

PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. LXI

NOVEMBER 1956

No. II



“उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।”

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

AMBROSIA

10. A man of no character—what will he understand of religion? Says the Lord, ‘My boys, be honest, be pure in heart, build your character: then alone you will understand me.’ A man with a defiled heart can never understand the scriptures. This is why such people take scriptures as mythologies. Again those very things appear true when one’s heart is purified by prayers and austerities.

11. Do you know the test of a *sādhu*? He will have no selfishness. Or you may say there is only one peculiar selfishness in him, viz. how he can have faith and reverence for the Lord. This world and worldly things appear hideous to him. It is to get peace that he renounces the world and turns a monk.

12. Honest is the man who fears God and walks the path of righteousness. How few are they!

13. Again how difficult is it to have that continuous current of faith in, devotion and adoration for, the *guru*, holy personages, and the Lord! And how fortunate is he who has it! It is through God’s grace that a man is endowed with all that.

14. Do you know why the *sādhu* begs his food like that? It is to rise above all prestige and humiliation, all sense of shame and greatness. They are regarded as vile and defiling as hog’s dung. Mendicant friars are above these pettinesses. Get your food by begging and call on the Lord with devotion, and He is sure to be merciful to you.

15. Do you want happiness in this world of vanities? Why, God alone is true and everything else is emptiness. How few can grasp this truth! Without an abundant grace of God one never understands this.

16. God and *guru* are one. Again in sport this One has become the Many. This One is Brahman, the Creatrix, the world, and the creatures dwelling in it. Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva are but three facets of the one Reality. It is due to ignorance that we make distinction between them. For this reason one must have a firm faith in the words of one’s *guru* and the Vedāntic texts, and muse and meditate on them, and discriminate between the abiding and the evanescent. One must have unbounded faith in God and *guru*, and must stick to them

through thick and thin. By degrees you will realize the unity behind. You will see Him in all things and beings.

17. There are high-sounding words in all scriptures. Of what avail are they? One is to realize their truth in one's life—that is practice, *sādhana*.

18. Mere taking of initiation is of little value. One is to act up to the instruction of one's *guru*. Then alone one understands the greatness of the *guru*.

19. As long as one does not realize God, some slight cheating propensity remains.

20. Master used to say, 'If you have enough to eat, eat and pray, and don't engage yourself in lying and cheating. Your soul will find peace.'

21. Morning, midday, evening, and midnight—during one or more of these times one should pray and meditate in strict accordance with the instruction of the *guru*. This quickens one's pace of practice—progress becomes rapid.

22. God I must have. If I do not get Him, the Author of the universe, of what use is this life? Prahlāda's was a pure selfless dispassion having no motive behind. Some show dispassion with an end in view. That also is good in a way. With or without motive, let man call on God.

23. People read or hear scriptures like the *Bhāgavatam*. If they try to act up to what are laid down there they are bound to have enlightenment.

24. Man must have unshakable faith in and devotion to God. Fortune and misfortune, pain and pleasure, are inevitable in this world of ours. But if under their stress man does not forget God, well, illumination is sure to come.

25. There are hundreds of *gurus* who whisper *mantras* into the ears of disciples. What will they avail, they are but vibrations. If they do not generate a stout faith in the disciples, God will never be realized through them. This faith is what is necessary. It is not an ordinary thing to have genuine devotion for

the Lord. We have come to such straits that we do not have any regard for our parents even!

26. They are *sādhus* over there, they have no fixed arrangement for food, and yet, how strange, they are serving the *liṅga* of Tilbhāṇḍeśwara so devotedly. In these terrible wintry days they get up very early in the morning, take a dip in the Ganges, and worship the Lord; and again in the evening before the vespers they do the same. Just look at their faith and devotion. I could not have done it. It becomes natural where there is genuine devotion. Oh, it is a great fortune to be able to serve deities. It is the grace of these deities that descends on us as such unique opportunities. But how many understand this? Soon their eyes get fixed on the money that comes from the visitors. Then they forget the divine service, throw off their devotion and hankering after salvation, and turn to mammon worship. And then come in its train miseries. But these *sādhus* at Tilbhāṇḍeśwara are nice people. I like them. Such devoted service to the Lord is an indication of true *sādhuhood*.

27. This wicked mind cannot rest for a second. It is on a haphazard run in all directions. One must keep a vigilant watch over its workings, over where it goes. For this the company of *sādhus* is very important, and prayer and meditation. Then alone does the mind slowly quiet down. If mind is not fixed on the desired work or object everything goes waste.

28. When the battle of Kurukṣetra was over Śrī Kṛṣṇa was about to start for his capital, Dwārakā. Do you know what Kuntī, mother of the Pāṇḍavas, winners of the throne of India, prayed? Said she, 'Kṛṣṇa dear, I do not want the royal enjoyments. Give me miseries, more miseries, which will constantly keep me in remembrance of you, will give me the yearning to see you. These princely enjoyments lead me to forget you.' Yes, sorrows are great reminders of God.

MAN—FINITE AND INFINITE

BY THE EDITOR

They say man is finite. Not only is his body limited but his sense-organs, mind, energy, drive, and desires are also so. All these, of course, grow up to a certain stage beyond which decay sets in and culminates in death with blankness and oblivion afterwards. And this puny man is placed at the hub of the universe with gigantic forces, mostly hostile, playing round him and threatening to crush him down every moment. Most of the creatures he has to contend with are more powerful than he or are endowed with tricks or poison to give him enough trouble or even to put him to death. As if not satisfied with overburdening him with these limitations, the Creator has chosen to furnish him with the capacity to remember what has happened, to apprehend dangers that may befall him, and to plan ahead, with results that add poignancy to life. That man has survived so many millenniums is the greatest wonder.

Man's frail body and weak sense-organs, wondrous though they are in the skill of their structure and functions, are insignificant when compared to this capacity. It has increased his sense of limitation, his sorrows, a hundred-fold. Torn between hopes and fears, exerting all the harder for overcoming obstacles, engaged in turning hostile forces into friendly ones, and smothered, more often than not, by defeats and frustrations, man would have passed out of existence without writing the history and destiny of the universe had there not been implanted in him the undaunted urge for the more—that inextinguishable fire which blazes steadily from eternity, that unborn immortal which, in fact, has created his encasement, the body, sense-organs, etc. It is this that has sustained him through the countless vicissitudes he had to pass through; it is this that has wrested victories from the jaws of defeats. But it has also done just the reverse. This urge for the more, though itself

undying, has wiped off individuals and nations from the surface of the earth, has pulled down cities and civilizations, and brought dismal darkness where candles of enlightenment were burning bright.

Man's encasement, the shell of a body, is essentially limited. But it is under what Russell calls 'steering forces of the Organic'. We would like to put the 'forces' in the singular, though with a plurality of functions, all of which put together give the sense of unity to man and serve a grand general purpose. A giant tree with its gigantic trunk, branches, etc. has a unity, an individuality of its own. Even if it does not flower and yield fruits it has served its purpose to a great extent, but its fulfilment lies in the production of fruits leading to the perpetuity of its kind. All the varied functions of the different parts of the tree, in this sense, may be said to have one grand purpose, viz. the production of fruits which will continue the existence of its kind. Its giant body and the tiny body of a grass have but one idea behind their existence, to produce seeds. What is really important is those portions of the body which yield fruits and flowers. The rest of the body is but the supporter of these parts, without which they would not play their parts in the way they do. And in the seed is contained the entire organization—'the steering forces', the base, and the purpose. But throughout the existence of the individual and the kind there runs the unbroken urge for the more. Starting from the single cell right through the bewildering bifurcations spanning eternity with eternity (for the dissolution of one globe is not the end of creation; re-formation under the same and similar conditions takes place) the urge continues through favourable and unfavourable circumstances, sometimes waking to life, sometimes sleeping.

This implants a doubt in our mind. Which

one is more fundamental, the perpetuity of the race or the urge for the more? For although they involve one another the perpetuity of the race does not cover all the ground. The life of a tree that has failed to produce fruits should, on the reproduction theory, be considered a waste of tremendous energy, which is hardly acceptable, seeing as we do many other purposes, apart from the individual tree's life, being served in this interdependent world of ours. Even if we judge such a tree by itself its urge and feeling of existence, its growth, and momentary and annual renewals, its exhilaration in sunshine and rains, its agitation in storm and fire—each and all serve a grand purpose in its individual life, the grace and beauty of which do not detract in the least because of its failure to reproduce. Each bit of chemicals that it has taken from the soil and the atmosphere it has paid back with its own contribution through metabolism and free giving out. Hence the urge for the more should be regarded as the fundamental force in all living organism. The perpetuation of race or kind is a by-product, not necessarily universal.

Mutual beneficence, *madhutva*, so beautifully brought out in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, is best served when the individual grows to its fullest height, unfolds its entire potentiality. But there are misleading paths that lead to blind alleys at the end of which all further progress stops. This is especially noticeable in human beings, who have developed a peculiar faculty which has distinguished them from the rest of creatures—it is their mind with its peculiar satisfaction beyond the physical plane. An Einstein, had he produced a hundred progeny like our Dhṛtarāṣṭra, would not have been the Einstein we adore and immortalize. But if he had not married and produced a single child but had done what he had achieved he would have been the same loving and adored personality. Again there are a number of great men who had frail bodies, but their greatness had not suffered on that account. Had the Mahatma Gandhi taken to wrestling to build up his body like that of a Gama with

the very noble idea of serving humanity better and longer, it would have given amusement to many but would not have added to his stature a fraction of an inch. He and others would have called the attempt a sheer waste of time and energy. These crucial instances show what man really is, what the purpose of his life is. Gama became the world champion but the growth is limited; and had he not retired in time he would have been defeated by another wrestler, for age is no respecter of persons. But the Mahatma was murdered, which made him a greater Mahatma. The Christ was crucified and the whole world worships him. Buddha died a natural death and the number of his votaries is swelling still. All these indicate that man's greatness, therefore the purpose of his life, has no connexion whatever with his body or what happens to his body, despite the glaring fact that unless encased in it he could not achieve anything. Body is just a vehicle, maybe a necessary vehicle, still it cannot be allowed to usurp the title of man, whom it is to carry as best as it can.

There are a number of great scientists, as great as, maybe greater than, Einstein. But while admiring them all, showing very great respect to their achievements and expressing our gratitude to them for their gifts to humanity, our hearts do not leap with joy in the same way as they do when someone mentions the name of Einstein. What is that quality in his personality? Einstein the scientist draws our admiration and gratitude but Einstein the something else draws our love and affection; and in that something there is no calculation of benefit or gift. This is very peculiar. Man is extremely niggardly. When the question of giving comes man shows his wonderful power of inventing excuses. To get his love, his very heart, unwanted and unasked, there needs must be a power that has no comparison with anything on earth. Man lives in, for, and surrounded by love; he cannot live a day deprived of it. It is the essence of his being. What is that quality that compels man to bestow his love without

stint, and feel himself enriched and expanded by that? It must be his very quintessence. He must have found in such a man the best of himself or even what he likes to have most in himself but finds lacking and what the company of and conversation with him supply him with. Or more truly, the company of such men opens out a hidden deeper chamber of his being and reveals the wonderful treasures, of whose existence he had no knowledge before. What men like Einstein could do in this regard is infinitesimally small compared to great personages like Buddha, Christ, and Ramakrishna. And the fact that this quality makes people be in rapport with its possessor without any worldly or other-worldly gains, proves that it is something that recognizes no material barrier, or for that matter, any barrier whatever, and that it is blissful and infinite by nature—it is our deeper self, the difference between a person and a person being that in a very limited few its gates are open and in most people they are carelessly and cruelly closed. Except this everything else is limited—man's body, sense-organs, mind, intellect, and egoity; his society, race, nationality, and humanity; even his known being. This the scriptures have variously named—spirit, soul, *ātman*. Any man who has been able to unlock the gates of his spirit, to get identified with it, automatically becomes the recipient of others' love, for he has become one with the universe to the degree of his identification.

This something is very attractive. It attracts persons without the knowledge of its possessor. In fact when the possessor feels that he possesses it, or in other words when he feels himself other than it, it vanishes, and when the sense of possession is absent, when the person as an entity is no more, is merged in it, it is most potently active. Its power of attraction is proportionate to the annihilation of egoity. Real greatness is always unconscious in this sense. The reason is simple. It is great because it is unlimited, it overflows the personality and overwhelms others by its loving intimacy. The conscious personality is limited viciously, it cannot exist even a

moment without excluding something from it, without placing something before it in contradistinction to itself. The unlimited and the limited cannot live together. As the enjoyments we crave for are of and through the limited, the unlimited leaves the field to the limited to play to its heart's content. With the craving for enjoyment our allegiance is bound to be to the limited. And as it is based on exclusiveness it repels others. Attraction and repulsion are opposites. Hence reason teaches us to leave off our personality if we want to grow vast and infinite, and to change our allegiance from the limited to this unlimited something if we want to attract others in absolute freedom. Man almost dies for attracting others, but that is for keeping them in bondage so that they may serve not themselves but himself. But this something's attraction is on a totally different plane—on the plane of freedom, of loving intimacy, of atonement. Men are attracted, as we have said, because they find their own deeper hidden self in the proximity of saintly characters that have merged themselves in this something. I am attracted by my quintessence, hence it is so blissful, so loving, so maddening. This peace and bliss, not being based on this or that thing or object, is abiding, and based on my own limitless self is infinite.

If this something is infinite and blissful and if it is my quintessence what are these ugly coatings that have bound me down to them and have made me a slave to petty joys and terrible sorrows? No man in his senses hugs miseries. The last sentence is wrong, for man *in his senses* does hug miseries. Because our senses are born of the desire to hug, otherwise there is no need for them. Eyes must see, ears must hear. And seeing and hearing must have their objects which are other than the eyes and ears as well as their possessors. These instruments are there to cull objects to be offered to the centre within, which is opposed to all *without*s. This gives rise to opposition, which again to sorrows and miseries. Einsteins also use their senses, otherwise they would not be scientists, but their senses are

not votaries to their egoities, but to truths that are universal, that belong to all. And the scientists of Einstein's class get enraptured in their investigations, lose themselves in these infinitudes; their puny personalities of trifling joys and sorrows fade out unconsciously, they do not know when and how, but they do feel themselves in others, a peculiar love emanates from them. A cheeky boy asks, 'O Mr., where are your socks?' And Einstein gently comes to him, pats him lovingly, and says, 'I am seventy-two, in my age one may go without them.' An all-knowing journalist does not appreciate music and is about to leave the hall. Einstein lovingly takes him by the arm, brings him to another room, and by playing one gramophone record after another makes him understand music. The personality is lost and in its stead a universality has grown unknown to the man. It is for this he finds joy in everything, praise or censure. What appears meaningless or queer to us, as in his behaviour with the unknown journalist, is full of meaning, because to him the journalist's unacquaintance does not matter at all. His defect, his deprivation of the joy of appreciating music, was not only of the journalist; he felt himself deprived of a portion of the joy. He could not stand it because a part of his own being was there in the journalist. So Einstein, though apparently *in his senses*, was not so in our sense. He transcended the limitations created by the senses, which instead of shedding him off from others, helped him in illumining all who came in contact with him. He has really become 'this something' that we call spirit or *ātman*. All limitations ceased for him. He lived in a vastness where all are gathered together.

This peculiar scientist—how did he achieve it, unsought and perhaps unknown? Sri Ramakrishna is said to have remarked about the Vidyasagara, 'Everything is ready over there (pointing to him); only there is "no information", he himself does not know it.' It happens, but how? In the case of the scientist, dealing constantly with abstract universal principles immanent in this vast won-

drous universe the cravings for the too stale creature comforts and for name and fame lost their attraction for him, who, consequently, became universal. But because it was not accomplished consciously, his conscious mind remained unaware of, though not unaffected by, it. In the case of Vidyasagara his capacity to feel others' miseries, his constant attempts at their removal, and the consequent compulsion of dwelling on them, took away from him the zest of living this too cramped up life.

What is needed is the recognition of the real nature of the life we live, and the world we live in. When its worthlessness, compared to the vastness in and around us, is brought home to us, and it can be done in hundred and one ways, we become what we are, our limitations fall off, the body, sense-organs, mind notwithstanding. This seems to be the idea behind the great Buddha's maintaining silence over the metaphysical problems. He knew too well that when somehow the zest for too narrow and fleeting life is once removed, the Reality will shine of itself—it needs no especial indoctrination. But the Buddha's preaching of Nibbana alongside his emphasis on the Sorrows made his disciples consciously achieve It, whereas in the case of the scientist and the philanthropist it was an unconscious achievement. Despite the difference in the conscious plane the achievement is real—what we thought to be limited in every respect reveals itself to be the unlimited Vast. Man is really infinite. What appears to be limited is not he but what he foolishly thought to be his or even he. His appearance is limited, his reality is infinite. And to come to his own depends on himself, on his being able to give up hugging the shadow.

The esoterics—the Śūfis, the Sahajiyās, the Zen masters, the Hasidim—have their different methods. Mostly the approach is from and through the conceptual to the beyond. Only in the case of the ultra-Vedāntists and the Zen masters it is the case of cutting the Gordian knot with one stroke of the sword—from the very start they would have

nothing to do with any concept at all. These radicals refuse to deal with the appearances of any kind, however pleasant they may be. And yet they may and do live in this world, even as ordinary mortals. The big volume of the *Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha*, and *Aṣṭāvakra-Saṁhitā*; and *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* and the numerous Zen *satoris* indicate the way, which is not too difficult to understand but much too stiff to realize in life—our life has become so saturated with concepts, really it is nothing but a huge bundle of concepts; and with what labour and relish do we try to multiply them! But the fact is simple; and the process of arriving at the truth is simplification of cumbersome complexities, refusal to accept what is not as what is, the mode as the reality.

Although there is thus the difference between understanding and realization, the former comes first and is very necessary; in fact true understanding is realization. Nothing is wrong with us—our being, life, attempts, and desires—but a basic misunderstanding. Nothing has become what it was not—it cannot be. The essence, the nature, does not change; fire cannot wet or get wet. If it does there is no difference between fire and water. Admitting the molecular difference fire cannot be water. Similarly admitting the differences among body, sense-organs, mind, etc. and that between them and the spirit that feels and uses them as its possessions, as its *other*, we cannot, we are not entitled to, identify one with the other or the rest. Still it is what we have actually done and are doing. The body etc. are not we, and it is they that are limited and not the spirit behind and running through them. We observe it, feel it, every moment of our life, that these fleeting spectres are madly rushing on hither and thither, appearing and disappearing, throwing us sometimes off and sometimes on, but ultimately leaving us alone deeply unaffected; yet we cannot accept the rational fact as the reality, we again allow ourselves to be tossed about, up and down. The non-*I*'s limitations make us cry and weep, and dance in joy and madness and leave ex-

hausted and dead. The whole drama is a comedy of errors, tragic while experiencing, comic when the end comes. Our understanding of this nullifies the tragic effect and leaves the amusing behind. Hence it is so important.

The bio-psychologists would object to the above. Why? They say whatever materials and qualities we are born with are contributions not only of our human forbears but our animal ancestors also, stored in us as a result of their successful fights against environments; and whatever we may acquire in the future—their possibilities are not negated—would also be done in the similar fashion, not during decades but centuries, maybe millenniums. The bio-psychologists have collected quite an imposing array of evidence in support of their contention. We do not contradict them. Nor do we controvert their conclusion that man's intelligence has taken a wrong course of development in that it has deviated from the well-tried and found-correct guidance of instinct. Still we would like to put one question to them as to all rationalists: What does an adult educated man think of himself? Bio-psychologists would at once object to this question, for, according to them, educated men are perverse slaves to sophistication, who have murdered happiness for the sake of 'ego'-aggression (they object to the use of the term, 'self-aggression'). We admit the force of this argument as well. But we as well as they cannot eschew reason altogether. To arrive at the truths we have reason as our sole guide. And the peculiarity of any rational view is that when it is explained to an unsophisticated but fairly developed and unbiased adult he accepts the new truth, though it takes a little time to get himself adjusted to the new situation. This is the unanimous verdict of the history of all thought movements.

What is the verdict of each man of himself? What does he consider himself to be? A thinking, reasoning, experiencing, planning something or a fortuitous combination of atoms and molecules that we call body; a blind life-force under the grip of the erratic behaviour of these atoms and molecules or an

organizer of these materials and cells in accordance with the natural and biological laws for a definite purpose almost predestined? When these alternatives are actually explained to a natural man, we believe, and it has been tried, he will say he is a conscious entity that organizes the materials and applies the laws for a definite purpose, or in other words, he is a spirit, well-saddled on matter, which, though it sometimes shies and plays undesirable tricks, is generally and ultimately under its control. *Bios* without *psukhe* is a wild force, rationally unthinkable; but that *psukhe* joined to matter is *bios* is a proposition that is perfectly rational—life is spirit plus matter. Without the immanence of spirit nothing can be organized, atoms are so wild. A man from outside sees another as the body but that is immaterial to the other man. What really matters is what he thinks of himself. Matter, by hypothesis is unfeeling, unthinking; but I regard myself as a feeling and thinking personality. When the new-born babe gives out the reflex cry, even then it is indicating a feeling. From then on, feeling never leaves him, though thinking may take a short holiday. And matter does not feel, nor the body or the nervous system as such. This 'feeling something' and nought else is the man. But none feels without a body and still the body by itself does not feel. Hence the conclusion, it is the presence of the spirit in the body that gives rise to feeling, thinking, etc. And feeling being the ultimate and invariable factor to distinguish spirit from matter, it is the nearest term to express spirit. If we are particular about using a more correct word we may take recourse to 'awareness', though neither feeling nor 'awareness' gives us the dynamism that must be associated with one who is an organizer. Without entering into the deep waters of philosophy let us be satisfied with this much understanding of the spirit. We are this spirit, for feeling, awareness, and will are our essence. Joined to matter it is limited by the limitations of matter. In fact all limitations are of and because of matter. This matter when

transformed into energy transcends its limitation, which fact shows that all limitations are due to this peculiar mode of energy-matter, the basic entity of the world and our bodies.

If energy and matter are convertible and if energy is unlimited and matter cannot exist without limitation what do they mean, what conclusion do they point to? If there are protons etc. and antiprotons etc., if there are neutrons that are automatically charged negatively at the elimination of electrons, if their sizes vary under different circumstances both natural and artificial, if new varieties of matter could be created, what do all these variables mean, what ultimate value can be attached to these 'bricks' of our visible world, what do all limitations produced by them amount to? They lead but to one conclusion, that energy is the basic thing and the bricks and their structures that give rise to forms and limitations are but variable modes, that the bricks and their piles are but energy, that the knowledge and control of this energy leads to the knowledge and control of everything else that appears as different from but in reality is identical with it. Again how are these forms made, who does the work? Is it anything other than the energy? There is no 'other' to this universal energy; no scientist has found that so far. Hence it is this formless, changeless, limitless energy that creates forms, and changes limitations.

Applying the above to the case of our body we arrive at the conclusion that it is the organizing energy within the body that creates, changes, and maintains the body, sense-organs, mind, etc. which are nothing but modes of this energy, therefore it. Our *I's* should properly be identified with this energy rather than its variable creatures, bodies etc., for the *I's* remain while the bodies etc. go on changing. When in the ordinary parlance we say 'I have grown old', 'I am drenched' what we really mean is that the body has undergone changes; it is because of our identification with the body. Otherwise who is the observer who notices the old age or the wet condition and gives expression to

them? How many *I*'s are peopling our body? Surely one, and we are that spirit.

Moreover the observer of the limitations and changes being other than they is not bound by them. Hence the organizing energy within and that without are not two but one. That energy which builds the vast structures of the universe organizes these small bodies and their minute wondrous parts and their more wonderful functions as well. If I am that energy within I am that energy without also. The visible body which seems to create a division between the apparent two, being itself a mode of it, and a variable mode at that, the continuity of the vast energy remains unbroken. So man is really vast, infinite. If he limits himself within a particular body and cries and weeps because of miseries natural to bodies that are subject to change and decay, that is his choice, a dangerous choice though.

But how does it occur? Nobody wants to suffer and still the sufferings are there. And who suffers? This energy, being all, cannot suffer, for the causes of miseries are all its forms—fire does not burn itself to ashes. These individual forms do not suffer by themselves either. Whence is this suffering then? It is by the impact of one or more on some others, when and where the identification has snapped and otherness has been born. When a particular body suffers from disorders it is originally from the inimical action of one part towards another, later giving rise to general disorder. It is always due to lack of identification between two things that suffering is born. Fire burns a piece of paper. What actually takes place is the identification of the blazing fire with the latent fire in the paper. What was not fire is left out. If we attribute feeling to the piece of paper what suffered by the consuming? The latent fire was rather glad to be released from its imprisonment. Thirty matches will not burn the carbon any more. What suffered then from the fire? It is the combination called paper which is other than fire. The identification with the *skandhas* as an entity is responsible for the other-

ness and therefore for suffering. In the case of man it is identification not with the energy but with its various modes, body, sense-organs, contact of sense-organs with various objects, etc. that gives rise to pleasures and pains, which are both miseries.

So why identify with this combination that is responsible for all the ills we suffer from? Ah! the pleasures are there. For their sake people undergo suffering. Their expectations, even hopings against hope, are pleasurable in the midst of actual sufferings. Even the most miserable man does not commit suicide; for he hopes better days may come. In vain expectations fifty or sixty years pass by in tears and agonies. Furious philosophizing, most rigorous application of logical laws, fails to eradicate these perennial expectations from the human heart. These, far less actual enjoyments, cannot grow without our identification with that combination. Hence we cling to it. There would have been no harm had we allowed ourselves to flow on with the same speed as these comings and goings of the pains and pleasures. But we stay on while we have no control over the passing off of our objects of longing. Knowing full well that the touches and the things of contact have all flowed off, we fondly wish to stay on, cherishing all the experiences with their settings. Here is the rub.

If my staying on is a fact then that *I* never came in contact with those objects of sensation; if it is not, I am always with those experiences. And they being many I am not one but many—I am reduced to those contacts. Or if contacts also cease, as they do according to most philosophers, then everything comes to an end, and there is no cause for sorrowing. But sorrowings are there and my staying on is undeniable. In the midst of the agonizing grief at the death of her dear child the mother falls asleep exhausted. Who cuts her out of the pangs? She herself, of course. In her deep sorrow when she feels herself unable to walk one step she finds a scorpion fast approaching her babe and she springs to her feet, runs with an incredible speed, kills the

scorpion, and saves her babe. Where is the sorrow, whence the strength? All these show that in the midst of her agonies, the real *she* remained unaffected and yet a sort of a *she* was sorrowing, though the real *she* retained her power to detach herself any moment she liked. Had this *she* been really attached to that intense agony it would not have been possible for her to detach herself instantly without a moment's notice. This is her real *she*, which, remaining absolutely unaffected all the while, was playing a part among many, innumerable, parts that she has been and would be playing from time immemorial to as long as she would like to play.

A terrible play, many would like to call it. Truly speaking it is not so. It is absolutely a fun she wanted to regale herself with. A hopeless cynic!—people might call us. But we have noticed in the case of the scorpion's approach towards the child that she retained her full control over herself. Why did she not make use of her power to shake off sorrow permanently? Why? Then again why do people recall their evil days, and quite unnecessarily? Had that real self been affected,

had man been unable to shake off sorrows, as pleasures, in the too long course of his evolution he would have devised an effective means of preventing that. How is it that when he went on adapting himself against his surrounding enemies with an amazing skill, he has done nothing to protect himself against such consuming fires? The only answer is—it is an amusing play, not of course to the suffering apparent self but to the real self, the 'Witness'.

Man is this self, infinite and immutable, one with the Creator and Destroyer of the universe, the dynamic Design immanent in the world, manifest and unmanifest; yet he is the Witness eternal, taking no part in it, self-contained and self-enjoying with no *other* within or beside. These are contradictory statements, it appears. But how many contradictions do we not experience in our deeper self if and when we but care to look within, snatching a few moments from our all-absorbing play, made too serious through foolishness! No, man is not the body or any limited thing. He is the infinite immanent Will and Awareness, the *Cicchakti*.

OUR UNIVERSE: A BLEND OF THE SEEN AND THE UNSEEN

BY SRI S. N. RAO

Science has long ignored and often denied the existence of things beyond the purview of sense perception. The tables are slowly being turned. The Universe of sense perception is not the whole of existence, is not the totality of creation. There is also the unseen beyond the seen, unperceived beyond the perceived. What is seen is only a part and not the whole. Such is the trend of Modern Science.

It is now conceded that what is seen and perceived is very small when compared with what is unseen and unperceived. All modern research is in the seen, but the striving is towards seeing more and more of the unseen through the seen. Eminent scientists are now

getting a glimpse of the fact that there is a constant and steady movement, a slow transformation of the world of the unseen to the world of the seen, a process of the unmanifest becoming manifest at different levels. All evolution appears to be nothing else but a slow transformation, an emergence of the imperceptible to become perceptible. That is what is taking place all over the Universe. It does not however appear that the traffic is all one way. While the unmanifest is slowly changing into the manifest, we see that the manifest is also changing, rather going back to the unmanifest. It is the principle of Conservation of Matter and Energy in active operation. Whatever exists, exists eternal either in the

manifest or in the unmanifest, and never ceases to be. All is existence, and there is no such thing as non-existence (*Gītā* II.16). We read in our Upaniṣads that the unmanifest is full and that the manifest which comes out is also full, and that fullness ever remains undiminished. The Vedānta points to a Beingness which is fullness, unborn and uncreate. This is a metaphysical truth, the very basis underlying the scientific principle of the Conservation of Matter and Energy.

What is that subtle force, that subtle principle which is driving what is hidden into the open and what is in the open to become hidden again? Does that force or principle lie in the realm of Nature or does it lie in the realm of Super-Nature? That is the problem which Modern Science has to realize and solve if possible. Has Einstein unwittingly given the clue through his discovery of the Unitary Field in which all known forms of energy appear to have become one in essence?

There is a saying which says 'Where Science ends, Philosophy begins.' Science undoubtedly advances, but does it ever end? Does Philosophy wait for Science to end? As Physics advances and when a stage is reached, it inevitably peeps into the realm of metaphysics. As Science advances and when a stage is reached, it has necessarily to trespass into the realm of Philosophy. And yet, all the conclusions so far arrived at shall continue to be valid and true: only they may not be conclusive. That is exactly the position which Science finds itself in today. We can know what lies beyond only when we know all that lies around us. For the perception of reality behind the appearance, whether it is on the relative or on the absolute plane, the spirit of Science must continue to prevail, but the methods may vary. We cannot limit ourselves to reason on sense perception only. When Science reaches the stage of philosophical approach, it then begins to see the unseen behind the seen and the seen in the unseen. When that stage is reached, there comes a change in the subject-matter of our search. Instead of dealing exclusively with Matter,

we shall have to begin to deal with Spirit as well. We cannot however analyse and classify Spirit as we have analysed and classified Matter.

Now, what is Spirit and what is Matter? Obviously Matter is in the realm of the seen while Spirit is in the realm of the unseen. And yet, that does not appear to be fully correct. There is a mix-up, or rather a blend of both the seen and the unseen in the realm of Matter. Even in the region of Spirit, there appears to be a blend of both the seen and the unseen. The unseen is not a void, is not nothing-ness. It is the background, a perennial ground, which serves the purpose of a screen on which all that is seen is projected. There can be no seen at all for us to see without that background. That unseen at a point is what we call *ākāśa* in Vedānta; it is the 'undifferentiated all-extensive substance, the raw material out of which everything is composed.' That unseen is the apparently empty space which is non-dimensional. Everything that appears must have dimensions and must be in space. Dimensional space is seen; while non-dimensional space is unseen because it is limitless, unoccupied and all-extensive. It is the unmanifest from which all that is manifest comes out. This coming out is what Modern Science calls Evolution, and Religion and Theology call Creation. The difference between Evolution and Creation is only conceptual; in essence they are one and the same.

All matter in its unseen and primordial state, and all energy in its unseen and primordial state, can only manifest themselves in non-dimensional space. That primordial—I should call it elemental—state is an equilibrium, unmoving and unmanifest. Just as we do not see space *per se* unless it shows its quality of dimension, so also we do not see energy *per se* unless it manifests itself in some form of movement. When the apple falls, we call it Gravitation; when we see sparks of lighting, we call it Electricity; when the needle moves to the iron rod, we call it Magnetism. We do not see the electric current and what we see is a filament ignited;

we do not see Magnetism itself and what we see is only a movement. We have therefore to conclude that the Universe contains both the seen and the unseen. It is a blend of both the seen and the unseen.

'All things that exist are only particulars.' Everything that is particular and concrete has its substratum in the abstract and the universal. Abstract and universal are only conceptual and inferential; they exist only in the realm of ideas, not seen in a concrete and a substantial form. All change, from birth to death, is only in the particular and not in the universal. Men may come and men may go, but Man is for ever. Hence, all that exists, exists first as an idea in the abstract, and when it takes both form and substance, it partakes of the nature of both the seen and the unseen. Here again, there is a blend of both in the Universe.

Modern Science has practically obliterated all distinction between Matter and Energy, and has come to the conclusion that both are one in essence. Matter is manifest energy. Matter is unseen without energy, and energy is unseen without matter. And what is that which we call 'Spirit'? It appears to be in a different category altogether, away from Matter-cum-Energy pattern. We know that Matter and Energy are the warp and woof that go to constitute the entire texture and make-up of the Universe as we see it. If we accept a purpose and a design in that Universe, we have only to look to that Spirit as the guiding principle that gave all the design and order, much of which we certainly see in the Universe. Where is any other alternative? While Matter and Energy are completely conditioned and governed by Time-Space-Causation axis without which neither can manifest, it does not appear that what we call 'Spirit' is so conditioned. Rather, the 'Spirit level' transcends while it does not exclude Matter-Energy continuum.

We do feel there is something, some principle that is guiding all movement and all life, both organic and inorganic in the Universe. We do not know exactly what that pervasive

principle is. We can only call it an intelligent and intelligible Spirit. By way of analogy for our understanding, shall we say that it is like the light from our Sun which shines by itself and makes everything else shine, alive and grow on this Earth? Is not that Spirit Consciousness *per se*? Is not that Spirit the only Seer, the only Subject while all the rest are objects in the realm of the seen? Why not call that Spirit the Light Divine which shines by itself and makes us shine, endow us with life, intelligence, and knowledge? How can we say that mere Matter, however high and complex its level of evolutionary development, can give rise to life in the human body and intelligence in the human mind? Mind, and intelligence which is only a function of the mind, and even our individualized consciousness or what we call egoity, are all in the realm of the seen. Hence the terms like 'my mind,' 'my idea,' 'my conscience,' etc. Though they are in the realm of the seen in association with Matter, their source appears to be in the realm of the Spirit. Here again, the Universe is a perfect blend of both the seen and the unseen. While Matter, Energy, and Spirit constitute the entire content of the Universe, Time, Space, and Causation constitute the screen on which that content is made to appear. It is an amazing appearance, a marvellous picture of an inscrutable blend of both the seen and the unseen, for us to comprehend and work upon.

At its highest point, our Universe is much more than a blend of the seen and the unseen; it is a synthesis of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*, in simple English, of God and Nature. In the maze of our analysis, conditioned as we are by pluralities and opposites, we are constantly losing the sense of awareness of that synthesis. '*Īśāvāsyamidam sarvam*' and '*Vāsu-devaḥ sarvamiti*' are not spiritual slogans. They are utterances of factual experience given by our ancient Seers to awaken in us that sense of awareness of synthetic relation between Man and his Universe. They have a meaning, value, and significance if we wish to understand the Universe we live in.

THE TRANSCENDENTAL EGO AND THE TRANSCENDENT SELF

BY KSHITISH CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI

The innermost soul hidden in its own light (*prājña*) is the blissful self (*Ānandamaya*), which creates the world.

But does not this go against the dictum of Śaṅkara, who, in his commentary on *Ānandamaya Adhikaraṇa* (*Brahma-sūtras*, I.i. 12-19), lays down that the self consisting of bliss is not the First Cause of creation? To this the reply is: The blissful soul is of two categories—the one, associated with the dream-state (*svapnānandamaya*) and the other, lapped in peaceful sleep (*suptānandamaya*). The first has mind as its limiting adjunct (*kāryopādhi*) and the second, situated further inwards, has causal ignorance or nescience as its characterizing mark (*kāranopādhi*). In his commentary on *Ānandamaya Adhikaraṇa* (the topic concerning the blissful self) Śaṅkara has disclaimed supreme creativity for the blissful soul experienced in dream, and not for the soul placed in 'wise passivity' above all psychoses. The innermost conscious principle bearing a (subjective) tinge of the unknown and not yet awakened to the consciousness of its transcendental glory is alone responsible for world-creation.

The reason why creativity has been denied by Śaṅkara to the blissful self of the first category is that it still possesses a limiting adjunct made up of fine matter and continues, as a dreaming subject, to regard himself¹ as a separate enjoyer of bliss. The word '*ānandamaya*' here denotes a mutable, non-empirical principle participating in inward felicity. Spiritual enjoyment results from virtuous acts and adoration of God. The soul that shares in the inner joys is more inward than the empirical practisant of virtue (*viññānamaya*). The harvest is awarded to him who

¹ A mere reflection of the real self and identified with *ajñāna*.

has sown for it. This mutable *ānandamaya*, the inward self of *viññānamaya*, experiences varied joys of expectation and fulfilment (*priya, moda, pramoda*) through subtler psychoses (i.e. joyful mental states now underlying causal ignorance or *ajñāna*²). The innermost soul with the joy of fulfilled desire is the mutable *ānandamaya* that sustains *viññānamaya* and is experienced during dreams.

This is Śaṅkara's commentary on *Ānandamaya-kośa* in the *Taittirīya Śruti*. His commentary on the *Ānandamaya Adhikaraṇa* in *Brahma-sūtras* bears the same purport, viz. that just as in *Annamaya* etc. so in the *Ānandamaya* the suffix '*mayat*' signifies change or transformation (not abundance or plenitude), i.e. the experience of spiritual rapture depending on devotional piety of the past.

We now turn to *Brahma-Vallī* (*Taittirīya*, II) for the *Ānandamaya* of the second category, which is not bound up with the fruits of action and meditation, but is itself the independent cause, compact of all bliss: *Brahma-vidāpnoti param* etc. (*Taittirīya*, II.i.1).

The sense of the above text has been set down in the following verses of the *Brahma-Gītā* (*Sūta-Saṃhitā*, Vol. III. iii. 31-32):

*Tad-vidyāviśayam Brahma satya-jñāna-
sukhādvayam
Samsārake guhāvāccye māyājñānādi-
sañjñite
Nihitam Brahma yo veda, etc.*

We refer to the commentaries of Śaṅkara on (1) *Ānandamaya Adhikaraṇa* of the *Brahma-sūtras*, (2) *Brahma-vallī* of the *Tait. Up.* and (3) *Māṇḍ. Up.*

1. Question: Why should the self-suffi-

² This is Wordsworth's 'Bliss of Solitude', i.e. when the empirical subject has faded into the self composed of bliss.

cient, independent Reality, Brahman, be described as the 'tail' of *Ānandamaya-kośa*?

Answer: There is nothing wrong about it. It is conceived as a tail or prop to uphold or sustain the complex scheme of *Ānandamaya-kośa* and forms the subsistent universal underlying the conception. Absolute bliss (Brahmānanda) is the terminus of all pleasurable experiences upon earth, in heaven or region of Brahmā. Bliss of Brahman (supreme joy) cannot be a component part, being infinite or immeasurable joy from which all finite and perishable pleasures on earth, in heaven, or higher abodes spring.

This is Śaṅkara's commentary on the topic concerning the blissful self and having a bearing on Jyotirbrahman³ (*Br. Up.*, IV.iii. 32), which signifies the one conscious principle lapped in peaceful sleep (*sauṣupta*).

2. The *Taittirīya Śruti* (II. viii.5) lays down:

Sa ya evamvit etam annamayam prāṇamayam vijñānamayam ānandamayam ātmānam upsasamkrāmati atha adṛśye pratiṣṭhām vindate.

It is proper to reflect upon as to who it is that thus knows the self, or how he passes through the physical, vital, mental, 'intellectual', and blissful (causal) planes. Does he experience himself to be some or all of these psycho-physico-spiritual states? Is he who passes over to his Real nature other than the Supreme Self and quite different from It, or is he the same one Soul who now re-discovers his authentic nature? If it is asked, what harm is there if he is regarded as different from the Supreme Self, we reply that this will be in opposition to *śrutis*, such as:

'*Tat syṣṭvā tadevānuprāviṣat*' (*Tai.*, II.vi), '*Anyo'sāvanyo'hamiti na sa veda*' (*Br.*, I. iv. 10), '*Ekamevādviṣyam*' (*Chā.*, VI.ii), '*Tat tvam asi*' (*Chā.*, VI.viii.7).

The querist may again ask: How can he be the same one Soul who discovers himself, for this will imply an identity of subject and

object, which is not possible? To this the reply is: It is the same Supreme Self who discovers his real nature through right knowledge. 'The knower of Brahman attains infinite Joy.' Now, one cannot attain what is foreign to oneself. If it is argued one cannot be said to attain what one already is, we refute it by suggesting the need for the removal of false knowledge about oneself that arises from ignorance (*avidyā*). It is the one Supreme Self indicated before (in the Fifth Chapter or *Anuvāka* by *Brahma puccham pratiṣṭhā*) that experiences through wrong knowledge endless miseries of worldly existence, and through right knowledge again realizes the soul's immensity and native freedom.

When an enlightened person finds no other soul (conscious subject) but himself he is firmly established in fearless felicity, which is his own. There is now nothing that can shake the serene soul. All inhibitions are things of the past. The conception of an external God has faded into a fable. The soul that has worked out its freedom by self-knowledge was erstwhile the creator of an illusory world; due to association with *ajñāna*, which it would only reveal, it was called creative, *Ānandamaya*. When this plane is left behind there remains no God, no individual subject other than one transcendental consciousness, the direct and immediate Supreme Self.⁴

If it is contended that other individual beings or things do not disappear on the attainment of insight, like a second moon in the sky never seen by a person of clear vision, we shall say that it is not so; for during dreamless sleep and unperturbed consciousness (*samādhi*) the soul is aware of nothing second to itself. In these states the presence of a separate divine Creator also is not felt. Therefore the experience of any second object in the waking or dreaming state is caused by ignorance of oneself, and falls off when the latter is sublated by insight.

⁴ This is the *Puruṣottama* of the *Bhagavad-Gītā* (XV), just as the creative *Ānandamaya* corresponds to *Akṣara Puruṣa* and the mutable *ānandamaya* to *kṣara puruṣa*.

³ This is 'The light that never was on sea or land', providing a poet like Wordsworth with the principle of romantic creation.

It can neither be urged that in sound sleep the soul experiences nothing, just as a man ceases to be aware of a present thing through temporary absorption of the mind in some other thing; for in peaceful sleep there is altogether nothing that can occupy one's attention.

If it is still argued that the fact of non-cognition in slumber is the effect of the veiling power of *avidyā*, we reply that this is not correct; for the absence of a second object in blissful sleep only represents what is true and natural. It is not caused by anything else. What constitutes permanence or reality of a thing does not undergo change, as it does not depend on another thing. Modification (caused by something else) cannot form the original essence of a thing. What is brought about by a certain agency is not the truth about a thing. A new quality or acquired distinction of a thing depends on some agency, and, as such, constitutes a modification. The experience of many individuals and things in waking state and dream is such a modification and does not constitute reality as such. That is the truth of a thing which is composed of its own essence without dependence on a second thing. A distinction of a thing that depends on another thing does not suggest the truth of the former, for this will cease to exist with the cessation of the latter. Therefore the truth of the present matter is that the soul exists without a second in the state of sound sleep, as also in waking and dreaming states. The experience of manifoldness arises from error and illusion.

Moreover, as the spiritual Principle that upholds the *Ānandamaya-kośa*, viz. *Brahma puccham pratiṣṭhā*—is conditioned by dreamless sleep it must be regarded as the inmost individual soul apparently obscured by primal *ajñāna*.⁵ The blissful soul that manifests (but does not mingle with) the unconscious (*ajñāna*) creates the cosmos⁶; and there is no

other creator or knowing subject other than the one Soul in the states of slumber and unqualified blissfulness (*samādhi*). Those who regard the Creator as being different from the individual soul and the work of an individual agent as distinct from creation can never experience inner repose; for as long as there is a second to oneself, the presence of the former is sure to cause apprehension in the mind of the latter. Such people fall into two classes: (a) those who hold the theory of the external divine Creator being both the efficient and material Cause of the universe, which is the product of the past mature actions of all created beings⁷, and (b) those who hold that God is only the efficient cause of creation, there being real difference between God and man.

3. We turn next to Śaṅkara's commentary on *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*.

The Blissful soul is the infinite reservoir of felicities enjoyed in the different regions (earth, heaven, etc.). Its essence is beatitude beyond which the inmost soul cannot rise⁸. And then: This soul compact of all bliss forms the Third Stage of the Self: on this rest the different states of unconscious, conscious, and sub-conscious experience. This is really the universal Creator, who inwardly controls the manifold things and beings, including the divine Maker. This inner individual soul is not different from God, as He is supposed to be by contrary schools of thinkers. This inmost Soul reveals all things, being immanent in every phenomenon. He is transcendent Light as well as in-dwelling spiritual Power. As being an immanent Principle, He it is who regulates all created things. From Him springs whole of reality, and the external world and other persons are representations of that self having no independent existence). But the monistic spiritualism of Śaṅkara is quite different from Berkeleyan Idealism, according to which other spirits or minds, besides God, exist.

⁵ The material cause of creation, with Space or *Akāśa* as the first evolute.

⁶ This resembles Solipsism (i.e. self alone; the individual self of the solipsistic philosopher is the

⁷ According to whom, the many individual souls are the Supreme Being bounded by certain limits (*avacchinna Brahma*).

⁸ *By Up. IV.iii.32.*

forth the multiform universe. He is the origin and terminus of all beings.

Similar in meaning is the commentary on *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*:

The original subject is the infinite Reality, which is Truth, Consciousness, and Bliss, to ascertain whose real nature the five vestures which enshrine the Soul have been here introduced. This supreme Reality is what dwells in them as their innermost substance, like kernel within an intricate series of shells. These sheaths appear to be real because of their connexion with this spiritual Reality. This is the Absolute on which they rest; this inmost spiritual Principle sustains them. All diversity born of ignorance melts away in this one blissful Soul without a second; for boundless bliss must form a unitary experience.

According to Śaṅkara, then, the individual subject (*viññānamaya*) who is the agent of actions, and the further internal blissful soul in the apparel of *ānandamaya-kośa* and arrogating to itself the privilege of inner felicities pertain to a state of introspection and sheer subjective experience. These extra-corporeal conditions resemble a state of dream, in which the soul is still handicapped by the subtle (i.e. sub-conscious) functioning of mind (which is a product of fine matter or the five subtle elements). Hedged in by dreaminess and a vesture of superfine matter, these two—*viññānamaya* and *ānandamaya*—precede the inmost soul, from which issue all the varied pleasures of earth and heaven. This innermost soul is what has been indicated in *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* as the 'Tail of *Ānandamaya-kośa*', and, being bereft of psychical vestment (*liṅga śarīra*) it is the blissful soul belonging to quiescent sleep.

Siva-Gītā (XIV) also lays down that the individual knower and the blissful soul are bound by a psychic vesture. Lord Śiva has just finished describing, for the enlightenment of Rāma, the first three of the five sheaths that, according to *Ānanda-vallī* of *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (II), screen the soul. He now introduces in order the fourth and fifth vestures of the soul beginning with *yā karmaviṣayā*

buddhiḥ and ending in *bhoktehāmutra saṁsmṛtaḥ*. The psychophysical or logical vesture of the soul (*viññānamaya-kośa*) relates to the practical intellect combined with organs of perception. The soul, through identification with this psychical vestment, wrongly regards agency (a property of the intellect) as his own and is subjected to ritualistic injunctions of the Vedas (such as *yajeta*, 'you should offer sacrifices to the gods'). Thus he becomes the agent, during his waking state of empirical experience, for the performance of duties bearing upon this life and the next.

The soul with the psychical encrustation is the volitional agent; next to it and more inward, is the fifth vesture which consists of bliss, as set forth in the *Taittirīya Śruti*, beginning with *etasmāt viññānamayāt anyo'ntara ānandamayāḥ* and ending in *ānanda ātmā* (*Tait.*, II.v). According to another *Śruti* text (*Ātmaprabodha Up.*, 24) hunger, thirst, etc. are psychical conditions (contents existing in the mind) only and do not belong to the true self. But when the soul, the inmost spiritual Witness, gets blended (integrated) with the psychical sheath like a red-hot ball of iron it is known as the blissful soul (*ānandamaya-kośa*), the legitimate enjoyer of the fruits of work and worship both here and hereafter.

After speaking of the blissful soul bound by psychic vesture (reflective awareness of the self) Lord Śiva nshers in the more inward spiritual Reality which forms the ultimate referent of all thought and is merely marked by *ajñāna* (i.e. one that is superimposed upon it but which it no longer arrogates to itself). This innermost soul has been set down as being the Supreme Entity supporting the psychic structure of *ānandamaya-kośa*⁹. It is conditioned by peaceful sleep (*sauṣṭa*) as the *Māṇḍūkya Śruti*¹⁰ also confirms.

*'Yadādhyāsam viḥāyaiṣa svarūpenāvatiṣ-
thate
Avidyāmātrasaṁyuktaḥ sākṣyātmā jāyate
tadā.'*

⁹ *Brahma puccham pratiṣṭhā* (*Tai.*, II.v.).

¹⁰ Beginning with *sūṣṭasthāna ekībhūtaḥ* and

The soul was just now the enjoyer of bliss through self-arrogation with the psychic vesture, and, as such, was the non-empirical subject (transcendental Ego of Kant, who is conscious of himself through introspection) in relation to the contential aspects of the mind (e.g. reflectively apprehending or remembering felt felicities). When later, with influx of peaceful sleep, this sub-conscious psychic experience (*svapna*) is over and the preference for the psychic garb has been put aside, the soul is said to be thinly obscured by primal ignorance—the root-cause of subtle elements, like space (*ākāśa*) etc. and their evolutes, like mind (*antaḥkaraṇa*) etc.—all of which have now disappeared in its womb. The soul said to be the origin and terminus¹¹ of all things now stands out as the single spiritual principle that creates space and the external world, and represents Bliss as it is in Itself; the other *Ānandamaya* being a reflective reproduction¹² of this original *Ānandamaya*¹³. The one unitary Soul in the repose of sleep¹⁴ shines upon the remnant of *ajñāna* (that not being really distinct from it is ineffectual in disguising its true nature) and is known as the spiritual witness (*ajñānamātra-sākṣī*).

The sequel of the point raised at the beginning of the present article is that

A. according to *Brahma-vallī* (*Tai.*, II)

(a) the empirical subject (*viññānamaya*) is a volitional agent (*karṭṛva-samyukta*);

(b) the non-empirical blissful soul (*ānandamaya*) is a relative experiencer of joy (*bhokṛtvamātra-samyukta*);

(c) the soul associated with mere causal ignorance (*ajñānamātra-sambaddha*) is above ending in *prabhavāpyayau hi bhūtānām* (*Mā. Up.*, 5).

¹¹ *Prabhavāpyayau hi bhūtānām* (*ibid.*).

¹² A reflection of the Self in *ajñāna* (psychoses); an introspective apprehender of his own soul of bliss.

¹³ This is not dreaming or derivative *ānandamaya* who is aware of himself and his enjoyment through reflective apprehension.

¹⁴ The vestige of (subjective) *ajñāna* vanishes with the sure knowledge that it is a superimposition and, as such, does not really exist in the Self,

relative psychoses and is the creator of the world (*sauṣṭa jagadīśvara*); and

(d) the Soul freed from all influence of ignorance (*ajñāna-vinirmukta*) is the transcendent Self (*turīya ātmā*).

B. according to *Mā. Up.* and *Bhṛgu-vallī* (*Tai.*, III)

(a) the relative psychical subject (the ground of apperception)¹⁵, viz. *viññānamaya* is both an Agent and Enjoyer (*karṭṛva-bhokṛtvayukta*).

(b) the inmost (individual) Soul, merely associated with *ajñāna*, viz. *ānandamaya*¹⁶ is the universal Creator (*sauṣṭa nikhīleśvara*);

(c) the Soul in its absolute nature is the (individual) subject above the three states (*turīya pratyagātmā*).

We thus find that in respect of the doctrine of one unitary subject there is no conflict between Śaṅkara's commentary on *Ānandamaya Adhikaraṇa*, negating the creativity of derivative or reflective *ānandamaya*, and the verdict of the Upaniṣads that declare that it is from the original or extra-psychical *ānandamaya* that the whole creation proceeds.

C. Authorities may be cited in support.

(I) Gauḍapāda in *Mā.-Kā.*, I.II avers that the individual subject in waking and dreaming states (*viśva* and *taijasa*) is characterized by both non-apprehension and misapprehension of Reality; but in the state of deep sleep the (individual) soul (*prājñā*) is characterized only by the non-apprehension of Reality. When the soul transcends these

¹⁵ Consciousness of one's personal identity. This unity of self-consciousness (as also in Kant) pertains both to the empirical ego (*pramātā*) and the pure ego (*ahamkāra* or *bhoktā*). The transcendental ego with Kant is a non-empirical principle which is the permanent spiritual substance underlying all states of experience and thus explaining its synthetic unity; according to *Māṇḍūkya* and *Bhṛguvallī* this is *bhoktā* or *bhokṛtvayukta viññānamaya*.

¹⁶ This essential *ānandamaya* is conscious of himself through intuition; while the non-empirical spiritual principle (*bhoktā ānandamaya*), through introspection or reflective apprehension.

three states then there is neither non-apprehension nor mis-apprehension of Reality.

The state of non-apprehension (*prājñā*) as such is said to be the cause¹⁷ of the states of mis-apprehension (*viśva* and *taijasa*). In dream and waking states there are both non-apprehension and mis-apprehension of Reality. But in deep sleep there is only non-apprehension¹⁸, i.e. the Soul does not shine in its true transcendental nature. Though the 'I' here becomes evident to itself through intuition, the element of the unconscious (which is the germ of *viśva* and *taijasa*) still darkens it, although it cannot really disguise it. This seeming veil (which stands revealed by the light of the inner Soul, on which it is a mere erroneous superimposition) is lifted up on the attainment of right knowledge. The inmost (individual) Soul then shines in its pristine splendour unbedimmed by the potentiality of reflective or empirical subjectivism.

Both the perceptive and introspective subject do not know the Truth; on the contrary, they wrongly apprehend it. The *prājñā*—the one Soul with non-reflective self-awareness as its essence, though *illuminating the unknown* (*agrahaṇa* or *avidyā*)—seems to be thinly disguised by it. With the dawn of right knowledge¹⁹ this illusory veil is rent asunder and the Soul bursts forth in its native glory and goodness (*cidānandasvarūpa*).

(2) Vidyāranya also in *Pañcadaśī* (VI. 157, 158, 160, 212) maintains on the strength of the Upaniṣads (e.g. *Mā.*, 5) and Śaṅkara's commentary that the blissful Soul connected with the condition of sound sleep (*sauṣṭpa ānandamaya*) is the universal Creator, and, as such, is recognized by the Vedas to be the Lord of all. He is described as pervading everything, all-knowing, and originating the universe. The Soul in the state of profound sleep creates all the things that are seen during

the states of wakefulness and dreaming, and, as no one is capable of undoing this creation, He deserves the appellation of the Lord Paramount (*sarveśvara*). *Ānandamaya* represents *Īśvara*, and *viññānamaya* represents *jīva*.

It cannot also be said that the Soul which experiences the three states is a creator only metaphorically; for it has just been shown above that the creativity which cannot be impaired by anyone must be supreme, and therefore not figurative.

(3) The author of *Samkṣepa Sārīraka* also has laid down on the basis of the Upaniṣads that the blissful Soul is creative *Īśvara*, and the Soul appearing disguised in the psychic vesture is *jīva*. The scriptural text means that *Īśvara* is conditioned by causal ignorance (*kāraṇopādhi*); *jīva* by psychoses (perception or introspection) born of ignorance (*kāryopādhi*).

(4) The author of *Advaita-Siddhi* also has affirmed that while *jīva* is bound by the effects of *avidyā* the Supreme Lord is the spiritual Principle associated with profound sleep.

It is thus clear that the one immutable supreme Spirit manifests itself under different conditions as:

- (a) the individual agent;
- (b) the non-empirical apprehender of bliss in deep contemplation;
- (c) the Supreme Lord associated with profound sleep (primal ignorance); and
- (d) the True (individual) Self transcending all limitations and shining in Its own pure light after the sublation of ignorance by insight. The first two represent the Perishable Entity (*kṣara puruṣa*); the third, the Imperishable Entity (*akṣara puruṣa*); and the fourth, the Supreme Entity (*uttama puruṣa*), according to the *Bhagavad-Gītā* (XV). According to the present context, the first two stand for *viññānamaya* (the psychic soul), the third for *ānandamaya* (the blissful Soul above mystic experience) and the fourth for *ānandaghana* (the Supreme Self shorn of creative obscurity on the attainment of spiritual insight). Bliss absolute manifests itself as the result of in-

¹⁷ That is why *prājñā* is the cause of creation.

¹⁸ This is sublated when the true nature of the Self is known; that is why the film ostensibly covering the Self has been said to be very thin.

¹⁹ Based on a sure conviction that non-apprehension is a false superimposition on the Self.

sight and sublation of psychoses and its root-cause (*ajñāna*).

The one Subject is without all inner difference, as it itself reveals, sustains, and inspirits the superimposed ignorance, the parent of experientialism. The individual Subject feels by the inner eye what he intensely imagines within himself. He is essentially not distinct from these representations of himself. There is thus no fundamental difference among the three states, through which the same one Sub-

ject shines alike, like one and the same person appearing unchanged in the different garments that he wears. There is also, as shown just above, no difference between the individual subject on the one hand and what is called the external world, together with other persons and the divine Creator on the other. For, it is one pervading (individual) Subject associated with Ignorance that appears under different conditions as the illusory many.

A REMARKABLE VERSE FROM THE GĪTĀ

BY SWAMI SIDDHESWARANANDA

He who can see inaction in action and action in inaction, is a sage among men. He remains in harmony (Yoga), even when he works.—*Bhagavad Gītā* IV. 18.

This verse gives expression to a very important principle of Vedānta. Truth (Absolute) cannot be expressed except by contradictions. The intuition of Reality cannot come from a logical interpretation. An interpretation is a succession of well-linked ideas, a standpoint that gives us but one and only one perspective. The Reality is not a sum total of all the perspectives; it is not a totalization.

How can we know that Reality by a supra-logical intuition, which cannot be attained by the play of contrasts? The finger which points out the moon is not the moon; a literal explanation will be inadequate.

This verse tells us that the sage who does an action does not work. The difficulty of discriminating between action and inaction has been already shown in the preceding verse of the *Gītā*. We are confronted with many contradictions in life. In the same way we imagine that, if there be a spiritual aspiration, liberation (*mokṣa*) could come only by the cessation of actions. This is a grand error into which we are led by *avidyā*, the primordial

ignorance. Cessation from action is also an action. All initiative taken by the ego is action; we only change the direction of the energy which had previously propelled us outwards. To stop a carriage in motion is also an action of our thought and muscles.

To see action in inaction is to know that none can get out of action. When we act, we think that the force which expresses itself issues from our individualized ego. But we should know that it is nature which does everything, as shown in the verses 8 and 9 in Chapter V.

"He who is in harmony (Yoga) and knows the essence of things should think, 'I do nothing'; while he sees, hears, touches, eats, goes, sleeps, breathes, speaks, gives, takes, opens and closes his eyes, he should affirm that the senses are moving amidst the objects of the senses."

In verse 15, it is said that knowledge is covered by ignorance and so all beings are overpowered by illusion. But the false notion that the source of my action is in me will be disproved by a total vision of nature which will show us that it is 'the nature of things', the cosmic energy, that acts.

All our attempts to stop action, with the idea of establishing ourselves in inaction, will

only involve us in deeper and deeper error. Our Scripture says that the soul is free from action, because it is unborn (*Gītā* II. 20-24). How can an unborn entity act? If the soul is unborn, it does not act; it is the Prakṛti which acts. It is in Prakṛti that the feeling of the ego is born and external objects exist: the internal and the external are a presentation of phenomena, that is to say, nature, Prakṛti.

The soul, the *Ātman*, is neither internal nor external. The *Gītā*, like all the Upaniṣadic texts, teaches the identity of the individual soul (in its own nature, beyond the Prakṛti) and the cosmic Soul, Brahman (beyond all the ranges of manifestation).

From the standpoint of *Sādhanā* (practice), we have to take a position beyond the manifestation of Prakṛti. This declaration itself contains a self-contradiction, because there cannot be any position beyond Prakṛti. It is only a manner of envisaging the direction of our spiritual efforts.

The present verse shows that the Wisdom and the Wise One (the sage) are identical. Wisdom is impersonal; the sage is also equally impersonal. This idea is difficult of comprehension by our lower *buddhi* (reason); we see a person who acts or does not act, who stands still or walks, and our intellect which only analyses and divides cannot grasp the impersonal character of the sage. The impersonal alone can understand the impersonal. The impersonal is beyond all reach. The nature and conduct of the man of realization is given in several parts of the *Gītā*. That conduct is in Prakṛti, which has three modes of expression, *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*. For those who observe him, the man of realization seems to remain on the plane of *sattva*; and his conduct is an ideal for the world. But none can comprehend his real nature, because he is impersonal, being himself Wisdom.

When that Wisdom condenses in action, we can see in the realized man the highest value of *sattva*; that man of firmly established wisdom (*sthita-prajña*) sees action in inaction

and inaction in action. (The *Gītā* tells us that the whole world is action, that is to say, the multiple expression of energy). In that Wisdom of the *sthita-prajña*, there is no sense of ego. Whatever be the action done, for him it is only inaction. All action implies an actor, one who acts; but when the sage breathes, speaks, goes, and does the various actions in life, he knows that it is nature in its integrality which acts and not himself. So, all that he does is inaction. But in the case of the man who has not realized the Truth, even his cessation from action is also an action.

This verse is regarded by Śaṅkara as one of the most important in the Advaitic teaching on the subject of action. Śrī Kṛṣṇa insists on the impersonal nature of Wisdom, which manifests itself to the ignorant by the actions of the sage, the man of Wisdom. We see that, in Indian thought, realization is not an abstract idea, distinct from the man who realizes. It is our intellect which artificially divides the Truth as a thought expressing the impersonal and as an object expressing the personal.

It is said in this verse that the man of firmly established intellect is also a harmonious man (a man of Yoga). There is harmony when all is seen without differentiation. The *Gītā* says that Yoga is equality of vision, equilibrium. It is from the standpoint of *Māyā* that we speak of equilibrium, equilibrium attained on the plane of *sattva*. The realized man sees with an equal eye a *Brāhmaṇa*, a cow, an elephant, a dog, and a Paria. (*Gītā*. V. 18). Only the person who has lost the sense of the ego, the sense of the personal and has attained to the impersonal, can get this vision.

It is by means of contradictions, as I have said in the beginning, that the Reality is indicated in this verse.

(Translated from the French original by Sri P. Seshadri).

LOGIC OF BEING IN VEDANTA

BY DR. P. S. SASTRI

(Continued from the October Issue)

8. While the identity of consciousness involves the validity of the principle of identity, its apparent otherness from its object offers the principle of difference or contradiction. Thus an entity that is produced is one which owes its existence to a cause; and that which is not produced exists by itself. Whether the self is treated as born or unborn, we must accept its existence though this may not be similar to the existence of the originated. An object that is originated is not a permanent or ultimately real existent.³⁹ The minutest particle to which a physical entity can be analysed has a spatial location. Occupying a limited space, it is a finite entity conditioned by certain limitations. Whatever is limited has a beginning and therefore an end. As such the very basis of a physical entity is liable to destruction.⁴⁰ Consciousness on the other hand, cannot be conceived in this manner. It is not an entity that can be localized, or spatialized, since it apprehends space. That which apprehends space, or contemplates space, is other than space. Such an entity cannot be treated as having a beginning or an end. It cannot also be viewed as a mental construct. The cloth for instance, is made up of a number of threads. Each thread is perceived as a thread, not as a piece of cloth. That the collection of the threads is a piece of cloth is what we assume. But there is no object called a cloth, for the real object is made up of threads. That it is a cloth is our idea; and we identify the object with our idea, or we infer the object to be a cloth after perceiving the threads.⁴¹ This process of mental con-

struction presupposes a real principle that constructs the object or has the idea; and this implies that such a principle is other than the ideas and mental constructions. It is an entity that doubts everything, but it itself is beyond doubt. It can seek objects in the universe which is external to it, but it itself is not external. It may recollect, but it is ever present.⁴²

Consciousness apprehends the objects that appear external to it. That which is apprehended is not mere existence, since a non-existent entity too can be imagined for a while and since existence is not the exclusive characteristic of the given. The same argument compels us to hold that the object cannot be the cause of our apprehension. Even the sense-organ like the eye, being the cause of the apprehension, we must in such a case be able to perceive our own eyes.⁴³ Nor can we take consciousness as the cause of the object.⁴⁴ We cannot also maintain that an object has an independent existence of its own; for, it is self-contradictory to apprehend the existence of an object when it is not an object for a consciousness.⁴⁵ Thus the principle of difference or contradiction is only a principle derived from the identity of consciousness.

9. The subject of the experience is in a certain relation to his object. Are these real entities identical with one another? Or have they an identical essence? Or is the object a mere fiction? I cognize patches of blue, white, and the like. I as the subject is neither the blue nor the white. The I, however, is an I only in relation to the *this* or to

³⁹ See VSB 85.3-4; B 84.3. cf. NV 339.10-13.

⁴⁰ cf. NBV 4.2.18.

⁴¹ See NBV 4.2.26; NV 519.14-19.

⁴² B 552.7-8.

⁴³ cf. NVT 656.11-17.

⁴⁴ cf. Kh 17.17-20.

⁴⁵ PVA 354.21-22, cf. ATV 214-15.

the *that*. In the absence of such a relation it is not even I. The relation implies the existence of the object as distinct from that of the subject. The two are inseparable, and in this sense they are non-different.⁴⁶ This non-difference need not necessarily mean the identity of the subject with the object. Mutually exclusive properties can be the objects of cognition, because they are not opposed to the apprehending self,⁴⁷ and yet the subject cannot be identified with both the exclusive properties, since the single subject will then have to be a many in one. When we admit that the subject and his object are related to one another, is this relation other than the subject and the object? In fact it is the relation that is interpreted as the subject and the object. Even if we admit that the relation is other than the terms, we have to recognize that it is grounded in the terms, not outside them.⁴⁸ Yet in cognizing I do not apprehend my consciousness which is formless as being identical with the objects that have forms, but I cognize the objects thereby making them intelligible to a conscious mind. This relation between me and the objects is a relation that holds in spite of the differences that differentiate one from the other.⁴⁹

Does this amount to an affirmation of an identity? The identity of the subject and the object would preclude all activity, and it may result in the absence of discrimination.⁵⁰ We do not apprehend the blue as the yellow. Nor can we accept the total difference of the object from the subject. If they are mutually exclusive how do they come together? How can the subject apprehend the other? All the differences are transcended in the apprehension because the apprehending self in revealing the object along with its differences is the very ground of the object; and apart from the self, the object has no existence.⁵¹ As unrelated

to the self and as ungrounded in the self, the object is never apprehended.⁵² But the subject does not need another subject to render it intelligible since the subject cannot become an object.⁵³ All consciousness is therefore self-consciousness,⁵⁴ and the consciousness of an object is not possible in the absence of self-consciousness.⁵⁵

10. In every cognition we apprehend an entity other than ourselves. We implicitly recognize the difference between the subject and the object. If this difference is real, then the subject and the object are not identical. If it is unreal, then the cognition is giving rise to an invalid apprehension since it makes the object other than the subject. In making an unreal entity the object, the cognition falsifies its real nature.⁵⁶ But that which is totally outside consciousness cannot easily enter into the field of conscious apprehension. As lying outside, it is something about which we can say it neither is nor is not. It is an unknowable and an unintelligible datum. When I think of my desires or feelings, I am surely having objects which are not separable from me. This may be the relation basic to a subject and his object. Then the difference between the two may be a conceptual one. If this difference is said to be due to the constructive or conceptual character of thought, is it a real or an unreal difference? Does it appear or no? If it is unreal and if it does not appear, how can a mind give rise to the appearance or awareness of the non-existent? We cannot have the mental construction of the non-existent; and if difference is such a construction, it is not non-existent.⁵⁷ But when the self cannot be an object even unto itself, we cannot bring in any relation of identity or difference between the self and the other.⁵⁸

⁴⁶ BBV 4.3.500.

⁴⁷ AAA 331.

⁴⁸ KKK 69.1-3.

⁴⁹ KKK 69.3-8.

⁵⁰ cf. ATV 190-1.

⁵¹ KKK 73.1.

⁵² PV II. 388.

⁵³ See PS I.11; cf. SVNR 209; Sigwart II. 138.

⁵⁴ NB I.8. cf. S.V. Ātmavāda 143.

⁵⁵ See PVA 286. 21-22; 288.9-12; TS 2074; KKK 58.1-2; Sigwart II.29.

⁵⁶ ATV 198.

⁵⁷ ATV 201.

⁵⁸ IS 3.1-3.

Reality then is non-dualistic and absolute.⁵⁹

As Candrakīrti said, simple humanity imagines and dichotomizes matter and mind and the like without going to the root of this dichotomy. All such imagined concepts constitute the inverted habit of thought, a habit coeval with the beginningless world process; they arise in a process of dispersion-into-manifold of the original unity of the Universe.⁶⁰ The couples generated by the understanding like cognition and the cognized sublimate each other by their relativity. This however does not mean that the external world is only an extension of the dream world,⁶¹ because of a difference between these two. The dream world is sublated when we wake up; and our waking world is not thus sublated at once. While the dream world to some extent participates in the character of recollection, our waking knowledge is direct and immediate and is dependent on the valid means of cognition.⁶²

11. The object apprehended is other than consciousness.⁶³ It is in a sense external. Cognition or apprehension is of the form of knowledge, of awareness. When we have the apprehension of an object, this apprehension being an activity of consciousness, the object must participate in the character of consciousness. It can do so only by becoming an image or an idea. In the absence of any such character to the object apprehended, the object would cease to be an immediately given one, and the apprehension would no longer be immediate. A mediated apprehension is an impossibility, since apprehension is always direct and immediate. No apprehension can determine the form or the character of an object that is not presented directly to consciousness. The object can be apprehended only when it comes within the scope of our cognitive activity. We cannot there-

fore prove the reality of an object lying outside the cognitive situation.⁶⁴ It is not the thing in itself that makes the apprehension of its existence possible. On the contrary it is our apprehension that renders its existence possible and necessary.⁶⁵ To determine that this is an object, I should first have an apprehension of the object; for all determination or certainty follows immediate experience. But a single experience may not enable us to ascertain the character of an object since all such ascertainment presupposes repeated similar experiences.⁶⁶

Further, what is the determinateness or specific particularity of an object? It can only be our understanding based on our apprehension. This apprehension which is basic to our knowledge is not other than the self because we cannot think of a self that does not experience and that therefore is not consciousness.⁶⁷ It is the self-consciousness that gives rise to the various acts of judgement or apprehension which reveal the necessity of thought.⁶⁸ This self-consciousness presents the unity of consciousness and its own identity amid varying acts of cognition. Thus the primary logical principle is that of identity; and this identity is the basis of all apprehension. This apprehension being consciousness, our experience itself carries indubitable proof of the self-luminosity of knowledge.⁶⁹ Knowledge is self-revealing because, when it arises, it does not remain unmanifested.⁷⁰

12. This position seems to imply a relational character. The crystal for example has a form. Due to its transparency it takes on the reflection of the red flower, though the flower is apprehended as different from itself. The white crystal comes to appear red.⁷¹ But this appearance is not its permanent or ultimate nature. Likewise when objects are

⁵⁹ Madhyāntavibhāga 9.

⁶⁰ *MMV* 350, cf. *Nirupama stava* 3; *Lokātīta-stava* 8-10.

⁶¹ cf. *VSB* 544.6-8.

⁶² *VSB* 555.10-556.3; *B* 555.11-12.

⁶³ cf. *TS* 559.

⁶⁴ See *VSB* 541.5-542.1; cf. *PVA* 345.25-32.

⁶⁵ *NVT* 399.8-9.

⁶⁶ See *PVA* 351.19-32.

⁶⁷ *IS* 24.19-20; *KKK* 58.7-9.

⁶⁸ cf. Sigwart I.187; II.29-30.

⁶⁹ *KKK* 81.

⁷⁰ *TP* 4.

⁷¹ *B* 7.5-7.

related to consciousness, the latter does not lose its real nature. As consciousness it continues to be present in every activity.⁷² The self to have any relation including that of revealing the objects, must reveal itself. By revealing itself, the self, however, cannot become a non-conscious entity like a jar. In other words, the self must become an object to have a relation, and yet it must remain a subject if it were not to be a non-conscious entity. It is a self-contradiction to have the self as both the subject and the object. It cannot be itself and also an other.⁷³ Moreover, the self as an object must be that which is revealed. Is this self non-conscious or self-revealing? If it is non-conscious, there is nothing that can reveal any object. We cannot also maintain that there is an inner consciousness which gives rise to the knowledge of both the self and the objects; for, a knowledge which is brought into existence partakes the character of the non-conscious. And that inner consciousness will have to be a self-revealing and independent reality or consciousness. The consciousness which apprehends the self or subject and the object may not be non-conscious; but it does not make the subject a conscious one. One cannot say that it is the very nature of the self-revealing consciousness to have the subject-object relation. If x is a scholar and y is his son, x and y are related as father and son, but this does not make y also a scholar. One may say that consciousness reveals itself only by revealing the subject and the object, only when this revealed consciousness and the revealed subject and object are different from consciousness as such. This would mean that consciousness cannot reveal itself and that it is

⁷² cf. ATV 361.

⁷³ B 34.8-12.

not other-revealing. But if the revealed consciousness and the revealed subject-object are not different from consciousness, then consciousness and the object must be compresent. Then y must be a scholar because his father x is one. Further we do not have this compresence whether the object is in the past or in the future.⁷⁴ Then we are driven to hold that anything which does not form the object of knowledge is self-revealing,⁷⁵ and yet the object it has must be an inexplicate something. In other words there can be no objects. This consciousness cannot be an object, since it is the cognizer of all cognitions.⁷⁶ It does not require anything similar or dissimilar to it to manifest itself.⁷⁷ Since it is not internally differentiated,⁷⁸ we cannot even cognize its part or aspect. If such a self is always revealing itself, it can have no relation with anything;⁷⁹ and if it is not self-revealing, it cannot be apprehended, and we cannot therefore speak of anything being related to it.⁸⁰ The real then is identical with itself and it has a character identical with its being. It does not take any attributes.⁸¹ Though this self-revealing consciousness is never an object of knowledge, still it possesses the competence for perceptual activity.⁸²

(To be concluded)

⁷⁴ See B 35.3-36.7.

⁷⁵ TP 5.

⁷⁶ cf. Bradley; Essays on Truth and Reality, VI; Bosanquet; Meeting of Extremes, 24; AAA 89.

⁷⁷ TP 3.

⁷⁸ See Ratnagotra Vibhāga, I.27.

⁷⁹ Ibid. 1-9.

⁸⁰ See PP 19; B 37.1-12; Madhyāntavibhāga Bhāṣyatikā 17; PPV 52; VPS 44-5.

⁸¹ cf. LS 2.134; 202; Madhyāntavibhāga Bhāṣyatikā, 20; Kir I. 36-4-5.

⁸² TP 9. See Advaita Siddhi 768.

'Where is the differentiation between two objects? Not in sense perception, else all would be one in it. We have to perceive in sequence. In getting knowledge of what a thing is, we get also something which it is not. The differentiae are in the memory and are got by comparison with what is stored there. Difference is not in the nature of a thing, it is in the brain.'

—Swami Vivekananda

THE CONCEPT OF FALSITY

(THE VIEW OF ANANDABODHA CONSIDERED)

BY SRI NIROD BARAN CHAKRABORTY

In Advaita philosophy, reality is one without a second and this is Brahman, the Supreme. What is other than Brahman is other than reality also. From this, it follows that the world as distinct from this One is distinct from reality. The Advaitins, therefore, regard this world as false. If the world were not false, Brahman would not be the only reality. In that case Advaita philosophy itself would be an impossibility. So, in order to establish Advaita we are to show first that the world is false. This shows that the concept of falsity is a very important concept in Advaita philosophy. Now the question is—in what sense do the Advaitins regard the world as false? or what is the definition of falsity? Śaṅkarites have defined falsity in different ways. Here in this paper we shall discuss the view of Ānandabodha, a famous Advaitin, with regard to falsity.

The author of *Pañcapādikā* regarded the *asattā* of merely nominal entities like 'hare's horn' as a category. The Advaitins themselves have no faith in this. They considered it at all only because their opponents, the Mādhvas, believe in such a category. Their terminology was used merely to refute their views. Ānandabodha proposed to define falsity without even recognizing this category. In his celebrated work *Pramāṇamālā* he defined falsity as 'being other than reality' (*sadviviktatvam vā mithyātvaṃ*).

Brahman is the only reality in the philosophy of Advaita. The world is false as it is other than Brahman. This is established by the following inference:

The world under dispute is false as it is an object (*dṛśya*).

Whatever is an object is false, as the silver superimposed on nacre is.

It may be argued that it is already established that the world is different from Brahman. So, unnecessary complication will arise when we try to prove this with the help of an inference. Actually speaking there will arise a fallacy which is technically known as 'proving the proved' (*siddha-sādhana*).

But the novelty in the present case is that the word 'sat' or reality in the definition is understood in a special sense. It means the object of knowledge that arises through a valid source.

But is the definition, so understood, free from all defects? The opponent urges that it is too narrow. The world, which, according to the Advaitin is known through perception, a valid source of knowledge, cannot be covered by the definition. If the definition is right the Advaitin will have to take the world to be as real as Brahman.

But in order to avoid this difficulty the Advaitin desires that by the expression 'valid source of knowledge' (*pramāṇa*), we are to understand not merely the immediate and unconditional cause (*kāraṇa*) of knowledge, but one which is *without any defect* (*doṣājanya*). Reality, then, is, according to the Advaitin, the object of knowledge known by such a *pramāṇa*.

The opponent may, however, argue that though the knowledge of the silver superimposed on nacre is due to the defects of similarity and the like, there is no such defect when the world is cognized. So, the world being an object of knowledge due to no defect has to be taken as real and not false as the Advaitin claims.

But this may be answered in the following way :

There is a defect here too, and it is funda-

mental. Nescience (*avidyā*) constitutes the stuff of *antahkarana* and therefore, also of any knowledge-of-an-object, which is a *vr̥tti* of this *antahkarana*. Such knowledge and the nescience are not, therefore, different from one another. Now, Advaita regards the nescience as the ground defect everywhere. So, the cognition of the world which arises due to the modification of the intellect is definitely due to a defect.

A subtler objection may again be raised. Is not the knowledge of Brahman also, arising out of hearing Śruti texts, due to defect, as it too is a *vr̥tti* of *antahkarana*? But this means that even Brahman is false.

To avoid this difficulty, the Advaitin further specifies his position. The final cognition of Brahman as the partless modification of *antahkarana* has, no doubt, *avidyā* as its stuff, but this *avidyā* is not the efficient cause of this cognition. And if the efficient cause of a cognition be a defect the cognition can be truly said to be defective. This is not the case with the cognition of Brahman. So, there is no difficulty here. The cognition of the world, on the other hand, has *avidyā* as both its stuff and the efficient cause, and is hence defective and therefore, the world is definitely false. Brahman is cognized through hearing Vedānta texts and has an object that is never sublated. This is why this cognition is valid and uncontradicted. The cognition of the world, on the other hand, is false as its object is sublated. Every false knowledge is due to a defect. So, it must be admitted that the knowledge of the world is due to *avidyā*, a defect. The false, therefore, is that which is an object of knowledge arising out of a defective source.

In course of the elaboration of this definition, Ānandabodhācārya says that truth is what is non-contradicted and falsity is what is sublated. Here it should be mentioned that what is non-contradicted is also established by means of a valid source of knowledge which has no defect. So, there is no inconsistency in the interpretation of this definition of falsity.

It may be objected that even 'hare's horn'

is to be covered by this definition of falsity, as it too is no object of cognition that arises through a valid source of knowledge. Moreover Brahman also will have to be regarded as false as there are some Advaitins who think that it cannot be known through *vr̥tti*.

But the Advaitins, in reply, propose to take the definition in a still modified manner. They hold that the false is that which is perceived and yet at the same time other than the object of valid knowledge. 'Hare's horn' cannot be perceived at all, as there is no possibility of the presentation of it. So, it cannot be false also. Those, again, who say that Brahman is no object of knowledge must also admit that Brahman cannot be perceived. The definition, therefore, does not apply to Brahman.

The opponents, the Mādhyas, have raised three further objections. But the Advaitin has replied to all the three. The objections and the replies are as follows:

(a) Does 'reality' mean a universal—*sattājāti* (the universal *existence*)—as the Naiyāyika holds? The Naiyāyika believes that as existence is immediately felt as the identical property common to all entities perceived as existent, it must be a universal (*jāti*), and like all universals, inheres in those entities. 'An entity is real' means that the universal *existence* inheres in it. If this also be what the Advaitins mean by the word 'reality' there will arise a difficulty. Brahman, according to them, is real and hence would possess the universal existence inherent in it. But Brahman, again, in their own admission, is without any feature and cannot, therefore, possess this universal existence. Or, in the alternative, Brahman is to possess, a false feature, viz. this universal.

But the Advaitins reply that by the word 'reality' they never mean the universal *existence*. They have definite objections against this Nyāya notion. If an entity can be said to *exist* only as possessing the universal *existence* inherent in it, then this very universal is to exist for that reason, which is absurd because (i) then there would be indefinite re-

gress and also because (ii) Nyāya never admits that a universal can possess, inherent in it, another universal.

(b) What does then the word 'reality' mean? Does it mean uncontradictedness (non-sublation)? But, then, what was the use of so much discussion in connexion with this definition of falsity? It would have been enough if the Advaitin had merely said that the false is that which is sublated. Needless complications might, then, have been avoided.

The Advaitins reply that this too they do not mean.

(c) But then, do they absolutely equate Brahman with the real, and hold that 'reality' is only another name for 'to be Brahman'? If so, falsity would mean 'not to be Brahman'. In that case would the falsity of the world be any serious doctrine at all? That the world is other than Brahman nobody would grudge. All the paraphernalia of logic to prove the falsity of the world would come to establish only the trite 'The world is not Brahman'. This is the fallacy of *Siddha-sādhana*.

The Advaitins reply that they do not mean even this. It is true that the real and Brahman ultimately come to be equated. But certainly the word 'real' does not mean Brahman immediately. It means, 'alternating with other things', what is purported in the fifth definition of Ānandabodha.¹

¹ Falsity has been defined by different Advaita thinkers in different ways. In Advaita literature we get five different definitions of falsity. All of them are alternatively true. In this paper we are discussing the definition of Ānandabodha which is generally regarded as the fifth definition of falsity. Ānandabodha and Padmapāda identify reality with non-temporality or eternality. To them what is non-temporal is real. Prakāśātman means by reality 'that which is never an object of absolute

The opponents may also raise another objection against this definition. If the false is what appears as real but is different from it the definition tries to prove what is already accepted partially. It is already accepted by all that the world at least appears as real and hence this need not be proved again.

But here the Advaitins will reply that the definition should be considered as a whole. Any part of it should not be separated from the context as in that case it loses its significance. Therefore no objection can be legitimately raised against any part of a definition in isolation from the whole context. So the aforesaid charge deserves no consideration at all. This part was inserted only because had it been dropped merely nominal entities like 'hare's horn' would have also to be regarded as false, for they are other than reality though they do not appear.

The Mādhvas may, again, say that the silver superimposed on nacre can never be an example of falsity as it is entirely *asat* in their philosophy. The Advaitins retort that the silver superimposed on nacre cannot be entirely *asat* as it appears and the *asat* cannot appear at all.

Thus all the charges against the definition of Ānandabodha fall to the ground. Therefore his definition of falsity is valid.

negation in the same locus where it appears'. This implies that reality is non-contradicted or eternally non-sublated. Prakāśātman also gives us another definition of reality. This is: the reality is that which never ceases with knowledge. Ānandabodha defines reality in the same line as that of Prakāśātman. To him the real is that the locus of which can never be the locus of its negation. He further adds that the real can never be negated at all. So 'the real' may imply any one of these things.

'Vedānta and modern science both posit a self-evolving Cause. In Itself are all the causes. Take for example the potter shaping a pot. The potter is the primal cause, the clay the material cause, and the wheel the instrumental cause; but the Ātman is all three. Ātman is cause and manifestation too. The Vedantist says, the universe is not real, it is only apparent.'

—Swami Vivekananda

EPISTEMOLOGICAL PROOF OF GOD

BY DR. PRAVAS JIVAN CHAUDHURY

A proof of God may be founded on our knowledge-situation. In other words, an inquiry into the question of how and what we know may lead us to acknowledge God as the explanation of this undergoing on our part. Let us see.

1. I perceive objects like chairs and tables. In this I am aware of myself as subject of perception as distinguished from the objects perceived. Some seek to do away with the subject which, they say, is just a cross-section of the world at a moment, the section that is then perceived, instead of speaking like 'I perceive a table', one should say 'There is a table'. Others seek to do away with the independence of the object which, they say, is adjectival to the mind that perceives; a table is but a quality of the mind at a moment when the mind perceives it. Both of these views are repugnant to common sense and to clear insight as well into the matter which tell us that in knowledge of the table one's mind is related to it in a peculiar subject-object relation which cannot be explained away, nor can it be reduced to some other relation, such as causal or substance-attribute one.

2. Now in perception I actually sense certain sense-qualities or *sensa* and believe certain others, known from previous experience to be associated with, to be there waiting for me or anybody to sense. Thus while I may be visually sensing the colour and shape of the table, I believe its other side and different perspectives, its smell and feel to touch, and many other qualities, to be actually there, only not sensed so far by me or anybody and which may be sensed if I or anyone fulfils certain suitable conditions, such as, for instance, moving about the table and looking at it from all angles, moving near it and touching and smelling it. Perceiving the table is

thus equivalent to sensing certain *sensa* and believing others, all associated with the table and constituting it. A physical object is a complex or family of *sensa*, some sensed and the rest only believed to be there.

3. Now consider the *sensa* that are sensed. They are sharply distinguished from the *sensa* which I have in free imagination, that is, those I deliberately conjure up in my mind. The former are *given to me* while the latter are *produced by me*. Even the *sensa* believed to be associated with those sensed are not freely imagined but one is led to imagine them by the latter; they are believed to be actually there though not sensed, while the imaginary objects are known to be fictitious. Thus perception, and particularly sensation, is an undergoing and not an activity on our part though we may have to voluntarily produce certain bodily and mental conditions for this undergoing, such as opening the eye to see the table or stretching the hand to feel it and attending to the objects. These activities and the organs employed are conditions of our perception though not known to be either sufficient or necessary ones, and so, they are not causes of perception. The object is a necessary condition of perception; and that bodily and mental activities on our part, almost universally found to be associated with perception, are not necessary ones is proved by such phenomena as telepathy and extra-sensory perceptions (E. S. P.) and spirits which are now extensively studied by scientists and are well-established facts. (See e.g. G. N. M. Tyrrell: *The Personality of Man*).

4. The *sensa* actually sensed in perception are given and not made. Yet they are not ultimate existents independent of our mind. We cannot think them to be there without any mind sensing them. The red of a rose cannot be red when none perceives

it just as the charm of a personality cannot exist when none is about the person to appreciate it. Certainly there is a strong belief that the *sensa* are still there though unsensed, but this is an illusion caused by our habit and custom, we construct in the mind the *sensa* we anticipate and believe them to be there just as we are led to do the same thing with regard to the unsensed *sensa* associated with the actually sensed ones in the so-called physical things. In each case there is an intuitive or immediate inference giving us the unsensed *sensa* which may be said to exist, but in a sense different from that in which the sensed ones are said to exist. We say the *sensa* of the inside of the drawer, when closed, exist; they are what one might sense if one could be inside the drawer and looked and felt. We imagine what one *might* sense and believe the objects of this *possible* sensation to be actually there. But this kind of existence must be distinguished from that enjoyed by the actually sensed *sensa*, so that the *sensa* depend on our mind for their existence. So they must be given to us by something beyond them. They are not perfectly opaque and hard data. This suspicion is strengthened by another feature they have: they continuously change and fly even without our interference with them and they change according to certain laws. This leads us to imagine something at their back which operates them. This something is imperceptible for it is behind the *sensa* and is their cause, and it is other than our mind for we have no control over it. It impresses on our minds with the *sensa* we sense in a regular manner; and from these *sensa* and because of this regularity we learn to anticipate others which we believe to be there even when not sensed by any mind.

5. This imperceptible other, over against which our minds are pitched in sensation, must be active, for it forces the *sensa* upon the mind. Secondly, this active cause must be of the nature of the mind to act upon the latter, for cause and effect must be homogeneous to make sense of the causal process. Thirdly, this active mind-like cause or spirit

must be methodical, and so, intelligent, for how else can the laws of nature, according to which the *sensa* are found to change (when we do not interfere with them), be understood? Again, how else can the remarkable correlation of the *sensa*,—made out by different minds, and by the same mind as it changes the position of its body, be accounted for? Fourthly, this spiritual cause of our *sensa* must be one, for there is perfect coordination in the universe, and the laws of nature are the same everywhere so far as we know them. Fifthly, this spirit must be above space and time yet pervading all space and time in order to operate constantly everywhere and everywhen. The spirit is thus transcendent-immanent. Again, it is as infinitely vast and everlasting as the sensible world; yet because it is a spirit beyond the sensible world which it impresses upon like-spirits, human and animal minds, it must be conceived as a spaceless and timeless infinity. That is, viewed as in contact with the world it imprints upon minds, the spirit is co-extensive with space and time, and so, is as infinite as the world is thought to be. This is quantitative infinite. The spirit may as well be viewed as a qualitative infinite, in the sense in which one's mind as standing above all one's perceptions and doings is an infinite; or as the perfect beauty of a flower or the harmony of a figure or a piece of music is one. This infinite means a measureless or non-quantitative entity, not an endless quantity.

6. We take up now the third point mentioned above for closer consideration. There is a super-mind behind the sensible phenomena which are excited in our minds by this agency in a regular manner, so that learning its ways from experience we can conduct life without surprise and frustration at every step. In fact, if there were absolutely no method in the sensible phenomena there would not be any life possible and there would be neither surprise nor frustration, as there would be no expectation or habit of anticipation. The changes in *sensa*, with or without changes in the position of our bodies, take place accord-

ing to the laws of perspective and cause and effect. These we gather from experience through our common sense, and apply in practice for efficient living which includes interpersonal communication and exploitation of nature for the benefit of life. Because these laws are constant we have ideas of permanent substances. Thus we believe that certain *sensa* will be met by us if we move in certain directions and use certain organs appropriately and that our individual sense-reports will be quite harmonious on the whole; and again, we believe in the actual existence of what we do not sense at the moment, the causes and effects (hidden from our perception) of things actually sensed. Now all these beliefs, engendered by the regular behaviour of things in the past, have a psychological necessity about them. And they lead us to believe in an objective conceptual world only a fraction of which is actually given to our senses. We commonly say that there exist in space and time substances having sensible qualities and these substances undergo changes because of interactions according to causal laws, leading to changes in the configuration of qualities. All these go on, we say, independent of our perception, we only happen to sense certain random portions of this big show that goes on about us quite on its own right. We may, however, interfere with this world a little, but nothing of it depends on our perception, which is not an activity but a passive witnessing, as we have seen here. This realistic faith is generated in us by the remarkable constancy of the laws of nature. Science and common sense believe in this objective world, so that if there appears in their study of nature any conflict in the reports of several observers about a thing, they hold that some of the reports may be wrong and not that the fact might be an abnormal one. Again, if an event is reported to have happened for which no cause could be found, either the report is declared wrong or the cause is declared to be so far unknown but not absent. This is the faith and methodological policy of science and common sense

whose task is to work out and exhibit the details of coordination that they believe to exist in our experience. The success of our scientific enterprise, which is but the extension and refinement of our common sense effort to know and master our environment, is known as a kind of proof of the correctness of its basic presupposition of an ordered conceptual world. We might, however, say that it is a proof that the spirit behind the world is a constant producer and correlator of sense qualities. Thus the naive realism of science and common sense can be traced to and explained by an idealistic principle of the kind we have offered here.

7. Now we are to face a few difficulties. First, how can a spirit, other than our mind, really act upon it? We have hypnotizers and telepathic communicators amongst us, no doubt, on the analogy of which we can conceive this cosmic spirit prompting us to sense *sensa*. But then the problem of relation of this spirit and the individual mind remains; for inter-personal communication itself may pose a problem. How can a mind affect another unless they have some underground community? There must be some common mental continuum of which our individual minds are but parts; the mind does not stop at the bounds of the body, it is nothing but a spiritual atmosphere. Again we see that the *sensa* are correlated with our organic movements and will, so that as I or others move our eyes or feel about us with hands, these *sensa* appear in regular order, because of which I am able to construct an objective world of physical things in common space and time. To find a solution of these two problems we have to think of this spiritual exciter of *sensa* as *in* us and prompting us to sense not only whatever it wants to sense but also to move and adjust our bodies and sense-organs in a fitting manner. Thus it is that a perfect correlation or unison is found amongst the two series of events, the organic conditions of sensation and the extra-organic *sensa* actually sensed by the mind. Again,

this spirit must be one and residing in all the individual minds, human and animal, for there is a correlation amongst their sensations. The spirit is thus to be conceived as an over-mind of ours of which our minds are but parts and a lower mode. That they are parts can well be understood, we are like so many eyes and ears of a great mind that sees and hears through them. That they constitute a lower mode of the over-mind may be understood on the analogy of our dream-mind as related to our ordinary waking one, for the latter prompts the former to sense objects. The dream-mind is a mode of the ordinary waking mind, one which the latter assumes and rules by a kind of hypnotic spell so that the objects appearing before the dream-mind are taken by it for given realities though they are not so for the waking mind which creates for its pleasure. Thus the individual minds are to be regarded as so many dream-selves of the cosmic spirit that dreams through them this world. The analogy, however, breaks down at several points. Thus an individual mind does not have many dream-selves at once but only one at a time. Then the dream breaks up to reveal the empirical world while no such breaking up of this empirical world into another has so far been experienced by us and is psychologically inconceivable for this reason; the expression 'the world is a dream,' appears to be meaningless to us. Further the individual dreamer gets his dream-objects from his empirical experience but wherefrom does the cosmic dreamer get the originals of his cosmic dream, this world? However, these difficulties of the analogy are not damaging to the thesis proposed here. For this analogy is not offered as an evidence for the thesis but as a help to understand it, and no analogy stands on all fours. Yet as an analogical argument, the dream analogy is not altogether ineffec-

tual, for one may say that dreaming is a characteristic activity of the spirit that indulges in it in various planes, and just as we have dreams within a dream, this world may be a dream within which we have our ordinary dreams. The spirit enjoys projecting objects taking them for realities; thus it assumes a self-deluded mode or attitude that accepts passively and blindly as given what it really has but conjured up. However, the main argument for the existence of a cosmic dreamer is not dream analogy but what we have given above, namely, that the *sensa* appear to be given to us and yet we cannot take them as self-subsistent objects independent of our sensing them. They have to be regarded as impressions made on us by a spirit which must be somehow our spirit, not an alien one, which controls our *sensa* and the bodily movements and wills in perfect order. This spirit may be imagined to be our over-mind, such that it is the mind of all of us and that we are its dream-selves. The dream analogy need not be pushed very far either as a help to understanding or as an argument. However, if we must speak in terms of this analogy we have to think of the cosmic spirit as a dreamer of dreams through us who are its dream-selves, and it gets the dream-objects from nowhere but its own imagination which is truly creative and not re-creative like ours; and this spirit arises from the dream only in such states as are spoken by some as cosmic dissolution or *pralaya*, when it comes to its own and there are no world and individual minds. All this is difficult for us to think, for we lack the requisite experiences, but to argue from this psychological difficulty to the absolute impossibility of such things is illogical and dogmatic blocking of philosophical research.

(To be Concluded)

'The best proof a Hindu sage gives about the soul, about God, is—"I have seen the soul; I have seen God",'

—Swami Vivekananda

NOTES AND COMMENTS

TO OUR READERS

'Our Universe: A Blend of the Seen and the Unseen' from the facile pen of Sri S. N. Rao is a piece of scientific philosophy which the moderns like. No philosopher who wants to base his thesis on the data supplied by positive sciences can say anything new and Sri Rao has not given us anything unexpected. Whatever he has said he has said rationally and beautifully. 'All evolution appears,' says he, 'to be nothing else but a slow transformation, an emergence of the imperceptible to become perceptible. . . . It does not however appear that the traffic is all one way. While the unmanifest is slowly changing into the manifest, we see that the manifest is also changing, rather going back, to the unmanifest. . . . Whatever exists, exists eternal either in the manifest or in the unmanifest, and never ceases to be.' Following Swami Vivekananda, Sri Rao says, 'That unseen at a point is what we call *ākāśa* in Vedānta; it is the "undifferentiated all-extensive substance, the raw material out of which everything is composed." That unseen is apparently empty space, which is non-dimensional.' To him Spirit 'appears to be in a different category altogether, away from Matter-cum-Energy pattern.' 'If we accept a purpose and a design in the Universe we have only to look to that Spirit. . . .' So with Rao Spirit is the efficient cause only, wherein he departs from Vedānta. To him the Universe is a 'blend,' 'a synthesis of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*,' which are evidently different. Still he would have us believe '*Vāsudevaḥ sarvamiti*.' Without reaching the ultimate unity he cannot be satisfied. . . .

Principal Kshitish Chandra Chakravarti, M.A., B.L., Kalna college, Burdwan, has discussed in 'The Transcendental Ego and the Transcendent Self', the '*Ānandamaya*', a very knotty topic in the Vedānta philosophy, creditably and has thrown a flood

of light on this important subject. The peculiarity of the scholarly delineation lies in the fact that it has freely and lucidly drawn upon the Eastern and Western philosophies and has explained an ancient though eternal theme in terms easily understandable by the moderns. The four stages of consciousness, the waking, dreaming, etc. have been endowed with deeper psychological import. The creator, creation, and the creature are but fabrications of the psyche—'the same one Subject shines' alone. . . .

Swami Siddheswarananda, head of Centre Vedāntique Ramakrishna in France, has, in the article entitled 'A Remarkable Verse from the *Gītā*', selected the eighteenth *śloka* of the Fourth Chapter as the key to unlock the treasury of the Vedānta philosophy to the moderns. 'This verse', says the Swami, 'is regarded by Śaṅkara as one of the most important in the Advaita teaching on the subject of action'. 'The *Gītā* tells us that the whole world is action, that is to say, multiple expression of energy. In that wisdom of the *sthita-prajña* there is no sense of ego. (So) whatever be the action done, for him it is inaction.' Who then acts? The Swami continues, 'but when the sage breathes, speaks, goes, and does the various actions in life, he knows that it is nature in its integrality which acts and not himself. So, all that he does is inaction. But in the case of the man who has not realized the Truth, even his cessation from action is also an action.' For he considers himself as the agent of the effort to cease acting, even as action in the act of dead stopping of a carriage in motion is felt in the tension of 'thought and muscles'. . . .

'The Concept of Falsity' by Sri Nirod Baran Chakraborty of the Department of Philosophy, Darjeeling Government College, is a sample of how the ancient philosophers in India used to argue their cases, according to the Nyāya method, with their opponents.

Ānandabodha is an important philosopher of the Advaita school, and the concept of 'falsity' occupies the central place in Indian philosophy ever since Śaṅkara has propounded his Advaita philosophy. Sri Chakraborty, however, has followed the orthodox method too rigidly to be fully appreciated by our Western readers. Others will follow the chain of reason with great interest. . . .

There are superstitions, both ancient and modern, which are equally ludicrous and immortal. One such modern superstition is to seek the proof of God in matter, despite the horrible absurdity involved in the search. By definition matter is diametrically opposed to consciousness, and God is consciousness in a higher sense. And yet modern minds try to establish a causal relation between the two, knowing full well that the effect is but a mode of the cause and therefore the two cannot but be homogeneous. As long as we do not change the definition of matter we cannot derive matter from God or God from matter. Hence scientific explanation or proof of God is as good as a square-circle.

If God is of the kind of consciousness, proof of the existence of God must be sought in consciousness, in its analysis. Indian metaphysics, almost from their birth, are all epistemological. Their approach has always been through the analysis of *jñāna*. And consciousness is so fundamental that even to refute it one has to take recourse to consciousness. Hence its reality is self-evident. The most incontrovertible, in fact, the only rational, approach to God can therefore be methodological. And Dr. P. J. Chaudhury's 'Epistemological Proof of God' is a brilliant performance in this regard.

INDIAN SOCIETY

From the *Mahābhārata* it is evident that there was a stage in the development of Indian society when there was no marriage, and up to the very recent times we have seen that marriage became so sacrosanct that dissolution was unthinkable. How could society move from one extreme to the other? It

was not merely God's command, as in the Catholic society. We had occasions to mention that the aim of the Vedic *ṛsis* was to build a divine society, a society where men and women would be inebriated with divine love and would build divine brotherhood of men. Marriage became indissoluble because of this noble urge. A divine brotherhood of men requires divine men and women who dedicate their lives to producing children holy from the conception and to training them to divinity in order to make them worthy torch-bearers. This was a task not of a few years but of the whole life. Dissolution of marriage would have made the task impossible of execution to any appreciable degree.

To produce holy children the married couple must be holier than the holy monks. To attain to that holiness and to preserve it intact under adverse conditions require great strength of mind and stern discipline. This itself is a life's work. And then to develop a pound of flesh and bone into a strong vehicle of divine forces, and incipient feeling of mere heat and cold and hunger into a receptacle of noble and sublime thoughts and emotions stretching up to the Infinite is a task whose idea makes our brain reel. Our heads bend low in utter reverence to this wonderful conception and its fine execution for several centuries. Evil days came, execution became difficult, and at last the idea was forgotten. The divine society turned into one of idle brutes. The fall is real and pathetic, but the idea and its execution are a piece of sublime history, undeniable and worthy of imitation.

Marriage, to a Vedic, is a preparation and training for invoking the Divine to incarnate in order to accept service and worship as a child, to give and take help and association as a youth, to achieve and show greater heights of spirituality, and to reveal what death really is and how to embrace it—death, an entrance into a more joyous and freer and ampler life. Society is a joint undertaking in the interplay of spirits, where matter burns incense to them. This aim cannot be achieved with pleasure as the incentive. It

requires high culture and higher spirit of sacrifice to bring down the kingdom of Heaven on earth, rather convert matter into spirit, earth into heaven. Dissolution of marriage ties takes place because of incompatibility of nature, which is produced by following different ideals by the parties. Here the ideal is settled and joyfully accepted by both the husband and the wife, and circumstances have been created to help both to attend the ideal. The entire life is a venture in dedication of self to this ideal and not in the aggrandizement of self. Hence the question of dissolution does not arise; nor is it sought by either of the couple. Nay, this solemn promise and undertaking to reach the goal together goes beyond deaths and births till the two merge their individualities in the universal. The Vedic society is based on the unity and universality of the spirit.

Here the society is not something to be shunned or avoided. It is not a drag to be removed or a tempter to be driven off. It is a field of *sādhanā* or spiritual practice, to remove a wrong conception that man is the flesh and to substitute the truth that he is the spirit and then to start a blissful sport of spirits, encased or uncased. This society is the real heaven, if there be one anywhere. It is with this end in view that four *āśramas* were instituted, that all relations were made permanent and inviolable. Evanescence of the world was never preached. The *Gītā*'s foundational *śloka* is that being and non-being are not convertible, one into the other—nothing passes off. What is permanently, what is not does not exist even for a moment. What the Veda preaches is not evanescence, but non-being, of the world. The world of matter is not, never exists, and that which does not exist can never fade away. So impermanence has never been spoken of reality but of appearance, which being manifold takes and forsakes names and forms. And the Veda invites people from what is not to what is. Lest men should commit a grievous mistake, the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* itself explains the two passages '*tamaso mā jyotirgamaya*' and

'*mṛtyor mā amṛtaṁ gamaya*,' (which literally mean 'lead me from darkness to light' and 'lead me from death to immortality') as really meaning what is meant by the first line, viz. '*asato mā sad gamaya*,' i.e. 'lead me from non-being (or appearance) to being (or reality)'. The Śruti never deals with the world we experience and know, but with the reality that we are, sporting and immutable. *Vairāgya*, dispassion, is enjoined not with regard to fading existents but as regards false things that do not exist, and that, with a view to effecting return to reality.

It is because of this that we find an apparent contradiction between the Vedic dictum 'Brahman alone is real and the world is false' and the permanent structure of the Vedic society. Men in society are instructed to take the facts as they are and not to bother about the forms, which are chained by the *pratītya samutpāda*, not to float on the surface and try to change the waves but to dive deep and change the under-current if need be or to enjoy the variegated nature of the deep reality. If man goes on changing relations, busies himself with constant adjustments, the currents are so numerous, particulars are so bewildering and illusive, that he will never find time to dive deep, never come face to face with reality. Reforms that he wants to bring about will never come into being. It is the contour of the bed of the ocean that directs current mainly. If the contour does not change currents cannot be permanently controlled, reforms cannot be effected. And it is the whole earth that changes the contour by seismic adjustments. It goes on changing not according to this man's or that nation's bidding but according to its own laws, its own nature. The Oversoul works in accordance with its eternal *karmas*, He brings about changes in proper time and place, throws up individuals and nations with definite ends and purposes. Blind men are automata in His hands. So the Śruti seems to say: 'Man, busy not yourself with appearances, dive deep, see the working of the Oversoul, be one with Him. If He wants to work through you let

Him, if He does not, allow that also joyously. For your willingness or unwillingness matters not to Him but to you, as by your unwillingness you keep yourself separate from Him and therefore invite troubles, being in the midst of appearances. Fix your eyes on reality and be real. It is by being real yourself that you really help others to improve, which is being real.'

To devote oneself to this grand task of being real one needs peace. Constant adjustments are the negation of peace and therefore of the search for reality. Hence permanent homes, permanent partners of life, etc. are essential for those who seek unification with the Oversoul. As long as that grand purpose of society remains bright before our eyes, as long as every man and woman understands this and endeavours to work it out in his or her life so long conjugal divorces and parental or brotherly separations, division of properties, quarrels, breaking of heads do not appear. When that is forgotten all these and many more rear their heads even in unexpected quarters. By the application of the double method of difference and agreement, a universally accepted law of logic, man should know the cause of troubles and try to remove that. Perversity goads him on to greater and greater troubles, warnings of saints and prophets notwithstanding. It is not by the adjustment of surface life but by living the deeper life, which is the life of the spirit, being spirit oneself, and looking upon others as spirits which they really are, that peace is attained, prosperity blooms forth, happiness surges on. Peaceful human relationship is the means, Vedic knowledge the end. When the two combine the ideal society, which the Veda envisages, is born. That is the society of the divine—man is no longer the flesh, he is the spirit; and activities are surgings of *ānanda*, bliss. But can it be attained without undergoing discipline and hard training? The way to *ānanda* is through austerities. Flesh must be denied before spirit is accepted. Or the two, the denial of the flesh and the acceptance of the spirit, should go together for

years, a hard struggle indeed, to attain ultimately the joy that knows no break.

WHO WORKS WELL?

Any movement is work. Because our body, sense-organs, and mind are constantly moving we are always working. Even when we rest there is movement, hence activity. But we do not honour such activities by calling them work. What then is work?

We work in fields and factories, in schools and hospitals, in offices and parliaments; we are said to be working when we are sitting quiet and mentally solving a problem or visualizing the construction of a bridge or evolving a plan of counterattacking our enemies. But we are not working when our houses are burning and we run about in a frenzy, or when our dear ones are dying and we beat our breasts and tear our hair, or when we patiently and laboriously build a superstructure and detonate a dynamic at its base at the same moment. Why so? It is the purpose that makes the big difference. And the nobler the purpose behind a work, the greater the value of the work.

What constitutes nobility? Man generally works for money and pleasures, which, though everybody runs after them, are considered ignoble. The next spring of action, especially in modern times, is the improvement of one's race or nationality, or humanity. Man's sacrifice centres round these three ideals. And it is admitted, at least in public, that to work for the improvement of humanity is the noblest. Improvement being physical, mental, moral, and spiritual, it is to be sought according to needs; and when other needs are met the need for the last is felt and should then be supplied. In this sense the last improvement is considered the noblest.

What is this spirit? It cannot be directly expressed. Its nearest approach is felt in our consciousness of *I*, in the awareness of all *my* work, thought, and feeling, minus my exclusiveness. When this feeling of *I* and *mine* covers the whole universe, makes me in rapport with each and all of the world, I am

said to be spiritual, to have realized the spirit. The culmination is reached when our material world appears as spiritual, and its plan and purpose, process and method, appear as emanating from this spirit, which is *I*.

This spirit is the truth. Reason, helped by the sense-organs, maybe aided by instruments and apparatuses, is said to be the discoverer of all empirical truths. But scientists and philosophers know that the highest discoveries have all been intuited first and rationalized next—they are revealed truths put in the framework of reason. And it is this rational background, that otherness around, that creates the illusion of the subject and the object, and next, of matter and mind. In the stage of intuition they are in deep embrace, each wholly in the other, the *ardha-nārīśwara*. The approach to truth is from duality to unity, from the many to the one. Discovery of laws and principles means gathering of many into the few and of the few into one; of the more limited into the less limited, and of the least limited into the unlimited. This is the highest intuition, the deepest truth. Nobleness has a meaning with reference to this. Thoughts and actions are noble or ignoble as they lead to or away from it.

Racial or national well-being, if not directed towards it, turns out to be suicidal, as is clearly illustrated by the modern attempts to such improvements. Humanism by itself is a meaningless ideal leading people nowhere. Providing food and shelter to men and women is understandable, is in fact not a problem, if selfishness does not intervene. But beyond that, 'doing good' differs from man to man. Even education, which is a universally accepted item of 'doing good,' differs from man to man and nation to nation; and the UNESCO's endeavour to evolve a universal standard is partially successful, success depending on its agreement with spirituality. It is but logical that any standard short of universality should divide man and create troubles. And no concept is universal except

being or knowledge or love. As long as our *I* is not equated with this being, knowledge, or love we are exclusive beings, with desires to possess ourselves by dispossessing others. Humanism based on universal love is the right ideal. If so, why call it humanism, why not call it what it is—love, *priya*, 'dearness'?

Being, knowledge, dearness (love) are universals. They are particularized because of their association with particulars, such as bodies, sense-organs, etc. in case of being; and subjects and objects in case of knowledge and dearness. These particulars are modes or peculiar ways of being (or existence), knowledge (or awareness), and love (or dearness). We have already seen (October issue) how being without knowledge and knowledge without being are impossible to conceive—they are one. Love apart from knowledge is equally impossible. We have seen that this knowledge or awareness is our being or *I*, which is both the lovable and the lover. We love an object as much as we infuse our *I* into it. Husband is loved to the degree wife is there in him. When this infusion of one into the other ceases, love goes and separation takes place. We can but love ourselves, our *I*'s. So being, knowledge, and love are one. And this One is the source of all feelings, thoughts, and actions, all of which come back to It, having given rise to and having passed through many particulars, which are also It, Its modes.

Who works then? This One. For whom? For this One. For whom are these particulars or multiplicity? For this One. Who are they? This One. We may, rather should, call it Love, when we talk of work or dynamism of any kind. Who works then? Love. Who works best? Love. And Love being knowledge is infallible, being existence immortal. An individual works best when his identification with this Love is complete, works well to the degree his identification approaches completion.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

THE IDEA OF GOD IN ŚAIVA-SIDDHĀNTA.
By T.M.P. MAHADEVAN, M.A., PH.D., PROF. OF
PHILOSOPHY, UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS. *Published*
by Annamalai University, P.O. Annamalainagar, S.
India. Pp. 43. Price Rs. 3.

The four chapters of this valuable exposition of Śaiva-Siddhānta doctrines correspond to four lectures arranged for 1953 by the Annamalai University under an endowment that Śrīlasrī Kāśivāsi Arulnandi Tambirān of the Tirupanandal Math has made in honour of his revered predecessor. The endowment is meant to encourage the study of Śaiva-Siddhānta, the chief stipulations being that every year four lectures are to be delivered on the principles of this philosophy, three in the Benares Hindu University and one in the Allahabad University, and that the lecturer, 'chosen irrespective of sex or caste,' is to bring on the return journey 'a pot of the holy waters of the Ganges for presentation at the Lord Śrī Natarājā's shrine at Chidambaram for abhishekam.' Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyer, while congratulating Dr. Mahadevan on having 'produced a handy synthesis of the system,' stresses, in his Foreword, 'the importance of Śaiva-Siddhānta,' 'especially at the present moment when antagonisms are stimulated as between Sanskritic and Tamil influences.' We may add that the very endowment, the history of the Math, the outlook of its heads, and the conditions for the lectures present many features that must inspire thoughtful people, Hindu or Muslim, living in any quarter, not only north or south. For the founder of the Tirupanandal Math was 'the holy seer-poet, Kumaragurupara Swamiji' whose exposition of the Siddhānta and of Kamban's Rāmāyaṇa in Benares impressed 'the Great Moghul, Akbar,' so much that he 'raised a grand Math for the inspired savant,' that stands on the bank of the Ganges even today.

With his characteristically direct and engaging style, Dr. Mahadevan shows us the uniqueness of Śaiva-Siddhānta, taking us smoothly through a brief yet forcible presentation and refutation of the positions taken up by the various other systems of thought—Lokāyata, Sautrāntika-Bauddha, Mādhyamika, Jaina, Mīmāṃsā, Kālavāda, Naiyāyika, Sāṃkhya, and Advaita's Māyāvāda. The turns of the discussion are made interesting, in true teaching style, by the timely introduction, by the speaker himself, of precisely those questions that any listener would like to put to him for further elucidation. For example: If God is the giver of all knowledge, why should

some know less and some more? Why should God endow the soul with instruments of knowledge? Or, how are we to know God before He can redeem us? The concluding lecture on 'God the Redeemer' explains the different degrees in the removal of dirt from the seeker's mind through the 'descent of God's grace' the functions of the *guru*, and the types of initiation, leading up to the condition of the *Jīvanmukta*. The attitude of 'synthesis' and the dignified manner of presentation, natural to the Doctor, add to the value of this volume, which is one of the many the University has brought out.

S. N.

AN INTELLECTUAL PRIMER. By JAY, C. KNODE. *Published by Philosophical Library, 15, East 40th. Street, New York 16. pp. 88. Price \$2.50.*

In this little volume Mr. Knode undertakes to orient the modern man to his intellectual world. Man occupies in the world a position of unique significance which can hardly be by way of his size, or of his individual capacity to survive. He is on the contrary what he is, because of his fore-brain and its capacities. This unique possession of man has resulted in the phenomenal achievements of science, and has opened up before him the door of unimaginable possibilities, at the sight of which mankind today is rather afraid of his own success. But, with an analytical study of the inner nature of man, Mr. Knode points a way out of this fear. Man is not 'only an animal that receives stimulus from the world around him and makes responses to it, but a higher animal that thinks, imagines, and creates art, religion, and philosophy; and has a profound sense value. Man like all other animals lives in this world of senses, but unlike all of them, goes beyond it in his curiosity, vision, and imagination. It is in the sincere recognition of this beyond aspect of man, in the discovery of ideals and values that man can hope to realize his true self and secure peace, freedom, and health for the human race.

This in brief is the moral Mr. Knode draws from a study of the achievements made by applied science during the last decade. His approach is scientific, but happily without the limitations of a specialist. He looks at life with the eyes of a philosopher, tries to understand it in the light of modern science, and reveals his own thought beautifully as a poet. Those who are interested in the problems and solution of the spiritual crisis

of man in the modern world will find something admirable in this little volume.

ANIL KUMAR BANERJEE

THE CULTURE AND HERITAGE NUMBER (1956) OF THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE MYTHIC SOCIETY. EDITED BY SRI S. SRIKANTAYA. *Published by the Mythic Society at the Daly Memorial Hall, Cenotaph Road, Bangalore-2. (India) Price Rs. 10-0-0.*

The 'Mythic Society,' founded in May 1909, is a unique institution in the sense that it was the first of its kind in India to be started by Indian scholars who chose the name 'Mythic' for it (as the message of a Founder-Member—Mr. Krumhiegel—to the Number, explains) because it was not only the most innocuous *then*, from the point of view of service rules but also suggestive (owing to its Greek origin) of matters connected with the dawn of history and even pre-history. The Quarterly Journal of the Society inaugurated in 1909 October has devoted itself to subjects of historical, literary and cultural interests, for well-nigh half a century now and for *the unfailing regularity of its publication* has few equals in India.

The number aptly opens with a very instructive and informative article by the Editor on Aśoka-Devānāmpriya whose centuries-old contribution to the cultural heritage is still with us to mould our policies in the national and international spheres. Professor Humayun Kabir's brief but brilliant survey of Indian history entitled "Unity in Diversity," appropriately ends on the appreciative note that "the tolerant, synthetic and synoptic spirit of ancient Indian thought has given to her culture throughout the ages, resilience and flexibility which have enabled it to resist all attempts to break its continuity." Sardar Panikkar clarifies the three characteristics of Indian Culture as 'wide tolerance, universal outlook and its inalienable faith in the worth of the individual.' Dr. K. M. Munshi in his scholarly review of 'the long career of our culture' sums up past achievements and rightly pleads that the Universities must take up the challenge of the new crisis, our Culture is facing now. Interesting articles on the study of anthropology, the art of dancing, on astronomy (and astrology), studies in the history of Mysore and South India (generally) and in its early literature (the article on 'Śilappadhikāram,' for example) and investigations in regional geography (like the one on Maḷa-Nāḍu)—all testify to the wide range of the topics treated.

"A Central Asian Study" is a thought-provoking paper which while reviewing past researches,

into "the Garden of Eden South of the Sea of Aral" highlights the value of studies in Avesta and the teachings of Zoroaster. This article and other papers on the Bhagavadgītā, Buddhism, Jainism, Jesus, the date of Śaṅkarācārya, the Philosophy of Pilleylōkācārya and on Gandhism—all bring into relief the broad cultural outlook of Bhārata, which considers all religions as but so many varying manifestations of one Universal Religion in different spatial and temporal settings.

Inspiring messages from scholars of repute and men of distinction in the public life of the country and some beautiful illustrations on art-paper enhance the value of the Number. The absence of a uniform and consistent system of transliteration and the indifferent get-up are minor blemishes in a volume, the publication of which does credit to the Editor, Curator, and other office-bearers of the Mythic Society.

V. M. APTE

SANSKRIT

DHARMA. BY SWAMI AGAMANANDA. *Published by the author from Ramakrishna Advaita Ashrama, P.O. Kaladi, T. C. State. Pp. 79+vii. Price Re. 1*

This beautiful brochure is a translated and abridged compilation of the speeches and writings of the learned author in Malayalam. The first section, the most comprehensive of all, was delivered at the Sanatana College, Alleppy. Having refuted direct perception and inference as proofs of knowledge, the Swami has declared, *à la* the orthodox tradition, the Vedas to be the primary one. Discipline, purity, charity, and truth are the four parts of Dharma according to Vyāsa. Then the writer passes on to discuss the decline of Dharma in the present age. 'Sri Ramakrishna,' he concludes, 'incarnated in our age to prevent the present decline of Dharma and to enunciate the ways and means for the stoppage of that decline. And Swami Vivekananda explained the import of Dharma as the age and people demanded. The repeated study of the life and teachings of Sri Ramakrishna and the works of Swami Vivekananda will enable you to grasp the manifoldness of Dharma and the various paths to its approach' (p. 48). The second, third, fourth, and fifth sections treat of the performance of Dharma, Dharma and politics, Dharma and wealth, and a general retrospect of the previous sections respectively. There is an appendix containing many relevant quotations from scriptures bearing on the subject.

The book is nicely printed and serves well as an introduction to the study and practice of Dharma.

B. R.

NEWS AND REPORTS

RAMAKRISHNA ASHRAMA PATHURIAGHATA

Report for the years 1952, 1953, 1954.

The Students' Home : The Home is primarily meant for meritorious students in indigent circumstances. Every year the number of the students receiving help is increasing. The average number of students in 1952 was 60 of whom 51 were free. The following year on the acquiring of a new building for the Home the roll went up to 110 of whom 82 were free. In 1954 there were an average of 116 students of whom 89 were free. Most of the students mentioned as free were supplied not only with free board and lodging but in most cases with books, tuition-fees, clothing, and all other requirements.

The Home maintained a small tutorial staff consisting mostly of ex-students in order to help those who are deficient in studies. The results therefore have been excellent as shown below:

Intermediate Examinations—

	appeared	passed
1952	16	15
1953	14	14
1954	25	18

Degree Examinations—

1952	8	6
1953	12	12
1954	13	13

M.A., M.Sc., & M.Com., Exams.—

1952	3	3
1954	2	2

One ex-student of the Home who, since taking his M.Sc. degree, had been serving it as a resident tutor for some years obtained the degree of D.Phil. in 1952.

Except cooking all the manual work is done by the students. Much importance is attached to this since it teaches them that all work is worship and no work is too low for them. Daily *upāsānās* are held both in the morning and evening. Almost every Sunday in the afternoon a discourse is given on a subject which has a bearing on the cultural and moral life of the nation. Now and again, distinguished scholars from outside are also invited to address the students. Debates are organized among the students from time to time.

Arrangements for teaching Hindi and Music have been recently made. The number of books in the library rose from 1957 at the end of 1952 to 3317 at the end of 1954. The reading room had 4 newspapers and 14 journals in 1954. A

seminar has recently been started with the help of a Government grant. A hall has been set apart for the purpose and this has been equipped with suitable furniture, lights, etc. A collection of text-books and books of reference is also under way.

During the autumn vacation of 1954 a Youth Leadership Training Camp was organized at Kamar-pukur, and lasted for eleven days. The University of Calcutta bore all the expenses incurred for the camp. The Ashrama is grateful to it for this.

As usual, the birth-anniversary of Swami Vivekananda was celebrated on an elaborate scale in the years under review. In December 1954, the Birth Centenary of the Holy Mother Sri Sarada Devi was celebrated. In 1954 the old and the present boys worked jointly in collecting funds to help the victims of Bihar and Assam floods. His Excellency Dr. H. C. Mukherji, Governor of West Bengal, Sri Atul Chandra Gupta, and Dr. J. C. Ghosh, the then Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University, presided over the meetings of the annual ceremony of *Vratadīkṣā*.

The Vivekananda Social Welfare Centre, Ram-bagan: The Centre came into being sometime in May, 1952. It was at first started by students of the Home as a night school for adults of the slum, where a large number of Harijans lived. Beginning with four the roll swelled to 20 in the first month. Separate classes were arranged for the younger ones who came along with the adults. Soon a complete section meant for the children took shape with about 100 children on the rolls. The present number is 130. Recently this has been recognized as a primary school.

Apart from conducting educational tours, sports and picnics, and free music classes for talented ones, the Centre organizes a number of religious and social celebrations annually. It has recently started a Cooperative Society among the Harijans. A Milk Canteen is being run right from the inception of the Centre. About 300 to 400 children receive milk every day. The milk powder is supplied by UNICEF and UCRW. Every year cotton garments and blankets are distributed. In 1953, 120 blankets and 200 garments for children, and in 1954, 150 blankets were distributed. The Centre is also conducting a Library and a Reading Room for the people of the slum. Though small they fulfil a vital need of the people. The Library contains 300 books and the Reading room offers 6 periodicals including a daily.

In 1953, 30 adults attained literacy and in

1954, 20. Altogether 80 have attained literacy since the Centre started working. But the number of literate adults who had lapsed into illiteracy but have since been reclaimed through the efforts of the Centre, must be 100 or more. After three years' efforts the literacy among the Harijans has risen from barely 5% to 15%. 200 to 300 adults

receive education through Social Education classes. For them film-shows, *Kathakatās*, and other activities are frequently arranged.

The Social Welfare Centre is entirely staffed by the students of the Home and the credit of its organization and efficient conduct is entirely due to them.

ERRATA

We are extremely sorry that along with change of the press, proofs corrected at Mayavati failed owing to the floods to reach the Publication Department in time, and in the anxiety to publish it punctually, print order for the October number was unfortunately given without waiting for the proofs. This has resulted in numerous mistakes, some of them serious ones, which are here corrected.

Page	Col.	Line	For	Read	Page	Col.	Line	For	Read
398	I	10	guidance	the guidance	412	I	9	space-time	space-time,
		28	Delete the	last sentence.			19,27,		
399	I	19	'first'	'now'			30	Fleatic(s)	Eleatic(s)
		33	like	liked	414	I	7	experience...is	experiences...are
		35	age	ago	415	I	3	receive	resolve
400	I	30	prayer	prayers			39	lies	lie
	2	22	palpable	palpable for anyone	416	I	5	Cavid	Caird
401	2	3	with	later with	417	2	18	in	into
404	I	32	unconscious	unexplained	418	I	1	service of all	(service of all)
	2	14	spiritual	a spiritual				prosperity of all	(prosperity of all)
405	I	13	troubles	burden	422	2	17	also	also be
	2	32	put	put it			27	but I	but the I
407	2	-8	spirituality that	spirituality,	424	2	8	mind	mind,
408	2	-2	curse	curses	427	I	7	of	for
409	I	-2	the life	life	429	2	30-31	compelled.	compelled to shoulder it.
		-1	Energy	an energy	420	2	24	It is here	Logic becomes
	2	3	So such	And this				meaningless if we do not admit that the activity of thought is the same in everyone and that it appears with its content in consciousness in the same manner. ¹⁶ It is here	
411	I	4	idealism	that idealism					