such ideas belong to the very flesh of humanity in the past, the present and the future. Their character is universal and eternal. I cannot

¹ We regret we cannot accept the author’s views for reasons which we hope to show another time. There are reasons to believe that Hellenic and Christian mysticism was indebted to Indian mysticism.—*Ed.*

begin to discuss even the question of their worth (problematical as all the ideas of the human spirit without exception), or the question bound up in it, that of the great scientific problem of “Introversion”. . . . I shall confine myself here to a summary of Vedântic thought, as it has been explained in these modern days through the mouth of Vivekananda.

All great doctrine, as it recurs periodically in the course of the centuries, is coloured by reflections of the age wherein it reappears; and it further receives the imprint of the individual soul through which it runs. Thus it emerges to work upon men of an age. Every idea as a pure idea remains in an elementary stage, like electricity dispersed in the atmosphere, unless it finds the mighty condenser of personality. It must become incarnate like the gods. “*Et caro factus est.*”²

It is this mortal flesh of the immortal idea, which gives it its temporary aspect of belonging to a day or a century, whereby it is communicated to us.

I shall try to show how closely allied is the aspect of Vivekananda’s thought to our own, with our special needs, torments, aspirations, and doubts, which urge us ever forward, like a blind mole, by instinct upon the road leading to the light. Naturally I hope to be able to make other Westerners, who resemble me, feel the attraction that I feel for this elder brother, the son of the Ganges, who of all modern men achieved the highest equilibrium between the diverse forces of thought, and was one of the first to sign a treaty of peace between the two forces, eternally warring within us, the forces of reason and faith.

If there is one feeling that is absolutely essential to me (and I speak as the representative of thousands of Europeans) it is that of Freedom. Without it nothing has any value. . . . “*Das Wesen des Geistes ist die Freiheit.*”³

² “And was made flesh.”

³ “The essence of the spirit is Freedom.” (Hegel).

But those who are best qualified to estimate its unique value are those who have known most fully the suffering of chains, either those of especially crushing circumstances or the torments of their own nature. When I was not seven years old, the universe of a sudden seemed to my eyes to be like a vast rat-trap wherein I was caught. From that moment all my efforts were directed to escape through the bars—until one day of my youth, under slow and constant pressure, one bar suddenly gave way and I sprang to freedom.⁴

These spiritual experiences which marked me for life, brought me singularly near to the spirit of India when later I came to know it. For thousands of years she has felt herself entangled in a gigantic net, and for thousands of years she has sought for some way of escaping through the meshes. This ceaseless effort to escape from a closed trap has communicated a passion for freedom, ever fresh, ardent and untiring (for it is always in danger) to all Indian geniuses whether Divine Incarnations, wise philosophers or poets; but I know few examples so striking as the personality of Vivekananda.

The sweeping strokes of this wild bird's wings took him, like Pascal, across the whole heaven of thought from one pole to the other, from the abyss of servitude to the gulf of freedom. His tragic cry immediately conjures up the chain of rebirth :

"Why! the memory of one life is like millions of years of confinement, and they want to wake up the memory of many lives! Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. . ."

But later he extols the splendour of existence :

"Never forget the glory of human nature! We are the greatest God that ever was or ever will be. Christs and Buddhas are but waves on the boundless ocean which *I am*."

⁴ I have related these experiences in a chapter of intimate memories as yet unpublished: *The Inner Voyage*, which so far has only been shown to my Indian friends.

Therein lies no contradiction. For Vivekananda the two conditions are co-existent in men. "What is this universe? . . . In freedom it rises, in freedom it rests." And yet with each movement every living being makes the chains of slavery eat more deeply into his flesh. But the dissonance of the two sentiments blends into harmony—a harmonious dissonance which, according to Heraclitus, is the opposite of the serene and sovereign homophony of the Buddha. Buddhism says to men :

"Realise that all this is illusion," while the Vedântic Advaitist says :

"Realise that in illusion is the real!"

Nothing in the world is to be denied : for *Mâyâ*, Illusion, has its own reality. We are caught in the network of phenomena. Perhaps it would be a higher and more radical wisdom to cut the net, like Buddha, by total negation, and to say :

"They do not exist."

But in the light of the poignant joys and tragic sorrows, without which life would be poor indeed, it is more human, more precious to say :

"They exist. They are a snare."

and to lift the eyes from this mirror to the larks, there to discover that it is all a game of the sun. The game of the sun, Brahman, is *Mâyâ*, the huntress with Nature her net.

Before going further let us rid ourselves of the equivocation, which is inherent in the very name of *Mâyâ* for even the most learned men of the West, and see how it is conceived by intellectual Vedântism of the present day; for as it stands it raises a fictitious barrier between us. We are wrong to think of it as total illusion, pure hallucination, vain smoke without a fire : for it is this idea which makes us keep our derogatory opinion that the East is incapable of facing the reality of life, and sees in it nothing but the stuff that dreams are made of, a conception that leads it to float through life, half asleep, motionless and supine, eyes fixed on the blue depths, like the webs of wandering spiders floating in the autumn breeze.

But I believe I am faithful to the real thought of great modern Vedântism, as it was incarnate in Vivekananda, by proving that his conception of Nature was not vastly different from that of modern science.

The true Vedântic spirit does not start out with a system of preconceived ideas. It possessed absolute liberty and unrivalled courage among religions with regard to the facts to be observed and the diverse hypotheses laid down for their co-ordination. Never having been hampered by a priestly order each man has been entirely free to search wherever he pleased for the spiritual explanation of the spectacle of the universe. As Vivekananda reminded his listeners, there was a time when believers, atheists, and downright materialists could be found preaching their doctrines side by side in the same temple;—and further on I shall show what esteem Vivekananda publicly professed for the great materialists of Western science. “Liberty,” he said, “is the sole condition of spiritual progress.” Europe has known how to achieve it (or to demand it) more effectively than India in the realm of politics,⁵ but she has attained it and even imagined it infinitely less in the spiritual realm. The mutual misunderstanding and intolerance of our so-called “free thinkers” and of our diverse religious professions has no longer the power to astonish us: the normal attitude of the average European may be summed up as “I am Truth!”, while the great Vedântist would prefer as his motto Whitman’s “All is Truth.” He does not reject any one of the proposed attempts at explanation but from each he seeks to extract the grain of permanent reality: hence when brought face to face with modern science he regards it as the purest manifestation of real religious sense—for it is seeking to seize

the essence of Truth by penetration and sincere striving.

The conception of Mâyâ is viewed from this standpoint. “It is not,” said Vivekananda, “a theory for the explanation of the world.”⁶ It is purely and simply a statement of fact” to be observed of all observers. “It is what we are, and what we see,” so let us experiment. We are placed in a world which can be reached only through the doubtful medium of the mind and senses. This world only exists in relation to them. If they change it will also change. The existence we give it has no unchangeable, immovable, absolute reality. It is an indefinable mixture of reality and appearance, of certainty and illusion. It cannot be the one without the other. And there is nothing Platonic about this contradiction! It takes us by the throat at every minute of our life of passion and action—it has been perceived throughout the ages by all the clear thinking minds of the universe. It is the very condition of our knowledge. Though we are unceasingly called to the solution of insoluble problems the key to which seems as necessary as love or bread, we cannot pass the circle of atmosphere imposed by nature itself upon our lungs. And the eternal contradiction between our aspirations and the wall enclosing them—between two orders having no common measure—between contradictory realities, the implacable and real fact of death and the no less real, immediate and undeniable consciousness of life,—between the irrevocable working of certain intellectual and moral laws and the perpetual flux of all the conceptions of the spirit and heart—the

⁵ At the moment she is using the same energy to crush it. And bourgeois democracies, while still maintaining “parliamentary” etiquette, are not in this respect behind communist or fascist dictators.

⁶ It would be more exact to say, if criticism is allowed, that it is a fact of observation, insufficiently explained, if not actually unexplained, as most Vedântic philosophers agree. (Cf. for example the most recent exposition of Vedântism by Dr. Mahendranath Sircar, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy at the Sanskrit College, Calcutta: *Comparative Studies in Vedantism*, Oxford University Press, Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, 1928.)

incessant variations of good and evil, of truth and falsehood on both sides of a line in space and time⁷—the whole coil of serpents wherein from the beginning of time the Laocoön of human thought has found itself intertwined so that as it unties itself on one side it only ties its knots more tightly on the other—all this is the real world. And the real world is *Mâyâ*.

How then can it be defined? Only by a word that has been made fashionable by science in these days—Relativity. In Vivekananda's day it had hardly appeared above the horizon; its light was not yet bright enough to fill the dark sky of scientific thought; and Vivekananda only uses it incidentally. But it is clear that it gives the precise meaning of his conception; and the passage I have just quoted in the form of a note leaves no room for doubt on the subject. Nothing but the mode of expression is different. Vedântic Advaitism (that is to say, impersonal and absolute Monism) of which he is the greatest modern representative, declares that *Mâyâ* cannot be defined as non-existence any more than it can be defined as existence. It is an intermediate form between the equally absolute Being and non-Being. Hence it is the Relative. It is not Existence, for, says the Hindu Vedântist, it is the sport of the Absolute. It is not non-Existence because this sport exists and we cannot deny it. For the type of man, so common in the West, who is content with the game from which they

⁷ "Good and bad are not two cut-and-dried, separate existences. . . The very phenomenon which is appearing to be good now, may appear to be bad to-morrow. . . The fire that burns the child, may cook a good meal for a starving man. . . The only way to stop evil, therefore, is to stop good also. . . To stop death, we shall have to stop life also. . . each of them (the two opposing terms) is but a different manifestation of the same thing. . . The Vedanta says, there must come a time when we shall look back and laugh at the ideals which make us afraid of giving up our individuality."

(Lecture on *Maya and Illusion*. *Complete Works*, II. pp. 97-98).

may derive profit, it is the sum total of existence: the great revolving Wheel bounds their horizon. But for great hearts the only existence worthy of the name is that of the Absolute. They are impelled to lay hold of it to escape from the Wheel. The cry of humanity comes across the centuries, as it sees the sand of its days running through its fingers together with all that it has constructed,—love, ambition, work and life itself:

"This world's wheel within wheel is terrible mechanism; if we put our hands in it, as soon as we are caught, we are gone. . . . We are all being dragged along by this mighty, complex world-machine."⁸

How then can we find the path to liberty?

For in the case of Vivekananda or of any other man cast in the heroic mould there can be no question of throwing the arms in advance, raising the hands and resigning himself to despair—still less is it possible to cover the eyes as do some agnostics, while they chant "What do I know?" and to gulp down the fleeting and passing pleasures which brush past our bodies like ghosts floating along the edge of the river!. . . . What is it that will assuage the cry of the Soul, the Great Hunger? Certainly these rags of flesh will not fill up the gulf! All the Epicure's roses will not keep him from starting back like the horses of Orcagna in the Campo Santo,⁹ from the stench of putrefying corpses. He must get out of the graveyard, out of the circle of tombs away from the crematorium. He must win freedom or die! And better to die, if need arises, for freedom!¹⁰

⁸ *Karma Yoga*, Chapter VIII.

⁹ Allusion to the famous fresco of Orcagna in the Campo Santo of Pisa. (XVth century.)

¹⁰ This brings out the error made by the psycho-pathologist in attributing to free Introversion a character of *flight*, misunderstanding its true character of *combat*. Great mystics, of the type of Ruysbroeck, Eckhart, Jean de la Croix and Vivekananda, do not

"Better to die on the battlefield than to live a life of defeat!"

This trumpet call from ancient India, sounded again by Vivekananda, according to him is the motto, the word of command, written on the starting post of all religions, whence they set out on their thousand year march. But it is also the motto of the great scientific spirit. "I will hew out a way for myself. I will know the truth, or give up my life in the attempt."¹¹ With both science and religion the original impulse is the same—and so too is the end to be achieved—Freedom. Is it not true that the learned man who believes in nature's laws, seeks to discover them solely for the purpose of mastering them so that he may use them in the service of the spirit, which their knowledge has set free? And what have all the religions in the world been seeking? They project this same sovereign freedom, which is refused to every individual being, into a God, into a higher, greater, more powerful Being who is not bound—in whatever form they may imagine Him—and freedom is to be won by the meditation of the Conqueror: God, the Gods, the Absolute or the idol; all are the agents of power, set up by humanity, in order to realise in its stead those gigantic aspirations, for which it can find no assuagement in a life that it knows is ever slipping away: for they are its bread of life, the reason for its very existence.

"And so all are marching towards freedom. We are all journeying towards freedom."¹²

And Vivekananda recalled the mysterious answer of the Upanishads to the question they propounded:

"The question is: 'What is this universe? From what does it arise? Into what does it go?' And the answer is: 'In freedom it rises, in flee. They look reality straight in the face, and then close in battle.

¹¹ Lecture on *Maya and Freedom*.

¹² *Ibid.*

freedom it rests, and into freedom it melts away.' "

You cannot give up this idea of freedom, so Vivekananda continued. Without it your being is lost. It is no question of science or religion, of unreason or reason, of good or evil, of hatred or love,—all beings without any exception hear the voice that calls them to freedom. And all follow it like the children who followed the Piper of Hamelin.¹³ The ferocious struggle of the world comes from the fact that all are striving among themselves as to who can follow the enchanter most closely and attain the promised end. But all these missions fight blindly without understanding the real meaning of the voice. But those to whom understanding is given realise in the same instant not only its meaning, but the harmony of the battlefield, whereon the planets, the brothers of the peoples, revolve, where all living beings, saints and sinners, good and bad (so called according to whether they stumble or walk erect—but all towards the same end), struggling or united press on towards the one goal: Freedom.¹⁴

There can be then no question of opening up an unknown way for them. Rather distracted mankind must learn that there are a thousand paths more or less certain, more or less straight, but all going there—and must be helped to free themselves from the quagmire wherein they are walking, or from the thickets whereon they are being torn, and shown among all these multitudinous ways the most direct, the *Viae Romanae*, the royal roads: the great Yogas: Work (Karma-Yoga), Love (Bhakti-Yoga), Knowledge (Jnâna-Yoga).

¹³ Allusion to the old Rhenish legend, told by Goethe, of the "Rat-catcher" whose flute captivated all who heard it and forced them to follow him. (The story is used by Browning in the *Pied Piper of Hamelin*.—Translator.)

¹⁴ And this object, as the Advaita Vedânta shows, is the subject itself, the real nature and essence of each one. It is MYSELF.

ASHTAVAKRA SAMHITA

BY SWAMI NITYASWARUPANANDA

एकस्मिन्नव्यये शान्ते चिदाकाशेऽमले त्वयि ।

कुतो जन्म कुतो कर्म कुतोऽहंकार एव च ॥१३॥

एकस्मिन् In the One अव्यये in the undecaying शान्ते in the calm चिदाकाशे in the space which is Intelligence अमले in the pure (च and) त्वयि in you जन्म birth कुतः from where कर्म action कुतः from where अहंकारः egoism एव even कुतः wherefrom च and (भवति is).

13. Wherefrom will there be birth,¹ action² and even egoism³ for thee who art one, immutable, calm, the space⁴ of Intelligence and pure?

[¹ Birth—One who is self-existent, all in all, and immutable, cannot be born; for birth implies the existence of parents and change, but nothing exists besides him.

² Action—Action also implies change and the desire to gain something which is not in one's possession. But the man of realisation knows himself as the Self which is calm and perfect.

³ Egoism—Therefore there cannot be any sense of the ego also in him; it results from our identification of ourselves with body and mind. But he perceives himself to be the "space of Intelligence" in which there is no trace of duality or variety,—he is pure.

⁴ Space etc.—Space is here identical with the *Chit*. *Chit* has been conceived as *ākāsha*, because like *ākāsha* it is all-pervasive and unaffected. Also, all perception requires as an essential factor the existence of *ākāsha*. Therefore three different *ākāshas* have been conceived: (1) *Mahākāsha*, the great space, which is our ordinary space, in which we perceive external objects; (2) *Chittākāsha*, the mental space;—everything that we imagine, dream or supersensibly perceive is in the mental space; and (3) *Chidākāsha*,—the Intelligence space,—the space in which the Self perceives itself;—here space is not anything different from the perceiver and the perceived as in the other two *ākāshas*, for in Self-perception, it is all one,—there is neither subject nor object; hence here space is identical with the Self. Really speaking, in Self-perception there is no space; but the word 'space' is used to extend the analogy of the other two kinds of perception to Self-perception.]

यत्तु पश्यसि तत्रैकस्त्वमेव प्रतिभासते ।

किं पृथक् भासते स्वर्णात् कटकाङ्गदन्तूपुरम् ॥ १४ ॥

यत् What त्वं you पश्यसि see तत्र there एकः alone त्वं you एव verily प्रतिभासते appear कटकाङ्गदन्तूपुरं bracelets, armlets and anklets स्वर्णात् from gold पृथक् different भासते appear किम् (interrogative).

14. In whatever you perceive you alone appear. Do bracelets, armlets and anklets appear different from gold?

[Advaita Vedanta holds that the Self is the only reality and the universe is no other than the Self itself,—only names and forms have been superimposed on it. Just as the reality of gold ornaments is gold itself and nothing but gold, so is the universe nothing different from the Self. The Self alone exists.]

अयं सोऽहमयं नाहं विभागमिति सन्त्यज ।

सर्वमात्मेति निश्चित्य निःसङ्कल्पः सुखी भव ॥ १५ ॥

अहं I अयं (pleonastic) सः He अहं I अयं this न not (अस्मि am) इति this विभाग distinction सन्त्यज give up completely आत्मा Self सर्व all इति this निश्चित्य realising निःसङ्कल्पः free from desire सुखी happy भव be.

15. Give up completely such distinctions as 'I am He'¹ and 'I am not this.'² Consider all³ as the Self and be desireless and happy.

[One should not think that one is only the Transcendental Reality and one is not the universe. As explained in the preceding verse, the universe is also the Self.

¹ *He*—the transcendental Self.

² *This*—the universe.

³ *All*—both the transcendental and the relative reality.]

तवैवाज्ञानतो विश्वं त्वमेकः परमार्थतः ।

त्वत्तोऽन्यो नास्ति संसारी नासंसारी च कश्चन ॥ १६ ॥

तव Your एव verily अज्ञानतः through ignorance विश्व universe (भवति is) परमार्थतः in reality त्वं you एकः one त्वत्तः than you अन्यः other कश्चन any संसारी transmigratory (Jiva) न not अस्ति is (त्वत्तः अन्यः कश्चन) असंसारी non-transmigratory (transcendental Self) न not (अस्ति is) च and.

16. It is verily through your ignorance that the universe exists. In reality you alone are. There is no *Jiva* or *Iswara* other than you.

[So long as the universe exists we have to conceive the Self in two aspects. In one aspect it is the transmigratory one (*Jiva*, going from birth to death and death to birth,—*Samsâri*), and in another aspect, it is *A-Samsâri* (God, beyond the cycle of birth and death, eternal and unchanging). But when the universe no longer exists, this distinction vanishes, and the universe, as has been said, exists in our ignorance. When we are rid of this ignorance, the universe disappears. So in fact, 'you alone are.']

भ्रान्तिमात्रमिदं विश्वं न किञ्चिदिति निश्चयी ।

निर्वासनः स्फूर्तिमात्रो न किञ्चिदिव शाम्यति ॥ १७ ॥

इदं This विश्व universe भ्रान्तिमात्र mere illusion किञ्चित् anything न not इति this निश्चयी one who knows for certain निर्वासनः desireless स्फूर्तिमात्रः Intelligence itself (सन् being) किञ्चित् anything न not (अस्ति exists) इव as if शाम्यति finds peace.

17. One who knows for certain that this universe is but an illusion and a nothing, becomes desireless and pure Intelligence, and finds peace as if¹ nothing exists.

[¹ *As etc.*—See Note 2, Chapter XI, verse 8.]

एकएव भवाम्भोधावासीदस्ति भविष्यति ।

न ते बन्धोऽस्ति मोक्षो वा कृतकृत्यः सुखं चर ॥ १८ ॥

भवान्भीषी In the ocean of the world एकः one एव only चासीत् was चस्ति is भविष्यति will be ते your बन्धः bondage मोक्षः liberation वा or न not चस्ति is कृत-
कृत्यः contented सुखं happily चर move.

18. In the ocean of the world one only was, is and will be. You have neither bondage¹ nor liberation. Live contented² and happy.

[¹ *Bondage etc.*—Bondage or freedom is possible only when there are other existences than the Self. But the Self exists for all times in its pristine purity and freedom and it alone is.

² *Contented*—One who has all his desires fulfilled, therefore desireless.]

मा सङ्कल्पविकल्पाभ्यां चित्तं क्षोभय चिन्मय ।

उपशम्य सुखं तिष्ठ स्वात्मन्यानन्दविग्रहे ॥ १९ ॥

चिन्मय O pure intelligence संकल्पविकल्पाभ्यां by decisions and indecisious चित्तं mind मा not क्षोभय disturb उपशम्य be calm आनन्दविग्रहे embodiment of bliss स्वात्मनि in your own self सुखं happily तिष्ठ abide.

19. O Pure Intelligence, do not disturb your mind with decisions and indecisions. Be¹ calm and abide happily in your own self which is Bliss itself.

[¹ *Be etc.*—Be free from decisions and indecisions,—such ideas as ‘I shall do this,’ ‘I shall not do this,’ etc.]

त्यजैव ध्यानं सर्वत्र मा किञ्चिद्दृढि धारय ।

आत्मा त्वं मुक्तएवासि किं विमृश्य करिष्यसि ॥ २० ॥

सर्वत्र In everything एव verily ध्यान thinking त्यज give up दृढि in the heart किञ्चित् anything मा not धारय hold त्वं you आत्मा Self (ततः therefore) मुक्तः free एव verily असि are विमृश्य thinking किं what करिष्यसि will do.

20. Give up contemplating anything and hold nothing in your heart. You are verily the Self and therefore free. What¹ will you do by thinking?

[¹ *What etc.*—Being the Self itself and therefore eternally free, there is no need of your thinking of anything, either for attaining freedom or achieving mundane objects.

Ashtavakra instructs the aspirant to dwell in the consciousness of his eternal self.]

NOTES AND COMMENTS

IN THIS NUMBER

The present number opens as usual with *Discourses on Jnana Yoga* by SWAMI VIVEKANANDA. . . . Our article, *A Brinjal-seller Appraises a Diamond*, is concluded in this issue. . . . Dr. MAHENDRANATH SIRCAR, M.A., Ph.D.

also concludes his *Phases of Immediate Experience* in this issue. . . . SWAMI SATPRAKASHANANDA who is a monk of the Ramakrishna Order, contributes to this number the first instalment of *Swami Brahmananda the Spiritual Son of Sri Ramakrishna*. Swami Brahmananda was second only to Swami Vive-

kananda among the Great Master's disciples. He was one of those very rare souls who come to the earth to bless mankind. Though he did not dwell before the public eye, his influence was nevertheless profound. Our readers, we have no doubt, will find the perusal of the article interesting and profitable. . . . PRAMATHA NATH BOSE, B.Sc. (LONDON) is known to our readers. He contributed a series of very interesting articles to *Prabuddha Bharata* last year on India and many of her problems. He believes the cultural revival of India to be the essential thing. The article that he contributes to the present number, *Revival of Cultural Swaraj: Non-Political Objections*, is a clear answer from his viewpoint to the objections that may be raised against his thesis. . . . *Maya and the March of Freedom* by ROMAIN ROLLAND is the first of a series of articles on the ideas and ideals of Swami Vivekananda to be published serially. In these very interesting essays, our readers will find how the thought of Swami Vivekananda has been reflected on one of the greatest minds of the modern West. . . . We have great pleasure in reproducing a picture of Swami Brahmananda as the frontispiece to this issue.

INFLUENCE OF INDIAN THOUGHT IN AMERICA

Many of us are vaguely aware that some of the greatest thinkers of the nineteenth century America were profoundly influenced by Indian thought. The name of Emerson prominently occurs to us in this connection. Our readers may remember our Note in pp. 359-360 of the *Prabuddha Bharata* of 1929. But few of us know the exact way in which Indian thought was communicated to Emerson and the other thinkers. We are grateful to M. Romain Rolland for important information on this point. He took great pains to find it out. We shall present our readers with it as published in his *Life of Swami*

Vivekananda. The thinkers who were most profoundly influenced were Thoreau and Emerson. But there were also Walt Whitman, Edgar Allan Poe, Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy and others.

Thoreau gives the sources from which he derived Indian influence: a French translation of the *Gita*, whose author must be Burnouf, although he does not mention him, published in 1840, and, more important, the English translation of Charles Wilkins, of which an edition had just appeared in 1846 with a preface by Warren Hastings. By the way, Warren Hastings, though he governed India, submitted to and publicly avowed the spiritual domination of the land of the Vedas. In 1786, he "recommended" a translation of the *Bhagavad Gita* to the President of the East India Company, and wrote a preface to it. He declared that "the writers of the Indian philosophies will survive when the British dominion in India shall long have ceased to exist, and when the sources which it yielded of wealth and power are lost to remembrance. "Thoreau also mentions other Hindu works, such as the *Shakuntala* of Kalidasa, and speaks enthusiastically of Manu, whom he knew through the translations of William Jones.

It appears that in 1854, the Englishman, Thomas Cholmondeley, the nephew of the great Bishop, Reginald Heber, visited Concord and became the friend of the whole intellectual colony. On his return to England, he sent Thoreau a collection of Oriental classics in 44 volumes. Thoreau said that it was practically impossible to find any of these works in America.

As regards Emerson, M. Rolland has given a clear account of his relations with Indian thought in his article published last month by us.

How far was Walt Whitman influenced by Indian thought? No direct connection has yet been discovered between them, though some resemblances may be observed between his thought and Indian thought. It is true in his books he has mentioned Indian terms

on a few occasions (such as "Maya," "avatar," "nirvana," "Brahma," etc.) and designated one of his poems as *Passage to India*, yet when Thoreau asked him about an year after the first publication of his *Leaves of Grass* whether he had read any of the Oriental poems, he replied with a categorical "No." In 1887 Whitman denied that he had read Emerson before 1855. But in 1856 he had written to Emerson that the latter had been the Columbus of the "New Continent" of the soul and Whitman its inspired explorer: "It is you who have discovered these shores. . . ." This at least proves that by that time he was acquainted with the thought of Emerson.

Poe had no less affinity to the spirit of India. His *Eureka*, published in 1848, showed thought closely akin to that of the Upanishads. Some people, such as Waldo Frank, believe that he must in the course of his wanderings have come in contact with Indian mysticism.

The indebtedness of Mrs. Eddy, the founder of Christian Science, can, however, be more clearly proved. It is enough to mention the little lexicon of philosophic and religious terms added by her to her Bible (*Science and Health*) in order to see the likeness of certain of her fundamental ideas to those of Vedanta:

"Me or I. The divine principle. The spirit, the soul . . . Eternal Mind. There is only one ME or US, only one Principle or Mind, which governs all things. . . . Everything reflects or refracts in God's Creation one unique Mind; and everything which does not reflect this unique Mind is false and a cheat. . . ."

"God.—The great I AM. . . . Principle, Spirit, Soul, Life, Truth, love, all substance, intelligence."

It would appear that Mrs. Eddy did not wish to acknowledge their origin. She has been silent on that point in the new editions of her book. But in the first she quoted from Vedantic philosophy. Swami Abhedananda, a dis-

ciple of Sri Ramakrishna, has related that the 24th edition of *Science and Health* contained a chapter, now suppressed, which began with four Vedantic quotations. In the same chapter Mrs. Eddy quoted the *Bhagavad Gita*, from the translation of Charles Wilkins, published in London in 1785 and in New York in 1867. These quotations were later omitted from the book: only one or two veiled allusions can be found to Indian thought. This attempt at dissimulation for the sake of the unwarned reader is a clumsy confession of its importance. (Cf. an article by Madeleine R. Harding, in *Prabuddha Bharata*, March 1928.)

Lastly, analogies to Indian thought are still more striking in the most important treatises on the Mind-cure by Horatio W. Dresser, Henry Wood, and R. W. Trine. But as they date from the end of the century, that is to say, after the death of Swami Vivekananda, they may well have owed much to the teachings of the latter. They agree on all points with the rules of Yogic concentration and with the faith behind it. We have reasons to believe that some at least of the protagonists of Mind-cure and New Thought had attended Vedanta classes. William James said of the Mind-cure: "It is made up of the following elements: the four Gospels, the idealism of Berkeley and Emerson, spiritism with its law of the radical evolution of souls through successive lives, optimistic and vulgar evolutionism, and the religions of India."

We have in the above briefly described the various ways in which Indian thought influenced some of the great American minds. But we must remember one important fact in this connection: there must have existed in the American mind at that time a *disposition* to accept and appreciate Indian thought. This disposition is nobody's gift, it is the expression of the evolving spirit of the nation. The American mind had reached in course of its history a stage where Indian thought was a desideratum and a necessity, and it came

through the dispensation of Providence and fulfilled it. M. Rolland has shown in his article last month how "the anarchic Brookfarm of George Ripley, the feverish assembly of the *Friends of Universal Progress* at Boston in 1840, brought together in one group men and women of all opinions and professions, all fired with primitive energy, and aspiring to shake off the shackles of past lies *without knowing what truth to adopt.*" (Italics ours). John Morley, in his critical Essay on Emerson, has painted a charming picture of this hour of intellectual intoxication—of this "madness of enthusiasm," as Shaftesbury called it,—which from 1820 to 1848 turned the heads of New England.

From the above, however, it must not be inferred that the necessary articulate, conscious thought could be evolved by the people themselves. The predisposition is there: the desire for a new orientation of thought is no doubt urgent. Yet we may not have it out of ourselves. All the inflammable materials have been brought together. But fire must be procured from elsewhere, at least a spark of it, before we can set them ablaze. Hindu thought implicitly believes in this necessity. It holds that however eager and prepared one may be for receiving or evolving a new vision, it must come from another who already possesses it. The belief is so strong in the Hindu mind that it declares that no one can realise truth without being initiated by another who has already realised it. Without *Guru-paramparâ*, succession of *Gurus*, no truth can be realised. This view, though it relates specially to spiritual truths, is also generally true of other truths. In fact it is a view confirmed by repeated experience. Spontaneous realisation of truth, secular or spiritual, is so rare! Even the little things of the material and intellectual world we have to learn with the help of others. Spiritual truths are a thousand times subtler than these. How much more difficult it would be to conceive them independently! If we try sufficiently

and if we can get hold of all the links, we shall more often than not find that our knowledge of truths is *derived* from other sources.

The presence of Indian thought in America is a case to the point. Its preparedness for and predisposition to Indian thought was the evolution of its own mind and nature. But the spark had to come from India before the whole mass of vague emotions and subconscious thoughts could be set aflame.

"THE MISTAKE OF ASCETICISM"

One of the strongest post-war tendencies is the defiance of all authority in every sphere of activity, in family, social and collective life. The love of freedom is being carried to its extreme to the borderland of license. People are up against all discipline, all that requires self-control. All social and traditional principles are being set aside as antiquated conventions and every one is a law unto himself. The natural consequence of this anarchy is everywhere in evidence. Any theory by any man, which panders to the instinct to grow wild, receives warm support, and all principles which have survived the human experience of thousands of years, are washed off.

One of the shibboleths of the modern age is that the attempt at self-control or curbing our senses is unnatural and is but the remnant of mediaeval asceticism. According to this theory, the whole of sexual morality depends on the ascetic notion that certain natural functions are essentially sinful and degrading. This teaching, it is said, has caused incalculable misery, and is now finally antiquated by modern psychology and its kindred sciences. To believe in this theory is to deny the experience of saints and sages in every religion, whose lives had been built on the bedrock of snow-white purity. And to put into practice this new theory means to degrade oneself below the level of a rational human being, instances of which are not rare among the protagonists of this new

gospel. It is true, asceticism in some cases in the past had been carried to most insensible end, but that has not done so much harm to the society as this new tendency.

Dean Inge views with alarm this modern outlook on life and thus writes in a recent issue of *The Forum* :

"I turn to the question of asceticism . . . and I will come to grips with the psycho-analysts and their friends at once. If there were no instincts in our nature which need to be repressed—buffeted, mortified, crucified, as St. Paul says : if all of them are to be gratified, in a more or less 'sublimated' form, then all the great moralists, pagan as well as Christian, Plato as well as St. Paul, are fundamentally wrong. But they are not wrong. The only possible harmony of our nature is a harmony of unified purpose, not of gratified instincts. These instincts are a turbulent mob, which can never be reduced to order except by what the Stoics called the ruling faculty.

"If we were mere animals, we might live as innocently as 'the petty little rabbits with their interesting habits'. But when Judge Ben Lindsey's young students imitate these engaging quadrupeds, the result is revolting and horrible. In becoming moral agents we have forfeited immunity from moral struggle. We can only rise to higher things on stepping stones of our *dead* selves; and a great part of our warfare, though certainly not the whole of it, is concerned with the conquest of what St. Paul calls the flesh. The doctrine of purity is quite clear. The obligation does not rest primarily on the injury which licentiousness does to other people, but on the fact that our bodies are temples of the Holy Spirit, and that misuse of the sacraments of love defiles this inner shrine. If any one thinks that this is mere monkish morality, let him read

what Plato says about the continence of Greek athletes. They do it to obtain a corruptible crown, he says, almost in the words of St. Paul; and shall not we, whose minds are better trained than theirs, and our bodies less lusty, do as much to win the incorruptible crown of self-conquest and converse with the Divine?

"Do not let us talk glibly about the mistake of asceticism. It is a mistake, very often; but it is a mistake which it is much easier to fall below than to rise above."

People who consider continence as self-repression make a great mistake. It is not a case of self-repression, but of self-restraint. Any one who pursues any avocation seriously, must deny some pleasure of life. A votary of the Muse of Learning burns midnight oil and restrains his mind from going after many enjoyments; a business man while bent upon increasing his wealth forgets very often the duties of family life. And why should not a man who is eager to find out the Reality behind the vanishing phenomena of the universe, control himself against the pleasures of sense-objects? And he has not to control his senses forcibly—he has not to suppress them unnaturally, as it is generally thought. His senses become automatically controlled, he finds less and less pleasure in sense-enjoyment as he begins to taste of higher joys. It is said that a man who goes a step towards the east recedes by so much from the west. In the same way the man who goes a step towards God is so much away from earthly joys. The man is kept up in his act of self-conquest by the joy of it and stimulated by the lure of some higher idealism. The Upanishad rightly says : "When a man finds joy, then he controls his senses, and not without getting any joy. It is only on finding joy that he does it."

REVIEW

KRISHNA OF VRINDABANA. By Krishnadas. Bengal Library Book Depot, Calcutta. 601 pp. Price Rs. 6.

The book is an appreciative and faithful exposition of Bengal Vaishnavism, in which Krishna of Brindaban figures as the Supreme God of Love and the central object of worship. It is divided into two parts. The first part narrates the life-story of Krishna up to the slaying of Kamsa. His superhuman exploits and love-pastimes with the *Gopees* are delineated in a chaste language without reservation. Out of the various sources of Krishna's life, the author's account is based chiefly on the *Vishnu-purâna*, the *Bhâgavata* and the *Gopâla-champu*. He has closely followed the texts without making any attempt to avoid or defend what may appear strange or repulsive to modern taste and understanding. With the characteristic humility of a Vaishnava, he has concealed himself under the pseudonym of Krishnadas (servant of Krishna).

The second part deals with the philosophical basis of Krishnaism. It gives all the essentials of the Religion of Love conceived by the Vaishnavas of Bengal. Their views relating to the supreme Godhood of Krishna, his various forms and incarnations, man's eternal relationship with him, the transcendent value of spiritual love, its growth and culmination in the love-life of Brindaban, the super-phenomenal realm of divine love, all have been carefully reproduced by the author from such authoritative works as *Sri-Chaitanya-charitâmrita*, *Ujjvalanilamani* and *Preetisandarbha*. The abstruse ideas have been elucidated by him with copious foot-notes. One striking feature of the book is adequate reference to alien poetry, philosophy and religion to illustrate and corroborate the thoughts and experiences of the Vaishnava seers. It is interesting to note that there are few such uncommon elements in the Bhakti cult of Bengal, the likeness or semblance of which is not to be found in the mysticism of other lands. The book is closed with some adorations of Krishna by Muhammadan saints. The long appendices, which include among other important subjects the English renderings of Valadeva's Dissertation on Bhakti and Narottamadasa's *Premabhaktichan-*

drikâ, have increased the value of the book. It will serve as a manual of Bengal Vaishnavism to the English-reading public. It is to be regretted that the book contains no index, which would have made it more useful to the readers. In spite of neatness of printing, the book is not free from typographical errors.

One notable feature of the Bengal School of Vaishnavism is its attempt to make a synthesis of the *Nirguna* (impersonal) and the *Saguna* (personal) aspects of Brahman. Like Ramanuja it does not explain the *Nirguna* as 'devoid of unworthy virtues' to thus identify it with the *Saguna*, but gives it a distinct place in the life of realisation. The three modes of spiritual practices, *Jnâna*, *Yoga* and *Bhakti* reveal the Supreme Being as Brahman (Impersonal Spirit), *Paramâtman* (Supreme Soul) and *Bhagavân* (God of Love) respectively. The knowledge of Brahman is a simple apprehension of the outer expression of the Divine Personality, when His infinite beauty, love and sweetness are not clearly manifest. Love alone can realise Him in His concrete fulness. But it should be noted that the Vaishnavic conception of Brahman differs essentially from that of the Advaitists. Samkara's Brahman is one homogeneous whole. It transcends all relativistic consciousness, while the Brahman of the Vaishnavas is the substratum of endless beauties, virtues and powers. The indeterminate knowledge of Brahman has even been discarded by the Vaishnava philosophers as fraught with pain. "Even in the *sâyujya*-salvation (absorption into the Divine Principle), owing to the complete absence of pain, joy must, too, be experienced as pain." This view of the *Ujjvalanilamani* reproduced by the author seems to contradict itself. Pain and pleasure are interdependent in relative plane, but not in the transcendence of absolute bliss. It is also argued that *Brahmânanda* amounts to non-existence, as no joy is possible without the differentiations of knower, knowledge and knowable. But Samkara's Brahman which is the identity of consciousness and bliss, is perfectly real to itself.

The basic difference between the Advaitists and the Vaishnavites lies in their attitudes of consciousness. The attitudes of know-

ledge and love have naturally given rise to two distinct types of philosophical thinking and concepts. Metaphysically, the disagreement between the two schools consists in their assertions of identity and difference between substance and attributes. In Samkara's Absolute all attributes have resolved themselves into substance. They appear in our empiric consciousness, but have no existence in the transcendence of Pure Knowledge. The Vaishnavas also do not maintain an absolute separateness between substance and attributes. Though distinct, they are non-different. The attributes inhere in the integrity of being. Jeeva Goswami has instituted a relation with essence (*svarupa-sambandha*) to maintain the identity. But the relation cannot logically establish the co-existence of difference and non-difference, which contradict one another. If it is inconceivable (*achintya*), it must be either non-existent or indefinable (*anirvachaniya*).

MYSTICISM IN BHAGAVAT GITA. *By Mahendranath Sircar, M.A., Ph.D. Longmans Green & Co. Ltd., Calcutta. xix+219 pp. Price Rs. 5/-.*

We are glad to observe that Hindu Mysticism has found a worthy exponent in Dr. Sircar. His deep understanding and appreciation of the religious ideals of the Vedanta, evinced in his two earlier works dealing with its different philosophical aspects, were clear evidences of his ability to deal with its mystical aspect with equal success. With the revival of the religious thought in the West, mysticism has been a subject of absorbing interest, and the mysticism of Christianity has engaged the attention of many profound thinkers in the field of religion. But no attempt worth the name, with the single exception of *Hindu Mysticism* by Dr. Surendranath Das Gupta, has yet been made to represent the mysticism of the Vedantic Religion. Dr. Sircar's *Mysticism in Bhagavat Gita* is an excellent promise in this direction. He has brought to bear upon the subject his wide study of the mysticism of the West. Certain striking resemblances in the mystical ideas of the East and the West have also been noticed by him. He has brought the subject in line with the modern way of thinking.

The author has treated the subject under the following heads: (1) the philosophical tendencies, (2) the descent of the soul,

(3) the ascent of the soul, and (4) the spiritual fulfilment. The distinctive feature of the mysticism of the Gita is its synthetic presentment of all the phases of mystic life, philosophic, devotional and contemplative in their concrete adaptation to life. "The Gita appeals by the presentation of all the phases of mystic life in its concreteness and shows clearly how in every turn, life dwells in its habitual plane and yet soars into the expanse. The end of mysticism is not only to give a glimpse of truth, but also to effect a transformation of the individual to make him a fit vehicle for the transmission of divine life. The Gita aims at the realisation of this concrete divine life in every finite being. He must be moved by the oscillations of the cosmic life. The direct aim is to break through the sense of limitations and to open the floodgate of divine life and energy to the fit enabling them to shape the world-process to cosmic ends. The Gita links the silence of transcendence to the active stirrings of life. It is a departure from the ancient mysticism of the Upanishads, and in this it has its own problem."

The author appears to have considered the mystical discipline of the Gita from the standpoint of monistic theism. As such, its devotional aspect has been treated in full length. The methods of reflection and discrimination have received much less attention. *Saranâpatti* (resignation) has been described as the last resort of the seeking soul for the realisation of the Divinity. The fruition of the spiritual life is not possible without grace. This view holds good, so far as the path of *Upâsanâ*, the meditation of the Personal God, is concerned. This is, no doubt, the outstanding mystical ideal of the Gita. But the Gita also inculcates, for those who are fit, the reflection of *Nirguna Brahman*, the Impersonal Being, as the direct method of attaining the ultimate stage of transcendence. In this the self realises the Self and there is no scope of grace. Though the Lord holds out to Arjuna the concrete spiritual life, he also advocates the mystic calm free from all active stirrings of life.

The book is nicely printed and got up. There is a synopsis at the head of each chapter. It contains a short glossary but no index or contents. The author's style is as fascinating as expressive. He has a wonderful power to delineate the subtlest spiritual ideas and ideals in a sweet, graphic and dignified language. The writing is

characterised by the depth and the sublimity of a sermon.

POTTER'S CLAY. By *Hilton Brown*. *Ganesh & Co., Madras.* 191 pp. Price Re. 1-8. A collection of stories beautifully written and nicely printed.

(1) **VACCINATION AND SMALL-POX.**
(2) **RIGHT KNOWLEDGE FOR HEALTH-SEEKERS.** By *K. L. Sarma, B.A., B.L.* *The Nature-Cure Publishing House, Pudukotah, S. I. Ry.* Price. As. 2 each.

ARA-NOOL OR DHARMA. By *Swami Shuddhananda Bharati.* Published by the same.

INDIA'S RELIGIOUS QUESTIONS. By *Rev. J. W. R. Netram.* Published by the *Christian Literature Society for India, Madras.* 95 pp. Price As. 12.

ONENESS WITH GOD. By *L. P. Larsen.* Published by the same. 72 pp. Price As. 5. Studies from Christian standpoint.

UPADESA SARAM. Published by *Sri Ramaniyavani Pusthakalayam, Tiruvannamalai, S. India.* Price As. 4. Teachings of a living Hindu saint, Sri Ramana Maharshigal of Tiruvannamalai, in English, Tamil and Sanskrit.

MY LISPINGS. By *N. S. Chetty.* To be had of the author, *Tata Construction Co. Ltd., Phoenix Building, Ballard Estate, Bombay.* Attempts at versification in English.

MOTHER AMERICA. By *Swami Omkar.* Published by *Ganesh & Co., Madras.* 75 pp. An expression of commendable and noble feelings that stirred within the bosom of the author as a reaction to his study of Miss Mayo's *Mother India.*

SOBS AND THROBS. By *Abdul Kareem Abdullah.* To be had of the author, *C/o. Meher Rice & Flour Mill, Talegaon Dabhade, Dt. Poona, Bombay.* 169 pp. Contains interesting information about Meher Baba and his disciples.

(1) **HOW THEOSOPHY CAME TO ME.** By *C. W. Leadbeater.* (2) **FIRST STEPS ON THE PATH.** By *G. Hodson.* (3) **THE WORK OF THE RULER AND THE TEACHER.** By *Annie Besant.* (4) **KRISHNAMURTI'S MESSAGE.** By *C. Jinarajadasa.* (5) **KARMA ONCE MORE.**

By *Annie Besant.* *Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras.*

All Theosophical writings.

GANDHI DIAMOND JUBILEE NUMBER. Published by *S. Ganesan, Madras.* Price Re. 1. Contains many interesting writings on and by Mahatmaji, and also innumerable pictures of him, his activities and those connected with him. Every admirer of Mahatmaji will appreciate this publication.

STUDENT LIFE IN MUNICH. Published by the *Foreign Students' Bureau in Munich, Germany.* The booklet is a guide-book for foreign students, giving accounts of various educational and cultural institutions in Munich. Illustrated.

PRACTICE OF YOGA. By *Swami Sivananda of Ram Ashram, Rishikesh, Himalayas.* *Ganesh & Co., Madras.* 247 pp. Price Rs. 2. Contains many interesting observations on the theory and practice of Yoga.

THE PSYCHOLOGY AND STRATEGY OF GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE. By *Richard B. Gregg.* *S. Ganesan, Triplicane, Madras.* 169 pp. Attempts to prove that non-violence is "a new and better weapon of war."

BEHOLD THE MAN. By *Prof. Dwijadas Datta, M.A., A.R.A.C. (Cirencester).* To be had of *Babu Ganesh Prosad, 84, Upper Circular Road, Calcutta.* 289 pp. Price Re. 1-8. Attempts at vindicating Keshab Ch. Sen against the charges brought against him by Sadharan Brahmo Samaj.

UNTO THIS FIRST OR THE ETERNAL IDEAL. By *Sri Mitra.* *The Satyen Library, 10, Bangla Bazar, Dacca, Bengal.* 112 pp. Price As. 12. A dead-set against much of what is considered modernism. The booklet is the first of the "Shun-Science Series." Contains lots of quotations from various sources.

VIVEKANANDA-VANI. By *Amarendra-nath Roy.* *Aryan Library, 204, Cornwallis Street, Calcutta.* 99 pp. Price As. 12. A Bengali essay delineating the development of patriotism in Bengali literature.

BHAGAVATA DHARMA. By *Abanimo-han Batabyal.* To be had of the author, *Gandaria, P.O. Faridabad, Dacca.* 84 pp. Price As. 8. Contains selections of Sanskrit utterances from various scriptural sources, with Bengali translations, bearing on the religion of renunciation. A fine little collection, nicely printed.

NEWS AND REPORTS

KUMBHA MELA AT KAILAS AND MANASAROWAR

Swami Anubhavananda, Ramakrishna Tapovan, P.O. Dharchula, Dt. Almora, U.P., has sent us the following appeal for publication:

I take this opportunity to inform the generous public that Purna Kumbha Mela will be held at the Holy Shri Kailas this year in July, 1930. It is therefore expected that many hundreds of Mahatmas, Sadhus, Sannyasins and other pilgrims from far and near will visit the holy place on this auspicious occasion. The Mela continues for about two months. It is not unknown that Shri Kailas is not only not easily accessible, but it is very difficult for pilgrims to prolong their stay at such an altitude on perpetual snow. The pilgrims have to travel hundreds of miles in difficult paths on snow and eternally snow-clad hills and narrow paths at a good height of about eighteen to twenty thousand feet before they can reach their destination.

I have a personal knowledge of the difficulties and hardships enumerated above of the pilgrims to Holy Shri Kailas, because I have been myself to the holy place twice. Also as Ramakrishna Tapovan is situated on the way to Shri Kailas, I have been observing all these half a dozen years the difficulties, inconveniences, and hardships of the pilgrims on the way. I may say that they perform the journeys sometimes at the risk of their lives owing to illness and fatigue. It is therefore human to say that any and every kind of help is welcomed by them at such a time. It can hardly be said now what form of relief or aid may be necessary to the pilgrims, but to name a few, they are woollen clothings, food-stuffs, conveyances and medical relief. With the co-operation of the munificent public, I hope to open a Chhatra and a camp of medical relief with the aid of a trained and qualified doctor and good unselfish workers for the pilgrims who travel to and from Holy Shri Kailas on this occasion, and also give them such other help and relief as will be at the time found necessary. From the Chhatra atta, rice, ghee, dal and potatoes will be doled out to the needy and deserving pilgrims; in the medical camp, pilgrims who fall ill

will be treated both in allopathy and homeopathy.

Should you think that the cause is worthy of your support, I appeal to you, the generous and charitable-minded ladies and gentlemen, to donate and contribute liberally. Contributions and donations, however small, either in coin or kind, will be thankfully accepted by me.

VEDANTA CENTRE, PORTLAND, U.S.A.

The Birthday of Sri Ramakrishna was duly celebrated on March 9th, by the Vedanta Society of Portland, Oregon, U.S.A.

At eleven o'clock in the morning the students gathered at the Vedanta Chapel, which had been beautifully decorated with choicest flowers, to pay homage to the Great Master.

Amidst the strains of soft music and fragrance of flowers, plus the inspiring aroma of incense,—each one contributed to the occasion,—either with song, speech, or silence, all alike entering heartily into the spirit of the hour.

In the evening Swami Vividishananda gave a most impressive lecture upon the Life and Teachings of Sri Ramakrishna. After the lecture, light refreshments were served, when all departed to their homes, taking with them the blessing of Sri Ramakrishna.

VEDANTA CENTRE, SAN FRANCISCO

The sixty-eighth Birthday Anniversary of Swami Vivekananda was celebrated at the Hindu Temple, headquarters of the Vedanta Society of San Francisco, California, U.S.A., on January 19th, 1930.

The Auditorium was beautifully decorated to suit the occasion. The large picture of Swami Vivekananda, which hangs on the side of the speaker's platform, was tastefully decorated with flowers and illumined with lights, the whole effect being both pleasing and inspiring.

The morning service was conducted by Swami Dayananda. The subject of his lecture was "Swami Vivekananda, the Greatest Figure in Chicago Parliament of Religions."

The Swami spoke both at length and feelingly of Swamiji's coming to America and the great spiritual message he brought to the Western world.

The service was attended by a large and appreciative audience.

Music fitting the occasion, both vocal and instrumental, was rendered by the students. In the evening, the service opened with chanting by Swami Dayananda, after which four students whose blessed privilege it had been to hear and also come into personal contact with Swamiji when he was in California in 1900, told of the different experiences they had had with the Swamiji and of his wonderful personality.

All testified that their viewpoint of life had been entirely changed. In some the walls of agnosticism had crumbled away before the convincing truths of Vedanta given forth by this great Teacher. Others felt that they had found the result of their years of searching for Truth.

Some students told anecdotes of their experiences with Swamiji, which were interesting and gave a glimpse into the more personal life of Swamiji.

After the discourses, *Prasāda* was distributed to all present.

The celebration was well attended, and there was indeed an atmosphere of harmony, peace and goodwill to all. The service was a great success. All were happy.

On the following two Sundays also Swami Dayananda spoke beautifully on "Swami Vivekananda and Regeneration of India."

A NEW VEDANTA CENTER IN HOLLYWOOD, U.S.A.

It was sometime in August, 1928, Swami Prabhavananda came from Portland to give a series of lectures to the students and friends in Los Angeles. Two sisters from Hollywood, disciples of the Swami Vivekananda, happened to be in the crowd that attended the Swami's lectures. One of the sisters had a home in Hollywood which she offered for a permanent home for the Vedanta work. Since then many old students of Swamiji and new friends around Hollywood and vicinity had been urging Swami Prabhavananda to come down to Hollywood and open a Vedanta Center here. But the Swami found no way to accept the

offer until another Swami came from India to take charge of the Vedanta work in Portland.

Swami Vividishananda was sent from India to assist Swami Prabhavananda in Portland. As soon as the new Swami was ready, he was given the charge of the work in Portland and Swami Prabhavananda came down to Hollywood to take up new and greater responsibilities. In February of this year Swami began a course of lectures in Hollywood. The lectures were well attended and some of the best minds of Hollywood got newly interested and enthused over the pure teachings of Vedanta. At the end of the course, the Vedanta Society of Hollywood was organized.

Regular Sunday services are held in a rented hall, located in Hollywood Boulevard. The large hall is crowded to capacity. The regular week-day classes on the Gita and Yoga Aphorisms are held at the Vivekananda Home, 1946 Ivar Avenue, Hollywood, which is a permanent home of the Ramakrishna Order.

The little modest home is situated on a large plot of land, thickly planted with an exquisitely beautiful garden. It is very centrally located, ten minutes' walk up the hill from the main Hollywood Boulevard. The home has a touch of Oriental architecture and the whole surrounding gives the peaceful atmosphere of a Temple and an Ashrama.

The Home was dedicated on Sri Ramakrishna's Birthday Anniversary.

Another branch center has been opened in Alhambra, California, where Swami Prabhavananda holds a regular week-day class on the Bhagavad Gita, which is very well attended.

Swami Prabhavananda was invited to address the members of the Psychology section of the Ebell Club, which is a cultural society for the women, and is said to be the largest club of women in the United States of America. The President of the Psychology section of the Club, who is also a devoted student of Vedanta, introduced the Swami in a neat little speech. Swami's lecture on Indian Psychology was well received, and the Swami was given an enthusiastic ovation.

The far-reaching effect of this lecture before the very cultured women of Southern California, cannot yet be gauged.



Swami Brahmananda