

PRABUDDHA BHARATA

VOL. LXIII

DECEMBER 1958

NO. 12



“उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।”

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

HOLD FAST

O Mother! Listen to this repeated prayer of mine. With great effort I have come to Thee. But I am about to run away from Thy presence out of fear. O merciful Mother, do not allow me to do so. If ever my mind, eye, or speech strays away from Thy feet, bind it firmly with Thy *guṇas* (auspicious qualities), so that it may never again go out.

Vijñaptir-avadhehi me sumahatā yatnena te sannidhim
Prāptam mām iha kāndīśikam adhunā mātār-na dūrīkuru;
Cittam tvat-pada-bhāvane vyabhicared-dṛg-vāk-ca me jātu cet-
Tat-saumye sva-guṇair-badhāna na yathābhūyo vinirgacchati.

AMBROSIA

DOUBT AND LACK OF FAITH

1. One should not take instructions from others until his unflinching devotion to and faith in Guru is crystallized,—since it may make him waver in faith in his Guru. Once doubt creeps into faith in Guru, it is very difficult to get rid of it.

2. Why do we obey others? Is it not because we cannot get out of our woes and are lacking in self-confidence? He who has confidence in himself never seeks to hang on others.

3. Doubt is never dispelled without the grace of Guru. Unwavering and unflinching devotion is the only means to obtain his grace.

4. Doubt must be wiped off as otherwise nothing can be achieved. Doubt flees away on constant uttering of God's name. It is He who generates doubt and He alone removes it.

5. During the period of illness a person would continue to utter, "Oh, Lord Tāraknāth! Oh, Lord Tāraknāth!" And at other times he would not even mention the name of Tāraknāth,—so what can avail him?

6. Those who have been indulging in bad deeds all through have faith in God once and lose it the next moment.

7. Apparently all are crying for grace. As a matter of fact who seeks God's grace? Man himself poses as God so long as he enjoys good health and has money with him. Does he care for God?

8. What shall I tell you—when you have already spent good fifty years of your life only to decide whether God is or is not, whether He has form or is formless,—when will you undertake Japa and meditation?

9. None can live in this world without any work. Some do good work and some do bad. God is kind to him and people respect him who does good work. He who respects God and carries out His will is sure to perform honest deeds. Only he who takes God's words as untrue will indulge in dishonest work.

10. Is it not a matter of pity that one is seized with a pang and is averse to offer Him

with devotion His own gift? Ah, you are subjected to such misery because of your lack of faith and devotion.

11. In this world all seek to deceive—even husband cheats his wife and wife her husband. What then to speak of others! This cheating business has been going on and on. None believes anyone. Be sure, he who attempts to deceive others is self-deceived,—rather he stands deceived before he intends to deceive.

12. Integrity of character is the main requisite. If character is not good, what can be expected of Japa and meditation? You have developed an impure mind because of evil deeds—this begets lack of faith in God.

13. Man is ever imprisoned in doubt. Is it easy to get rid of it? God takes human form to dispel the doubt of man.

14. In ancient days people used to live together in a friendly way—never disbelieved each other. So they were happy. But nowadays modern education has brought distrust in its wake. People cannot live jointly and they suffer from misery.

TRUTHFULNESS

1. When truthfulness does not require payment of rent and tax, what's the harm in speaking the truth? What spiritual achievement can they expect who do not care to speak one single true word?

2. He who fears and doubts cannot make any progress either in spiritual or worldly sphere. Mind is cramped. He alone is a hero,—he alone attains greatness who moves forward to realize the truth without caring whether the world is real or not.

3. Those who cannot utter one single true word, how can they undertake meditation and japa? Those who cannot meditate, let them help and serve the poor and distressed as far as possible. God will be pleased at that.

4. Oh man! Try to love truth, try to realize truth. God is Truth incarnate—there is no scope for falsehood, hatred or hypocrisy.

TOWARDS FULLER VISION

BY THE EDITOR

He sees rightly who sees clearly within himself that the Omnipotent and Infinite Spirit, Non-dual and of the nature of Consciousness, is present in all the states and conditions of all beings.

He sees rightly who sees clearly within himself that the individual soul and the world appearing to be different from it are ever non-different from the Supreme Self and that everything is a spark of the Supreme Intelligence.

He sees rightly who sees clearly within himself: 'What is called the "three worlds" is verily like the limbs of my body,—as waves stand in relation to the abode of waters.'

He sees rightly who sees clearly within himself: 'The three worlds are like a younger sister to me,—tender and deserving compassion and protection at my hands.'¹

I

Much of our present knowledge is due to 'specialization'. The items on which thoughtful men are conducting research is almost endless. 'Food' may be taken as one of them. But that itself is as vast as an empire. Vegetables, fruits, nuts or edible oils form just a small subdivision within it. We know that successful production of these depends upon a number of steps like classification of soils and their enrichment, or improvement of the quality of seeds through grafting and allied processes. As we make further observations along these lines we shall get a mental picture of a huge world of enquirers, each original in his or her own way, but all eager to grasp subtle truths and eliminate obstacles that stand in their path. One prominent feature of modern discoveries is the realization that there is amazing power locked up in the subtle as contrasted with the gross aspects of the universe. To take a simple example: Let us remove more and more heat from the human body; a stage must come when physical death will be the result. But deal with certain metals or chemicals in a similar way; when cold or 'pressures' are stepped up as far as technically possible, what do we find? It is not anything 'akin' to death that takes place, but the emergence of hitherto unexpected qualities like ability to defy gravity or penetrativeness of an incredible type! It is the glory of science that it enters different

fields, 'unpromising' in the beginning, devises experiments to evoke responses from deeper levels, and arrives at a better understanding of the creative forces that lie embedded in them. This is with regard to the world of the senses.

Compared with this, the world of religion and philosophy may be called 'internal'. But it is not strictly or exclusively so. Most of us may be so obsessed with our own problems that we may often imagine the goal of spiritual disciplines to be the end of personal sorrows and entry into a realm of personal security and happiness. Our individual limitations, however, should not be used to lower the ideal as it is presented in sacred texts.

¹ Sarva-śaktir-anantātmā
Sarva-bhāvāntara-sthitaḥ
Advitīyaś-cid-ityantar-
Yaḥ paśyati sa paśyati.

Yoga Vāsiṣṭha, Sthiti, xxii. 27.

Ātmānam itarac-caiva
Dṛṣṭyā nityā'vibhinnayā
Sarvaṁ cij-jyotir-eveti
Yaḥ paśyati sa paśyati.

Ibid, 28.

Yan-nāma kiñcit-trailokyam
Sa evā'vayavo mama
Taraṅgo'bdhā'vivetyantar-
Yaḥ paśyati sa paśyati.

Ibid, 33.

Socyā pālyā mayaiveyam
Svaseyam me kañiyasī
Trilokī pelavety'uccaiḥ
Yaḥ paśyati sa paśyati.

Ibid, 34.

Disciplines, according to them, are meant primarily to aid mental purification. If practised properly, they can help us to shed selfish values and the complexes developed through faulty reactions to the environment. Does this accomplish anything more than the acquisition of a noble and admirable character? What the books claim is that the faculty of 'attention', when thoroughly disentangled from wrong associations and emotions, also becomes capable of registering the subtle principles underlying every aspect of the universe on which we may choose to focus it later. The scientist can take advantage of the resultant clarity and use it for the discovery of the 'truths' related to the field of his investigations. The social worker, the economist, and the politician too can likewise depend upon it to gain successes in their own spheres. It does not matter what the area to be covered is; what matters is the clarity,—single-mindedness of the aim, the passion for truth.

What, then, is the department in which the spiritual aspirant is expected to specialize? Is there one such at all? If there is, how is it related to the other kinds of enquiries? One text, by way of an answer, so to speak, makes a sweeping movement in which it brings together three items:² the universe before its manifestation, the functioning of life in the bodies of creatures like man, and the Supreme Self in which all knowledge is unified. What is the basis for the selection of these three?

II

Ancient books are highly suggestive. Their object is to take us to the realm of the Immutable, the Immortal, as distinct from the realm of the changing and the perishable. Reaching It, the wise man, they say, will 'see' himself abiding in perfection even when his body is engaged in its own day to day activities. He will be intensely conscious of 'himself' as Free Awareness presiding, as it

² *Bṛh. Up.* I.iv.7.

were, in a general way over all that evolution means and, in a particular way, on those sections which cosmic pressures bring before him from time to time. The field of evolution is not blotted out, ignored or rejected, but estimated, outgrown, and seen reverently in the glorious light of the Supreme Self, apart from Whom it cannot be conceived of. Ordinary 'specialization' consists in cutting off a small unit from a vast area and in digging into it for getting detailed information. Naturally, as a result of such specialization, as discoveries mount up, and increasing need arises to fill up gaps and to co-ordinate the numerous laws that happen to be framed. In the case of the spiritual seeker, there is no cutting off, except in a figurative sense. He puts the world of change, of efforts and gains, into one big bundle and tries to attach himself to the Totality which alone can account for all rise, growth, and development. There cannot be a Totality *in addition to* the 'parts' which are observed moving from an inferior to a superior state. If a causal relation is to be introduced, the Perfect Entity itself must be accepted as the Prime Cause leading to individual 'perfections' as 'results'. But is it not possible, at a certain stage of mental purity, to rise above the causal complex? One text insists that we should. It says that as long as we allow ourselves to be 'possessed' by the ghost of the belief in causal connection, so long our rotation in Samsāra or relative experience is bound to continue unabated. It adds that if, on the other hand, we outgrow the tendency to view events only in terms of cause and result, the oppressive delays and frictions of a compulsory relative experience will cease to operate in our case.³

We may explain it thus: A man may think, 'I am the agent. These virtuous and vicious deeds belong to me; and I shall reap their consequences in the present or in a future state'. In other words, he attributes causality to the Ātman and devotes his mind to foster this conviction.⁴ He does not under-

³ *Māṇḍūkya Kāvīkā*, IV.55-56.

⁴ *Dharma-adharma-ākhyasya hetoḥ aham kartā*,

stand that thought is cosmic creative power; or that its repetition can give it the momentum needed to transform it into 'expected' or 'dreaded' forms on the material plane. That thought takes visible shapes is clearly referred to in many places. One passage points out the fact that even little worms have the ability to make their own cortices or coatings. It then applies this principle to human beings and says that it is the 'mind' that has, by its own inherent power, produced the body for its abode, though normally we are unable to detect the subtle processes by which this is accomplished. The physical, vital, intellectual and other layers of the personality are also declared to be only fitting expressions of condensed aspiration,—right or wrong, knowingly or unknowingly entertained. In fact, 'there is nothing that the mind cannot get or build out of its unique field of throbbing imagination, however difficult or unattainable it may at first appear to be'.⁵ As a person thinks repeatedly, so he becomes and so he experiences.

But is this the highest level that man can reach,—run after various objects of sense pleasure and fritter away valuable energy to secure perishable stuffs that only fan the flame of desire in him? Instead of using that energy to aim at a *future* satisfaction and to struggle day and night, full of doubt and anxiety till it is got, is it not wiser to employ that same energy in the *present* to reach its inexhaustible Source and to abide in Its plentitude with unshakable assurance and profound

mama dharma-adharmau, tat-phalam kālāntare
kvacit-prāṇi-nikāye jāto bhokṣye: iti yāvad-hetu-
phalayor-āveśo . . . ātmani adhyāropanam, tac-
cittatā . . . tāvat . . . dharma-adharmayoḥ tat-
phalasya ca anucchedena pravṛttiḥ. *Ibid*, Śaṅkara
Bhāṣya.

⁵ Manasedam śarīram hi
Vāsanārtham prakalpitam
Kṛmi-kośa-prakāreṇa
Svātma-kośa iva svayam.
Na tad-asti ca yan-nāma
Cetaḥ saṅkalpam-ambaram
Na karoti na cā'pnoti
Durgam apyatiduṣkaram.

Yoga Vāsiṣṭha, Sthiti, xlv.7-8.

gratefulness? We unquestioningly accept that the *hope of getting* something is an essential ingredient of the aspiration that produces favourable changes *later*. In other words, we believe in the efficacy of mental formulas like this: 'I *feel* myself *small*. I *hope* to *fill up* this *want*, this *blank*, by *gaining* that object. I *fear* I may have to strive hard for a *long time*. But I am *determined* to succeed.' It is not difficult to see that the really creative 'pull' in this mental operation comes from the focussing of 'attention' on a specific desirable *condition*. The rest, viz. the assumption of present smallness balanced by future fulness, or the present feelings of fear and anxious waiting balanced by the determination to enjoy are all parts of a psychological drama which the aspirant finds helpful in keeping up his interest and in releasing his energy without a break. Now the question is whether there is any absolute value in the details of this drama and whether it could not more profitably be replaced by another in which the belief in causality is pushed away from the centre of 'attention'. A formula, for example, like this: 'This seeming imperfection is like a dream or reverie, sure to break, and fit only to excite a smile when full waking takes place. Nay, it is the Supreme Perfection alone that is shining through this space-time set up. It is fully Awake and Free even now. Whatever is registered through the senses and the mind as imperfect bits is indeed the Infinite, the Immutable, which in Its Totality can never be caught in thoughts and concepts.' A little reflection will show that the 'pull' exerted by this conviction leaves nothing to be 'desired'. On the contrary, it has the exceptional advantage of eliminating doubts and anxieties from the mind of the person who arrives at it by valid means, and corresponding delays and resistances from the fields he contacts in the course of his daily work.

III

Among the valid means, scripture occupies a dominant place. Without it to light up our

path with its illuminating words, guiding ideas, corrective illustrations or poetic suggestions, we would at every turn reduce the Supreme Reality to the position of a rigid concept and afterwards become perplexed at seeing it stand as a rival or supplement to other concepts equally limited. Scripture knows, so to speak, our inability to grasp subtle principles without the use of the causal relation. So in different ways it 'delineates the projection of the universe, the entrance of the Self into it, as also the continuance and dissolution' of what is thus projected. These descriptions are not given with the idea that we should unduly discuss or, in a strictly laboratory sense, try to verify, the steps involved in the manifestation of the visible world from its unmanifested condition. These descriptions are meant only as aids to the realization of the Self, declared again and again to be 'the highest end of man'. As the commentary puts it, 'the entrance of the Self into the universe is but a metaphorical way of saying that it is perceived in the midst of the latter'. 'For the all-pervading Self, which is without parts, can never be supposed to enter in the sense of leaving a certain quarter, place or time and being joined to new ones'. And wherever conscious activities like seeing or thinking occur, there cannot be any 'seer' 'other than the Supreme Self, as is testified by such scriptural passages as, "There is no other witness but This, no other hearer but This", or "It knew only Itself". "Therefore It became all".'

As in other instances, scripture facilitates realization by drawing pointed attention to the personality itself, where 'the intelligence of the Self is perceived up to the very tips of the nails'. In what way has It entered or does It exist there? Two simple examples are cited. 'As in the world a razor may be put in its case' or 'perceived as being within it', 'in one part'; or 'as fire lies in wood, pervading it' and may be brought out through proper rubbing, 'so does the Self reside in the body', pervading it in a 'general way' as 'living',

and in 'particular ways' as 'hearing', 'seeing', and so on. But this is not enough; 'people do not see It' yet as It really is. 'For It is incomplete' when known only so far. In what way? The text explains: 'When It does the function of living, It is called the vital force'; similarly, 'when It speaks, the organ of speech; when It sees, the eye'; and so on. In other words, we are observing only single functions indicating either Its powers of action or Its powers of knowledge. 'He who meditates upon each of this totality of aspects', 'without combining the other aspects' or functions, misses the Truth. 'As long as the man knows the Self as possessed of all the natural functions and thinks that It sees, hears or touches, he does not perceive the Whole Truth.' Then by what kind of vision can he fully know It? It is replied that he must realize It as the Unity in which 'all these differences due to the limiting adjuncts such as the vital force and denoted by names arising from the functions living etc. *become one with the unconditioned Self*,—as the different reflections of the sun in water become one in the sun'. This is the significance of the term *alone* in the direction: 'Of all these, the Self alone is to be realized.'

One may ask; If this is the intention, why is there the mention of 'all these', viz. movements in time and space,—all that is implied not only in the life and spiritual exercises of the aspirant, but also in the compassionate behaviour and the formal acts of teaching of the illumined sage? Are these to be neglected or shut out altogether? The reply is: 'Not so; although they are to be known, they do not require a separate knowledge over and above that of the Self. For one knows all these things other than the Self *through It* when the Self is known.'

Most people will like to ask whether a distinction should not be made between 'knowledge' and 'attainment'. In reply it is said that 'the non-attainment of the Self is nothing but the ignorance of It'. In the case of every other thing, there is a difference between the

attainer and the object attained. A person who assumes that there is something else to attain, considers his individual 'self' to be the attainer and the 'not-self' the thing to be got. And 'this, not being attained, is separated by acts like producing', themselves dependent upon the presence of various factors like the agent, his instruments and the like. The results too, when they appear, will be found to be perishable, since things procured under specific conditions cannot remain intact when those conditions change. But the case of the Self, dealt with in scriptures, is quite different. It is being perceived *all the time*, but wrongly apprehended. What is needed is the removal of the mental obstructions that prevent Its being 'seen' as the grand Unity, *outside of which there is no second* to be seen, heard or thought about. As this 'seeing' implies a radical alteration in the outlook, scripture insists rightly that It should first be heard of from a teacher and from holy texts, then reflected on through reasoning, and then meditated upon, i.e. dwelt upon *reverently* in the mind till conceptual distinctions of Self and 'not-Self' or of agents, action and goal, or of aspiration, waiting and achievement are all harmonized and smoothly outgrown.*

IV

There are, however, many concepts that positively assist in the widening of awareness

* In this third section many passages from Śaṅkara Bhāṣya on *Bṛh. Up.* I.iv.7 have been strung together, e.g. Na tu sarvagatasya niravayavyasya dig-deśa-kālāntara-apakramaṇa-prāpti-lakṣaṇaḥ pravēśaḥ kadācid-apyupapadyate. Na ca parād-ātmano'nyaḥ asti draṣṭā, 'na anyad-ato'sti-draṣṭṛ, na anyad-ato'sti śrotr' . . . upalabdhyarthatvāt ca sṛṣṭi-praveśa-sthiti-apyaya-vākyānām. Upalabdheḥ puruṣārtha-śravaṇāt . . . Yāvad-ayam veda, 'paśyāmi, śṛṇomi, sprśāmi' iti va, svabhāva-pravṛtti-viśiṣṭam veda, tāvat añjasā kṛtsnam ātmānam na veda. Katham punaḥ paśyan veda? . . . sa yathā kṛtsna-viśeṣopasaṁhāri san kṛtsno bhavati . . . evaṁ kṛtsno hyasau svena vasturūpeṇa gṛhyamāṇo bhavati . . . Kim na vijñātavyam eva anyat? Na . . . jñātavyatve api, na pṛthak-jñānāntaram apekṣate ātmajñānāt . . . Jñānalābhayor-ekārthatvasya vivakṣitatvāt . . .

till total harmony is achieved. Each religion supplies a number of them. Each individual who is sincerely interested in actual practice can easily pick up some, suitable to his taste and temperament. If attention is made to play upon chosen particulars,—'forms' of God, as devotees call them—the mind of its own accord gradually lifts up their barriers and accommodates them in the 'general' knowledge which, at each stage, is relatively 'infinite'. Thus disputes about the superiority of the initial concepts or 'forms' serve no useful purpose. What is essential is, in the words of Sri Ramakrishna, to 'hold fast to some form of God or some mood, whichever you like; it is then only that there will be steadfastness'. For, 'He is realizable by spiritual moods (Bhāva) alone'. And this consists in 'establishing a relationship with God and keeping it bright before our eyes at all times,—at the time of eating, drinking, sitting, sleeping, etc'.⁷ When the principle is understood, it will not be difficult to cultivate the right type of *feeling* conveyed in the *Saundaryalaharī* hymn: 'Whatever actions I do may be taken as intended for Thy worship,—my prattle as prayer to Thee; the manifold forms of my manual work as Mudrās, pious hand-movements employed in Thy worship; my loiterings as circumambulations round Thee; my taking nourishment as the offering of oblations to Thee; my lying down as prostrations to Thee; and my attending to all other comforts as the dedication of my entire self to Thee.'⁸ Of course, in the case of the aspirant the feeling would be one roused by special effort, while in the case of the sage it would come like a spontaneous downpour from his steady illumination.

⁷ Sri Ramakrishna the Great Master, p. 381.

⁸ Japo jalpaḥ śilpam sakalam api
mudrā-viracanā
Gatiḥ prādakṣiṇya-kramaṇam
aśanādy-āhuti-vidhiḥ
Praṇāmaḥ saṁyeśaḥ sukham akhilam
ātmārpaṇa-daśā
Saparyā-paryāyas-tava bhavatu
yan-me viṣāmitam!

This brings us to some of the conversations of Sri Sarada Devi about various other details of Sādhanā. Once a disciple wanted to know why the name of God should be repeated 'using the fingers'; could it not be done solely in the mind? In her own quiet way she answered: 'God has given the fingers that they may be blessed by repeating His name with them.'⁹ Is there any limb that cannot become purified by being actively associated with devotional acts? Her own life was an object lesson in this respect. One never found her 'idle'; at least her hands would be busy doing something or other connected with the shrine, say preparing betel rolls for regular offering. When spiritual vision dawns, men and material objects appear transformed, thereby introducing a special element of sweetness and sacredness into daily activities. This was revealed in a most natural way when one day, by sheer accident, the disciple's elbow touched the Holy Mother's feet while he was carrying some Prasāda for the devotees. 'Ah!' said the Mother, and saluted him with folded hands. Ignoring the young man's protest, she even bowed down to him and expressed her feeling in other suitable ways. 'Thus', says the record, 'she used to respect her disciples as the manifestations of God, and at the same time show her affection to them as a mother does to her children.'¹⁰ The intensity of genuine compassion, found in all great souls, can be easily gauged from a little anecdote casually given by the Mother herself. 'Once Balaram's wife was ill' and the Master asked her to go to Calcutta and visit her. But the Mother hesitated as she could not 'see any carriage or other vehicle' there. The Master who was always considerate in his talks with her 'replied now in an excited voice: 'What! Balaram's family is in such trouble and you hesitate to go! You will walk to Calcutta. Go on foot.' . . . 'Where, indeed,

will man be if God will not protect him in his trouble?'¹¹ Her ability to infuse courage and confidence was superb. Once she referred to the exclamation of Naren: 'Let me have millions of births, what do I fear?' Commenting on it, she quietly added: 'It is true. Does a man of knowledge ever fear rebirth? He does not commit any sin. It is the ignorant person who is always seized with fear.'¹² Herself absolutely pure, she yet fervently 'prayed',—'with tears in her eyes', says the record—in the temple of Rādhā-ramaṇa: 'Lord, remove from me the habit of finding fault with others. May I never find fault with anybody!' The disciple tells us that 'her prayer seems to have been answered literally'; and she herself speaks about it and observes: 'It is the nature of man only to see defects. One should learn to appreciate others' virtues.'¹³ How significant is her rejoinder to Golap-Mā who once exclaimed in a pique: 'Mother, what is the good of telling you? You cannot see the defects of others!' The Mother told her these unforgettable words,—which can serve as an excellent motto for us as well—'Well Golap, there is no want of people to see the faults of others. The world will not come to a standstill if I am otherwise.'¹⁴

Indeed, how can one who 'sees' the Self *alone* be ever moved by emotions opposed to reverence and the spirit of loving service? 'He who sees everything in his Ātman and his Ātman in everything' can never perceive any 'object' to excite the feeling of revulsion in him.¹⁵ His unified outlook will make him an embodiment of love, goodwill, and peace.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 424-425.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 458.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 182.

¹⁵ Sarvā hi ghrṇā ātmano'nyad-duṣṭam paśyato bhavati, ātmānam eva atyanta-viśuddham nirantaram paśyato na ghrṇā-nimittam arthāntaram asti iti prāptam eva; taṭo'na vijugupsate' iti, Śaṅkara Bhāṣya, *Iśa*, 6.

⁹ *Sri Saradadevi* (Madras Edn. 1940), p. 391.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 400.

GLIMPSES OF THE HOLY MOTHER

BY SRIMATI SARASWATI GOWRISHANKAR

To us, in India, the concept of God incarnating Himself for the uplift of mankind is quite familiar. With the play of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, of Sītā and Rāma still fresh in our imagination, it is easy for many of us to accept it as simple fact that here, almost in our own time, God once again came to dwell amongst His children—as Śrī Rāmakrishna and His Divine Consort, Śrī Sārādā Devī. To such persons, every deed, every word of these great personalities must be the source of all inspiration, both in their endeavours to lead a spiritual life and in the conduct of their daily affairs.

But, of course, there must be many amongst us also, to whom such an act of faith does not come easily, with quiet acceptance. Such persons will seek to know—through much questioning—what there is in these great personalities that has captured the adoration of millions in this country and abroad.

Miracles? Great deeds? There are none at all that would attract the attention of any journalist today! And in the Mother's life, especially, there is nothing on the surface, to distinguish it from that of any of India's humblest housewives. It must be a certain extra quality then—of fineness, of a delicacy of emotion, of a core of courage and discipline and devotion to duty, of overflowing joy and love and compassion—that has placed her apart as someone who has set before us all, men and women, a supreme ideal for the conduct of life, which inspires us in all our daily activities.

And where shall we seek for a glimpse of this 'extra' quality? In the very ordinary story of her life—in her conversations, while working, with those about her (there are so few of these recorded), and in the chance remarks made about her by her companions—

as we scan the pages, perhaps we may catch something.

Let us read together, for instance, of a scene in Mother's home in the Bengal village, Jayrambati. The year is 1907, twenty-one years after the passing away of Śrī Rāmakrishna. The moment is recorded for us in the diary of a monastic disciple:

'I went to the Holy Mother again at three or four o'clock in the afternoon and found her kneading dough for bread. She was seated on the floor facing the east, her legs stretched out in front of her. The oven stood near her. Casting a benign glance upon me, she said, "What do you want?"

Disciple: "I want to talk to you."

Mother: "What do you want to talk about? Sit down here."

She gave me a seat.

Disciple: "Mother, people say that our Master is God Eternal and Absolute; what do you say?"

Mother: "Yes, he is God Eternal and Absolute to me."

As she had said "to me", I went on, "It is true that to every woman her husband is God Eternal and Absolute. I am not asking the question in that sense."

Mother: "Yes, he is God Eternal and Absolute to me as my husband and in a general way as well."

Then I thought that if Śrī Rāmakrishna were God Eternal, then she, the Holy Mother, must be the Divine Power, the Mother of the Universe. She must be identical with His Divine Consort. She and he are like Sītā and Rāma, Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. I had come to the Holy Mother cherishing this faith in my heart. I asked her, "If that be the case, then why do I see you preparing bread like an ordinary woman? It is Māyā, I suppose, is it not?"

Mother: "It is Māyā, indeed! But God loves to sport as a human being. Śrī Kṛṣṇa was born as a cowherd boy and Rāma as the child of Daśaratha"!'

* * * *

It is indeed Māyā—this play of Mother's on earth, and we do not seem to tire of being told time and again of how the Holy Mother, Śrī Sārādā Devī, born to pious parents in the village of Jayrambati, was wedded at the early age of six years to Śrī Rāmakrishna—already then immersed in God. We have heard too of her long separation from him, and of how, at the age of eighteen, she courageously set off to seek him out in the far-off city of Calcutta—her husband, this village priest, whom they all called mad. Let us recall also with reverence the scene of their meeting in the hallowed room in Dakshineswar on the banks of the Hooghly and of her association with him in the performance of the Śoḍaśī Pūjā.

Her life in the succeeding years was one continuous act of service to Śrī Rāmakrishna and those about him, and the long years of widowhood that followed were but a continuation of that service.

Mother's busy day usually began at three or four a.m. and continued far into the night, with scarcely a moment's respite. For Śrī Rāmakrishna was a hard task-master, and from him she received detailed instruction on all matters ranging from how to trim lamps or dress vegetables to the deepest spiritual exercises. And he further saw to it that her every waking moment was filled with some useful activity. Cooking (on very slender resources), cleaning, making betel rolls, fetching water, washing, were all interspersed with an arduous programme of Japa and meditation that left her not a moment of leisure. Added to this, she lived in accordance with the social custom of the time, in virtual seclusion, in a room scarcely thirty square feet in area, and seldom emerged from it except before day-break or after sunset.

Never too, for a moment, did her devotion

to duty slacken or show sign of boredom. Of those busy days, Mother used to say in later years, "In what bliss I was! What a curiously mixed crowd of people came to see him then! Dakshineswar used then to be a mart of joy!"

And this—in spite of the fact that on many days, she had not even a glimpse of the Master. "At *that* time", she says, "I would see the Master perhaps once in two months. I used to console my mind by saying, 'O mind, are you so fortunate that you can see him every day?'"

Turning for a moment to the words of Gaurī Mā, one of the women devotees, we hear, "Though these two sometimes did not see each other for six months together, in spite of being only about seventy-five feet apart, how deep indeed was their love for each other!"

Śrī Rāmakrishna was indeed always careful to treat her with the utmost deference and courtesy. In later years, Mother would say, "I was fortunate to be wedded to a husband who never addressed me as 'tui' (thou). Ah, how he treated me! Not even once did he tell me a harsh word. He did not strike me even with a flower."

In the harmony and sweet felicity of their life together we seem indeed to see the practical demonstration of the verse from the Upaniṣad which says:

"It is not for the sake of the husband that the husband is loved, but it is for the sake of the Self that he is loved. It is not for the sake of the wife that the wife is loved, but it is for the sake of the Self that she is loved. It is not for the sake of the sons that the sons are loved, but it is for the sake of the Self that the sons are loved."

* * * *

We see, too, that though Mother's whole life was tuned in reverent surrender to the will of the Master, yet she retained her independence in her own domain of motherhood. Many stories are told of how on occasions when Mother's love for her children

came in conflict with the wishes of the Master, it was always the former that she obeyed. One such is particularly touching:

It was Mother's duty every night to take the Master's food to him in his room after all the visitors had left. But one night, as she stepped on the verandah, a woman devotee snatched away the plate of food crying, "Give it to me, Mother, give it to me" and quickly placed it before the Master. When he sat for his meal, however, he could not partake of it and importuned the Mother, "Promise me you will not hand it over to anybody hereafter." With folded hands, Mother replied, "That I cannot promise. I shall certainly bring your food myself, but if anyone begs me by calling me 'Mother', I shall not be able to contain myself" and cleverly added, "Besides, you are not my Master alone, you are for all." That, we are told, cheered up the Master and he began eating.

In her youth, Mother tells us, she sometimes felt a pang that she had no child of her own. "Of a truth, should even a single son be denied me?" she had thought sorrowfully. "When I went to Dakshineswar, the question arose in my mind. When I first had the thought, I did not tell anybody, but the Master said spontaneously, 'Why do you worry? I shall leave you such jewels of children as one can hardly get, even if one performs the severest of austerity to the extent of cutting off one's head. You will find in the end so many children calling you 'Mother' that you will be unable to manage them all.'"

And in truth, Mother's family in her own lifetime grew apace. Her love and compassion embraced all her children, from the Master's young disciples (spiritual giants who were the first monks of the Order of Śrī Rāma-krishna) to the insane Rādhu, from the lowly Amzād to the devoted foreign daughters like Sister Nivedita.

She had an unerring intuition that enabled her to go straight to the heart of any problem that was put before her, and her loving guidance, in spiritual and administrative matters

as well as in matters of daily life, was given to all alike. Not merely this, but her words apply as truly to our lives today as they did in her own time.

At the same time, Mother who was the spiritual guide of hundreds of men and women, draws us to herself by the profoundness of her religious culture. Some of her observations read to us like some ancient scriptural text and not indeed the words of a simple village woman who had had no formal education.

Let us listen to some of her words.

* * * *

"What does a man become by realizing God? Does he get two horns? No. What happens is he develops discrimination between the real and the unreal, gets spiritual consciousness and goes beyond life and death. God is realized in spirit."

"But one thing I tell you. If you want peace, my daughter, don't find fault with others, but find fault rather with yourself. Learn to make the world your own. Nobody is a stranger, my dear. The world is yours."

"Nothing can happen without the will of God. Not even a straw can move. When a man passes into a favourable time, he gets the desire to contemplate on God. But when the time is unfavourable, he gets all the facilities for doing evil actions. Everything happens in time according to the Will of God."

A disciple asked, "If He (God) be really our 'own', then why should we pray unto Him in order to see Him? One who is truly my 'own' would come to me even if I did not call to Him. Does God do things for us as our parents do?"

Mother replied, "Yes, that is true, my child. He Himself has become our father and mother. He Himself brings us up as our parents. It is He alone who looks after us."

And it is in words such as these with their triumphant affirmation of man's utter dependence on God that we have the reply to the passionate cry of the weary soul:

"Open the gates of light, Oh Mother, to me, thy tired son.

I long, Oh, long to return home, Mother, my play is done."

There follows infinite peace in the whispered accents of reassurance, "Why are you so restless, my child? Why don't you stick on

to what you have got? Always remember—I have at least a Mother, if none else."

May that Gracious Mother guide and inspire us that we may become more worthy to be called Her children!

THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

As A Way To

UNITY OF RELIGIONS

BY PROF. FRIEDRICH HEILER

(Continued from previous issue)

III

Sixth, all high religions teach not only the way to God, but always and at the same time the way to the neighbour as well. A neighbour is not merely every man without exception, but every living being. The mystic way of salvation is not completed in the *via contemplativa*, in the "flight of the alone to the alone", as Plotinus said. Rather it finds its necessary continuation in service to the brother, the *vita activa*. When Gotama Buddha had achieved perfect enlightenment under the Bodhi tree, he withstood the temptation of remaining in undisturbed silence. Out of compassion for all beings perishing without his message of the way of salvation, he resolved to preach to all the sacred Truth disclosed to him. Meister Eckhart declared that if someone in his highest rapture notices a sick man in need of a bit of soup, it would be better for him to leave his rapture and serve the one in need. Confucianism, Taoism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Mazdaism, Islam, and Christianity, all preach brotherly love. The Buddhist *Tipitaka* contains a hymn of brotherly love even as just the Christian New Testament. According to the words of Buddha, all

works of merit do not have one sixteenth the value of love. According to 1.Cor.13, all the magnificent gifts of special grace are worthless and useless in comparison to the humble, sacrificing, forgiving, and patient agape. This love has no limitations. "As a mother protects her own child, her own son, with her love, so the disciples of Buddha have boundless love for all beings," so we read in the *Suttanipāta*. This universality of love finds its most wonderful expression in the formula of the Buddhist Pāli canon concerning the meditation of love, compassion, and mutual joy; the contemplative monk—

lets the power of love which fills his heart, spread throughout one quarter, yea beyond a second, third, and fourth quarter, above, beyond, sideways, in all directions, in all completeness, he lets the power of love that fills his heart stretch out over all the earth. Such is the extent of that great, wide, and boundless love which is free from hate and malice.

In like manner, he radiates his compassion, joy, and holy equanimity throughout the entire cosmos. In its breadth and depth, this meditation on love measures up to the uni-

versal intercessory prayer which is firmly rooted in Christian liturgies as well as in the individual prayer of the great Christian saints. This love excludes no living being, it encloses even the subhuman creatures of the animal world. The Christian saints compete with Buddhist and Hindu saints in their love of animals. "St. Francis was a Buddhist", an Indian Yogi once told me. One can just as well turn this around, and say, "Buddha was a Franciscan." The two currents of Christian love and Buddhist compassion for all living beings flow together in the saying of one of the greatest Eastern orthodox mystics, Isaac the Syrian, a saying that is at once entirely Buddhist and Christian:

'What is a merciful heart? A heart inflamed for all creatures, men, birds, and animals, yea even for demons and all that is, so that by the recollection or sight of them tears fill the eyes because of the power of mercy which moves the heart in great compassion.'

In later Mahāyāna Buddhism this contemplative love takes on a strongly active character. Love becomes the selfless service to all beings. "As the element of water brings growth to all grass, shrubs, and herbs, so the pure Bodhisattva gives bud to all beings through the testimony of his love. He makes the good qualities of all beings grow." His task to which he has dedicated himself in a solemn vow, is the conquest of all suffering in other living beings through his own vicarious suffering. "I take upon myself the burden of all suffering . . . , the salvation of all living beings is my vow . . . I must take upon myself the whole load of suffering of all beings . . . I must bring the roots of the good to maturity, so that all beings attain infinite happiness, unimaged gladness." This Buddhist love includes the love of the enemy. The early Christian writer, Tertullian, asserted that the love of the enemy was an exclusive characteristic of Christianity. In this he was profoundly mistaken. All high religions of the earth, not only the Eastern religions of

redemption but the pre-Christian religions of the West, know the commandment to love the enemy. The wise Laō-tse emphatically demands, "to reply to adversary with mercy and goodness." Loving the enemy has been commanded in India since the earliest times. We read in the heroic epic *Mahābhārata*: "Even an enemy must be afforded appropriate hospitality when he enters the house; a tree does not withhold its shade even from those who come to cut it down." In the other epic, *Rāmāyana*, it is said: "The noble man must protect with his life an enemy who is in distress or who out of fear has surrendered himself to the protection of the enemy."

Buddhist literature contains wonderful examples of love for the enemy, as in the stories of King Long-Sufferer and his son Long-Life and of Prince Kunala. The spreading of the concept of loving the enemy in pre-Christian times proves the validity of Lessing's statement, "Christianity existed before evangelists and apostles had written." The faith that God is love, and the commandment that man shall become like God in this all-embracing love which includes enemies, constitute by themselves alone a strong sense of community among all high religions. The concept of humanity is basically no mere rational or purely ethical idea, but a deeply religious one. We of the West inherited this idea from the ethics of the Greek and Hellenistic religion as well as from the prophetism of Israel whence came early Christianity. But the Eastern cultures, too, have arrived at the idea of humanity by way of their religions. Confucius said, "All men dwelling between the four oceans of the world are brothers of noble men." The corollary of the concept of humanity is the idea of universal peace. Lao-tse and his disciples appeared in China as mankind's first apostles of peace. Of the latter, a saying traditionally attributed to Tswang-tse says: "Through burning love they sought to unite fraternally the people of the world . . . they forbade aggression and ordered weapons to be laid aside so that

mankind might be rescued from war . . . With this teaching they spread over the entire world."

Love is being regarded as God's own doing. It flows not from the small heart of man but from the eternal love of God. But as love flows forth from the heart of God, so it flows back to Him again; the neighbour to whom man renders love, is God himself in human form. The ancient Greek spoke of his highest god Zeus secretly approaching us in the suppliant, the fugitive, and the companion as Zeus xenios, phyxios, hykesios, and metoikios.

Buddha taught his disciples to care for him even in the form of his sick companions. According to Jesus' prophecy of judgement (Matth. 25, 31 ff.), The Messianic judge will count every act of charity rendered to the hungry, thirsty, stranger, naked, sick, and imprisoned as done unto him and every such person neglected as the neglect of him, a thought briefly and concisely summarized by the extra-canonical saying of Jesus, "If you have seen your brother, you have seen your Lord." *Homo homini Deus*—Man in need is God in disguise, and his permanent incarnation. "Here is thy footstool, there do thy feet rest where the poorest and lowliest, where the lost do live"—is the prayer of Rabindranath Tagore. Where there is so great a love, the barriers between religions must fall, and if until now they have not fallen, the only reason is that they have not taken seriously the consequences of their most ultimate and profound principles.

Seventh, love is a most superior way to God. In this way all high religions reach out toward the ultimate goal of divine infinity in which all finiteness finds its fulfilment even though this goal may be visualized in different images. The kingdom of God, heaven, paradise, the land of happiness (*sukhavati*), *Brahma Nirvāna*, and *Parinirvāna*—these are all but various names for one reality, the "highest blessedness" (*paramam sukham*), as the Buddhists say. Though this blessedness

now be imagined as a dissolving of the finite into the infinite (the Upaniṣads compare it to salt dissolving in water, and Buddha compares it to rivers flowing into the ocean) or as the vision of the divine countenance or as a uniting of the soul with the heavenly spouse—it is one and the same reality to which the pious soul keeps looking while in this state of finiteness, and which it already anticipates within this finiteness. This bliss, however, for deeper spirits in the high religions, is a total and universal one. It excludes the cruel and godless idea of the popular belief in an eternal punishment in hell. The merciful Bodhisattva vows not to enter blessedness himself until all living things have found redemption. This doctrine of Mahāyāna Buddhism is contiguous with the Mazdayanic doctrine of the universe which is ultimately filled only by divine beings, and with the Christian doctrine of the restoration of all things (*apokatastasis hapan-ton*) advocated by Origen (following early Christian gnosticism) and promulgated by the great Church fathers of the East, Gregory of Naziansus and Gregory of Nyssa, and professed by many Christian saints in opposition to popular dogmatics. Origen speaks out a word which sounds rather Buddhist: Christ is not able to enjoy the full bliss as long as only one of his members is anyhow entangled in the evil or in suffering.

Thus there is an ultimate and most profound unity of all high religions, including ancient Buddhism, which in spite of its apparent anti-metaphysical agnosticism reveals a mystic religion of redemption equal to the noblest forms of mysticism of all times and all religions. This unity exists in spite of all differences in doctrine and cultus; one need not establish this unity artificially but simply like a diver lift up out of the deep that treasure which rests upon the ocean floor. Occasionally, however, such a precious treasure emerges on the surface of the water by itself and is visible to all. "One of the most astounding facts of the history of religions," Max Muller points out, "is the admission of

Buddha to the Roman Calendar of saints. One of the most widespread medieval legends of the saints was that of Barlaam and Joasaph; it is nothing other than the legend of Buddha entering in the Eastern as well as Roman Church via Persia, Syria, and Byzantium. St. Joasaph, whose remembrance is annually observed in the calendar of the Greek orthodox Church as well as in the *Martyrologium Romanum*, is none other than the Bodhisattva. This occurrence has symbolic meaning; it proves the validity of the statement of the medieval Venetian traveller Marco Polo, "If Buddha had been a Christian, he would have been a great saint of our Lord Jesus Christ—so good and pure was the life that he led." Such saintly persons we find in great number in all high religions. And only because the living saints of the various religions are so similar to each other could it happen that the founder of the greatest Eastern religion of redemption was admitted to the throng of canonized Christian saints.

With respect to this great unity of the high religions one can only repeat the prayer of Cardinal Nicolas of Cues: "It is you, O God, who is being sought in the various religions in various ways, and named with various names, for Thou remainest as Thou art, to all incomprehensible and inexpressible. Be gracious and show Thy countenance. . . . When Thou wilt graciously perform it, then the sword, jealous hatred, and all evil will cease and all will come to know that there is but *one* religion in the variety of religious customs" (*uno religio in rituum varietate*).

IV

One of the most important tasks of the science of religion is to bring to light this unity of all religions. It thereby pursues only one purpose, that of pure knowledge of the truth. But unintentionally there sprouts forth from the root of scientific inquiry into truth not only a tree with wondrous blossoms, but also with glorious fruit. When Helmholtz discovered the ophthalmoscope a century ago,

he was pursuing no practical medical purpose but only a theoretical research. But through his research zeal he brought help to millions who suffer with eye disease. The same is true of the scientific study of religion. Its inquiry into truth bears important consequences for the practical relationship of one religion to another.

Whoever recognizes their unity must take it seriously by tolerance in word and deed. Thus scientific insight into this unity calls for a practical realization in friendly exchange and in common ethical endeavour in "fellowship" and "co-operation." This unity and fellowship is as little a syncretistic mixing of different religions as it is a conversion from one system of religion to another. Schleiermacher's *Reden* contains the sincere warning: "If you want to contemplate religion with religion as the eternally progressing work of the divine spirit, you must give up the vain and futile wish that there ought to be only one; your antipathy against the variety of religions must be laid aside, and with as much impartiality as possible you must approach all those which have developed from the eternally abundant bosom of the Universe through the changing forms and progressive traditions of man." Rabindranath Tagore agrees with this warning against antipathy toward the variety of religions and the will of one religion to dominate. He states: "The attempt to make their own religion the ruling one everywhere and for all time is natural to men who incline toward a sectarianism. Therefore they do not want to hear that God is magnanimous in the dispensing of His love, or that His dealings with men are not limited to one blind alley which comes to a sudden halt at one point in history. If ever such a catastrophe should break in upon mankind that one religion should swamp everything, then God would have to provide a second Noah's ark to save his creatures from spiritual destruction." Joy in the individuality of another religion is lastly joy in God Himself. Schleiermacher asks the question, "In its general extension shall Chris-

tianity reign alone eternally and as the only religion of mankind?" And he answers, "Christianity despises this despotism; it honours each of its own elements enough to grant it a wholeness of its own; it will not only produce an endless diversity in itself, but also look outside itself. . . . It likes to see other and younger forms of religion emerge close to its own form from all points, even from those areas which Christianity holds to be the most extreme and dubious borders of religion at all."

The religion of all religions cannot gather enough material together for the most delicate side of its interior viewpoint, and as there is nothing more irreligious than to require uniformity among mankind generally, there is nothing more un-Christian than to seek uniformity in religions. Toynbee, in *An Historian's Approach to Religion*, recalls the wonderful statement that the defender of dying pagan religions, Quintus Aurelius Symmachus, used against the Church father, Ambrosius, "The heart of so great a mystery can never be reached by following only one way." To this Toynbee adds the comment: "We can take the statement of Symmachus to our hearts without being disloyal to Christianity, but we cannot harden our hearts against Symmachus without hardening them against Christ; for what Symmachus preached is Christian love of which the Apostle says that it will never cease. Though there be prophecies, they shall pass away, and though there be tongues they will cease, though there be knowledge, it will pass away." The deeper our reverence for the divine and holy, the deeper also must our reverence for other religions be. He who has penetrated the mystery of religion will cease wanting to simply convert the believers among the other high religions; moreover, his desire is twofold, to give and to receive, to represent the purest form of his own religion to others and in turn to learn about the most intimate character of the belief of others. He does not want to conquer those religions, but unite with them at a higher level. He would

not "destroy" them but "fulfill" them (Matth. 5,17); he does not want their death, but (as Rudolf Otto said) he wants "no religion to die before its ultimate and most profound meaning has been told." The meaning of true mission is not propaganda or conversion, nor domination of others, but brotherly exchange and brotherly competition. In this sense we must not only wish that Christian mission continue among the religions of the East (Max Muller said that for every missionary he would rather send out ten more), but also that the religions of the East send missionaries to us, as Leibniz had already desired in the introduction to his *Novissima Sinica* published anonymously. Such a mission does not lead to syncretism and eclecticism, but to "such growth in the essentials," as Aśoka had demanded from the different religions, and that means nothing other than growth in love toward God and man.

If the religions thus learn to understand each other and co-operate, they will contribute more to the realization of humanity and thereby to world peace than all the noteworthy efforts of politics. A torn humanity which has passed through so many catastrophes, which has ruined itself through so many wars, which is still bleeding from so many wounds can be saved by one thing only which is rooted in and proceeds from Divine love as it lives in high religions, primarily in their saints and martyrs. Responsibility before the eternal God and selfless love for the brethren, these alone warrant the greatest security. Satyāgraha (the apprehension of truth), ahimsā (the inviolability of all life), parātmā-samatā (the identity of all alien spirits), parātmā parivartana (the self-transformation into an alien soul), mahāmaitrī (great, all-encompassing love), and mahākaruṇa (great compassion) are age-old religious ideals which Indian saints realized centuries before Christ and which Gandhi put into practice anew in our century. Gandhi is likewise an example for the unity of religions. He drew not only from the treasure store of his Indian fore-

sorrow, doubt, and disappointment. To him the entire universe is only a mine of sorrow and pain. After *Sandhyā-Sangīt* comes *Prabhāt-Sangīt* where Rabindranath sees a faint ray of hope. In *Mānasī* he tries to seize upon something real but the real eludes his grasp. In *Sonār Tarī* he learns for the first time that this life is meaningful. In *Chitrā* he gets a glimpse of the real, the long wished-for Jīvan-Devatā who is at once the hope and bliss of mankind. *Naivedya* and *Kheyā* talk of human values and the surrender of egoistic tendencies to the cosmic order. In *Gītāñjali*, *Utsarga*, *Gītāli*, and *Gītimālya* Rabindranath realizes the supreme Reality, Jīvan Devatā, and enjoys His company in pure love. Thus the final battle against pain and evil is won and the victory of realization achieved.

In most of the philosophies we find that there has been a reasoned account of a flight either from the Absolute to the finites or from the finites to the Absolute. But in Rabindranath we at once start from the Absolute and finites. He does not start from the one and ascend or descend to the other. At the very outset he emphasizes the finite-infinite nature of the finite individual. Like Green and Bosanquet he too asserts that the finite individual is torn between finiteness and infinity. "In this mortal region I have tasted the Immortal, in weal and woe, at every moment. Again and again, I have seen the Infinite at the background of the finites" (See *Janmadine*). Again in *Personality*: "What is it in man that asserts its immortality in spite of the obvious fact of death? It is not his physical body or his mental organization. It is the deeper unity, that ultimate mystery in him, which, from the centre of his world, radiates towards its circumference; which is in the body, yet transcends his body. It is the personality of man, conscious of its inexhaustible abundance." This abundance is the infinite in him.

The Infinite or Jīvan-Devatā is one, non-dual. 'Ekamevādvītyam' is the keynote of

Rabindranath's sermons in the temple (See *Santiniketan*, Vol. 1). But why does the One become many? Śaṅkara, the pronounced Advaita thinker, adduces the cause to Māyā. But nowhere in Rabindranath's writings is the concept of Māyā welcome. On the other hand, whenever occasion has arisen, he has vehemently protested against it. In the vein of Vaiṣṇavism he thinks of Jīvan-Devatā as 'Rasa' and this is why He, though one, becomes many. He creates man for playing the game of love with him. The Infinite wilfully and gladly allows Himself to be caught in the snares of the finite. The Infinite is the eternal Lover and He needs an object of love. Jīvan-Devatā and man are bound up in an indissoluble tie and the truth of the one lies in that of the other. If Jīvan-Devatā creates the finite individuals for enacting the love-drama, does it not imply a limitation of His infinity? It is undoubtedly a limitation but it is a self-imposed one. The fulfilment of Jīvan-Devatā's existence lies in love and this is why He imposes on Him the above-said limitation. There is an eternal thirst in the Absolute's heart for the finites. In *Fruit Gathering* he says, "I came and you woke and the skies blossomed with lights. Yet I know the endless thirst in your heart for sight of me, the thirst that cries at my door in the repeated knockings of sunrise."

The Infinite or Jīvan-Devatā is Mind. Like Hegel, Rabindranath too believes that we, the finite individuals, are the finite representatives of the Infinite Mind. My mind is not separate from yours. Had it been so, no communication between mind and mind would be possible. My mind is universal and though it is circumscribed in my body, yet it is not thereby segregated. Rabindranath explains the Indian Gāyatrī Mantra thus: 'Let me contemplate the adorable splendour of Him who created the earth, the air, and the starry spheres and sends the power of comprehension within our mind' (See *The Religion of Man*, p. 93). The same Mind which is permeating Nature is also in me and this is why it is

possible for me to understand Nature. The external Nature and my mind are expressions of the Infinite Mind.

Finite individuals exist in time. Is Jivan-Devatā also in time? Or, to put it in other words, is the Absolute static or dynamic? In his lyric *Balākā*, Rabindranath describes the change-aspect of Reality. Interrogating the river about change he writes: "You move on, move on, move in speed. You fly undaunted and seldom do you look back." The life-process is moving on in an infinite pursuit. Life around us is fully dynamic. Also it is progressing, for it has received within it a *nisus* to the Eternal. If for a moment the life-process stops in tiredness, at once the universe is filled with matter. This reminds us of the philosophy of Bergson whose *Élan Vital* always moves on. The onward march of life is the only real thing; and if somehow this progressing flow is retarded, and consequently there happens to be a backward move, matter arises. But change is not final in Rabindranath's philosophy. The Absolute is eternal. The One is realizing Himself in the many that are in time.

The Infinite is Satyam, Ānandam, and Sundaram—the Truth, the Bliss, and the Beauty. These qualities are not contradictory to one another. On the contrary they lie in Divinity in perfect union and amity. Finites have been engaged in cultivating these values. But what is the ultimate destiny of the finites? Are they lost in Jivan-Devatā with their whole array of values? The absolutistic thinkers of the West (Bradley and Bosanquet) extol the Absolute and disparage the claims of finite individuality. According to them the finite individuals are the elements which make up the Absolute; but in it, they do not exist in their original form. There they are re-arranged and transformed. "The plurality of souls" says Bradley, "in the Absolute is appearance and their existence is not genuine. . . . To gain consistency and truth it must be merged and recomposed in a result in which its speciality must vanish" (*Appearance and*

Reality, pp. 304-6, Ed. 1916). Bosanquet too tells us that the contents of the imperfect individual have to be transmuted and re-arranged. (See *Logic*, Vol. II, p. 258, 2nd Ed.) In some of his poems and sermons Rabindranath extols the Absolute, disregarding the claims of finite individuals. At certain moments his mind has been seized by the supreme glory of the Absolute. Actuated by such feelings he degrades the finite individuals to the rank of mere elements. He even calls the Absolute "the inscrutable without name and form" (Eng. *Gītāñjali*, 95). But this must not be supposed to be the final teaching of Rabindranath, for in him concrete idealism excels over absolutism. To him a Vaiṣṇava ideal is more acceptable than the Absolute of Śaṅkara.

The finite individual and the values culled by him are not lost in the Absolute. Rabindranath pleads for the immortality of persons with values. By person he does not mean the egoistic person who is confined within narrowness and limitation. It is not the material or the social "me" for whose survival he pleads. It is not our lower nature but the higher nature which constitutes our true personality. And according to Rabindranath the true person is immortal.

From the side of the Infinite, the meaning of Saṁsāra lies in the creation of finite individuals, for He can receive the tribute of love only from them. The finite again makes his own unique contribution to the life of the whole. The finites are the vital parts of a whole and a relation of inseparability obtains between the two. How does the finite make his unique contribution? He does it by returning love to the Divine. Love generates in the individual all-consciousness (Sarvānubhūti). It is the feeling of at-homeness in the whole. The Infinite or Jivan-Devatā is both transcendent and immanent. To love Jivan-Devatā is to love the entire creation, human beings, animals, and trees. In his Hibbert lectures Rabindranath formulates and develops, what he calls, the religion of Man. The idea

of the humanity of our God or the divinity of Man the Eternal is the main subject of his lectures. Though he desires to spread his love over all creation, yet man is his first preference. Man, according to him, stands at the apex of creation and he is the representative of the Universal Spirit. Rabindranath has never denied man and his world. Always he has emphatically admitted the value of his existence, and it is no wonder that Rabindranath's religion should be centred round man. He says: "My religion is the reconciliation of the Super-personal man, the universal human spirit, in my own individual being" (*The Religion of Man*, Appendix). "Whatever I can offer to God, I offer to man and to God I give whatever I can give to man. I make God man and man God" (*Sonār Tarī*).

Rabindranath's emphasis on man and human values in the total process of reality

constitutes his originality. "In the vast evolution of the world we come across the first meaning in life-particles, then in animals, and finally in man. The outer doors begin to open one after the other, till we come to the innermost region of man. Here we find the finite soaked in the Infinite" (See *Mānuṣer Dharma*, p. 97). Man is not a mere fact in this world. Man is a person. "Of all creatures it has been possible for him to comprehend this world in his knowledge and in his feeling and in his imagination, to realize in his individual spirit a union with a spirit that is everywhere" (*The Religion of Man*, p. 103). All through his writings, Rabindranath has pleaded for the unity and fulfilment of mankind on cultural, moral, and religious planes. A poet and philosopher of integral humanism, he has distilled the Upaniṣads in song and sun-burnt mirth.

THE ESOTERIC TEACHINGS OF THE UPANIṢADS

BY DR. HAROLD BARRY PHILLIPS

The teaching of the Upaniṣads is homogeneous: there may be differences in detail, but the main lines are the same in all, the same images and terminology recur, inextricably intertwined, so that the teaching of any one Upaniṣad, while not necessarily a complete whole in itself, contains the same essential traits as the others, and an analysis of the thought in any one of the leading Upaniṣads reveals the same basic teaching which underlies all. To exemplify this, and at the same time to give an exposition of my own interpretation of this esoteric teaching, I shall analyse the main lines of thought of two of the Upaniṣads, the *Kaṭha* and the *Śvetāśvatara*.*

*I have made use of the edition of Sri Ramakrishna Math, Madras, in the case of both the Upaniṣads, the *Kaṭha* being edited and translated by

The Essence of the Kaṭha Upaniṣad

The key to the ontology of the Upaniṣads lies hidden in the following verse: "Brahman is seen in the Self as one sees oneself in the mirror; in the world of Manes, as one perceives oneself in dream; in the world of Gandharvas, as one's reflection is seen in the water; in the world of Brahmā, as light and shade" (vi.5).¹ Brahman is here said to be perceived differently in different worlds. These worlds are drawn from the popular conceptions of ancient times, and so this passage is expressed in what is termed the ādhidaivika sense, i.e. in terms of

Swami Sharvananda, the *Śvetāśvatara* by Swami Tyagishananda.

¹ Yathā ādarśe tathā ātmani yathā svapne tathā pīṭhloke yathā apsu pari iva dadṛśe tathā gandharvaloke chāyātapayor iva brahmaloke.

the tutelary deities and the conceptions of popular religion. But this is a stage in the spiritual evolution of man which must be transcended. Hence, this description must be taken as analogical merely, and its true meaning must be sought in the *ādhyātmika* sense, that is, in terms of the Self or Mind. The passage will then mean that Brahman manifests Itself differently at different levels of reality. As there is no necessary reason why the number of different levels of reality should correspond to the number of worlds of popular religion, we must seek these different levels of manifestation not by taking each of these worlds one by one and seeking its significance, but rather by looking to other texts of the Upaniṣad.

The first such text is the following: "This syllable is Brahman; this syllable is also the highest" (ii.16).² By this syllable is meant OM, and OM is here distinguished as (1) the highest or Nirguṇa Brahman, and (2) Brahman simply, i.e., the lower or Saguṇa Brahman. The significance of this is that Brahman has at least these two levels of manifestation, each as real as the other, namely, (1) the highest or first level at which It subsists free from all determinations whatsoever—that is, as Pure Mind without any Mental Content, and (2) at a lower or second level, at which It subsists with determinations—that is, as Mind with a specific Mental Content.

This Mental Content can be analysed into certain varieties, which is done in the following passage: "He who was born of knowledge in the beginning, and born even prior to the waters—one who sees Him as dwelling with the elements, having entered the heart, he verily sees Brahman. This is verily That. Aditi, the soul of gods, who manifested in the form of Prāṇa and was created with the elements, who dwells having entered the heart—he who knows her, knows Brahman indeed. This is verily That" (iv.6-7).³ Now "He who

was born of knowledge in the beginning and born even prior to the waters," taking "waters" to symbolize all the five traditional elements, means that the first act of Brahman ("in the beginning") was to "think" a Mental Content (as is implied by "born of knowledge"), whereby the Saguṇa Brahman comes into existence before the physical world comes into existence ("prior to the waters"). This is clearly level 2 referred to above, and is further characterized as "Prāṇa" or Energy. Now if this level of manifestation is level 2, and if it existed prior to the waters or physical world, then clearly the level of reality which is the physical world is level 3. And the next stage is when Brahman, now dwelling with the elements, i.e. being already manifest as the physical world, enters the heart, or becomes manifest as the Life Force. This is level 4.

A different line of thought is expounded in the next passage with which I shall deal: "That Ātman by which man cognizes light, taste, smell, sounds, touches, and the sexual contacts,—what is there unknowable to that Ātman in this world? This is verily That. The wise man grieves not, having realized that great all-pervading Ātman through which one perceives all objects in dream as well as in the waking state" (iv.3-4).⁴ It is clear from this passage that it is the same Self that lies behind the cognitions of the senses ("by which man cognizes light, etc."), and that lies behind dreaming ("through which one perceives all objects in dream"): we can indeed equate sense-cognitions with dreaming as analogous functions of the same Self (Self is the translation of Ātman). But we must draw a distinction here: we cognize the objects of the senses in two different ways—by sensation and by perception, and dreaming is analogous only to the former. Hence, when the Upaniṣad *vyapaśyata, etat vai tat. Yā prāṇena sambhavaty aditir devatāmāyī; Guhām praviśya tiṣṭhantīm yā bhūtebhir vyajāyata, etat vai tat.*

⁴ *Yena rūpakam rasam gandham śabdān sparśānś-ca maithunān; Etena eva vijānāti kim atra pariśiśyate, etad vai tat. Svapnāntam jāgaritāntam ca ubhau yena anupaśyati mahāntam vibhum ātamānam.*

² *etat hi eva akṣaram brahma etat hi eva akṣaram param.*

³ *Yaḥ pūrvam tapaso jātam adbhyaḥ pūrvam ajāyata; Guhām praviśya tiṣṭhantam yo bhūtebhir*

adds: "as well as in the waking state", it can be accepted that it is perception that corresponds to the waking state. Sensation is the type of cognition that an animal might be supposed to enjoy—the sensations of different patterns of light and shade, etc., while perception is the type of cognition characteristic of Man—the recognition of these patches of colour as Objects. Thus, I identify the level of sensation with the dream state as the fifth level of reality (for the fourth level is that of the Self in itself, that is, in deep sleep, as is implicit in the passage quoted above from iv.6-7—the level of the Vital Force, "in the heart"), and I identify the level of perception with the waking state as the sixth level of reality. Thus, in levels 5 and 6 the Self becomes aware of the external physical world at two different levels of reality, at the levels of sensation and of perception.

Now levels 2, 3, and 4 were phases of the Mental Content of Brahman; similarly, levels 5 and 6 are phases of the "mental content" of the Self; and this level 6 is the level at which an Ego is ejected which is capable of its own mental activity, in virtue of which, indeed, we talk of self-consciousness. That the Upaniṣad recognizes a distinction between the Self (the Transcendental Self) of level 4 and the Ego (the empirical self) of level 6 is apparent from the following: "There are two selves, the apparent self and the real Self. Of these it is the real Self, and he alone, who must be felt as truly existing. To the man who has felt him as truly existing he reveals his innermost nature" (vi.13).⁵ Consider the context. In the previous verse it was affirmed that the Self cannot be reached by speech, by the senses, by the mind, but only by intuition. Thus, we have two selves, the one known only by intuition—this is the real Self; and the other one which is thought to be known by the intellect—this is the apparent self. This

⁵ Asti iti eva upalabdavyaḥ tattvabhāvena ca ubhayoḥ; Asti iti eva upalabdhasya tattvabhāvaḥ prasīdati. For the translation here I have used the Prabhavananda Manchester translation (New American Library, 1957).

justifies the translation given above. The real Self can only be the Vital Principle of level 4, and the apparent self will be the supposed substrate of the objects of the senses when viewed from the higher level of awareness, that of perception, which is level 6.

The whole of the esoteric teaching expounded above is summed up in the following passage: "Beyond the senses is the mind, beyond the mind is the intellect, beyond the intellect is the Great Ātman. Superior to the Great Ātman is the Unmanifested. And verily beyond also the Unmanifested is the all-pervading Puruṣa devoid of all distinctive marks" (vi.7-8).⁶ Each of these stage corresponds to one of the levels of manifestation deduced above, six in all, but the order is different. The order given here seems to depend on that of psychological awareness: I start out from the "given" to the senses, and by a process of analysis I move by steps to the mind (=sensorium) which projects the sense-data, then to the intellect which conceptualizes the sense-data into the Object, then to the Self (Ātman) which is the "mind" behind all this, and so on. I took a reconstructed chronological order of unfoldment: first Pure Mind, then Mind with this Content, then Mind with that Content, and so on. Rearranging the above concepts, then, I get the following six steps: (1) First is the all-pervading Puruṣa, for nothing is prior to this; this represents Brahman, conceived as Pure Mind. (2) Brahman conceived as Mind with a Content, that Content being Energy, is represented as the Unmanifested. (3) From Energy is compounded the world of molecules, i.e. the external physical world of which our bodies and sense-organs are a part, as well as the objects which stimulate these organs, namely, the sense-objects—wherefore this world is represented by "the senses". (4) The Great Ātman is the Self considered at a certain level of consciousness, namely, that of con-

⁶ Indriyebhyaḥ param mano manasaḥ satvam uttamam; Satvād adhi mahān ātmā mahato'vyaktam uttamam. Avyaktāt tu paraḥ puruṣo vyāpako'liṅga eva ca.

tinuity of consciousness, as in the germ-cell state, or (so it is claimed) as in the state of deep sleep. (5) Mind is the sensorium, the principle which projects the Object and which dreams. (6) Finally, we have the intellect, the waking, self-conscious principle or Ego. But it is actually an oversimplification to put the matter thus. It is in the Cosmic Field that Brahman manifests Itself as six different types of reality; in the Individual Field it is the Self that experiences the deep sleep, dreaming, and waking states. So "Some souls enter the womb to have a body, others go to the plants—just according to their work, and according to their knowledge. The Puruṣa who remains awake shaping all sorts of objects even while we sleep—verily that is the pure, the Brahman, and that is also called the Immortal. In that rest all the worlds, and none can transcend that. Verily this is That (v.7-8).⁷ In its context, this passage describes the "descent" from the "city of eleven gates" to rebirth in "the womb", which represents the Animal Kingdom in general, or in "plants", which is of course the Vegetable Kingdom. The context shows that it is the Self that is the subject of discussion here, and this Self is said to be "awake even while we sleep," that is, the state of sleep is its true level of awareness; further, it can achieve the state of dreaming, and is thus the substrate of all our psychological experiences. The last part of the quote brings us around again to the point of departure: It manifests Itself as different worlds; for example, in the Cosmic Field It manifests Itself as Plants, Animals, and Man, levels 4, 5, and 6; in the Individual Field It is also the substrate (in the guise of Its mode, the Self) of the sleeping, dreaming and waking states of Man, levels 4, 5, and 6 respectively. There is a level 7, but for this the reader must refer to the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*.

⁷ Yonim anye prapadyante śarīratvāya dehināḥ; Sthānum anye'nusamyanti yathākarma yathāśrutam. Ya eṣa supteṣu jāgarti kāmam kāmam puruṣo nirmimāṇaḥ; Tad-eva śukram tad brahma tad-eva amṛtam ucyate. Tasmin lokāḥ śritāḥ sarve tat u na atyeti kaścana, etat vai tat.

The Essence of the Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad

"It should be known that Energy assumes various forms such as earth, water, light, air, and ether at the command of Him who is the master of Guṇas and the maker of time, who is omniscient, who is Pure Consciousness itself, and by whom all this is ever enveloped" (vi.2).⁸ Here the "master of the Guṇas and the maker of time" is Pure Consciousness—this is level 1, if taken in the abstract. Hence, Its first manifestation must be on the plane of what can only be described as Thought, and that is here named Energy, = level 2. This Energy, the passage tells us, assumes the forms of the five traditional elements, which represent of course the world of molecules, of Inorganic Matter, level 3.

If the physical world is the "Thought" of God, the psychic world is the "Feeling" of God—or, as Rāmānuja expresses it, these are the external and internal bodies of God respectively. This Feeling of God, the Self, has its own "mental content", and so far as Man is concerned, this "mental content" can be differentiated into two broad divisions: the perceptual and the conceptual. Percepts are projected by a part of the "mind" termed the sensorium, and concepts are formed by the reason or intellect. So the next passage, "Subtle as the point of a goad, and pure, effulgent and infinite like the sun, He alone is seen assuming as another the size of a thumb on account of the finiteness of the heart, and associating Himself with egoism and Saṅkalpa on account of the limitations of the intellect" (v.8).⁹ The Self as a "Feeling" of God is here expressed as God assuming the size of a thumb in the heart of man. There instead of the Mental Powers by which the physical world becomes real, we find the secondary "mental powers" by which the psychical world becomes objective (so "on account of the finiteness of

⁸ Yena āvṛtam nityam idam hi sarvam jñāḥ kālākāro guṇī sarvavid yaḥ; Tena īśitam karma vivartateha pṛthivyaptejoni-lakhāni cintyam.

⁹ Aṅguṣṭhamātro ravitulyarūpaḥ saṅkalpāhaṁ-kārasamanvito yaḥ; Buddherguṇena ātmaguṇena ca eva ārāgramātro pi aparo'pi dṛṣṭaḥ.

the heart," this is God at the second remove, so to speak). These "mental powers" are distinguished as Saṅkalpa or the power of projecting images, whether these be the objects seen in dreams, in imagination, or in sense-perception, and as Egoism or the power by which the Self conceives itself as a person, and this is associated with the reason or intellect (so "by the limitations of the intellect"). This same line of thought is found also here: "Assuming a form of the size of a thumb, by virtue of Buddhi, Manas, and Heart, the Infinite Being dwells in the hearts of creatures as their inner self" (iii.13).¹⁰ Here the levels referred to in the previous quote are clearly more conveniently referred to as those of Heart, Manas, and Buddhi, levels 4, 5, and 6 respectively. The Heart is the Ancients' equivalent of the Sympathetic Nervous System, the centre of the vegetative functions; Manas or Sensorium is the seat of sensation and imagination, the dream world; and Buddhi is the level of the Ego and of conceptual thought, seated in the intellect or higher brain centres.

Next, take this passage: "The conscious subject and the unconscious object, the master and the dependent, are both unborn. She, too, who is engaged in bringing about the relation of the enjoyer and the enjoyed is unborn" (i.9).¹¹ Here "the unconscious object" represents the external molecular world (level 3) and the "conscious subject" represents the Self (level 4). In this relationship the latter might also be called the "enjoyer", the former the "enjoyed". She who brings these two into relation is Māyā, that is, the "rainbow world" of colour, sound, and smell, projected by the sensorium (level 5). Put it this way: there are certain molecules. In themselves these have neither colour, taste, nor smell. But when they act upon our sense-organs, the Self interprets the resultant impulses as certain colours, tastes, and smells,

¹⁰ Aṅguṣṭhamātraḥ puruṣo'ntarātmā sadā janānām hr̥daye sanniviṣṭaḥ hr̥dā manīṣā manasā abhikṛpto. (Tr. slightly altered).

¹¹ Jñajñau dvau ajau īśānīṣau ajā hi ekā bhoktr̥bhogyārtha-yuktā.

which enable us to "enjoy" the qualityless world of molecules.

Turn now to the Cosmic Field. We have seen that there are three levels of awareness in Man: his vegetative functions traditionally centred around his heart (level 4); his animal functions centred around what is called his Manas, chief of which is sensation (level 5); and his specifically human function, self-conscious awareness, or egoism and ratiocination, especially speech, which are centred in the Buddhi (level 6). But Man is only one of many types of creature on this earth, and, as the terminology used above suggests, we can also distinguish Plants, and Animals, as well as Man, respectively levels 4, 5, and 6. That is, all creatures have the vegetative functions; all the higher forms of life have sensation; but only Man has reason. This teaching is hidden in the following: "This Divinity . . . has entered into the womb. . . . He is inside all persons as the Indwelling Self, facing all directions. Salutations to that Divinity . . . who is in the plants, who is in the trees" (ii.16-17).¹² Here obviously "plants and trees" represent level 4; "wombs" level 5; and "persons" level 6.

Finally, we have a passage which distinguishes between the Self and the Ego: "Two birds of beautiful plumage, who are inseparable friends, reside on the self-same tree. Of these, one eats the fruits of the tree with relish while the other looks on without eating" (iv.6).¹³ The Self, the Witness, looks on without eating, that is, without being bound by desires and enjoyments—for it is pre-conscious. The self-conscious principle, the Ego, with its "me" and "mine" enjoys life and earns merit, or the opposite. These are inseparable because the Ego is ejected by the Self. The Self exists in itself at level 4, the Ego at level 6.

¹² Eṣo ha devaḥ . . . sa u garbhe antaḥ . . . pratyaṅ-janāḥ tiṣṭhati sarvatomukhaḥ . . . ya oṣadhīṣu yo vanaspatiṣu tasmai devāya namo namaḥ.

¹³ Dvā suparṇā sayujā sakhāyā samānam vṛkṣam pariśasvajāte; Tayoḥ anyāḥ pippalam svādu atti anaśnam anyo abhicākaśīti.

Thus, we see from these two Upaniṣads—and the same esoteric teaching can be traced in the other Upaniṣads generally—that there are three grades of mind. There is the unique Mind, Brahman, that Thinks protons and electrons; that organizes these into molecules; and Feels the Selves: cp. “The whole world is filled with beings who form His parts” (*Śvet.* iv.10).¹⁴ Each of these Selves has the same three powers, but in an inferior degree, namely, they “organize” food into the body (a point not brought out above); “project” the rainbow world of Object; and “eject” the Ego or self-conscious principle. So also the Ego has these powers, yet more diluted, so that it forms concepts or ideas; organizes them into Speech; and personifies certain concepts into, let us say, fairies and other such invisible beings.

¹⁴ Tasya avayavabhūtaiḥ tu vyāptam sarvam idam jagat.

These powers of the human mind are not dealt with in the two Upaniṣads analysed above, and indeed only one of these powers is at all explicit in any of the Upaniṣads, namely, Speech. But any further consideration of these ideas would take us too far afield.

It will be obvious, however, that here we have an ontology for Mysticism: the whole universe is, directly or indirectly, a manifestation of Brahman at six (in the *Māṇḍūkya*, at seven) different levels of reality. At any one level, at least so far as affects human beings, the Object appears as dependent on mind, its *esse* is *percipi*; the mental content of the lower levels (taking level 6 as the highest) are given as real, independent of mind; and the entities of higher levels simply vanish, cease to exist. But in a short article like this I cannot go into any further detail. But it seems to me that the thought of the Upaniṣads is still a living philosophy.

LOGIC OF CHANGE IN ADVAITA

BY DR. P. S. SASTRI

(Continued from previous issue)

13. We cannot, however, accept a Reality which continues to be external and yet is perpetually transforming itself. If x in its entirety undergoes a transformation or modification, it is no longer x. It loses its reality as x. If it is a part of this x that has this transformation, is this part different or non-different from it? If it is different, then it is not x that is evolving but some other, y. When y is transforming itself, we cannot say that x is undergoing this transformation. If this part is not different from x, it is no longer a part but the whole x.¹⁸⁷

One may argue that this Reality is an identity-and-difference. As having the charac-

ter of the cause, it is non-different, and it is different as having the character of the effect. The golden bracelet is different from the golden chain because one is a bracelet and the other is a chain; and the two are non-different because both have the character of gold. It cannot be argued that difference and non-difference, being contradictories, cannot inhere; for what we apprehend as a fact cannot be brushed aside as a contradiction.¹⁸⁸ When we say that this ear-ring is gold, we are putting the ear-ring in apposition with the gold since we apprehend not only their difference but also their identity. If the ear-ring and the gold are completely non-different only, we should

¹⁸⁷ B 117.2-5.

¹⁸⁸ cf. *Brahma Siddhi*, 63ff.

say that this ear-ring is an ear-ring or that this gold is gold. That is, we should have a tautology. If there is only difference between the two, we cannot put one in apposition with the other. Likewise we cannot have this apposition even when both have an identical ground or when one is the ground of the other. The apprehension of this relation of apposition is uncontradicted, undoubted, and universal; and it establishes the relation of identity-and-difference between a cause and its effect.¹⁸⁹

This argument ignores a good deal. What is this difference which coexists with non-difference or identity? If it is said that this difference is only mutual exclusion, does it subsist between the golden ear-ring and a gold chain? In the absence of such an exclusion the two would become identical; and the reality of this mutual-exclusion would make them only different from one another. We cannot also say that existence and non-existence are non-contradictory since their very co-existence is an impossibility. If it is a possibility, one should say that in reality the ear-ring and the chain are identical.

Let us admit that the ear-ring is not different from the chain. As far as the character of the gold chain is concerned, this character must be assumed to be non-different from the golden ear-ring, the golden bracelet, and the golden vase. Likewise the character of the golden ear-ring cannot be different from the rest. Since the ear-ring and the chain are not different from one another, and since the difference is not apprehended, only one of these objects must be deemed to be real. Let this real thing be the gold chain. Then the other objects cannot be real if they are other than the gold chain.

It may be contended that the identity refers only to the character of the gold chain and that the various objects differ from one another because of the differences in their forms. But if the ear-ring is not different from the chain, how is it that the gold chain is not immanent in the various golden objects?

If it is not immanent, how can the different objects be identical with one another? If something is present in a variety of objects and if yet the objects are exclusive of the immanent principle, they cannot be identical with it. The string that holds together the various flowers into a garland is different from the flowers in spite of its being immanent in them. If the gold chain runs through all the golden objects and if the golden objects are not co-present with it, then they are different from the chain. But if it is said that existence is a character immanent in all objects, then we cannot have expressions like: 'This is not here', 'This is not from this', 'This is now not this', 'This is not like this'. As immanent it should make all objects identical with one another and then nothing could be distinguished from any other. If from a distance we perceive an object to be a golden one, we should not then begin to enquire as to what specific golden object it is, because that object *ex hypothesi* cannot be different from gold, and because we already know that it is gold.¹⁹⁰

From the standpoint of identity and difference, we may be told that there is also difference, that the object perceived is not merely golden, and that this specific character is yet to be known. But one can retort by saying that since there is identity between gold and this object and since we already know it to be golden, we know it fully; and then there should be no further need to know it further. If the causal process is merely a transformation of a cause, once we know the character of the cause, we also know thereby the character of the effect. As such an enquiry into a specific knowledge of the effect is futile. But when an apprehension of x does not include the apprehension of y, then this x is different from y. Thus when we apprehend an object from a distance to be gold, if this apprehension does not include the apprehension of ear-ring, then the ear-ring does differ from gold.

Then how can we account for the apposi-

¹⁸⁹ B 117.5-118.3.

¹⁹⁰ B 118.4-119.6. cf. PPV 213.6ff; VPS 204-5.

tion of the gold with the ear-ring in the expression, "This ear-ring is gold?" An apposition, however, does not imply that the two have an identical ground or that one is the ground of the other. Nor can we say that *x* and *y* differ in one aspect and do not differ in another. On the contrary the apprehension of difference presupposes an identity as its basic ground, and not the reverse. Difference depends on the differing entities, and each differing entity is one. If it is not one, then difference cannot have a ground and it therefore becomes impossible. Each entity by itself is not dependent on difference. Difference requires at least two entities, while each taken by itself does not presuppose difference. Thus all difference has its ground or being in identity, and difference itself is inexplicable, indeterminable, and self-contradictory. Difference is an appearance.¹⁹¹ This conclusion is strengthened by a consideration of the relation of the face to its reflection in a mirror. There is only one face existing at one only place; and it appears as two at two different places. Yet we do not accept the reality of this difference. The difference here is an appearance.¹⁹²

14. The causal relation cannot therefore be an identity, a difference, an identity in difference, or a succession. The cause and the effect must be existents also. A destruction which is non-existent cannot destroy an existent entity, since the non-existent cannot act. In other words an existent entity can destroy itself only when it is its nature to do so.¹⁹³ The Buddhist thinker propounds the momentary character of the existent.¹⁹⁴ But to say that an existent has the character of destruction is to treat the existent in a self-contradictory manner.¹⁹⁵ Still this self-contradiction is at the very basis of our conception of the physical universe. Whatever exists,

exists separately from other existents.¹⁹⁶ Matter cannot exist apart from sense-data. If so, matter cannot lay any claim to existence as such. Any entity then cannot be destroyed by any other; for, in reality nothing comes into being.¹⁹⁷ Yet we are told that existence is always an action, that existence is work.¹⁹⁸ Causation is kinetic.¹⁹⁹ The contradiction here is resolved by arguing that the efficiency or activity of the point-instant is other than the efficiency of the empirical object which is associated with that point-instant.

15. Every product on such a view is the result of the interplay of a number of infra atomic point-instants called *dharms*. These elements appear in functional interdependence upon one another. We may glance at Vasubandhu's statement. There is a cause cotton which is the cause of the being, of an effect, cloth. We have a co-operating cause in the loom, an immanent cause in the threads, an inciting cause in the weaver, an all-pervading cause in space, and an immediate cause in the warp and woof.²⁰⁰ These causes seem to be necessary for the emergence of the cloth. The immanent and all-pervading causes are present in the past and also now.²⁰¹ It is the co-operating and inciting causes that are said to bring forth the effect,²⁰² since these alone make the cause efficient.²⁰³ There are others who speak of five different types of causes. The seed is the generating cause of the plant; the smoke is a reminding cause of fire; the light is the manifesting cause of the objects; the club is the destructive cause of the jar; and the car is the cause that reaches us to a destination.²⁰⁴ Likewise there can be a plurality of factors working together to bring forth an effect. The tree, the axe, and the hands are required in felling down the branch of a tree;

¹⁹¹ B 119.6-16. See BS 63-70; and the preceding chapter.

¹⁹² See PP 23.5-7; PPV 64.10-12.

¹⁹³ PVV 520.1-3.

¹⁹⁴ cf. Russell: *Logic and Mysticism*, 129.

¹⁹⁵ BBV 1.2.47.

¹⁹⁶ See NS 4.1.36.

¹⁹⁷ PV III. 281.

¹⁹⁸ TS 177.2.

¹⁹⁹ TS 1.

²⁰⁰ AK 2.49.

²⁰¹ AK 2.55.

²⁰² AK 2.59.

²⁰³ AK 2.63.

²⁰⁴ AKV on 2.55. cf. LS 83.

but taken severally, any one thing cannot accomplish the result. The final result arises as dependent upon various factors; and as essentially dependent, it does not have its own character. If it has no character of its own, it is not an existent, and then we cannot speak of its emergence, origination, or manifestation.²⁰⁵

On the Yogācāra view, we have one point-instant succeeding another, and it is preceded by a series of such point-instants. These immediate antecedents of a point-instant are taken to constitute its causes and conditions; and it has a functional dependence on this totality. In other words, everything that exists is a cause because existence and cause are synonymous terms.²⁰⁶ This theory assumed a variety of forms during the development of the Buddhist thought. One of the earliest statements was: when this is, that appears.²⁰⁷ A second variety argued that there is no real emergence of an effect since there is only interdependence. A third view was the denial of a force or activity to every entity. The second and the third appear in Buddhist Idealism.

Whatever arises from causes and conditions is that which does not have its own essence. It is a dependent existent.²⁰⁸ If it has its own essence or character, what would be the use of the causes and conditions which are essential for its origination?²⁰⁹ It should exist even without these factors.²¹⁰ Since every existent is that which must also have a character of its own, and since every effect as dependent on its causal factors does not have its own character, an effect cannot claim existence.²¹¹ Let us admit that an effect called jar comes into existence. When does this origination take place? It is only when the clay is given the form of a jar we observe that it is a jar. At the initial

stage it is not yet a jar, and yet the initial moment is necessary for the emergence of the effect. The effect then has a dependent existence;²¹² and the cause and the effect are relative to one another²¹³ like the short and the long. If something is short, it is because something else is long. Likewise if x is a cause, it is because y is its effect. That is, the causal law is a hypothetical proposition.²¹⁴ The Yogācāra Idealism accepts this relativity maintaining at the same time that pure consciousness is the only non-relative element. This relativity was later developed in two ways. The prāsaṅgika branch of the Madhyamaka system led by Buddhapālita argued that since every existent comes into being only from causes and conditions, it has no permanent and independent character and is therefore unreal.²¹⁵ The Svātantrika branch of the same system led by Bhāvaviveka held that an existent is the product of causes and conditions only from a conventional point of view, and that from a transcendental point of view there is no causation.²¹⁶

16. The causal relation is one of dependence (NVT 426, TC II. 222-4). The effect depends on the cause for its origination. Thus the seed begets the branch and so on. But the material which constitutes it and gives it a shape is other than the cause. The plant is the form that represents the unity of the various elements like earth, air, and water. The plant which has its specific cause and conditions is not there originated by itself; nor is it entirely dependent on the others because it has its own specific mode of existence. It is not, however, an eternal existent since it originates after the cause has ceased to be and since it too ceases to be after some time. But it emerges at the moment when its cause ceases to be. The two take place simultaneously, and we cannot therefore say

²⁰⁵ LS 198-200; MK 4.93; MSA 11.51; AVS 49.

²⁰⁶ TS 175ff.

²⁰⁷ cf. *Ratnāvalī* 1.48; AK 3.20ff.

²⁰⁸ CS 9.7.

²⁰⁹ MMK 7.16; 15.1,2.

²¹⁰ Vi. Vy 22. cf. *Lokātīta Stava* 4.20.

²¹¹ CS 9.1. cf. *Acintya Stava* 10; AVS 25-27.

²¹² cf. *Acintya Stava*, 5, 11.

²¹³ *Ratnāvalī* 1.49.

²¹⁴ CS 14.23. cf. Sigwart: *Logic*, II.358; Bosanquet: *Logic*, I, 251-2.

²¹⁵ See Buddhapālita on MMK 1.3, 10.

²¹⁶ See KR 35.

that it arises from an annihilation. The plant being different from the seed, the seed does not run into its effect. There is no immanence of the cause in the effect. Yet the plant has to wait till the seed acquires the proper state when the non-emergence of the effect is negated. The non-emergent effect that is negated is no other than the anterior non-existence of the effect.²¹⁷ This process continues in a cyclical manner. From a seed arises a plant, and this plant brings forth another seed which issues into another plant. Thus there is a mutual causation based on interdependence. The effect accordingly is not real because it changes. It is not unreal because it does bring forth another effect. It is the product of certain factors and yet it appears to have an independent being. It is an element in a never-ending process. As an element, it is relative to the process,²¹⁸ though it is devoid of its own character. The character of the effect is not found in its cause. When its own character does appear independently in the effect, how can we relate that which is not its character to itself. The nature of the plant is not present in the seed, and the character of the seed is other than that of the plant. Then the causes and conditions of an effect are futile.²¹⁹ When everything is dependent on another and when it does not have its own character, there can be no cause which can be taken as the cause of an effect.²²⁰

17. Even the concept of succession is of no avail. An antecedent moment that is sublated, being at present non-existent, cannot be the cause of the present moment. It may be said that the antecedent moment assumes the character of existence and has fully evolved its own individualistic essence, and that such a moment is the cause of the subsequent

moment.²²¹ But if such a moment has also an additional creationistic activity, then it is entering into a relation with another moment. If it is said that the creationistic activity is no other than its coming into existence, then we have only to remember that no effect which is not imbued with the character of its own cause can ever come into existence; and this would put an end to the doctrine of the momentariness of things. If the effect is not imbued with the characteristic of the cause, then, since such an absence of imbuing is possible at any place or time, anything can be the cause of anything else.²²² Pots and gold ornaments are actually apprehended by us as having the characters of clay and gold respectively. Such a character cannot exist if the cause is not present during the time there is the effect. This does not mean that there is only a similarity between the cause and the effect; for, in the absence of some common character running into the effect, we cannot speak even of similarity. If this character is present, then that is the cause.²²³ To argue that even without the cause or the preceding moment persisting in the moment of the effect, there can be the origination of the effect, is to contradict facts of experience. If something can originate even in the total absence of all causes, there will be no restraining agency; and everything should originate everywhere. If every entity is momentary it cannot endure till the origination of the subsequent moment.²²⁴ Vasubandhu, therefore, held that there is no motion. Every movement needs something enduring. But an entity being momentary. It annihilates itself.²²⁵ Strictly speaking motion involves only a series of immobilities. The momentary point-instant being devoid of a force, there is no cause-effect relation in an ultimate sense.²²⁶ We can only say that an event is the result of all

²¹⁷ *Ārya Śālistamba Sūtra* 4-7. cf. *Abhidharma Samuccaya*, 28-29.

²¹⁸ *Ārya Śālistamba Sūtra*, 13.

²¹⁹ MMK 1.3.

²²⁰ MMK 1.13; CS 14.13; LS 2.1 and page 191; cf. *Śikṣā Samuccaya* 263; *Bodhicaryāvatara*, 9.150.

²²¹ TS 440-1.

²²² VSB 531.15-532.3.

²²³ B 532.1-3.

²²⁴ VSB 533.2-4; B 532.4-5.

²²⁵ AK 4.1.

²²⁶ TSP 399.12ff.

the preceding moments of the universe;²²⁷ for, the effect is nothing over and above the presence of the totality of its causes.²²⁸

18. The causal relation is a principle meant to explain change. Change may seem to be a fact in our empirical or finite existence. But in itself change is an impossibility. There can be no motion. Change involves states that come from a past heading towards a future. If past and future can be real, the change represented by the present can be valid. The past is beyond change since it is no more here and now. The future is that which is not yet, the unborn. Change cannot be predicated of the unborn, nor of that which is already born. The present cannot be present if it is changing continuously. It is present only if it has a duration. Further, change is not an independent existent. We do not say that change is changing, since it can be the predicate only of that which is not change. If change is not a predicate, then there should be an unchanging change or a changing static entity. In other words, change is possible only when it is both the subject and the predicate. Thus we have to speak of the movement of a moving body; and this amounts to saying that there are two subjects which are equally moving. That is, if the subject is not already in a state of motion, we cannot predicate motion to it. Thus the non-moving body cannot move. Only that which is moving is capable of moving. But that which moves must be other than movement. As such neither a moving body nor a non-moving body can move. If it is already moving, we cannot speak of a beginning in its movement; and if it is a non-moving body, it cannot move without ceasing to be itself. The very beginning of movement is not possible.²²⁹

If *x* has begun to move, then this movement refers to a past which is no more; and since the past is excluded by the present and future, we cannot speak of its movement. If it is a non-moving body, there can be no

beginning of a motion of *x*. The present moving state is that which is not the beginning. The beginning of the movement requires either two subjects or two predicates, as we have seen. The moving body does not begin to move since it is already in motion; and the non-moving cannot move. When there can be no beginning of motion, there can be no change.²³⁰

When an entity originates, during the moment of origination it has a specific character. If this character includes its existence, it is not that which is originating but that which has already originated. As originating, it cannot be the existent, and as existent it is not subject to change. Further, that which originates can have only a finite existence. It should then have the character of being liable to be destroyed. Now, existence and destruction being mutually exclusive, an entity cannot have both the features of existence and non-existence. Thus if an entity originates as having only the character of existence, it cannot cease to be at any time; and if it does not have such a character, it is a non-existence and as such we cannot speak of its origination.²³¹ We cannot therefore speak of the beginning and end of any entity; and whatever has no beginning and no end, has no middle.²³² It is an appearance pure and simple.

19. We are thus driven to hold that it is the knowledge of the causal process which finds its culmination in the knowledge of the cause or ground of the process,²³³ since the effect is necessarily grounded in an entity which is called its cause.²³⁴ The causal relation, however, is a construction of the conceptual understanding.²³⁵ Normally we do not have the cause when the effect has come into existence; nor do we have the effect when there is the cause. If the two coexist, we

²³⁰ MMK 2.12ff.

²³¹ MMK 7.1-2.

²³² MMK 11.2; MK 4.19.

²³³ B 401.1.

²³⁴ HBT 112.8ff.

²³⁵ MMV 16.

²²⁷ cf. AK 2.50.

²²⁸ See NVTI 122.12-13.

²²⁹ MMK 2.1ff.

cannot treat two coexisting entities as causally related. If they do not coexist, at any given moment we have only one of these entities; and we cannot speak of a relation between an existent entity and a non-existent one. We cannot argue that the causal relation is one which slides from the cause to the effect in a succession; for, even then it will be a relation which does not have two entities. If two entities are taken to be causally related because they are together related to an identical ground, then the horns of the animal have an equal claim to be causally related.²³⁶ When we have x which brings forth a y, there is no relation intervening between these two; we have x and we have y which we interpret as related. It is the human subject that visualizes a relation. When we see x, we go in search of the y, just as when we see smoke we seek the fire which we do not first see. It is the perception of these two entities as coexisting that enables us to refer them to a causal relation; and this way of describing their existence is resorted to mainly because it is a convenient way of circumventing a round-about description. The terms cause and effect then are only signs which refer to the entities and not to any relation between them. They are just mental constructs which speak of a relation between entities while no such relation is apprehended.²³⁷

No entity can be its own cause, since such an origination or emergence is devoid of any purpose and since it is an impossibility (K.I.43). If the seed does not originate from itself, can we say that it originates from something else? But there can be no specific entity from which it can be brought forth. The only sensible way of speaking would be to admit that everything can emerge from everything else. When we cannot admit either the existence or the non-existence of the effect prior to its emergence, we cannot hold that it has

a specific cause. We cannot also say that the entity is self-originated and also caused by an other, since this is an inconsistent position. Nor can it arise without there being a cause.²³⁸ In reality there is neither origination nor destruction.²³⁹

We have plenty of instances in actual experience of objects that owe nothing to known specific entities. The appearance of water in a mirage, *fata morgana*, objects cognized in a dream, spatial distances revealed by a painting, the circle formed by the fire-brand, the bubbles in water, shadows in a lake, reflection in a mirror, echoes and such other appearances owe their being to the mind only.²⁴⁰ They do not have any origination and yet have a character; or they do not have a character and yet are originated. In either case they defy the very nature of the causal law because of their non-being or because of the absence of external causal factors. They do not arise from non-existence, nor are they modifications of the existent.²⁴¹ Still we attribute them to some cause or other and we derive some other effects from them. Thus though the causal relation does help us to some extent in interpreting phenomena, still it is not a valid and consistent principle.²⁴²

Logic deals with an examination of the nature of thought in relation to existence. And the foregoing justifies us in rejecting any logical theory that is based on the concept of relations. The relational logic may explain empirical experience, but it cannot claim ultimate validity. The logic based on relations points to a logic founded on identity; and the self-contradictions inherent in the former do not appear in the latter. This is the direction in which the logical theory of Advaita moves.

(Concluded)

²³⁶ MMK 1.1 along with Buddhapālita's *Vṛtti*.

²³⁹ MMK 21.13; MK 4.22; MMV 2. cf. *Aṣṭa Sāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, 39-40.

²⁴⁰ LS 90-94.

²⁴¹ LS 3.87-100.

²⁴² MMK 7.34; MMV 57.

²³⁶ SP 7 to 10; PKM 506-7.

²³⁷ SP 12 to 17; NBT 73.19-21; PKM 507-8.

THE STORY OF GIDEON

BY SRI C. GOPALAKRISHNAN NAYAR

The story of Gideon has been told in the Book of Judges in the Old Testament. Gideon was a Judge over Israel and he judged the people for forty years. The Judges referred to in the book were not officers appointed by any king or governor as the word signifies in its present-day sense, nor were they themselves kings or governors over the country. They were occasional deliverers raised up by God to rescue Israel from oppression and to administer justice.

Whenever the children of Israel disobeyed the Word of God and did evil in His sight, He allowed them to be conquered and oppressed by the neighbouring nations. Then, naturally, the people repented for their sin and prayed to God for deliverance, for Israel was then a Theocratic kingdom and God Jehovah Himself was the King Invisible. God saved them through the Judges whom He raised up.

Of all the several Judges mentioned in the Book of Judges, Gideon interests us the most. The other Judges were not so perfect as Gideon; each had his or her own weakness. Othniel first came forward to fight the Canaanites, hoping to win the hand of Caleb's daughter if he came out victorious. Ehud played false on the king of Moab and killed him treacherously. Deborah could not deliver the people of herself, but required the help of Barak. Barak had to be inspired both by the words and presence of Deborah, before he could deliver the people from the hands of the Canaanites. He could not kill Sisera himself; but Jael had to do it. Tola and Jair had comparatively little work to do. Jephthah was grieved when he found that he had to sacrifice his daughter—his only child—to God so as to fulfil his vow. Further, he was not, it appears, cent per cent confident of victory over the Ammonites. If he was so, he had not to take

the vow. Ibsan, Elon, and Abdon had not much work to do. Samson was lustful. He was often allured by women out of his path and out of it he perished.

Gideon was devoid of all these faults. Besides, he had many good qualities to his advantage. The word "Gideon" means a "Cutter down". First of all he was a hardy man accustomed to labour. Again, he was cautious in all his works. When the Angel of the Lord came and sat under an oak, Gideon was threshing wheat by the wine-press, to hide it from the Midianites. He was sorely grieved at the miserable plight the Israelites were in, and desired much to save them. When the Angel of the Lord appeared to him and said, "The Lord is with thee, thou mighty man of valour," the very first question that he asked the Angel was, "If the Lord be with us, why then is all this befallen us?" This shows how unselfish he was. It was not his personal interest, but the welfare of the people, that was foremost in his mind. He had no personal interest apart from that of the people. The Angel said, "The Lord is with *thee*"; but he put it "If the Lord be with *us*." Mark his selflessness! If God was not with the people, He was not with Gideon too—so was his conviction.

He was humble. The Lord looked upon him and said, "Go in this thy might, and thou shalt save Israel from the hand of the Midianites." Gideon's reply to this was, "Oh my Lord, wherewith shall I save Israel? Behold, my family is poor in Manasseh, and I am the least in my father's house." The Lord then encouraged Gideon saying, "Surely I will be with thee, and thou shalt smite the Midianites as one man."

Gideon was not puffed up with pride when the Lord assured him of His support.

Instead, he wanted to convince himself that the Lord actually spoke to him and that his experience was not mere frenzy. So he said, "If now I have found grace in thy sight, then shew me a sign that thou talkest with me." Again, Gideon wanted to worship the Lord. So he said, "Depart not hence, I pray thee, until I come unto thee, and bring forth my present, and set it before thee." The Angel of the Lord agreed to do so. Gideon went and brought the articles and placed them before the Angel. Then the Angel of the Lord put forth the end of the staff that was in his hand, and touched the flesh and the unleavened cakes; there rose up fire out of the rock, and consumed the flesh and the unleavened cakes. Then the Angel of the Lord departed out of his sight.

Gideon had fear of the Lord and His word. When he perceived that it was an Angel of the Lord that he saw, he became afraid; for it has been said, "No one can see God face to face and live." The Lord comforted him saying, "Peace be unto thee; fear not: thou shalt not die." Then Gideon built an altar there unto the Lord, and called it Jehovah-Shalom, which means "The Lord send peace."

That same night the Lord asked him to throw down the altar of Baal* that his father Joash had, to cut down the grove that was by it, to build an altar unto the Lord upon the top of the rock, and to make a 'burnt sacrifice' on it. Here again Gideon was very cautious. He could not do it in the day time because he feared his father's household and the men of the city. So he took ten men of his servants and did it by night.

In the morning the people enquired and found that it was Gideon who did all that. Then they said unto Joash his father, "Bring out thy son, that he may die: because he hath cast down the Altar of Baal." Joash refused to do so. He said, "Will ye plead for Baal? Will ye save him? He that will plead for him, let him be put to death. . . .

*Baal was a God of the Gentiles (non-Jews) and the Jews are forbidden from worshipping Baal.

If he be a God, let him plead for himself, because one hath cast down his Altar." And Joash called Gideon "Jerubbaal" which means "let Baal plead."

The Midianites and the Amalekites were gathered together in the valley of Jezreel. Gideon also gathered an army and pitched his camp beside the well of Harod: so that the host of the Midianites were on the north side of them, by the hill of Moreh, in the valley. This shows his carefulness in selecting a strategic place for his camp.

Before starting to meet the Midianites and pitching the camp, Gideon was wise enough to ascertain whether God was with him. As prayed for by him, God showed him the fleece put by him on the floor wet with dew on a hot day and dry on a dewy day. And Gideon was convinced.

The army that Gideon had collected was large; because the Spirit of the Lord was in him and many men came forward at his call. Now, the battle was to be fought by the Lord. The honour was to go entirely to the Lord and not to the people. So, at God's word, Gideon tested his men. All those who entertained the least fear were allowed to depart. The remaining men were then led to the water to drink. Every one that bowed down upon his knees to drink was sent back; and they that 'lapped of the water', putting their hand to their mouth, them he retained. They were only three hundred in number.

That night the Lord said to him, "If thou fear to go down, go thou with Phurah thy servant down to the host: And thou shalt hear what they say; and afterward shall thine hands be strengthened to go down unto the host." Gideon went with his servant, as commanded by the Lord, and he overheard a man telling the others of his dream and the interpretation thereof by another. The dream was this:—"A cake of barley bread tumbled into the host of Midian, and came unto a tent, and smote it that it fell, and overturned it." The dream was interpreted that Gideon was to overcome the Midianites.

Gideon returned to his camp emboldened by what he overheard. He divided his men into three companies and put a trumpet in every man's hand, with empty pitchers, and lamps within the pitchers. And he said unto them, "Look on me, . . . and when I come to the outside of the camp. . . As I do, so shall ye do.' "

It is here that we see Gideon's greatest quality. The enemies were many. They lay along in the valley like grasshoppers for multitude; and their camels were without number, as the sand by the sea side. Gideon had but three hundred men. Further more, he and his men were not going to fight the battle with sword, for the battle was to be fought by the Lord. Gideon had full faith in God and His word, so he hesitated not the least to advance with his men.

After getting to the outside of the enemies' camp, he and his men, as previously directed by him, blew the trumpets and broke the pitchers and held the lamps in their left hands and the trumpets in their right hands to blow withal: and they cried, 'The Sword of the Lord and of Gideon.' The Midianites, thus taken by surprise, were terrified and they ran and fled for they thought that a big army had surrounded them. In their confusion they slew one another. The Lord set every man's sword against his fellow, even throughout all the host. The men of Israel gathered themselves together out of Naphtali, and out of Asher, and out of all Manasseh, and pursued the Midianites.

Then Gideon sent messengers throughout all Mount Ephraim asking them to come down against the Midianites and to take before them the waters unto Beth-barah and Jordan. They did accordingly. They also took two princes of the Midianites, Oreb and Zeeb, and slew them.

The men of Ephraim then chid Gideon sharply for not calling them when he

went against the Midianites. But he pacified them saying that what he was able to do was comparatively not so great as what they did. This shows how wise and tactful he was in his dealings with his people.

Gideon and his men, though they were faint, crossed Jordan and pursued the Midianites. When he came to Succoth, he asked the people there for loaves of bread. But they refused. Gideon then vowed to punish them when he would return victorious. The same thing happened at Penuel. He vowed to break down the tower of Penuel on his way back. This shows his undaunted valour and will power.

Gideon pursued the Midianites and took Zeba and Zalmunna captives and returned. On his way back he fulfilled his vows. Then he slew the two kings, for they had killed his brothers.

The men of Israel then offered to make Gideon their ruler. But he refused the offer, saying, "The Lord shall rule over you." Mark his humility and submissiveness to God!

That the people may be satisfied, Gideon requested them to give him every man the ear-ring of his prey. They willingly gave; and Gideon became a rich man. With the spoils he made an ephod and put it in his city. He lived for forty years thence and there was peace during the whole time.

One charge can, however, be brought against him, that he had many wives. But that was the custom of the time and he cannot be blamed for that.

Now, this is the lesson that we learn from this story: If we deviate from the ways of God, we are sure to go astray, allured by the fleeting pleasures of evil. The consequences will be terrible. Humility, fear of God, love, submission to God, obedience, contentment, faith, bravery, and consistency in the ideal—these are the good virtues to be acquired and cultivated so as to eradicate all sinful thoughts.

ŚRĪ-BHĀṢYA

BY SWAMI VIRESWARANANDA

(Continued from previous issue)

TOPIC II

BRAHMAN'S CREATION HAS NO MOTIVE BEHIND EXCEPT A SPORTIVE IMPULSE

In the previous topic it has been shown that as Brahman is endowed with all powers It is capable of creating the world through mere volition. A fresh objection is raised that It cannot be the cause of the world as It has no need to create a world, being self-sufficient.

न प्रयोजनवत्त्वात् ॥२११३२॥

32. (Brahman is) not (the creator of the world) because (creation appears to have) a motive (behind).

There is some motive or purpose at the back of this creation and the Lord has no purpose to gain by such creation. Nobody engages himself in any action without a motive or purpose. This purpose can be twofold. It can be either to satisfy one's own desire or for the sake of others. Brahman being self-sufficient, It has nothing to gain for Itself by the creation of this world. Neither can it be for the sake of the individual souls, for in that case It would have created a world full of happiness, out of pity for the souls, and not this world full of suffering for them. Therefore, as Brahman has no purpose whatsoever to achieve by this creation, It cannot be the cause of the world.

लोकवत्तु, लीलाकैवल्यम् ॥२११३३॥

33. But (Brahman's creative activity) is mere pastime, as is seen in the world.

Even as kings engage themselves in activity, like playing with a ball, without any motive but for mere amusement, or even as

children play out of fun, so also Brahman, without any purpose to gain, engages Itself in creating this world of diversity as a mere pastime.

An objection is raised against the view expressed in this Sūtra. The creation of a world in which there is so much suffering would subject Brahman to the charge of partiality and cruelty. So Brahman who is full of pity cannot be the cause of this diabolical world even out of mere sport.

वैषम्यनेर्घृण्ये न, सापेक्षत्वात्, तथा हि

दर्शयति ॥२११३४॥

34. Partiality and cruelty cannot (be attributed to Brahman) on account of Its taking into consideration (other reasons in that matter), because (the scripture) declares (it to be) so.

Some are born as men while others are born as gods; so the Lord is partial to some. He is cruel inasmuch as He creates a world full of suffering for the souls. The latter part of the Sūtra refutes these objections and says that on account of the Lord's taking into consideration the past Karma of the various beings before creating them as gods, man, or lower animals, partiality cannot be attributed to Him. Souls are born according to their past Karma in different species. So their Karma accounts for the difference in their condition and not the Lord's partiality. Śruti also declares the same thing: 'A man becomes good by good work, bad by bad work' (Br. 3.2.13). The Lord is only operative cause in the creation of beings; the main cause is the past Karma of the beings. Just as rain helps different seeds to sprout, each according to its nature, so the Lord is the general efficient

cause in bringing the latent tendencies of each individual to fruition. Hence He is neither partial nor cruel.

न कर्माविभागादिति चेत्, न, अनादित्वात्,
उपपद्यते चाप्युपलभ्यते च ॥२११३५॥

35. If it be said (that is) not (possible) for want of any distinction in work (before creation), (we say) no, because (the world) is beginningless; this is reasonable and is also seen (from the scriptures).

Before creation there was Brahman alone and nothing else existed; there were no individual souls and so there was no Karma to justify the inequality in creation. That there were no souls before creation is declared by the scriptures: 'In the beginning, dear boy, there was this Being alone, one only' etc. (*Ch.* 6.2.1). The Sūtra refutes this and says, 'No'; for their souls and their Karma form an eternal stream which is beginningless. Individual souls are not created but existed even before creation in a very subtle condition almost non-distinguishable from Brahman, and hence the scriptural texts which declare the non-existence of everything but Brahman before creation. What the texts deny is the existence of beings in a gross state with name and form. But the souls did exist in a subtle condition even before creation. This is reasonable also, for otherwise souls would be punished for acts they did not commit and go without punishment for wrong acts committed by them. That the souls are eternal is also declared by the scriptures: 'All this was then unmanifest. It became manifest only as name and form' (*Bṛ.* 1.4.7). As the text talks of mere manifestation in gross form, the souls are eternal and existed before creation also. 'He is the eternal among the

eternal' (*Śvet.* 6.13); 'This unborn, eternal, everlasting ancient One' etc. (*Kaṭh.* 1.2.18); 'The conscious subject and the unconscious object, the master and the dependent, are both unborn' (*Śvet.* 1.9). Smṛti also declares the same: 'Know that Prakṛti and Puruṣa are both beginningless' (*Gītā,* 13.19). Moreover, creation also is beginningless, and when the scriptures talk of the beginning of creation they mean only the beginning of a new cycle. This is borne out by texts like, 'The Lord devised the sun and the moon as before' (*Rgveda,* 10.190.3).

So partiality and cruelty cannot be attributed to the Lord.

सर्वधर्मोपपत्तेश्च ॥२११३६॥

36. And because all attributes (required for the creation of the world) are possible (only in Brahman, It is the cause of the world).

As all attributes necessary for the creation of the world which were denied in the Pradhāna and atoms in Sūtra 2.1.29 are possible in Brahman, It is alone the cause of the world. As the powers of the Pradhāna and atoms are limited and as they are of the same nature as things seen in the world, there are any number of objections against the possibility of their being the cause of the world. But as scriptures alone are the source of knowledge with respect to Brahman, It being quite different in nature from all things experienced, and as scriptures declare that It possesses infinite powers and that It has no other motive than sport in creation and arranges the diversity of creation in accordance with the Karma of the souls, It alone can be the cause of the world.

(To be continued)

NOTES AND COMMENTS

TO OUR READERS

'AMBROSIA', as our readers know, is the English version of *Sat-Kathā*, a comprehensive collection in Bengali of the intimate talks of Swami Adbhutananda. We are thankful to Prof. Shambhunath Basak of Charu Chandra College, Calcutta, for continuing the translation from the section completed by the previous editor, Swami Satswarupanandaji. . . .

'Glimpses of the Holy Mother' is adapted from the text of a talk given by Srimati Saraswati Gowrishankar at the Ramakrishna Mission, New Delhi, on the occasion of the birthday anniversary of the Holy Mother last year. We delayed its publication so that it may appear more or less during the same season this year. Within a small compass, the 'extra' quality that distinguishes Śrī Sārādāmani from 'any of India's humblest housewives' is very well brought out—the quality, as the speaker puts it, 'of fineness, of delicacy of emotion, of a core of courage and discipline and devotion to duty, of overflowing joy and love and compassion, that has placed her apart' as 'supreme ideal' for 'us all, men and women' for the conduct of our life. . . .

Establishment of a 'relation' between the finite and the Infinite has been one of the corner-stones in all systems of Indian Philosophy, in fact, the main cause of their differences. 'How has the One become the many?' is the one question that each one has attempted to answer, and in trying to do so has drawn its own conclusions as to the nature of that 'transformation'. Such a divergence in viewpoint with regard to the Absolute is but natural. The very term 'Infinite', used when speaking of the Absolute, justifies there being 'infinite' explanations of that 'relation' or 'transformation'. And each is true and correct within the limitations of its own logic. . . . In

this issue we are glad to publish two interesting studies by two eminent writers from two independent angles of approach, throwing much light on this important question.

One is from the pen of Sri Benoy Gopal Ray, Reader in Philosophy, Visvabharati University, Santiniketan. He treats this subject in the light of the philosophy of Rabindranath as given expression to in his works. 'Rabindranath's originality,' he makes clear, 'lies not in the formation of a new theory but in the emphasis given by him and in the manner of exposition of the original truths that are to be found in the Upaniṣads and the Vedānta.' The 'poet and philosopher of integral humanism' that Rabindranath was, he found the 'Vaiṣṇava view more acceptable'. 'The Infinite is the eternal Lover and He needs an object of love.' So 'He creates man for playing the game of love.' 'The One is realizing Himself in the many that are in time.'

The other is by Dr. Harold Barry Phillips of Johannesburg. He takes up two of the Upaniṣads, viz. *Kaṭha* and *Svetāśvatara* to illustrate his analysis of the essential basic teaching of the Upaniṣads. The 'manifestation of Brahman' as the universe is presented as being through six different stages or 'levels' of evolution, viz. Nirguṇa Brahman, the Pure Mind without any Mental Content, the Saguṇa Brahman, the Mind with a specific Mental Content, the physical world, the Vital Principle, on the Cosmic level, and as the world of 'perception' and 'sensation' corresponding to the waking and dreaming states on the individual level. The author has beautifully strung together, with interpretative comments, suitable verses from each of the Upaniṣads to arrive at this analysis. Highly significant is the remark of the author: 'The thought of the Upaniṣads is still a living philosophy.' The readers will at once notice that the article is the result of much thought and deep study. Dr. Phillips

is a teacher of Senior Latin and English at the Johannesburg Indian High School, South Africa. He saw War Service in Abyssinia, Egypt, and Libya for three years. He received the degree of D.Litt. from the University of Witwatersrand in 1949 for the thesis: 'Socrates, the Historic and the Platonic,' and the degree of Ph.D. from the University of Cape Town in 1954 for the thesis: 'Plato and the Philosophy of the Italians.'

It is a general principle that an external calamity cannot overtake an individual or a community unless something seriously wrong had been allowed to happen,—and continue uncorrected—in the thought world. To quote a Purāṇic example: Sāmba and the descendants of Kṛṣṇa had become swollen-headed and highly irreverent. The fact that they dressed up one among them like a pregnant lady and asked some sages whether a boy or a girl would be born to 'her' was only *one* of the *minor symptoms* of the *degeneration* that had crept into their combined mentality. And the curse that the sages gave, viz. that an iron husking rod would be the child and that it would bring about the ruin of their entire race

was not exactly the equivalent of the particular act of mockery, but the statement of the external collapse which must follow as the inevitable expression of the violation of Dharma that the arrogant warriors had already committed in their mental world. If we grasp this principle, we shall, probably, derive great benefit from studying most of the 'stories' found in sacred books, irrespective of the 'religion' which 'officially' acts as their special custodian. Curses and blessings, visions and prophecies, will then appear in a better light and help us on in our spiritual quest. We are thankful to Sri C. Gopalakrishnan Nayar (of Tiruvilwamala, Kerala State), who has, with characteristic devotion and broad-heartedness, studied the Old Testament and entered into the spirit of 'heroic' devotees,—men and women mentioned in it, who literally lived, moved, and had their being immersed in the thought of God. We shall all surely be inwardly enriched, individually and collectively, if we bring into the study of 'other' religions the same feeling of reverence and 'faith' that we entertain when we approach God through the gateway that our 'own' religion has offered to us from our childhood.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

DATTĀTREYA. BY HIS HIGHNESS SRI JAYA CHAMARAJA WADIYAR BAHADUR, MAHARAJA OF MYSORE. Published by George Allen and Unwin, Ruskin House, London, pp. 285. Price 21 sh. (Available also at H. Venkataramiah & Sons, Vidyanidhi Book Depot, New Statute Circle, Mysore).

This scholarly volume opens with the highly significant dedication: "To my mother who showed me the light of Datta" and "To my maternal grandmother who kindled in me an interest in Lord Datta", both examples of the "highest order of Indian womanhood". As Dr. Radhakrishnan points out in the Introduction, *Jīvanmukta Gītā* and *Avadhūta Gītā*, explained in detail in this book, "expound the Advaita Vedānta philosophy, which offers the basis for a sympathetic understanding

among different religions.' 'The works here brought together speak of the spirit behind all religions independent of the restrictions of dogma.' 'The writer's translations and notes,'—which include also a Sanskrit commentary on one of the texts—'reveal his vast learning and deep devotion. The writer is not merely a theoretical student but a practising disciple, a *sādhaka*.' 'Those who read this book will have a rewarding experience.'

Says the Maharaja, in the course of his lucid explanations: 'The process of realization involves a systematic spiritual development which is accelerated at each stage by the spontaneous grace of God.' In fact, at every turn, His Highness stresses the comprehensive role of *Īśvarānugraha*. 'The flowering and fruition of this process of growth con-

sist in the acquisition of Advaita *bhāva* or the Advaitic attitude.' To the question as to what it can achieve, the answer is given: 'This frame of mind comes to permeate every phase of a person's activity and enables him to steer clear of illusions and delusions, passions and prejudices.' And who does not stand in need of it?

Mere imagination or system-making, according to individual taste, does not help knowledge' (p. 148). 'Not to see the unity of thought' both in Śruti and Smṛti 'is often due to the mistake of trying to draw too close a distinction between duality and identity, both are true and both are false. The history of Vedānta thought illustrates this point. . . . Neither duality nor non-duality is therefore the truth. It is the philosophy of equipoise, *sama*, as *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* puts it. The same is the philosophy that Dattātreya has expounded in the *Avadhūta Gītā*.' The truth of equipoise mercilessly demands a way of life consistent with it, a way of life that leads to its realization.' 'A word by itself is innocent. . . . It is . . . the meaning that is the cause of different emotions. But commonly the words are made much of and the effect of the meaning is totally ignored. Such is the case with duality, identity and so on. He (Lord Dattātreya) is prepared to reject the term 'equipoise', '*sama*' if a lower meaning is attached to it',—prepared even 'to signify the Truth as identity, *advaita*, or duality, *dvaita* provided the correct meaning is apprehended.

There are valuable remarks and hints scattered throughout this lucid and well reasoned out presentation of the philosophy of equipoise; and who can be a greater direct witness of its efficacy than His Highness who is ever in the midst of the often conflicting forces working for public welfare? He says that 'even though knowledge of science is supposed to grow, man is not developed. He is the same. From the point of knowledge he has never gone far from the starting point.'

The amount of sustained meditation and reflection that have gone into the writing of this volume can be well gauged by the fact that 262 important scriptural passages, given separately in footnotes covering 29 pages of very small print, have been translated, interpreted, and woven into the texture of this precious volume. We find here a garland of sacred texts, interspersed here and there by relevant references to Western philosophers.

SANSKRIT.

CHĀYĀ-ŚĀKUNTALAM: BY SRI JIVANLAL PARIKH, *M. T. B. College, Surat*, pp. 25. Rs. 2.

This is a nice little drama in Sanskrit. There is no Prākṛit. The context is a return to Kaṇva's Āśrama by King Duṣyanta with all his memories intact. Anasūyā and 'sharp-tongued Priyamvadā meet him and while Sānumatī and Śakuntalā suit-

ably hidden by Tiraskarini, look on and even 'interfere' in their own ways, the conversation is so turned that the story of the ring and of Durvāsā's curse is revealed and many of the tensions in all hearts are removed in a unique manner. There are fifty-one smooth-flowing stanzas in different metres. The last one is a chorus by Sānumatī and Anasūyā. According to the context, two lines "Svapnaḥ kim eṣa . . . na jāne" come to be repeated by Śakuntalā as well as the king. With a few more dramas like this, students can easily pick up excellent phrases for conversation in pure Sanskrit.

MĀṆḌŪKYA-RAHASYA-VIVṚTIH: BY ŚRIMAT SWĀMI SACCIDĀNANDENDRA SARASVATI MAHARĀJ. Published by *Adhyātma Prakāśa Kāryālaya, Holenarasipur, Southern Railway*, pp. 618. Price Rs. 12.

In a brief "Acknowledgements" section, the Publishers explain the various factors that have enabled them to bring out Swamiji's "master work at long last". "Swamiji," it points out, "has made use of many published writings on Vedānta and Buddhism, as will be seen from the acknowledgement of his sources." The Publishers also indicate that "in the course of Swamiji's commentary, will be found many illuminating observations contrasting Vedānta with the Mahāyānic Buddhism." A number of generous men and women, including His Holiness Śrī Śaṅkarācārya, of Dwārakā Śārādā Pīṭha, have donated funds for bringing out this scholarly volume.

The Swamiji has "generally proceeded on the principle that unless and until the universally accepted tradition has been finally proved to be baseless, there is no reason to trouble ourselves about the various incompatible opinions of theorists, or even about opposing views of recent adverse critics of Advaita from among mutually different schools of Vedānta." Is the Māṇḍūkya a genuine Upaniṣad? Is Gauḍapāda the author of the Kārikās? Do the four chapters form a compact whole? Questions like these find a place in the preliminary discussions of the Swamiji. Later comes a detailed analysis of the views of scholars like Prof. Vidhusekhar Bhattacharya who believe that "Gauḍapāda is the originator" of "the Vedāntic school of Vijñānavāda as contrasted with that of the Buddhists" and that "Gauḍapāda's Brahman and the *Citta* in Vijñapti-mātra of the Yogācāras are in fact the same thing" with slight differences. The Introduction in English and the Bhūmikā in Sanskrit are both scholarly and valuable. "Coming down to recent times", says the Swamiji in English—and the same idea appears in Sanskrit as well, in suitable contexts—"when both the Vivaraṇa and the Bhāmatī schools of interpretation came to be welded into one, we are

confronted with a new twist of the Avasthātraya teaching." This is followed by a criticism of the views of the writer of the *Pañcadaśī*, of the prescription of "Pātañjala Yoga for the removal of obstructions to realization", and so on. The Swamiji holds that "really, reference to Omkāra and Vaiśvānara, etc. has primarily nothing to do with meditation." The para on Jñāna-samādhi-

ādi-vivekaḥ and other sections in the Sanskrit commentary bring out this side of the author's uncompromising stand. The language is easy and forcible. The last part of the volume contains a detailed Index of Kārikā lines, a discussion entitled "Bauddha-prakriyā-sāmya-vicārah", and other important items. This is a book that requires and deserves careful study.

NEWS AND REPORTS

PASSING AWAY OF SWAMI NIRVEDANANDA

With the deepest sorrow we have to record that Swami Nirvedananda, one of the trustees of the Ramakrishna Math, Belur, a member of the Governing Body of the Ramakrishna Mission, and the founder President of the Ramakrishna Mission Calcutta Students' Home passed away at 5-58 p.m., on Saturday the 15th November. For a long time the Swami was suffering off and on from hypertension and diabetes. His high blood-pressure set in before 1936 and diabetes followed in 1937. Though these ailments were kept under control by expert treatment, he was never completely cured. In spite of this he maintained his activities all through and put in substantial work of outstanding merit. His last illness was of very short duration. He was attacked with cerebral haemorrhage at about 6 a.m. and passed away within 12 hours the same day.

Sri Surendranath Mukherjee by name, the Swami belonged to a well-known family of the district of Barisal. He was, however, born and brought up in Calcutta. Born in the year 1893, he passed his Entrance Examination in 1909 from the Hare School and graduated in Science from the Presidency College in 1913. He then passed the B.A. Examination and got his M.A. degree in English in 1916. Professor S. N. Bose, Dr. J. C. Ghosh, Dr. J. N. Mukherjee, and late Dr. M. N. Saha are some of his intimate classmates.

About this time he came in contact with the senior monks of the Ramakrishna Order, particularly Swami Premananda and Swami Shivananda, direct disciples of Sri Ramakrishna. This acquaintance soon developed into deep admiration and complete acceptance of the ideas and ideals of the Ramakrishna Order. He formally joined the Order in 1919 and was initiated to Brahmacharya in 1920

by his Guru, Swami Brahmananda, the first President of the Ramakrishna Math and Mission. He was ordained into Sannyasa in 1923 by Swami Shivananda, the second President.

In 1916 he founded the Ramakrishna Mission Calcutta Students' Home, the only such institution at that time in Northern India and nourished it from a very small beginning in a rented house in Calcutta up to its present position. This institution harmonises the modern educational system with the old Gurukula one. He was a joint founder of the Ramakrishna Mission Vidyapith, Deoghar and was very closely associated with it during the first ten years of its career. He was also in close touch with many institutions inside and outside the Ramakrishna Mission as a member or office-bearer of their managing committees.

He was an erudite scholar and a deep thinker. His works like *Sri Ramakrishna and Spiritual Renaissance*, *Hinduism at a Glance*, *Religion and Modern Doubts*, *Our Education* etc., bear eloquent testimony to his high intellectual and spiritual attainments.

His special field of study was education, and many were the institutions that profited by his experience and advice. Besides, he exercised a very healthy influence over the young men who came into contact with him. His old students, some of them highly placed, remember him still with love and veneration. It is also noteworthy that so far about 30 ex-students of his Students' Home, trained and educated under his magnetic personality, renounced the world and joined the Ramakrishna Order.

His passing away has created a void in the Ramakrishna Order which will be difficult to fill up.

THE HOLY MOTHER'S BIRTHDAY

The 106th birthday of Sri Sarada Devi, the Holy Mother, falls on Thursday, the 1st January, 1959.