

VOL.89

OCTOBER 1984

Prabuddha Bharata

OR

AWAKENED INDIA



By Karma, Jnana, Bhakti, and Yoga, by one or more or
all of these the Vision of the Paramatman is Obtained.

ADVAITA ASHRAMA
MAYAVATI, HIMALAYAS



Prabuddha Bharata

Started by Swami Vivekananda in 1896

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF THE
RAMAKRISHNA ORDER

Editorial Office

P.O. Mayavati, Via Lohaghat
Dt. Pithoragarh 262 524, U.P.

Publication Office

5 Dehi Entally Road
Calcutta 700 014
Phone : 29-0898



[Rates inclusive of postage]

Annual Subscription

India, Nepal & Bangladesh	Rs. 15.00
U.S.A. & Canada	\$ 10.00
Other Countries	£ 4.00

Life Subscription (30 years)

Rs. 300 \$ 200 £ 60

Single Copy

Rs. 1.50 \$ 1.00 50 P.

Information for contributors,
publishers, subscribers, and
advertisers overleaf.

OCTOBER 1984

CONTENTS

Integral Vision of Vedic Seers	401
About this Issue	402
Understanding Advaita—I —(Editorial)	402
Mantra-Yoga —Swami Shraddhananda	411
Models, Metaphors, and Idols —Hans Elmstedt	415
They Lived with God: Ram Chandra Datta —Swami Chetanananda	429
Reviews and Notices	435
News and Reports	437
Notes and Comments	440



Prabuddha Bharata

VOL. 89

OCTOBER 1984

No. 10

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

INTEGRAL VISION OF VEDIC SEERS*

'Truth is one: sages call It by various names'

तम आसीत्तमसा गूळहमग्रे
सप्रकेतं सलिलं सर्वमा इदम् ।
तुच्छये नाभ्वपिहितं यदासीत्
तपसस्तन्महिनाजायतैकम् ॥

In the beginning¹ there was darkness² concealed³ in darkness; all this⁴ was indistinguishable⁵ water.⁶ That which was the all-encompassing⁷ one covered by the void,⁸ manifested itself⁹ by the greatness of Tapas.¹⁰

Rg-Veda 10.129.3

* The Hymn of Creation, *Nāsadiya-sūktam* is continued here.

1. That is, before the creation of the world.
2. It cannot be denied that the word darkness (*tamas*) here anticipates Śamkara's concept of *Māyā* or *ajñāna*.
3. From the root *guh* 'to hide'. As Sāyaṇa has pointed out, the expression clearly indicates that *ajñāna* is not mere absence of knowledge but 'something positive' (*bhāva rūpam*).
4. All this manifested world.
5. *Apraketam*, without a mark.
6. *Salilam*, i.e. *salilam iva*, like water, i.e. the primordial cause.
7. So Sāyaṇa. Macdonell takes *ābhu* to mean 'coming into being' (similar to *ābabhūva*

of verses 6 and 7).

8. *Tucchya* is the Vedic form of *tuccha* meaning void, insignificant. It also means chaff. Just as the chaff encloses the grain, so *Māyā* enveloped the emerging reality of the world.

9. *Ajāyata*, 'was born', does not mean the creation of something new; rather it means the manifestation of something already present in a potential form.

10. *Tapas* means any concentrated effort. Here, according to Sāyaṇa, it means God's precognition or prevision of things to be created. cf *yasya jñānamayam tapah* (*Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* 1.1.9). The infinite formless Reality preparing Itself to assume form, the focusing of divine Will—this is what *tapas* really means here.

ABOUT THIS ISSUE

An attempt is made in this month's EDITORIAL to dispel some wrong popular notions about Advaita.

Spiritual aspirants who follow the path of Japa will find invaluable practical guidance in the article MANTRA-YOGA by Swami Shraddhanandaji, spiritual head of the Vedanta Society of Sacramento, California.

Through a brilliant analysis of the symbolization process involved in both science and religion, Hans Elmstedt brings

together these two disciplines at a new level of understanding in his article MODELS, METAPHORS, AND IDOLS. This is a stimulating study which reveals the similarity between the use of models and metaphors in science and the use of images, icons and idols in religion.

In the second instalment of RAM CHANDRA DATTA Swami Chetanananda, spiritual head of the Vedanta Society of St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A., concludes his short biography of one of the foremost lay disciples of Sri Ramakrishna.

UNDERSTANDING ADVAITA—I.

(EDITORIAL)

The Advaita in perspective

No other system of Indian philosophy or religious thought is more well known and admired in India and in the West than the Advaita system. It has now been widely accepted by Western scholars that the Advaita system is one of the greatest philosophical achievements to be found in the East or the West. 'On the tree of wisdom there is no fairer flower than the Upaniṣads and no finer fruit than the Vedanta philosophy', said the famous German orientalist Paul Deussen in a talk given at Bombay in 1893. And he added: 'The system of Vedānta, as founded on the Upaniṣads and Vedānta Sūtras and accompanied by Śaṅkara's commentaries on

them—equal in rank to Plato and Kant—is one of the most valuable products of the genius of mankind in his researches of the eternal truth...'. The distinguished existentialist philosopher Karl Jaspers once told an Indian professor that there was no metaphysics superior to that of Śaṅkara.¹ The degree of importance attached by Western scholars to Śaṅkara's philosophy may be inferred from Lowes Dickinson's statement that 'the real antithesis is not between European philosophy and Indian systems, but between Advaita on the one

1. K. Satchidananda Murthy, *Revelation and Reason in Advaita Vedanta* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1974) p. xvii

hand and the rest of the world's philosophical systems on the other'.

In India millions of people accept Advaita as the basis of their religious faith and ultimate goal of life. Though few among them live or practise its principles, it has shaped the attitudes of the majority of Hindus towards life and reality. Originally Advaita as a religious philosophy was restricted to a small circle of orthodox Brahmin monks and scholars. But it rapidly gained in popularity and reached the common masses of people through the teachings and writings of sages and saints.

In the course of centuries, as the inevitable consequence of getting adapted to the diverse intellectual and emotional needs of people belonging to all walks of life and strata of society, a religion or philosophy undergoes some modifications. Śrī Śaṅkara's main effort was to counter Buddhist nihilism by establishing the absoluteness of Brahman as the sole reality, the ultimate cause of the universe and the supreme goal of human life. But post-Saṅkara Advaitins, in their effort to defend the system against the attacks of rival schools of philosophy, were forced to shift the emphasis to Māyā and to build a rigid logical structure upon it. Some of the Bhakti teachers, like the authors of the *Bhāgavatam* and the *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa*, introduced several modifications to make Advaita a vehicle for the spreading of their doctrines. In modern times Swami Vivekananda attempted to make Advaita the foundation of a universal religion and a social philosophy for the creation of an egalitarian, enlightened society. Dr. Radhakrishnan used Advaita as a counterpoise to meet the challenges of Western philosophy. And in recent years attempts are being made to make it absorb the best elements of modern science.

These attempts at reinterpreting and adapting Vedānta are a part of the dialectics of history. Without them Advaita

would have ceased to be a creative force in the lives of people and would have become a dead philosophy like that of Jaimini or Spinoza. A perpetually evolving philosophy is the secret of the unceasing vitality of Indian culture and its survival through millenniums.

The progress of philosophy in India has been the progressive refinement of one or two systems of religious thought. Apart from Buddhist and Jaina systems which are considered heterodox, there are six systems of Hindu philosophy. These 'orthodox' systems are: Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta. Of these six systems none but Vedānta has survived as a living philosophy to this day. Unlike the other systems which are mostly speculative, Vedānta is a philosophy of life. It is the sole religious philosophy governing the life of Hindus. Vedānta is a comprehensive, highly adaptive, vitally active existential philosophy which has been continuously evolving for more than three thousand years.

The Advaita school itself rose as a result of this self-evolving activity of Vedānta, which, however, did not cease with that. Other schools—Viśiṣṭa-advaita, Dvaita, Pratyabhijñā, Acintya-bheda-abheda etc.—arose at different periods. Advaita is indisputably the most important school and has overshadowed the other schools, but the latter are still active with their own followers. Based as they are on the eternal truths of Upaniṣads, all these schools have an indestructible vitality and perennial relevance. Even those people who claim to follow Advaita turn out to be out-and-out dualists in the practical field of religion. It was left to the genius of Swami Vivekananda to show that the different schools of Vedānta are not mutually contradictory but represent different stages in the attainment of the total vision of Reality. The time has now come to reconcile the

differences among the different schools and build Vedanta into a well-integrated open system capable of meeting new challenges, absorbing new values, and adapting itself to the diverse needs of the rapidly changing modern society.

One of the first steps to be taken in this unification process is to understand the Advaita school itself properly. Any attempt to understand Advaita should take into consideration two points. One is the need to distinguish and preserve the original teaching of Śaṅkara in its pristine purity. Later manifestations and reinterpretations are to be understood as such, and should not be confused with the original teaching. Secondly, there is the need to rid the system of the wrong notions that have come to be associated with it. Some of these notions deserve a detailed examination.

Advaita as experience and advaita as philosophy

The term 'Advaita' is used in two distinct senses: the direct mystic experience of the non-dual Reality, and the system of philosophy developed by Śaṅkarācārya. The failure to keep in view this distinction has created a good deal of confusion.

Advaita as a form of experience is as old as the Upaniṣads, and may even be traced to Ṛg-Veda. Alluding to the sages' experience of the non-dual nature of the ultimate Reality, the Upaniṣads declare: 'There is no diversity whatsoever in It.'² 'But there is not that second entity differentiated from it which it can see',³ 'In the beginning there was only Being,

2. नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन ।

Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.19

Katha Upaniṣad 4.11

3. न तु तद् द्वितीयमस्ति ततोऽन्यद् विभक्तं

यत् पश्येत् ।

Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad 4.3.23-30

one only without a second',⁴ 'The fourth state is that...in which all phenomena cease and which is unchanging, blessed and non-dual'.⁵ Through the 'great statements' (*mahāvākya*) the Upaniṣads teach the oneness of the individual self and the Supreme Self. One of the mistakes of the teachers of dualistic schools was their refusal to recognize the possibility of the non-dual experience of the ultimate Reality. They either interpreted these non-dualistic statements of the Upaniṣads in terms of dualism or simply ignored them.

Advaita as a system of philosophy is the creation of Śaṅkarācārya. Around the eighth century he laid the foundation of this system and put up the scaffolding for the superstructure which was completed by his followers. He made the experience of non-dualism the foundation of his system, and for this he quarried necessary materials almost entirely from the Upaniṣads. But the scaffolding of metaphysics was partly his own and partly borrowed from Buddhist logic. No one with an unprejudiced mind can fail to notice the striking similarity between Nāgārjuna's great work *Mulamādhyamaka-kārikā* and the later Advaitic treatises. Nāgārjuna was one of the first philosophers to establish ontologically the illusoriness of phenomena. This he did by showing the contradictory nature of all phenomena; whatever is contradictory is false and whatever is false is unreal, illusory.⁶

4. सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत्, एकमेवाद्वितीयम् ।

Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.2.1

5. प्रपञ्चोपशमं शान्तं शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते ।

Māṇḍukya Upaniṣad 7.

6. cf. 'Bhagavan (Buddha) said that being the false creations of mental impressions, all phenomena are false and hence illusory.'

तन्मृषा मोषधर्माः यद् भगवान् इत्यभाषत ।

सर्वे च मोषधर्माणिः संस्कारास्तेन ते मृषा ॥

Nāgārjuna, *Mulamādhyamaka-kārikā* 13-1

According to him the cause of false mental constructions is *avidyā*, ignorance, and the cessation of ignorance can be effected only through knowledge and meditation.⁷ Nāgārjuna also introduced the concept of two levels of truth: conventional truth (*samvṛti-satya*) and absolute truth (*paramārtha-satya*). Śaṅkara took over the best elements of Nāgārjuna's dialectics not only to build his philosophical edifice of Advaita on the foundation of Upaniṣadic truths, but also to defeat Buddhism itself on its own ground. This has been pointed out by several Western and Indian scholars. Dr. Satkari Mukherji, a former professor of Sanskrit at the University of Calcutta, gives his impartial judgement on this point as follows:

The logical weapons by which the unreality of the plurality of subjects and objects is brought home were already forged in the arsenal of the Mādhyamika school. Śaṅkarācārya exploited these dialectical weapons with a view to establishing his monistic metaphysics. The later dialecticians of the Vedānta school carried this destructive logic to the highest limits of perfection... (But) It would be a mistake to suppose that Śaṅkarācārya was indebted to Vasubandhu or Asvaghōṣa for his monistic philosophy. The Buddhist philosophers owed their inspiration to the Upaniṣads, when they gave monistic interpretation to the doctrines of Buddha. Śaṅkarācārya derived his monistic inspiration direct from the Upaniṣads, and only worked out the negative logic in order to vindicate his position. In this negative enterprise he was assuredly influenced by the Mādhyamika polemics, and he utilized them for reinforcing his logical standpoint.⁸

A system of philosophy is a system of concepts derived from the phenomenal world. Nāgārjuna has shown that concep-

tualization invariably involves a contradiction, and Kant has shown that it is impossible to know the Reality (noumenon) through concepts. Hence there is no such thing as a perfect system of philosophy, and Advaita is no exception.

We have seen that, as experience, Advaita is the highest and that to deny this fact, as the followers of dualistic schools have done, is a mistake. But it is also true that, as a system of philosophy, Advaita too has its own conceptual defects and so it is a mistake to regard as the highest and most perfect system, as some of its overzealous protagonists have done. The highest and most perfect system of philosophy is perhaps not a single philosophy, but the sum total of all philosophies each of which is regarded as providing a different view of reality. This was what Swami Vivekananda tried to evolve. He regarded Vedānta itself as one total vision of Reality with each school of Vedānta representing one mode of expression of it. This was the original vision of the Upaniṣads. What is needed now is a revival of this ancient vision and the unification of Vedānta into an integral system of thought. This cannot be done unless an equal, round-table status is given to every school of Vedānta.

Advaita and rationalism

There is a popular conception that Advaita is rational and scientific, whereas the other schools of Vedānta are dogmatic, being based on faith and love which are irrational. This notion is based on ignorance about other schools of Vedānta and about the meaning of rationalism.

'Reason', 'rational', 'rationalism'—these are English words which have specific connotations in Western thought, and one should be careful in using them in discussions on Indian thought. Let us first of all

7. cf. *ibid* 26.11

8. Satkari Mukherji, 'Buddhism in Indian Life and Thought', in *The Cultural Heritage of India* (Calcutta: Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, 1958) Vol 1, p. 593

see the meaning of 'rationalism' in Western thought. In philosophy rationalism is the doctrine that mind itself is a source of knowledge independent of sense-experience and that through reason alone it is possible to arrive at universal truths; it also holds that the criterion of truth is not sensory but deductive. Rationalism is the basis of the philosophy of Descartes, Leibnitz and Spinoza. Rationalism leads ultimately to the school of philosophy known as 'idealism' which holds that the external world is only a mental construct. Opposed to rationalism is empiricism which is the doctrine that all knowledge (including universal truths and laws) comes from sense experience alone. Though some Western philosophers used the empirical method to establish idealism, the natural product of empiricism is the school of philosophy known as 'realism' which holds that the external world is real and is independent of the human mind. The criterion of truth according to this view is direct experience, experimental verification, inductive reasoning.

It is clear from the above that science and scientific method are closer to empiricism than to rationalism. The whole fabric of science is made up of the belief that the external world is real, that it can be known fully with the help of appropriate instruments, and that the laws governing the universe can be discovered through experiments and inductive reasoning. It was this belief that got a rude shock when Heisenberg through his Uncertainty Principle showed that empirical knowledge has a certain limit beyond which it cannot go. This discovery, combined with the success of mathematics, especially Einstein's application of Riemann's geometry in General Theory of Relativity, made several physicists swing to the rationalist position. When James Jeans said, 'The universe begins to look more like a thought than

like a machine', he was asserting the growing distrust of empiricism.

But have the scientists found safe refuge in rationalism? Is reason an adequate means of knowing all truths, and a perfectly reliable criterion to judge the validity of knowledge? Unfortunately, just as Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle has shaken the foundations of empiricism, so also 'Godel's Theorem' has shaken the foundations of rationalism. Reasoning involves two processes. One is to form appropriate concepts through the process of abstraction. The next step is to interlink the concepts to form a logical system; this process is known as formalization. Tarski showed that if a theory of sufficiently rich content is formalized, it cannot be fully reflected in this formal system: an unascertained and unformalized residue always remains in a theory. Kurt Godel generalized this principle in his celebrated theorem which states that if any logical system that includes arithmetic contained a proof of its own consistency, it would also contain one of its own inconsistency. So far nobody has found out a theory or equation that explains everything—no, not Einstein's $E = mc^2$, not even the Vedantic equation *tat tvam asi* ('That thou art'). Every logical proposition needs for its proof another proposition which in turn needs yet another, and so reasoning is an endless process.

It is the failure of both empiricism and rationalism to provide a stable basis for science that has made several up-and-coming young scientists like Fritjof Capra turn to Eastern thought. Nowadays it is customary to quote the statements of eminent modern physicists in discussions on Vedanta. This is a useful device in interpreting truths in the contemporary idiom, no doubt. But it should be kept in mind that though science and Vedanta are not contradictory to each other, they deal

with two orders of Truth using two different methods.

Let us now turn to the meaning and place of reason in Vedānta. As it is not possible to discuss this subject in detail here, we mention only a few important points.

(1) There is no popular word in Sanskrit which precisely corresponds to the English word 'reason'. Śrī Śaṅkara has in his commentaries used the word *tarka* more or less in the sense of reasoning, and later Vedāntins popularized the term *yukti*. Another word commonly met with in Vedāntic literature is *vicāra*; it really means not discursive reasoning but enquiry—an opening of the *buddhi* to Reality.

(2) In Western thought 'reason' is commonly used as a direct means of knowing universal truths. But in Indian thought the corresponding word *tarka* is used only in two senses. One is inference, *anumāna* Indian logic recognizes two types of inference: syllogistic inference (e.g. inferring the presence of fire in a distant hill from observing smoke) and analogical inference, *sāmānyato dṛṣṭānumāna* (e.g. from the observation that an effect like a pot requires an agent like the potter for its production, it is concluded that the world as an effect must have a causal agent like God).⁹ It may be mentioned here that in Western logic two types of inference are recognized: deductive and inductive. The first one is the syllogistic reasoning taught by Aristotle (All men are mortal/Socrates is a man/so Socrates is mortal) In modern times deductive reasoning has been almost wholly replaced by inductive reasoning in Western thought. John Stuart Mill was one of the first to

9. Prof. M. Hiriyanna has discussed this type of reasoning in a lucid manner in the paper 'The Place of Reason in Advaita' included in his book *Indian Philosophical Studies* (Mysore: Kavyalaya Publishers, 1957) vol 1, pp. 45-52.

point out that inductive reasoning is really the basis of the method of science. In modern science inductive reasoning is made more empirical and perfect with the help of the branch of mathematics known as statistics. Indian syllogism is a synthesis of both induction and deduction.

The second sense in which the word *tarka* is used is with reference to the interpretation of scriptures.¹⁰ The science of interpretation of scriptures, containing the canons and rules of interpretation, is called hermeneutics.¹¹ Hindu hermeneutics was developed by the Mīmāṃsaka philosophers. All schools of Vedānta have adopted it with suitable modifications. One of the important functions of reason is to explain phenomena on the basis of scriptural revelation. In other words, the second type of reasoning is nothing but applied hermeneutics. For Śaṅkara reasoning has no other value or use than this. As for independent personal reasoning, Śaṅkara emphatically states in his commentary on the *vilakṣaṇatva-adhikaraṇa* of *Brahma-Sūtra*:

For this further reason one should not on the strength of mere logic challenge something that has to be known from the Vedas. For reasoning that has no Vedic foundation and springs from the mere imagination of persons, lacks conclusiveness. For man's conjecture has no limits (*utprekṣāyā nirāṅkusatvāt*). Thus it is seen that an argument discovered by adepts with great effort is falsified by other adepts; and an argument hit upon by the latter is proved to be hollow by still others. So nobody

10. The two types of *tarka* or reasoning discussed here are referred to as *puruṣa-tarka* and *vākyārtha-tarka* by Vṛṣabha Deva in his commentary on *Bhartrhari's Vākyapadīya* 1.30

11. A whole new science of interpretation, called semiotics, applicable to all branches of knowledge, including science, is now being developed in the West.

can rely on any argument as conclusive, for human intellect differs.¹²

According to Śaṅkara, reasoning should be based on scriptures (*śrutyanugrḥīta*). Elsewhere he says that the purpose of reasoning is to make scriptural meaning certain (*niścaya*) for ourselves.¹³

(3) If this is what reasoning means—logical interpretation of scriptures—then Advaita cannot be claimed to be more 'rational' than the other schools. Every school of Vedānta has built a formidable fort of dialectics to protect and uphold its doctrines. Every school of Indian philosophy has produced brilliant dialecticians. The qualified-monist Vedānta Deśika, the dualist Vyāsa Tīrtha, the Buddhist logicians Dīnāga and Dharmakīrti and the stalwarts of the Bengal school of logic Gaṅgeśa and Gadādhara ('the prince of Indian schoolmen') are at least as brilliant as Śrī Harṣa, Citsukha and Madhusūdana of the Advaita school. Professor Surendranath Dasgupta remarks: 'In my opinion Jaya Tīrtha and Vyāsa Tīrtha present the highest dialectical skill in Indian thought... The logical skill and depth of acute dialectical thinking shown by Vyāsa Tīrtha stands almost unrivalled in the whole field of Indian thought.'¹⁴

Post-Śaṅkara Advaitins centred their dialectics on the doctrine of Māyā which proved to be the most vulnerable part of the system. In the introductory part of his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra* Rāmānuja asks, what is the *āśraya* (locus) of Māyā? Can darkness lie upon light? Vyāsa Tīrtha has exposed the inadequacy of the rope-snake analogy employed by

Advaitins. In order to mistake a rope for a snake a person should have previously seen a *real* snake somewhere else.¹⁵ One who has never seen a real snake will never mistake a rope for a snake. So the above analogy actually proves the world to be real! Advaitins have found no satisfactory answer to these objections. This shows that the real strength of Advaita lies not in its dialectics but in its larger scriptural foundation and greater openness to Reality.

(4) Is reason a direct and independent means to the highest spiritual realization? Could any one realize Brahman merely by the exercise of the reasoning faculty? Śaṅkara's answer is a categorical no.¹⁶ According to him the Ātman can be known by no means other than the Upaniṣads.¹⁷ He explains:

For this very profound mystery concerning the reality of the world and leading to liberation cannot even be guessed without the help of the Vedas.¹⁸

For this entity is not an object of perception, as if it is devoid of form, etc. And it is not subject to inference, being devoid of all grounds

15. cf. Śaṅkara's definition of *adhyāsa* or superimposition:

स्मृतिरूपः परत्र पूर्वदृष्टावभासः

'(Superimposition is) the illusory recognition of something previously observed in some other thing'. Introduction to *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya* 5th sentence. For the arguments of Vyāsa Tīrtha see, S. N. Dasgupta *History of Indian Philosophy* Vol 4. P. 204 FF.

16. This issue has been discussed in detail by Dr. Satchidananda Murthy in his *Revelation and Reason in Advaita Vedānta*, op. cit.

17. उपनिषत्स्वेव विज्ञेयो नान्यप्रमाणगम्यः ।

Śaṅkara. Commentary on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 3.9.26

18. नहि इदमतिगम्भीरं भावयाथात्म्यं

मुक्तिनिबन्धनम् आगमान्तरेण उत्प्रेक्षितुमपि

शक्यम् ।

Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya 2.1.11

12. *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya* 2.1.11 (Translation Swami Gambhirananda's)

13. cf. *Kena Upaniṣad Vākya-Bhāṣya* 3.1

14. See, S. N. Dasgupta, *History of Indian Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1949) Vol. 4, P. viii

of inference, etc. But, like religious injunctions, this Atman is known from scripture alone.¹⁹

Reasoning has a place in Self-realization, but only as a subsidiary means, and only if it is based on the Vedas.²⁰ In other words, the basis of Śaṅkara's methodology is faith—faith in scriptures, faith in Dharma, faith in God. In this regard his position is not much different from that of the teachers of the other schools of Vedanta. Śaṅkara did not attempt, as Immanuel Kant did, to establish a personal source or standard of morality or spirituality independent of scriptural authority. Advaita is not a secular philosophy like that of Kant or Spinoza: nor is it a branch of empirical science like quantum mechanics or relativity mechanics. Like all other schools of Vedanta, Advaita too is essentially a religious philosophy and a practical discipline for the direct experience of transcendental Reality.

(5) This does not, however, mean that Advaita has only a spiritual value or has relevance only in a religious context. There are two universal principles in the methodology of Advaita which make it a highly versatile and flexible framework. Swami Vivekananda was the first to point this out. The first principle, as put by Swamiji, is that 'the particular is explained by the general, the general by the more general, until we come to the universal.'²¹ This is actually the principle of inductive reasoning. In Advaita one begins the study of Being with the irrefutable experience of one's own 'I'. Then by the process of desuperimposition larger and larger dimensions of the self are attained until

one reaches the Infinite, absolute Brahman, which is the highest generalization of Being possible. The second principle is what Western philosophers call 'naturalism'. It holds that the explanation of a phenomenon must be sought within the system of which the phenomenon is a part, not outside the system. Swami Vivekananda has explained this principle with characteristic lucidity as follows:

There had been a belief that, when a man threw up a stone and it fell, some demon dragged it down. Many occurrences which are really natural phenomena are attributed by people to unnatural beings. That a ghost dragged down the stone was an explanation that was not in the thing itself, it was an explanation from outside. But the second explanation of gravitation is something in the nature of the stone; the explanation is coming from inside. This tendency you will find throughout modern thought; in one word, what is meant by science is that the explanations of things are in their own nature, and that no external beings or existences are required to explain what is going on in the universe.²²

It should be noted here that this principle of 'naturalism' is inherent in all the schools of Vedanta, as they all accept God as the immanent supreme Self (*antaryāmin*) of the universe.²³ But, except Advaita, all other schools conceive the supreme Self as an anthropomorphic Deity, and this restricts their scope. The impersonal outlook of Advaita makes it universally acceptable.

Advaita and oneness

We now turn to another wrong notion, the tendency to refer to all kinds of oneness or unity as advaita. Advaita is not mere

19. *ibid* 2.1.6

20. श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवाङ्गत्वेना-

श्रीयते ।

ibid 2.1.6

21. Talk on 'Reason and Religion' in *The Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda* (Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama, 1977) Vol 1, P. 369

22. *ibid* P.371

23. It may also be noted here that 'naturalism' 'realism' and 'rationalism' are all different concepts. Naturalism is only a theory explaining the cause; its opposite is supernaturalism. The opposite of realism is idealism, and the opposite of rationalism is empiricism.

oneness. Had it been so, Śaṅkara would have used the word *ekatva*. Oneness is a numerical conception, and the idea of one implies the idea of many. It is to deny this implication that Śaṅkara employed the negative term *a-dvaita*, non-duality. Appropriately, then, his system of philosophy has been termed 'non-dualism' in contradistinction to 'monism' which it is not.

In Vedantic literature three types of difference are mentioned. *Vijātiya-bheda* is the difference between two different species, eg: between a tree and a stone. *Sajātiya-bheda* is the difference between two individuals of the same species, eg: between two mango trees. *Svagata-bheda* is the difference among the different parts of the same individual, eg: the differentiation of a tree into branches, leaves, flowers, etc.²⁴ In Western thought by 'dualism' is meant only the first two types of difference. But—and this is an important point—all the schools of Vedanta deny the first two types of difference in Brahman. So 'dualism' has a different meaning in Vedanta. The 'dualism' of Rāmānuja and Madhva is *not* the same as the dualism of Kapila's Sāṅkhya which regards Puruṣa and Prakṛti as different. All teachers of Vedanta, including the uncompromising Madhvācārya, say that there is only *one* Reality, Brahman. So they are all monists, and Vedanta as a whole is a system of monism.

The main quarrel among the different schools of Vedanta is over *svagata-bheda*. All schools except Advaita hold that there are 'internal' differences in Brahman; that is to say, Brahman is differentiated into God, souls and the universe. In the Vedantic context, the term 'dualism' means only the distinction between God and the soul (*Paramātmā* and *jīvātmā*). Advaita

is the only school which denies this distinction, but even in this school this denial is made only at the highest level of the Self. This, then, is what *advaita* really means: non-duality of Self-awareness.

Like all other teachers of Vedanta, Śaṅkara too gave primary importance to Brahman, and only secondary importance to the individual self. His approach was ontological, and he looked upon Brahman not as an abstract philosophical concept or an inert ocean-like entity, but as an all-knowing, all-controlling living Presence—the Māyāvī, the wielder of Māyā, who projects and withdraws Māyā whenever He pleases.²⁵ Egoism and selfishness had no place in his system. These evil qualities and an attitude of escapism came to be associated with the system in the later centuries when its teachers, following an epistemological approach, emphasized the individual self and Māyā, and ignored the unity and divinity of life. The modern trend, initiated by Swami Vivekananda, is to recover the original vision and adapt it to the needs of the rapidly changing society.

There is no doubt that modern science is moving towards some kind of monism. It has given up atomism, has achieved the unity of matter and energy, and is currently tackling the problem of consciousness. Its present position, however, is not much different from that of Sāṅkhya philosophy. As already mentioned, Advaita is not mere monism; it really means the non-dualism of self-awareness. Modern science is far from attaining it in theory or practice.

We have examined some of the wrong notions about Advaita. We shall next discuss some of the true foundational principles of Advaita.

(To be concluded)

24. cf. *Pañcadasī* 2.20

25. cf. Śaṅkara, *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya* 2.1.9,21,22

MANTRA-YOGA

SWAMI SHRADDHANANDA

The nature of mantra

The spiritual practice which enables one to be united with God with the help of a mantra (Holy name) can be broadly called Mantra-Yoga. The term Japa Yoga has a similar but more restricted connotation, for in the higher levels of spiritual practice some of the techniques of Mantra-Yoga are more significant than Japa Yoga.

What is a mantra? The word or words signifying God. Whether God is with attributes or without attributes He can be indicated by a word formula. This formula is the mantra. The mantra can be just one word like *Nārāyaṇa*; *Namo Nārāyaṇāya* ('salutations to Nārāyaṇa') is a two-word mantra; the mantra *Om Namo Nārāyaṇāya* ('Om salutations to the Lord Nārāyaṇa') has three words. Those who are following the path of Advaita (non-dualism) also use mantras like *Om* or *Om Tat Sat* ('Om That, the goal of your search, is pure existence'). The Upaniṣads mention some short sentences called Mahāvākyas, like *Aham Brahmāsmi* ('I am Brahman') or *Tattvamasi* ('Thou art that'). These Mahāvākyas are treated by Advaita Vedantins as mantras. Buddhism also prescribes several mantras for spiritual seekers like *Buddham śaraṇam gacchāmi* ('I take refuge in Buddha'), *Dharmam śaraṇam gacchāmi* ('I take refuge in dharma'), *Sangham śaraṇam gacchāmi* ('I take refuge in the Sangha'). These three sentences together form the Triśaraṇa-Mantra (Three vows of refuge), the repetition and contemplation of which strengthens the spiritual life of the Buddhist seeker. In some traditions of Christianity and Islam too the repetition of the divine name is practised.

According to the ancient spiritual tradition of India, the mantra is not an arbitrary human composition but is revealed to the pure-hearted seer. In Hinduism, meditation on God with the help of the mantra is widely prevalent. This is due to the very basic and central belief proclaimed in the Vedas and other scriptures that the *nāma* (name) is not different from the *nāmī* (that which is indicated by the name). Brahman is described as the supreme word—*Śabda-Brahman*. It is from this concept of *Śabda-Brahman* that the deep reverence for the holy name has sprung. *Om iti Brahma* ('Om—this word is Brahman'), *Om itīdam sarvam* ('Om is all this') declares the Taittirīya Upaniṣad.¹ This declaration is echoed in many of the sacred books of India. A religious-minded Hindu cherishes the hope that, at the time of death, he or she may be able to remember the holy name of God. A person dying with the consciousness of the holy mantra commands admiration. In the eighth chapter of the Gītā, the death of an ideal yogi is described as follows:

Closing all the gates of the senses, confining the mind in the heart, and fixing the Prāṇa in the head (between the eyebrows), thus engaged in the practice of concentration (Yoga); uttering the monosyllable 'Om', (the sound) Brahman, and meditating on Me, he who departs, leaving his body, he attains the supreme goal.²

The first stage of Mantra-Yoga

A spiritual seeker goes on repeating the holy name (mantra) retaining great faith on its efficacy. This is the first step in Mantra-Yoga. The principle mentioned

1. *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.7

2. *Gītā* 8.12-13

earlier that the mantra is one with the Iṣṭa (the chosen deity which may be a divine Incarnation or the supreme Self) is difficult to understand in the beginning. But it will be sufficient at the primary stage if the sādḥaka can practise japa remembering that the mantra is connected with the power of divine consciousness. The aspirant should think that the holy name is imparting spiritual vibrations in the body-mind-life system. This vibration is not like that of a material energy like magnetism, heat or electricity. It is generated by the power of the Divine. Gradually, the spiritual seeker merges the mantra vibration into the movement of Prāṇa (life force). He begins to experience the unification of the two movements. This leads to the higher experience that the movement of Prāṇa itself is mantra repetition. The japa has been transferred from the tongue or throat to the life principle operating in the body. Each Prāṇic action becomes mantra-vibration. As a result of this practice, a great harmony descends into the Prāṇa. What is achieved by the practice of Prāṇāyāma in Rājayoga, is accomplished more completely in this stage of Mantra-Yoga.

If mantra japa (repetition of mantra) is directed to the five sense organs—eyes, ears, nostrils, tongue, skin—these organs become refined and the corresponding five sense perceptions—sight, hearing, smell, taste, touch—become purified. We know that the sense objects constantly draw the mind outward causing distractions, agitations, and sufferings. When the sense organs become more imbued with *sattva*, this state of things changes. Then whatever we experience through our senses will no longer agitate the mind. We read in the *Gītā*,

But the self-subjugated attains prasāda (tranquility) and moves among objects with the senses

under control, free from any longing or aversion.

The prasāda indicated by that verse can be attained by the practice of Mantra-Yoga. In a way, it is more effective than the efforts for direct control of the senses. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* illustrates how it is possible for our minds and senses to attain this *daivī-bhāva* (divine state).⁴ In that state, the eyes become as radiant as the sun, the mind becomes as cool and soothing as the moon. If love of God or Self-Knowledge be the ultimate aim of life, then the purification of body and senses is essential. This purification is easily obtained by Mantra-Yoga.

Like the senses of perception, the senses of action (*karmendriya*) also, can be purified by mantra sādhanā. If *japa* is continued during our physical activities, like the movement of limbs, working, gardening, sweeping, etc., then the corresponding organs of action undergo an inner transformation. The sādḥaka gradually begins to feel a spiritual vibration in the movements of the organs. In one of the Bengali songs of the great saint Rām Prasād, we read:

Oh my mind, if you like you can worship Mother Kālī in any informal way, provided you carry on japa of the mantra received from the Guru day and night. Rām Prasād declares with much amusement that the Mother is present in all affairs of life. Oh my mind, when you are walking around the town, think that you are circumambulating Mother Śyāmā.⁵

3. *Gītā* 2.64

4. cf Ch. 1, section 3.

5. Mono boli bhajo Kālī icchā hoy tor je
ācāre

Gurudatto mahāmontro dibānisi japo kore.

...

Koutuke Rāmprosād rate

Mā birājen sarbo ghate
(tumi) nagor phero mone karo prodokkhino
syāmā māre.

Next comes the application of the mantra to the *cittavṛttis* (mental waves). Endless thoughts and emotions are constantly arising in the mind. It is indeed difficult to stop them. In the *Gītā* when Arjuna mentions this problem to Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the Lord replies:

Doubtless, O mighty-armed, the mind is restless and difficult to control; but, O son of Kunti, through practice and dispassion (renunciation) it can be conquered.⁶

The practice of Mantra-Yoga in this context is to communicate the great power of the Holy name with faith and love to the mental waves. In this practice there is not a bit of the toughness or aggressiveness that is required to challenge the mind directly. The distractions of the mind become naturally calm by the divine influence inherent in the mantra.

The second stage

When the body, senses, *prāṇa*, and mind become infused with *sattva* by the practice of mantra japa, it is time to 'purify' all objects and phenomena outside of our individuality. This is possible and should be done. The endless sky above, according to our normal vision, is material. But when you look at the sky, and connect it with the Divine through the inner repetition of mantra japa, the material space will change its appearance. The goal of the mantra, namely Divine Consciousness, will be peeping from the sky, as it were. The sky will appear to be a shawl on the cosmic body of God. In a similar manner, the moon, sun and stars above, the trees, shrubs, flowers, streams, forests, hills, deserts and again, living beings on earth or water, all of these endless segments of the universe can be 'purified' by the mantra and be experienced as parts of the cosmic body of Sat-Cit-Ānanda.

6. *Gītā* 6.35

The third stage

In the next stage of Mantra-Yoga, the necessity of directing the mantra inside and outside to objects is transcended. Now, in our comprehension, the mantra has to be identified with the *Iṣṭa*. This comprehension should grow stronger and stronger along with the repetition of mantra. The form of the deity or the impersonal idea of God should be present in the mind. As this practice ripens, the word of the mantra and the *Iṣṭa*, with or without form, will become more and more unified. *Mantra-caitanya*, that is, the divine consciousness implied in the mantra, will then be awakened. No more will there be doubts that the mantra is one with God. The heart will be filled with joy and peace.

Slowly, it will be felt that the mantra, as *Śabda-Brahman* is emanating from the innermost centre of the universe; the meditator's heart has become as it were, one with the heart of the universe. Not only that, every object and event in the cosmos will be established and will function in the great reality which is the mantra.

In this stage of Mantra-Yoga the word is more and more revealed as consciousness. The mantra is felt to be the radiant light of consciousness. That light spreads out in the life principle and mind, flooding the heart with immeasurable peace. For a person carrying on *sādhana* in the path of *bhakti* (devotion), the form of the *Iṣṭa* is experienced as the light of consciousness. The meditator's love for the *Iṣṭa* becomes immensely intensified. In the path of *Jñāna* (knowledge), the mantra reveals the deepest reality of the Self, as clear as daylight. *Mantra-caitanya* and *Ātma-caitanya* (*Ātman* as consciousness) become one.

When the mantra is transformed as consciousness, the whole universe is experienced as consciousness grounded in

mantra consciousness. The five *bhūtas* (elements) and all that is made of them are then nothing but the emanation of consciousness. The declarations of the Upaniṣads expressing Brahman or Ātman as pervading everything such as 'All this is verily Brahman', and 'Ātman alone is all this'⁷ become living to the sādḥaka by means of Mantra-Yoga. Now there is no longer any repetition of this mantra in the usual sense of the term. The mantra is no longer a word or words, but one with Sat-Cit-Ānanda.

The mantra, Śabda-Brahman, is continually revealing itself in its own glory. The culmination of this glory can be said to be the third or final stage. The grammatical derivation of the term Mantra-Yoga is now 'mantra as yoga' (according to the rule of karmadhāraya samāsa in the sense of identity). The body, mind, prāṇa, are all expressions of the *mantra-caitanya*; so is this vast universe. There is nothing else but the mantra as consciousness; consciousness far away, consciousness near, nearer, nearest. As if one colossal flood had inundated everything, all names and forms are drowned in one vast torrent of consciousness. In this stage is it possible to perceive the dualities like great and small, gross and fine, outside and inside, preced-

ing and succeeding, and so on? Only as long as the sublime experience of all pervading consciousness has not come, can we use those terms associated with space and time. In consciousness there is neither space nor time. Space and time spring from consciousness. When consciousness is realized as the supreme, both merge into consciousness.

Can we then describe this supreme glory of Śabda-Brahman in words? No, we cannot. We read in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad:

Whence words together with the mind turn away unable to reach, That is the supreme Bliss of Brahman. He who knows this becomes free from all fear.⁸

Thus, at the ultimate level of Śabda Brahman words have become wordless, forms have become formless, all multiplicity has unified in consciousness stationed in that transcendent glory beyond mind and speech. The seeker has become dumb. His mind also has met its death.

Holding onto the Iṣṭa mantra (holy name received from the guru) with faith and love, experiencing the revelations of the mantra step by step, surely we can reach this ultimate goal of our spiritual life as declared by Vedanta.

7. सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 3.14.1
आत्मैवेदं सर्वम् *ibid* 7.25.2

8. यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते । अप्राप्य मनसा सह ।
आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान् । न बिभेति कुतश्चनेति ॥
Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.9

Be moral. Be brave. Be a heart-whole man—strictly moral, brave unto desperation. Don't bother your head with religious theories. Cowards only sin, brave men never, no, not even in mind.

Swami Vivekananda

MODELS, METAPHORS, AND IDOLS

HANS ELMSTEDT

Introduction

What do models, metaphors, and idols have to do with science and religion? Are science and religion so completely separate in the methods they employ, because of the different ends being sought, that no common ground exists or can exist in which they both have their roots and can obtain nourishment for growth and development? That such a common ground does indeed exist is the subject of this paper and the title indicates some of the places we will look for it.

Science and religion

One of the most important features that separates and distinguishes us from the lower animals is our evolved capacity for and demonstrated ability to conceptualize, i.e., to form concepts whereby data and facts are derived or established and arranged in a rational or useful order that serves some larger purpose. The uniquely human cerebral cortex, being greatly developed and thus convoluted, capping and completely covering the rest of the brain, has large uncommitted association areas that are known to be importantly involved in the higher mental functions. These functions subserve that most important of man's abilities, conceptualizing, with its related processes of abstraction and generalization. Science and religion, in the main, have grown out of and subsequently evolved by means of the ability to abstract and generalize.

Science has meaningfully and productively used conceptualization to deal with the outer objective world. It has comprehended and organized that world by way of

an empirical orientation that seeks and finds its data through the senses. The derived concepts and constructs have led to substantial control and prediction of much of the phenomena so presented, experienced, and developed. Models and metaphors have been usefully employed as aids or heuristic devices in the constant search for ways to make the unknown knowable, or to extend the known into the realm of the unknown. Feeling and value have been ignored for the most part, being considered superfluous and outside the main purpose or business that science engages itself in.

Religion, being a manifestation or product of both the spiritual and psychological substratum that is the fount of man's deepest needs and interrelated dynamics, has also used the conceptualizing function to approach and deal with its inescapable concerns, the inner subjective world. This world includes the various spiritual values and seemingly enigmatic feelings that are a significant part of experience, but historically avoided or ignored by science. It too has its methods that serve to bring its followers or practitioners closer to their expected goals and conversely, these goals or ends closer to them. Faith, belief, and conviction are important aspects or components of this methodology. But these are and must be based on experience if they are to be meaningful and worthwhile. Further, it must be clearly recognized that science itself ultimately depends on experience for its final support and foundation. It would seem that if we were to understand the processes that produce and influence experience we would be closer to understanding the how and the why of science and religion, since experience is

so basic to both. This paper will offer some ideas to that end.

Religion also makes use of models and metaphors as it attempts to understand what it seeks to know and to express what it has found or discovered. But religion, perhaps because of the nature and aims of its search and methodology, does not have the good fortune of being able to label its devices as science has been authorized to do. Instead the devices of religion must sometimes suffer the judgemental and pejorative label of 'idols' or worse, religion itself to be seen or characterized as the simple panegyrics or encomia of individuals who are ignorant, misguided, or deluded.

The vehicle of science, in its current state and stage of development, allows for effective two-way movement of the mind on the busy road or pathway of the senses, resulting in greater mental understanding and physical control of the phenomena that it investigates, which is basically, the outer material world. Religion does this also, but its essential purpose is to understand and control the movement of the mind on the pathways of the senses so that the mind itself can be isolated from the phenomena of the outer world, and because that world includes the body and brain as an important part of it, this will eventually determine how the world presents itself on these pathways.

The extraordinary growth of both science and religion has been effected through the application of the processes of abstraction and generalization to the domains that science and religion address themselves to. These domains in turn have caused seemingly apparent methodological differences to develop that, on the surface, is understandable and reasonable if one considers what each of them attempts to deal with, but, on closer examination, can be shown to be clearly apparent, not actual, and thus untenable. Models, metaphors,

and idols must be understood to be terms assigned to some of the products of man's conceptualizing. Definitions of, comparisons between, and misunderstandings about these, as they relate to science and religion, will be examined and explored. It is hoped that upon closer scrutiny a clearer and better understanding will emerge, bringing about an increased willingness to deny the real importance of any seemingly inevitable methodological differences in conceptualization and instead lead us to view these differences strictly in terms of application and its resulting products, not to basic differences in processing.

Conceptualization

As stated above, the human brain with its non-specific association areas, unique among all living creatures, except perhaps certain marine mammals, is probably indispensable for the ability to abstract and generalize, which underlie the special function we call conceptualization. To abstract is to characterize or delimit any aspect or quality of something, whether that is an object, event, or idea and to consider it apart from the thing itself, or from some other aspect or quality with which it is associated. In this process there is a purely mental separation involving ideas or words where a quality or some aspect of a thing is isolated, more or less depending on what is being abstracted and who is doing it, from the original thing itself. We can see this abstracting process occurring when we develop the concept of 'tree'. The process is multi-sensory where each sense can contribute, more or less, some aspect, quality, or characteristic of the tree to the developing concept. Visually, a tree has a certain structure or shape and size, auditorily, a certain sound when the wind causes its parts to move, olfactorily, when we smell its parts for the aroma that

may be given off, gustatorily, when we taste its parts for its edibility, and tactually, when we feel with our hands the texture of its parts. This ability to abstract permits us not only to comprehend relationships between concrete objects and events, and 'intangible' concepts and symbols, but to react to them as well, making them important determinants of meaningful behaviour. An important result of all this is that we are able to use language and other symbolic systems, applying them to data given to us from the outer world by means of our senses, thus allowing and helping us to construct the classes and categories that provide the basic concepts that we use in our thinking.

Abstracting is only one part of the process essential to conceptualization. The other important part is that of generalization. It is a process whereby derived facts or concepts are extended to other things, objects, events, or ideas, that are perceived to be examples of, belonging to, or capable of acting as instances of those things taken as the original fact or concept. Abstracting helps us to form the concept, but generalizing is the direct application of abstraction in order to find other instances of that thing or concept. Conceptualizing, with its foundational abstracting and generalizing, is thus based on a reciprocating process of going from the known to the unknown and back to the known. Abstraction yields a concept that then becomes part of the known, and generalization is applied abstraction, in terms of the known, to the unknown, in turn causing that to become known. The common concept of 'water' can serve to illustrate the process. We establish a concept named by the label or word, 'water', by abstracting certain important qualities or characteristics that serve as criteria which must be present for something to be designated as 'water'. In this

case the criteria are basically sensory, the taste, smell, appearance, touch, and even the sound of it are all used in making the determination. We can generalize when we find other objects to which these criteria apply and when we do we can label it and feel free to use it as we would water.

The process of conceptualization can operate on two levels, one conscious, the other subconscious. When it is conscious we are aware of doing it and we can shape or develop it as we wish by applying meaningful effort in any amount or form and, if it is done properly, we can also call this being rational. When it operates subconsciously, outside of awareness, we call it intuition or insight and it can come upon us suddenly with little or no effort and sometimes with great meaning and significance. The conscious process is often generally taken to be analytic and the subconscious process to be synthetic. Much of the conceptualizing that we do in science is done analytically, and in religion, synthetically, yet each mode is important to all of our thinking. Our production of models, metaphors, and idols is importantly influenced by both of these modes and we will see that science and religion make significant use of these products regardless of the mode of their production. At our present level of understanding it is virtually impossible to separate any mental product or process into its constituent modes. We must understand and accept the fact that the analytic and synthetic modes are present in every thought and are part of the essential, underlying dynamics that generate all phenomenal experience.

Models

As we examine the idea or concept of models, it will quickly become evident that there are many ways that they can be and

are used or applied to the things that we encounter or deal with in both the outer and inner worlds of experience. This important and sometimes unrestrained use to examine and relate various phenomena suggests that it serves an important, even critical, purpose in man's development and use of concepts as he attempts to make his experiences understandable. This also implies that a better understanding of the psychological dynamics that underlie the formation and use of models can be crucial to our knowledge about mental functioning, especially its underlying inherent tendencies, capacities, and potentialities.

Most of us are familiar with models as toys. A toy is usually a small copy of the real thing. There are miniature airplanes, ships, and railroads that serve to entertain children and even adults who care to engage their fantasies in this manner. Another use of the model is as something, either an object or event, to be copied or imitated, that thing being an ideal, a pattern, or perfect form that is admired. An example is a person, a hero, real or imagined, an ideal character who embodies some respected and desired quality or attribute, such as strength or beauty, or some special talent that we esteem and wish for ourselves. In the West, sports figures and theatrical performers are currently popular and serve this function, and it might be worthwhile to add, for better or worse.

A third use of the model is as a physical device showing how something works. It serves to demonstrate or display the different parts of a whole in their relationship to each other and to the whole itself. An example is a scale model of the brain or of the atom as a miniature solar system. These display the basic qualities, relationships, or characteristics of the component parts of the phenomenon being investigated.

If we stretch or extend this particular use a bit we can see it as the model used to exhibit the latest fashions of clothing or jewelry, displaying what we consider to be beautiful and desirable.

At a more abstract level, a model can be taken as a system. This involves a system of symbols that answers a need to describe a set of data, where the rules of the symbolic system determines the manipulation of these symbols and thus indirectly, by extension or analogy, the data itself. The resulting match between the system of symbols and the original, empirically derived data, is compared. The data can find coherence, meaning, and significance within the system if the match is warranted, relevant, and relatively isomorphic. Often, one or another field of mathematics, such as algebra or topology, serves as the symbolic system into which the data is found to fit, more or less precisely. The use of mathematical models has become widespread, even in the social and behavioural sciences, especially as they seek to join the ranks of the physical sciences where the use of mathematics indicates a certain desired level of sophistication and maturity. Sometimes a system is used that is based on facts and ideas that have been established empirically. The picture-taking camera is an example of just such an empirical system. The optics of the camera is known to operate according to the established laws and principles of light and lenses. The eye shares certain structural features with the camera which has caused its functions or mechanics to be usefully compared to that of the camera, which now is used as a model for certain aspects of the eye.

It should be noted that the uses and applications that have been listed above for the concept of the model can really only be partial, aiding the formation of concepts about the phenomena being

studied. These models actually serve as a kind or type of analogy or resemblance. The difficulties that apply to the use of analogies also hold with the use of models. A model can help as a cognitive aid in seeing or establishing relationships between the data or parts of any phenomenon that we are trying to understand. A model, as with an analogy, can never act to verify a theory, idea, or an experience. It can only help us to understand them and possibly lead us beyond to discover new theories, ideas, experiences, or additional aspects of them.

M. Black, professor of philosophy at Cornell University, has written about the kinds and important uses of models in science. He lists four types. Scale models are those which 'cover all likenesses of material objects, systems, or processes, whether real or imaginary, that preserve relative proportions'.¹ Analogue models are models of 'some material object, system, or process designed to reproduce as faithfully as possible in some new medium the structure or web of relationships in an original'.² The last two, of the four types of models, include mathematical and theoretical models that use and extend the methods and contents of mathematics and theories and their construction. Mathematical models can give form to an explanation, but can not give causes, showing the kinds of mathematical functions that would approximately fit the known data. Theoretical models often begin as analogue models but end up existentially, where 'as if' becomes 'as being', as evidenced by the now discarded ether theory of physics, where a fluid substance was thought to fill all space, acting as a medium for the propagation of light and electromagnetic radiation.

1. Black, M. *Models and Metaphors* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962), p. 220.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 222.

Although the use of models in science is controversial and has been criticized by some scientists and philosophers, the actual benefits have been shown to clearly outweigh the risks. Professor Black emphasizes the heuristic value of models, especially as they open up and stimulate the imagination, an aspect of science that he thinks has been neglected. He even goes so far as to assert that, 'For science, like the humanities, like literature, is an affair of the imagination'.³

Models can clarify and direct our thinking so that what we seek to know will become better known and thus serviceable, to help us to delve into other and seemingly endless, deeper realms of the unknown. We will try to show later that the processes involved in model construction and their use, to be the same as or similar to the ones used in religion as it attempts to make the world understandable in terms of man's higher spiritual needs and values.

Some individuals have compared the use of models in science to the use of metaphors in other areas of investigation and knowledge, in as much as each substitutes one thing for another, both having what appears to be a heuristic purpose. Models and metaphors offer a means to describe, understand, and even to explain when ordinary language proves inadequate for that purpose. Models deal mainly with the cognitive aspect of relations between things, and are clearly objective. Metaphor not only does that but also tries to deal with the more tenuous, subjective, and more individual emotional aspects of our experiences.

Metaphor

To understand metaphor is to realize and understand the limits of ordinary language as it is used to describe and

3. *Ibid.*, p. 243.

explain the phenomena of the various kinds and levels of experience. To describe things belonging to different classes or basic sensory experiences such as a taste or a smell, we must compare these with something familiar. We find the form of the simile handy and very useful, where the words 'like,' 'as,' 'than,' or 'seems' are engaged to establish a relationship between terms or ideas involved. Other forms find uses in different contexts and for different purposes. These include analogy, parable, allegory, and personification or reification. What all these have in common is that the connotations, the more subtle and variable associations and suggestions of the related terms, are differentiated and emphasized, subordinating, for the most part, the denotations, their meanings as given by a dictionary.

J. Jaynes, a Princeton University psychologist, offers an interesting examination of and insight into metaphors as he develops his thesis that the 'subjective conscious mind is an analog of what is called the real world. It is built up with a vocabulary or lexical field whose terms are all metaphors or analogs of behaviour in the physical world'.⁴ Here Jaynes differentiates between analog and model. A model can be anything that serves as a hypothesis offering an explanation or understanding, and an analog is a special kind of model that matches point for point the thing that it is an analog of. Jaynes also defines metaphor in a very general way as, 'the use of a term for one thing to describe another because of some kind of similarity between them or between their relations to other things'.⁵ He divides a metaphor into four parts, metaphiers,

metaphrands, paraphiers, and paraphrands. These 'hybrid' terms, as he calls them, merely indicate that metaphors seek to establish or describe, by way of their similarity or relationships, one thing, the metaphrand or the thing to be described, in terms of another, the metaphier, or the thing being used to elucidate it. Going further, Jaynes offers the idea that in complex metaphors, the additional associations or attributes of the metaphier be called paraphiers, and when these are projected back into the metaphrand, they then be called paraphrands. In this manner Jaynes clearly acknowledges that metaphors seek to do more than just describe or explain. He states, 'The grand and vigorous function of metaphor is the generation of new language as it is needed, as human culture becomes more and more complex'.⁶ Jaynes regards metaphor as more than just a device of language, instead taking it to be the 'very constitutive ground of language'.⁷ He also sees language as having more importance than is usually given it. He declares, 'Indeed, language is an organ of perception, not simply a means of communication'.⁸

Although these ideas about the importance of metaphor and language are extreme, they at least point toward the idea that language is perhaps underrated in its role as a determining factor in our struggle to understand and to make sense of ourselves and the world we live in. Metaphor may be one aspect of our inherent cognitive style and have its basis in language, but it is the important and critical background that provides for all experience including feeling and acting, based on language or not, that is the real problem and the source of our confusions

4. Jaynes, J. *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1976), p. 55.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 48.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 49.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 48.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 50.

because we do not always realize its importance, much less its existence. Jaynes' position on metaphor and language takes them into the more remote area of the metaphysical, since language is generally taken to be the principal medium of the higher symbolic processes, importantly serving the cognitive function itself. Moving beyond the function of cognition we are carried into a more abstract and inclusive realm, where we are forced to confront our own nature, of who and what we are, and this leads us directly into the religious and the spiritual.

A physicist who also has a unique view of metaphor is Roger S. Jones of the University of Minnesota. Jones has arrived at and advocates a position that recognizes the need to include and involve the subjective, metaphysical, and the ethical in science. He states:

'I define metaphor as an evocation of the inner connection among things: It is an act of consciousness that borders on the very creation of things, blurring the distinctions between them, even between them and their names. I think of metaphor in the larger context in which all things are related to one another through an underlying unity—some cosmic principle or force, such as Brahman in the Hindu pantheon. Metaphor tantalizingly evokes this hidden synthesis through its dramatic juxtaposition of apparently unlike things. It is as if the poet, in using a metaphor, not only refers to a symbolic or ironic connection between two things, but hints at the very creative act itself which underlies all naming and evoking processes.'⁹

Although this statement indicates the general direction that our struggles to understand reality must take, it is an extreme position and places too much importance on metaphor as a cognitive

function. It raises metaphor from being a product to that of the basic process itself. Whatever the underlying unity is, it must be seen as providing the background for all experience, which importantly includes feeling and acting.

Jones goes on to extend his ideas into the very heart of physics itself:

'We shall now examine physics as metaphor by exploring its four major constructs, space, time, matter, and number. Because these constructs are fundamental to our modern scientific conception of the cosmos, because they are the starting point for quantification, and because they offer a basis for wholeness, I call them cardinal metaphors. I see space, time, matter, and number as possibly the deepest expressions of the present state of our consciousness.'¹⁰

Jones considers these metaphors to be constructs, which are really only a kind of model, but it seems that they are more than this. They are basic structural forms by which and in terms of which we experience reality. A construct has a large conscious component, as do all models, but what he calls the cardinal metaphors are more than that. They have their origins in the deeper realms of the subconscious and thus they are indelible.

Both models and metaphors will perhaps eventually be understood as the products of more basic psychological and underlying neurological processes that are presently inadequately understood. Science has built itself into a blind generator or pilotless engine of material progress by means of these processes which are just now being significantly recognized as connected to knowledge about ourselves and our viewpoint and concepts about the outer, phenomenal world. If models and metaphors have proved useful and basic to man's attempts to understand, predict, and control the outer objective world, then

9. Jones, R. S. *Physics as Metaphor* (New York: Meridian-New American Library, 1982), p. 4.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

their use must also be seen as valuable and meaningful for man's historical struggle to give or find meaning, value, and purpose to his own existence. In the East, much of this struggle has centred on man's own nature, the inner, subjective world and which, in the West, has been disregarded and even vigorously shunned by traditional science. Man in his religious striving has had recourse to models and metaphors as he tried to deal with this inner world, but we don't see them as models and metaphors, but as images, idols, and icons. The psychological needs and processes that underlie the production and use of models and metaphor also underlie that of the idols, icons, and other images that man needs to help him to express his knowledge about and to explicate his deepest needs and highest aspirations.

Images, idols, and icons

If science has had to find and develop ways to concretize the abstract and to objectify the subjective, religion even more so, has had to do this. Science has had the good sense, or should we say foresight, to achieve a certain manner or degree of control over the kinds of phenomena that it investigates or is willing to deal with. Religion necessarily seeks this control also, but for most of us this control is not as explicit or tangible as it is for science, since religion has had to confront ultimates and absolutes. Religion must instead rely on faith and belief to support its methods and contents. God is omnipresent, both transcendent and immanent, yet remains elusive. It is unusual for us to experience God through the normal use of our senses. Although God is infinitely present within and without, we must approach or grasp God only in and through an attitude of faith and belief. Science has generally been able to choose what it wants to deal with and

how best to go about doing that, for the most part ignoring the major and significant portion or aspects of experience. Needless to say, there are some individuals who recognize this to be the most meaningful portion. Religion has not been able to choose or select its domain because existence and purpose itself, the major aspects of experience, are within its province and can't be avoided. This is not so with science. Simply stated, what science avoids, religion confronts.

Although religious faith and belief can lead to important convictions regarding attitudes toward and understanding about existence, it does not leave us impotent or powerless as we confront our own nature and the world of the senses and its derived phenomena. We can still use our ability to conceptualize. We do this by developing and using symbols that become our images, idols, and icons. Idols and icons are types of images, which in turn are kinds of symbols that the mind develops and finds convenient to use as objects, becoming concrete or ideational expressions of abstractions that are spiritually important to us. Man abstracts and generalizes when he forms concepts. If a concept thus formed is too remote or abstruse, as so often happens in religion, he concretizes it so that it can be held in the mind. Images serve this purpose, holding an idea, concept, or feeling in the mind by symbolically presenting these to the senses in the form of an object. Indeed, they can also evoke, not just represent, a desired idea, concept, or feeling. Who has not had strong feelings while looking at the picture of a loved one, or had the mind lifted up into the higher realm of spiritual experience, while engaged in individual or communal worship?

Icons serve as representations of sacred personages or events and are usually done in mosaic or wood, or as a mural painting.

In the Eastern Christian tradition they are an essential part of the church, given special liturgical veneration and also serve as a medium for instruction by providing or depicting scenes from the Bible, church feasts, or popular saints. Traditionally, icons have been taken as symbolical art, rather than realistic, its function being that of expressing in line and colour the theological teachings of the church. Icons are thus important religious symbols that answer man's deeper spiritual needs in a manner and form consistent with the basic dynamics of his mind which provide the products of man's imagination, scientific and religious.

Idols can be generally and usefully taken to be an image or some other material object representing a deity to which religious worship is addressed. This religious concept of idol has taken on a pejorative connotation because, in the West, it has come to be taken, for one reason or another, in the following ways. It is seen as an image or a deity other than God and used as an object of worship, as a mere image or semblance of something invisible but without substance, and finally as a figment of the mind, a fantasy or false conception or notion. Religious intolerance is very much evident in these views and it is based on ignorance and perhaps a certain combativeness stemming from a feeling or attitude of competition, where one's professed religion is not only to be defended, but vigorously propagated or proselytized. Any intolerance, ridicule, or overt or covert condemnation of one religion by the followers of another, does not meaningfully or significantly indicate the unworthiness of the religion being condemned, but rather suggests the shallowness and shortcomings of those doing the condemning. Variety in religious approaches to God only follows and reflects the plan followed by nature, variety, diversity, and an in-filling of the physical

as well as the mental and spiritual levels of reality. To think less is to misread both the smaller reality we struggle against, and the larger Reality we aspire towards.

If we look at the dictionary we see that the word 'idol' comes from the Greek word 'eidolon' meaning 'image' or 'idol,' which is derived from the Greek word 'eidos' meaning 'shape'. Swami Abhedananda, a learned spiritual teacher and bearer of Vedanta to the West, quotes Thomas Carlyle from *On Heroes, Heroworship, and the Heroic in History*:

'Idol is eidolon, a thing seen, a symbol. It is not God, but a symbol of God; and perhaps one may question, whether any (but) the most benighted mortal ever took it for more than a Symbol. I fancy, he did not think that the poor image his own hands had made was God; but that God was emblemed by it, that God was in it some way or other. And now in this sense, one may ask, is not all worship, whatsoever a worship by symbols, or eidola or things seen? Whether seen or rendered visible as an image or picture to the bodily eye, or visible only to the inward eye, to the imagination, or to the intellect; this makes a superficial, but no substantial difference. It is still a Thing Seen, significant of Godhead, an Idol.'¹¹

Swami Abhedananda goes on to say that for all religions any object of worship, whatever the form of that object, is just as much an idol as any other, being an image or thing seen, not itself a god, but God symbolized by it.

If we return to the model as it is used in science, we can see that the same basic and essential motives and processes are involved in religious symbology. Scale models are also used in all religions. Some extensively and overtly, some covertly, being thinly disguised, but nevertheless evident. One important kind of such models or forms is that of the Cross, often

11. Swami Abhedananda *Complete Works of Swami Abhedananda* (Calcutta: The Ramakrishna Vedanta Math, 1967) Vol. I, p. 330.

being worn on a chain around the neck. Other forms include the Fish, the Crescent, the Wheel, the Dove, and the Swan. The statuary and other sculptured and natural forms that are used by most religions also serve as modelled representations. Indian art is highly symbolic, where the symbol represents or manifests an invisible idea, and the relation between sign or symbol and the underlying idea being one of unity.

A. K. Coomaraswamy, a gifted and sagacious scholar, discussing the ideal of spiritual motifs that inspired the art of India, writes,

'The Indian imager approached his work with great solemnity, invoking the God whom he would represent...Were it possible to find any true short way to art, it would surely be this, that the artist must identify himself with his subject; it should be an insult to credit him with observation, for to observe implies a separation from that which is observed. It is likewise a test of art, that it enables the spectator to forget himself, and to become its subject, as he does in dreams...All these sculptors, poets, or singers, desired to make themselves a channel for the passage of ideas from a divine world to this physical earth, and all equally regarded personal and discrete intellectual activity as incompatible with the apprehension of remote truth'.¹²

If the artist can thus acknowledge the intuitive, real source of his inspiration and uses symbols to concretize this as his developed images, how much more so must the worshipper be inspired by this same attitude or reverence for the divine. Swami Asehananda, head of the Vedanta Society of Portland, Oregon states,

'When the devotee's heart has become pure, he will reach the state of bhāva samādhi: then the image that the devotee worships will not be an external statue made of clay or even a subjective idea of the mind, but the image will

be a solidified mass of consciousness, a tangible reality, radiant, living, pervading each person and object of the universe'.¹³

Models, as ideals in religion, often take the forms of saints and other holy personages who embody the highest standards of faith, character, and behaviour. Thus we have the worship or veneration of the Madonna, Moses, Mohammed, John the Baptist, Lao Tzu, and Hanumān, to name a few. Models, as spiritual ideals, are heuristic and inspirational, directing the mind and the heart of the believer toward the ideals so clearly manifested by these personages. But the burden remains with the believer and the inspired, and this burden is a readiness to believe and a willingness or need to emulate the model or strive toward that which is symbolized in and by it.

There is also a religious counterpart to the model as a physical device, showing how a thing works or displays the relationships of the different parts of a whole to each other. The Eastern religions have a well developed tradition that uses such devices. One of them, the maṇḍala, is a complex diagram that, together with an appreciation and knowledge of its purpose and use, serves to focus cosmic and psychic energies. It is an image of the universe, a receptacle for the gods and is often used as an aid to concentration. While the maṇḍala is a generalized form, the yantra, a kind of maṇḍala, serves a more restricted purpose. It can be drawn on any material, made out of any substance and is worshipped as containing the presence of a specific deity.

Religious symbolism

For the Westerner, this proliferation of forms and images that are a part of Eastern

12. Coomaraswamy, A. K. *The Arts and Crafts of India and Ceylon* (New York: The Noonday Press, 1964), pp. 25-26.

13. Swami Asehananda *Glimpses of a Great Soul* (Hollywood: Vedanta Press, 1982), p. 85.

religions, tend to bewilder his mind. This can be seen as partly due to ignorance of Eastern religious tradition and thought, and to an inadequate understanding of the need for and use of symbols. It also suggests that the East has, and West has not, accommodated the infinite versatility and adaptability of the human mind and the potentialities and possibilities that this proffers, by providing a richness of forms that individuals may consider and choose from, suiting their varying temperaments, moods, and capacities. This is not an exercise in ignorance and delusion, but an honest and earnest recognition and application of the extraordinary potency of the human imagination and individuality. The relative paucity of images in the West, and also the deficiency in the constructive use of symbols generally, is perhaps due to the fact that in the West the outer world, as presented through the senses, importantly determines the contents of the mind, allowing for little real freedom for individual subjective expression. On the other hand, in the East, the inner world of the mind importantly determines its contents, allowing for more real freedom of individual subjective expression. Symbols are thus accepted as valid and necessary expressions and manifestations, both of this individualized inner subjectivity, and for some, a larger transcending common ground of subjectivity, having its source in the Absolute, or Universal Consciousness.

Swami Vivekananda, who originally brought the essential message of Vedanta to the West, stresses the importance of and need for symbols as an aid for the worship of the Personal God. He writes,

'This idea of devotion and worship to some higher being who can reflect back the love to man is universal. In various religions this love and devotion is manifested in various degrees, at different stages. The lowest stage is that of ritualism, when abstract ideas are almost impossible, and are dragged down to the lowest

plane, and made concrete. Forms come into play, and, along with them, various symbols. Throughout the history of the world, we find that man is trying to grasp the abstract through thought-forms, or symbols. All the external manifestations of religion—bells, music, ritual, books, and images—come under that head. Anything that appeals to the senses, anything that helps man to form a concrete image of the abstract, is taken hold of, and worshipped.'¹⁴

It seems that the mind's very nature forces it to objectify, and these objects are images and forms that we produce and experience in the outer, material world, and the names, forms, and ideas of the inner immaterial world. To ignore or deny this is to demonstrate an ignorance of basic mental processes and laws, and by the act and attitude shown by that denial, seek to deprive oneself and everyone else of an opportunity to seek and to realize the various levels of truth, physical, mental, and spiritual.

Again Swami Vivekananda, in discussing worship in terms of substitutes and images, uses the concepts of Pratīkas and Pratimās. Pratīka means 'going toward' and Pratīkas are things worshipped as a substitute for the real thing, being more or less satisfactory for that purpose. Pratīkas can become more and more like the real thing, in some one or more respects, but never that thing itself. Prāmās are the images so used. Swami Vivekananda writes,

'One thing, therefore, has to be carefully borne in mind. If, as it may happen in some cases, the highly philosophic ideal, the supreme Brahman, is dragged down by Pratīka-worship to the level of the Pratīka, and the Pratīka itself is taken to be the Atman of the worshipper, or his Antaryāmin, the worshipper gets entirely misled, as no Pratīka can really be the Atman of the worshipper. But where Brahman

¹⁴. Swami Vivekananda, *The Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda* (Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama, 1963) Vol. II, p. 38.

Himself is the object of worship, and the Pratika stands only as a substitute or a suggestion thereof, that is to say, where, through the Pratika the omnipresent Brahman is worshipped—the Pratika itself being idealized into the cause of all, the Brahman—the worship is positively beneficial; nay it is absolutely necessary for all mankind, until they have all got beyond the primary or preparatory state of mind in regard to worship'.¹⁵

A stress is thus placed on the critical fact that the symbol is to be viewed or taken as Brahman, or the thing symbolized, not Brahman as the symbol, i.e., becoming the symbol. This ensues from the idea that each view as given by a symbol of Reality, represents the entire Reality. Whatever aspect of Reality one wishes to represent in one's symbols, represents the whole Reality and if used properly can lead to knowledge of that Reality. Brahman is not 'condensed' into the symbol, but rather the symbol stands for or substitutes for Brahman. We have in this idea a possible reason for the negativity shown toward religions that prescribe or advocate worship of images. It is wrongly assumed by many individuals that this worship is of the object alone, where in actuality, it is of the Reality that stands behind, and which the symbol, in the form of the object or image, substitutes for. It would indeed be idolatry if the image was worshipped as God, but to do that is to misunderstand the purpose of the image as symbol. All religions have their idolaters, who through ignorance, can't see or understand the Reality behind and beyond the image itself.

Worshipping pratikas is natural for most individuals and serves their needs and purposes. As long as the mind is conditioned by and thus subject to the limitations of the body and the searching, struggling mind itself, pratikas will be

necessary and useful. But one should beware of their circumscribing nature. Swami Vivekananda goes on to explain,

'When, therefore, any gods or other beings are worshipped in and for themselves, such worship is only ritualistic Karma; and as a Vidyā (science) it gives us only the fruit belonging to that particular Vidyā; but when the Devas or any other beings are looked upon as Brahman and worshipped, the result obtained is the same as by the worshipping of Ishvara. This explains how, in many cases, both in the Shrutis and the Smritis, a god or a sage, or some other extraordinary being is taken up and lifted, as it were, out of its own nature and idealized as Brahman, and is then worshipped'.¹⁶

Unless the worshipper has intuitive, experiential, or other knowledge of the real nature of existence and how the world and he himself are part of it, these helps or aids must and will be used. Images and substitutes will have an important use and their best use is achieved when there exists a background or attitude of understanding. Real understanding is elusive and arrived at or gotten with great difficulty. In the conditioned state, knowledge is really a continuum that can be usefully divided into levels, ranging from lower to higher, from concrete to abstract. As we move toward the higher or more abstract, we tend to resort to express what we sense or feel to be true for our level of experience and understanding. As we move to these higher levels, language no longer serves us and we find it increasingly difficult to express what we know or experience. Religion deals with these higher levels and so images and other methods must be adopted or used to express what one feels or knows or aspires to feel or know. Much of the religiously inspired poetry, songs, and hymns of the various religions of the world, in both their liturgical and individual expressions, have

15. Ibid., (1960) Vol. III, p. 60.

16. Ibid., p. 60.

used metaphor to describe and proclaim the glories of God.

It has been suggested earlier that metaphor is basic to the dynamics of language development and use. It is used to relate something better known to something less well known. This is done by a kind of transference of meaning that involves the relevant properties, qualities, attributes, or characteristics of that which is better known, onto and into the lesser known. What is transferred can vary, better known, at least in terms of that which has been transferred from the better known. What is transferred can vary, where simile weakly compares, metaphor strongly identifies. J. Jaynes has addressed this problem of transference. He states,

'Like children trying to describe nonsense objects, so in trying to understand a thing we are trying to find a metaphor for that thing. Not just any metaphor, but one with something more familiar and easy to our attention. Understanding a thing is to arrive at a metaphor for that thing by substituting something more familiar to us. And the feeling of familiarity is the feeling of understanding'.¹⁷

The important idea here is that of familiarity. Jaynes believes that this familiarity is what is transferred or shared and this in turn brings understanding to the lesser or unknown term of the metaphor, the metaphrand. But this still does not inform us as to the real nature of understanding itself. Familiarity may be an aspect of understanding, but it is not understanding itself. The all too intimate epistemological difficulties concerning the nature of understanding and knowledge remain and will have to be dealt with, eventually.

Conclusion

Can metaphor do any more than describe and substitute for an explanation?

Just as a model serves understanding, so too does metaphor. But an important aspect of explanation is to tell why. Models and metaphors can't do this when used in religion because to know or understand the why of ultimate things, especially of reality and existence, is to know God's purpose and we will never really know that with any certitude. We must always be careful how we use or interpret symbols, because if done improperly, it can be misleading. Swami Abhedananda suggests one way that it has led to what seems to be a misleading interpretation of one significant aspect of Christianity. In discussing religious symbols the Swami states,

'This is the united centre of the Absolute. This is the Christ within. The second coming of Christ to the earth is not the coming of a literal historical personage, but is a state of spiritual wisdom of growth among men,—the highest personification of spirituality possible to mankind, which is yet to be developed in humanity at large'.¹⁸

Whereas it is generally believed by many Christians that Christ will appear again physically, Swami Abhedananda suggests that this is more symbolic than literal and indicates that it is really the state of highest spiritual wisdom that will come to all men. Just as the Buddha taught that all people should strive to become Buddhas, or enlightened ones, so Christ will appear in the individual as the state of highest spiritual wisdom or enlightenment.

Religious symbols, properly understood and used, should be seen as substitutes for the real thing, especially if that thing is highly abstracted, and so metaphor should not always be taken so literally, but understood in terms of the hidden value

17. Jones, R. S., op. cit., p. 52.

18. Swami Abhedananda, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 264.

or truth that the symbol substitutes for or serves to indicate or point toward.

In this paper we have seen how models, metaphors, and idols are related to each other both in science and in religion. It has also been suggested that the underlying need that produces and sustains them and makes them useful, acts in a similar way for the aims of both science and religion. Many individuals find science and religion incompatible because they fail to understand or ignore the important fact or idea that both science and religion are really only methods, differently arrived at and applied to different aspects of reality and existence.

Complementarity is a term used in science to indicate that the same object or event can be viewed differently and even taken as essentially different, according to one's perspective or method used. The difference is not real, only apparent, and is based on or derived from the different perspectives, views, or methods one has or adopts. Science and religion are likewise complementary, each sees the basic or fundamental Reality from a different perspective. Science sees Reality as an outer objective reality of material substance. Religion sees Reality in terms of an inner subjective reality of immaterial spirit. The truth is that Reality is both, outer and inner, objective and subjective, immanent and transcendent. The problem has been, and the reason why we are confused, is

that we have been limited by the tools and methods that we use as we attempt to understand this Reality. Models, metaphors, and images serve a valuable purpose, but they must be seen for what they are. They are basic to knowing but only as a method or means and they must not be allowed to obscure the Reality that is their real object. These methods obscure that Reality when we ignore their limiting conditions, causing us to forget that they are only substitutes, a means to point toward or indicate what lies beyond. We must not let the naive acceptance of the means or method confuse us into thinking or assuming that these are the ends. If we do so we will continue to blindly pursue the means, never reaching the end, the real goal, which is the Reality that gives light and life to us as being, consciousness, and feeling.

Science must learn to use the methods of religion, especially that of the East, as we turn our minds toward the outer world, helping us to know the Reality as It is reflected or manifested there. Religion must learn to use the appropriate methods of science, as we turn our minds toward the inner world, to seek and know the Reality as It is manifested there. Together the two, religion and science, each can be seen not only as compatible, but as necessary, in our quest for knowledge and understanding of Reality in Its totality, immanent and transcendent.

RAM CHANDRA DATTA

SWAMI CHETANANANDA

(Continued from the previous issue)

On Saturday, June 2, 1883, the full moon day of the Bengali month of Vaiśākh, Sri Ramakrishna came to Ram's house. Ram felt so blessed on this occasion that later he would arrange a festival every year to celebrate that auspicious day. After this Ram invited the Master to his house many times and became so expert in festival management that other devotees would consult him before inviting the Master to their homes. Slowly the Master uprooted Ram's miserliness and made him a generous devotee.

The day after Sri Ramakrishna's first visit to Ram's house (June 3, 1883), Ram went to Dakshineswar and received various spiritual instructions from the Master. At ten o'clock that night Ram took leave of the Master and went out. It was dark and cloudy. While he was still on the verandah he noticed that the Master was coming out of his room. Sri Ramakrishna suddenly came up to Ram and asked, 'Well, what do you want?' Ram was utterly amazed. He felt as if his whole body was charged with electricity. Although he realized that Sri Ramakrishna was standing in front of him like a *kalpataru* (wish fulfilling tree), ready to grant any boon that he wanted, he was at a loss to know what to ask for from the Master. In the presence of Sri Ramakrishna's spiritual magnitude, he felt how petty it would be to ask for wealth or supernatural powers. Finally, overwhelmed with emotion, Ram replied, 'Lord, I don't know what to ask

for. You decide for me.' 'Give me back the *mantra* I gave you in the dream', said Sri Ramakrishna as he entered into *samādhi*. Immediately Ram prostrated himself before the Master and offered the *mantra* mentally at his feet like a flower. Sri Ramakrishna touched Ram's head with his right foot and Ram also lost outward consciousness. He did not know how long they stayed in that state. Gradually the Master came back to the normal plane of consciousness and took his foot away. Ram stood up. 'If you wish to see anything,' said the Master to Ram, 'look at me'. Ram looked and saw that Sri Ramakrishna had taken the form of his Chosen Deity, the form of God that was dearest to his heart. Then Sri Ramakrishna told him: 'You do not need to practise any more spiritual disciplines. Just come here and see me now and then, and bring with you a pice worth of something as a present'.

After this Ram was free of all his restlessness. Moreover, his experience convinced him that Sri Ramakrishna was an Incarnation of God. Once, in Dakshineswar, the exuberant Ram expressed his belief to the great devotee, Girish Chandra Ghosh: 'Do you understand, brother Girish? This time all three—Sri Caitanya, Nityānanda, and Advaita—are united in the form of Sri Ramakrishna. Love, devotion, and knowledge are equally manifested in this present Incarnation'.

A true disciple carries out to the letter his teacher's instructions, proving thereby

his love for his teacher. The Master had said, 'Those who serve the devotees, serve me'. Ram strictly observed this commandment of the Master, serving the followers of Sri Ramakrishna with great devotion until the end of his life. He used to say, 'He who calls on Sri Ramakrishna is my nearest relative'. His wife, Krishnapreyasi, who was also very devout, cheerfully helped her husband in his spiritual path. Ram, furthermore, had heard the Master cautioning the devotees about money: Just as water under a bridge is constantly flowing and as a result it never becomes stagnant and foul, so also the money earned by a real devotee should be spent for a noble cause rather than be accumulated. The desire for accumulation breeds the poison of attachment. Ram, therefore, did not save his earnings, but spent money freely for the good of others, especially for the poor, the needy, and the afflicted. He helped many students financially, even to the extent of providing free board and lodging in his own home. But Ram's main interest was in arranging *kīrtan* (devotional singing) every evening in his home and feeding the thirty or so participants.

Spiritual life is not always smooth. Ram and the devotees would become absorbed in their singing until late hours of the night, but this naturally caused much disturbance and Ram's neighbours began to complain. Ram then decided to buy a secluded garden house where he could hold *kīrtans* and practise spiritual disciplines. When he informed the Master of his intention, Sri Ramakrishna advised him, 'Buy such a solitary garden house that if a hundred murders were committed there no one would know it!' Accordingly, in the middle of 1883 Ram purchased a garden house at Kankurgachhi, an eastern suburb of Calcutta.

After a few months the Master said to

Ram: 'How is it that you have not yet taken me to the new garden you have purchased for holding *kīrtan*? Let us go one day to your garden to see what it is like'. Ram was exuberant. Immediately he arranged everything for the Master's visit. On Wednesday, December 26, 1883, M. recorded in *The Gospel of Sri Ramakrishna*:

Sri Ramakrishna, accompanied by Manilal Mallick, M., and several other devotees, was in a carriage on his way to Ram's new garden...

Master (to Manilal): 'In order to meditate on God, one should try at first to think of Him as free from upādhis, limitations. God is beyond upādhis. He is beyond speech and mind. But it is very difficult to achieve perfection in this form of meditation.'

'But it is easy to meditate on an Incarnation—God born as man. Yes, God in man. The body is a mere covering. It is like a lantern with a light burning inside, or like a glass case in which one sees precious things.'

Arriving at the garden, the Master got out of the carriage and accompanied Ram and the other devotees to the sacred tulsi-grove. Standing near it he said: 'How nice! It is a fine place. You can easily meditate on God here.' Sri Ramakrishna sat down in the house, which stood to the south of the lake. Ram offered him a plate of fruit and sweets which he enjoyed with the devotees. After a short time he went around the garden.

In sacred memory of Sri Ramakrishna's visit to the garden and because he had mentioned it as an ideal place for meditation, Ram named the place 'Yogodyāna' (garden for practising yoga). Ram gave the mango tree the name 'Ramakrishna-bhog' (delight to Ramakrishna), and to the lake where the Master had washed his hands and feet he gave the name 'Rama-

krishna-kunḍa'. In the northeast corner of the garden Ram planted a *Pañcavatī* (a grove of five trees) at the Master's suggestion. After the passing away of the Master, his relics were enshrined on the spot near the tulsi-grove where the Master had bowed down. A temple was later erected there.

Even during his boyhood, Ram was strong, assertive, and manly. He was a leader in the local gymnasium, the theatre club, and other social organizations, and people respected him for his character and integrity. Knowing Ram's faculty for leadership, Sri Ramakrishna called him 'Captain', and he also sometimes consulted with him. Once Girish Ghosh, while in a drunken state, humiliated the Master. The devotees were furious with Girish. But when Sri Ramakrishna told Ram about it, Ram defended Girish, suggesting to the Master that Girish was like the serpent Kāliya who had nothing to offer Sri Kṛṣṇa but its venom. Immediately the Master forgot the affront and went with Ram to Girish's house to forgive him.

Ram was free and frank with the Master, but he was also very outspoken and easily piqued. Once Adhar Sen arranged a recital of the *Caṇḍī*, at his house in Calcutta and invited the Master and many of the devotees. Ram, somehow, was overlooked. He became very upset when he heard about it and complained to the Master. But Sri Ramakrishna replied: 'Suppose he didn't invite you to his house. Why such a fuss about going to a place where the name of the Lord was sung? One may go unasked to participate in religious music. One doesn't have to be invited.'

The Master had a wonderful sense of humour and would sometime remove the seriousness of a situation or the misunderstanding of the devotees through a joke or by teasing him. On one occasion Ram was trying to prove the superiority of the

Master in his presence. While Ram, with all his vigour, was denouncing the Brahmos, the Master said to him: 'Now tell me why my arm was hurt. Stand up and deliver a lecture on that'. Everyone laughed. Another time (September 28, 1884), the Master in a deep spiritual mood was talking to the devotees at Ram's house. But Ram did not hear the talk because he was busy making arrangements to feed the devotees on the roof. When he finally came downstairs the Master asked him, 'Where have you been?' 'I was upstairs, sir'. Immediately the Master reminded him to be humble: 'Isn't it better to stay down below than to be high up? Water accumulates in low land but flows down from a high mound'.

On Sundays and holidays many devotees would visit the Master at Dakshineswar and ask him questions about spiritual life. Ram had a desire to preserve the Master's words so he always carried a pencil and paper with him. While Sri Ramakrishna was answering the devotees' questions, Ram would write down what he was saying. Seeing Ram's enthusiasm and sincerity, the Master one day said to him: 'Why do you take so much trouble? Later your mind will be your guru and will give you the proper guidance whenever you are faced with life's problems'. After receiving this blessing from the Master, Ram stopped taking notes.

When a flower blooms, bees come of their own accord. In the later part of the 1870s people began to hear more and more about Sri Ramakrishna, and in the 1880s many new-comers came. Forgetting his body, the Master helped the seekers of God. But one day at Dakshineswar he complained to the Divine Mother like a child: 'How is it that you are bringing such a crowd here? I find no time even to bathe or eat. (Pointing to his own body) This is but a perforated drum, and

if you beat it day and night, how long will it last?' Then, on another occasion, he prayed to the Mother, 'Please give a little power to Vijay, Girish, Kedar, Ram, and Mahendra (M.), so that they may, to a certain extent, prepare the new-comers before they come to me'. Thus Ram was commissioned to teach by the Master. About this same time Ram also received permission from the Master to give a lecture at the Konnagar Hari-sabhā on 'What is True Religion?'

In May 1885, Ram compiled some of Sri Ramakrishna's important teachings that he had noted down and brought them out in a Bengali book entitled *Tattvasāra*. A few of the devotees, however, objected to this and even reported it to the Master. Sri Ramakrishna called Ram aside one day and said: 'Look here, some devotees informed me that you were publishing a book. What have you written?' Ram replied, that he had collected some of his (Sri Ramakrishna's) teachings and put them together in a book. Ram then read some of it to the Master, who said: 'Oh, you have written those teachings? Very good. Listen, if you think that you have written them you will get very little response from others; but if you think that the Lord is working through you then it will be in great demand.' Sri Ramakrishna further cautioned Ram: 'Do not publish my biography now. If you do, my body will not last long'. Ram obeyed, but after the Master had passed away he wrote the first biography, *Śrī Śrī Ramakrishna Paramahamsadever Jīvanvṛttānta*. Later he enlarged *Tattvasāra* and published it as *Tattva-Prakāśikā* (The Teachings of Sri Ramakrishna). He also began to publish a Bengali magazine, *Tattvamañjarī*, in order to spread the Master's teachings.

In September 1885, Sri Ramakrishna moved to Shyampukur, in the northern section of Calcutta, for his cancer treat-

ment. Ram took an active part in the arrangements that were made for the Master's care. As the day of the Kālī Pūjā approached the Master expressed a desire to celebrate the occasion with a worship of the Divine Mother and asked the devotees to collect the necessary materials. Accordingly, they procured flowers, fruits, sweets, sandal paste, incense, and candles. When the auspicious time came they placed them in front of the Master, thinking that he would perform the worship. There was no image. The devotees sat around the Master silently waiting, but he remained in meditation. All of a sudden the thought came to Ram's mind: 'It is needless for the Master to perform worship. We shall worship him'. Ram whispered this idea to Girish, who responded: 'What did you say? Is the Master waiting to accept our worship?' Immediately Girish took some flowers and offered them to the Master, saying, 'Victory to Sri Ramakrishna! Victory to Mother!' The hair of the Master's body stood on end and he entered into samādhi. His face was radiant with a divine smile. The rest of the devotees also offered flowers to the Master and were blessed.

The stuffy, polluted atmosphere of Calcutta aggravated Sri Ramakrishna's illness. In accordance with the doctor's advice, the devotees moved him to a garden house in Cossipore, a northern suburb of Calcutta. Ram, as usual, took the managerial role there and also contributed money toward the Master's living expenses according to his means. One day, hearing that the Master needed a tongue-scraper, Ram bought a silver one and presented it to him. But the Master would not accept it, saying, 'What have you done? Take it away. Please buy a one-pice brass tongue-scraper for me.' Sri Ramakrishna was very much against luxury. Ram remembered this and later followed the Master's example.

On January 1, 1886, Sri Ramakrishna went into an extraordinary spiritual mood and blessed many devotees, saying 'Be illumined'. Ram was one of those present on that occasion. Later he celebrated that day every year as 'Kalpataru Day' (Wish Fulfilling Day) at his garden house.

Sri Ramakrishna passed away on August 16, 1886, at the Cossipore garden house. After his cremation the major part of his sacred relics was preserved and worshipped by the young disciples who later became monks. The remaining portion was installed at the Kankurgachhi Yogodyana on Janmāṣṭamī (the birth anniversary of Sri Kṛṣṇa, which fell that year a week after the Master's passing away). Ram took the initiative and immediately arranged for regular worship of the relics. Since then Janmāṣṭamī has been observed every year as the main festival day at Yogodyana.

It is noteworthy that Ram was the first person to publish a biography of Sri Ramakrishna, to build a temple for the worship of the Master's relics, and to preach publicly that Sri Ramakrishna was an avatar. His burning faith, devotion, renunciation, erudition, and his power to convince people made him an ideal evangelist. And more important, he had the blessings of his guru, Sri Ramakrishna. From 1893 to 1897, he gave eighteen lectures on Sri Ramakrishna's life and teachings at the Star, City, and Minerva Theatres. They created a sensation in Calcutta. At first some of Sri Ramakrishna's devotees objected to these lectures, but Ram would not listen to them. On Good Friday, 1893, he began a series of lectures, the first of which was 'Is Ramakrishna Paramahansa an Avatār?' Ram substantiated his view through scriptural quotations, reasoning, empirical evidence, and incidents from his own personal experience.

Ram realized that people would not listen to his lectures on Sri Ramakrishna, who was the embodiment of renunciation and purity, if he himself did not renounce lust and greed. True religion, according to Sri Ramakrishna, unites the mind and speech, and Ram sincerely endeavoured to translate the Master's teachings into his own life. Though he held a good position in his office, he was never proud of it, and he never allowed himself to crave for a higher position or for worldly objects. As regards food and clothing, he followed the path of simplicity. In spite of the many duties connected with his job and his family, Ram's mind was always on the Master and the Kankurgachhi Yogodyana. He lived with his wife and children at their Simla home, but he used to visit Kankurgachhi every day. Later he moved to Yogodyana and did the worship service, gardening, and cleaning himself. Sri Ramakrishna had taught his disciples, 'if you desire to live in the world unattached, you should first practise devotional disciplines in solitude for some time.'

God tests his devotees in many ways. A real lover of God is he who can overcome all temptations. Once a Calcutta merchant imported four shiploads of kerosene oil from England. Before marketing the oil, however, he had to bring a sample to Ram for chemical analysis. Ram tested the sample three times and found that it was short by three points, so he would not approve the kerosene for marketing. The merchant was deeply distressed, for it meant the loss of millions of rupees. He offered Ram a bribe of Rs. 40,000 to approve the merchandise, but Ram refused to accept the money and told the merchant that he could never write a false certificate. Although Ram received many such offers in his life, he never deviated from the truth.

Ram's surrender to the Master was

phenomenal. During the later part of his life someone asked him why he had not saved some money for his wife and children. He replied : 'If I wanted I could easily have saved a lot of money, but I never felt that I was maintaining my family. I know the Lord provides everything for my wife and children, and after my death he will continue to do so.' When one of Ram's young daughters died on December 7, 1886, from burns suffered in an accident, he endured that terrible grief, and to those who came to offer consolation, he said: 'The Lord gave me that daughter and he took her away. Why should I lament?'

Ordinarily, when people get together, they love to chat, gossip, or criticize others. But to Ram worldly conversation was like deadly poison, and he would not allow anyone in his presence to talk about anything other than the Master or spiritual life. When he talked about Sri Ramakrishna his face would beam with joy and tears would flow from his eyes. His faith and devotion were palpable. He had some initiated disciples and he changed quite a few lives through his spiritual power. Every Sunday Ram and his followers would sing kīrtan and dance barefoot through the streets of Calcutta. Through the grace of his guru, Ram tasted the bliss of God and eagerly shared it with each and all.

Ram's strenuous ascetic life at Yogodyana eventually affected his health. In 1898 he had a severe attack of dysentery which, along with his diabetes and a carbuncle that was making him suffer, caused him to move back to his Simla residence for treatment. His wife, friends, and disciples devotedly served him, and other disciples of Sri Ramakrishna were able to visit him more easily. One day Swami Vivekananda came to see him. It was a wonderful meeting of these two great disciples of Sri Ramakrishna. While they

were talking about their old days with the Master, Ram had to go to the bathroom. Since there was no one else present, Swami Vivekananda helped him put on his slippers. Seeing Swami Vivekananda's humility, tears came to Ram's eyes and he said: Bille (Swami Vivekananda's family nickname), I thought that after travelling to America and becoming famous you might have forgotten us. But I now see that you are my same little brother Bille.' (Ram Chandra Datta and Swami Vivekananda were cousins.) It is worth noting here that both Swami Vivekananda and Swami Adbhutananda came into contact with Sri Ramakrishna through Ram. Swami Adbhutananda in his early life (then known as Latu) had been an employee of Ram. In 1898, when Ram was seriously ill Latu Maharaj went from the monastery to serve him. He was very grateful to his former employer for taking him to the Master.

In spite of the best available treatment and care, Ram's physical condition deteriorated. He developed heart disease and experienced severe breathing difficulty which led to chronic asthma. He would pass sleepless nights chanting the name of the Master. After a month and a half at his Calcutta residence he had a premonition that he would not live long. He asked his wife and family to send him back to Yogodyana so that he could die in that holy place where Sri Ramakrishna's relic had been installed, but they were reluctant to let him go. Ram finally ordered a palanquin and left for Kankurgachhi with his disciples. When he arrived there he said: 'I have come here to have my final rest near my guru, Sri Ramakrishna.' He lived only five more days.

On January 17, 1899, at 10:45 P.M., Ram breathed his last. His body was cremated on the bank of the Ganga and the relics were placed next to Sri Rama-

krishna's temple at Yogodyana. Before he passed away he told his disciples: 'When I die please bury a little of the ashes of my body at the entrance to Yogodyana.

Whoever enters this place will walk over my head, and thus I shall get the touch of the Master's devotees' feet for ever.'

(Concluded)

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

SAT-DARSHANAM (*Forty Verses on Reality*). TR. A. R. NATARAJAN. Published by Ramana Maharshi Centre for Learning, No. 40/41, 2nd Cross, Lower Palace Orchards, Bangalore 560 003. 1982 Pp. 48. Rs. 3.

The original or the present work is a Tamil composition of Ramana Maharshi titled *Ulladu Nārpadu* or Forty Verses on Reality. Coming from the pen of an illumined soul, the verses have a unique significance and power. The original Tamil form of these verses is said to have a crispness of diction, softness of rhythm and luminosity of its own. The verses serve as a clear guide to a spiritual aspirant following the *Vicāra mārṅa*. The Sanskrit rendering by the great scholar Ganapati Muni is charming, poetical and at the same time lucid. In the present book the Sanskrit verses are translated into English with a commentary by A. R. Natarajan. The main theme is self-abiding and watching the rise of the I-thought. Some of the other ideas connected with it are: the seen is none other than the seer; time and space are in the Self; everything rises with the ego, and the ego rises from the Self. The translation is faithful to the original and the commentary is lucid. Verses such as 28, translated as:

Discover the real source of the ego,
By exploring within, with keen intellect,
By regulating breath, speech and mind
As one would do to recover a thing
Which has fallen into a deep well.

have a special charm. The commentary takes much pains to show the uniqueness of Ramana Maharshi's technique of Self-enquiry and its difference from the traditional ways of *vicāra*. This attractive publication, offered at a modest price is in its second edition.

SWAMI AMRITANANDA
Secretary, Vivekananda College, Madras

EKA SLOKI OF BHAGAVAN SRI RAMANA MAHARSHI. BY C. SUDARSANAM. Published by Ramana Maharshi Centre for Learning, No. 40/41, 2nd Cross, Lower Palace Orchards, Bangalore 560 003. 1982. Pp. 20. Re. 1.

Sri Ramana Maharshi himself put the distilled essence of his teachings in a nutshell in a four-line Sanskrit verse—his first Sanskrit composition. Later on this was included in the *Ramana-Gītā* composed by Kavyakanta Ganapati Muni who said his entire work was a commentary on this one *sloka*. Tersely worded, the verse is capable of being interpreted in diverse ways. In the present book the author examines some of these views. The difficulty in giving a universally acceptable meaning to this *sloka* seems to be that it appears to speak of three paths, Vichara, Bhakti and Raja Yoga, whereas the devotees hold that he taught only Vichara. Is this a case of three-in-one or one-in-three? This question is answered in the end. An attractive publication which stimulates thought.

SWAMI AMRITANANDA

MAHATMA GANDHI IN SOUTH AFRICA:
BY P. S. JOSHI. Published by P. S. Joshi, 11 Jagnath Plot, Rajkot 360 001. 1980. Pp. viii + 364. Rs. 35.

Mahatma Gandhi in South Africa by P.S. Joshi is a factual account of Gandhiji's life and work in South Africa. In twelve chapters running into some 357 pages, the author first describes briefly Gandhiji's life in India prior to his departure for South Africa, and then provides a greatly detailed—almost a day-to-day—account of the struggle Gandhiji waged in the period between 1906 and 1914 against the racist white

regime in South Africa to end racial discrimination or apartheid to which the Indians in South Africa were subjected. The struggle of the Mahatma was no ordinary struggle of meeting physical force with a similar force, but the struggle to conquer violence with non-violence, brute force with soul force (satyāgraha). In such struggles, the Satyāgrahī suffers silently at the hands of his opponent and eventually conquers him by convincing him of the wrongfulness of his actions. Passive resistance of this type in the political field was hitherto unknown to the world, and to Gandhiji goes the credit of organizing and commencing the first passive resistance struggle in modern history. Nor did the world know before of such a non-political approach to politics which insisted on sticking to the truth at all costs and conquering hate by love. The spiritualization of politics and the doctrine that means are as important as the end that Gandhiji articulated and practised in Indian political arena subsequently were the direct result of his discovery of and experiments with satyāgraha in South Africa. Thus the South African experiments provide the background, 'the threshold' in the words of Pyarelal, and without an understanding of this chapter of Gandhiji's life it would be impossible to get any real insight into the thought and actions of this saintly colossus.

The immediate goal of Gandhiji's struggles in South Africa was to secure relief for the Indian people who had to suffer the ignominies of colour prejudice in South Africa. The Indian Relief Bill that was enacted in 1914 and the Smuts-Gandhi Agreement that was concluded at the same time heralded some progress in that direction. The Act and the Agreement however did not materially go very far. It did not end all hurtful discriminations, it did not achieve equality for the Indians. 'What the Agreement mainly achieved was the community's right to reside, to work, to trade and to enjoy the fruits of labour at a time when the Government was contriving to force them out of the country, lock, stock and barrel, by a drastic legislation. It made the Government accept them as citizens of the land and removed the Damocles' sword hanging over their heads. The foundation was well laid for their future entrenchment and property.' As Gandhiji himself said on the eve of his departure from South Africa: 'In the present conditions of South Africa, the Indian Relief Bill was the best that could be obtained.'

One has to remember that Gandhiji had

objectives larger than the immediate goal he sought in South Africa. The larger objective was to awaken the soul of the suffering masses in South Africa, to mould, in the beautiful words of Sarojini Naidu, heroes out of clay. As Dr. James D. Hunt, professor of religion and philosophy at Shaw University in Raleigh, North Carolina (U.S.A.), who is engaged in a study of the living, economic and working conditions of Gandhiji's ashrams, recently observed: 'I find he (Gandhiji) was less interested in gaining victories over oppressive laws that existed in South Africa than in making the Indian people there believe in themselves and experience their own power.' (*The Statesman*, Calcutta, dated December 29, 1980). Indeed the lasting significance of Gandhiji's movements in South Africa lies in his realizing this larger objective.

Gandhiji is no more, but his message continues to live and influence men like Dr. Martin Luther King and Mr. Nelson Mandela, winner of Nehru award two years ago, who carried on all through his life the struggle that Gandhiji had begun against the apartheid regime in South Africa. Discrimination is yet to end and racial equality is yet to be achieved in South Africa and many other parts of the world. Gandhiji's influence in the making of the present century is yet to be assessed correctly. But one thing is certain: he was centuries ahead of the world which unfortunately continues to pay only lip service to his ideals without sincerely following them in practice.

The book is essentially a chronology. The author, a resident of South Africa for thirty-seven years, has gathered his materials 'from persons close to Mahatma Gandhi then alive', and from the South African newspapers of the years 1904-1914. He also gives at the beginning of his book a list of the published works he had consulted. Regrettably in the main body of his writings he does not provide detailed references to his sources or footnotes, nor does the book provide an index, an invaluable aid to reading a book of this kind. Further, a large number of printing and spelling mistakes have crept into the book affecting its readability to some extent. What stands to the credit of the author is that he has made an honest effort in throwing light on Gandhiji's life in South Africa from historical and political perspectives and has amassed a wealth of facts in the process, which should pave the way for a more meaning-

ful analysis and for the movement from facts to theory.

DR. ANIL BARAN RAY, M.A., Ph. D.
Professor and Head of the Department of
Political Science
University of Burdwan

SANSKRIT—HINDI

SAPARSADA SRIRAMAKRISHNA-RATNA STOTRAMALA. COMPILED BY SWAMI APURV-ANANDA. Published by Ramakrishna-Sivananda Ashrama, P. O. Barasat, 24 Parganas, West Bengal. 1982. Pp. 312. Rs. 12.

SRI SRI RAMAKRISHNA-SARADA NAMAMRITAM. COMPILED BY SWAMI APURV-ANANDA. Published by Ramakrishna-Sivananda Ashrama, P. O. Barasat, 24 Parganas, West Bengal. 1982. Pp. 312. Rs. 1.50

In a silent, unobtrusive way Swami Apurvanandaji has been rendering a signal service to the cause of the Ramakrishna Movement by being instrumental in compiling, translating and bringing out several books. These books are of a unique nature and are an enduring contribution to the advancement of Sanskrit-Hindi literature.

The first book is an anthology of 108 Sanskrit hymns with their translations. Of these, 40 hymns are addressed to Sri Ramakrishna, 28 to Sri Sarada Devi, 17 to Swami Vivekananda, 16 to the other disciples of Sri Ramakrishna and 7 to different divinities. With the exception of a few composed by Swami Vivekananda, Swami Abhedananda and one or two of other Direct Disciples, most of the hymns are the work of scholarly devotees of Sri Ramakrishna, monastic and lay. Many of these hymns had been published earlier in the *Udbodhan* but a few

seem to have been obtained directly from the poets. They vary greatly in length and quality. They attest the versatility and creative power of the devotees of Sri Ramakrishna. All the hymns are instinct with devotion, purity and the spirit of universalism which are the outstanding characteristics of the Ramakrishna Movement. There is thus a sublime harmony and integrality in the whole book. It is a refreshing and elevating experience to look through this remarkable literary kaleidoscope. Evidently, however, the book is not intended merely for literary enjoyment. At least some of the hymns can be and should be used for daily recitation, worship and meditation. The reader may choose the verses according to his temperament, moods and needs.

Dr. Mohan Chandra Mishra's Hindi translation is simple and elegant. Nowadays Hindi is widely understood, if not spoken, all over India. *Sapārsada Śrī Rāmakṛṣṇa-ratna Stotra-mala* therefore deserves to be popularized among the devotees of Sri Ramakrishna even in the South. The printing and get-up of the book are pleasing, and the price, reasonable.

The second book *Śrī Rāmakṛṣṇa-Sārada Nāmāmṛtam* is a collection of hymns and songs on Sri Ramakrishna and Sri Sarada Devi chiefly meant to be sung as Bhajan. It includes the three litanies sung during the evening *ārati* in all Ramakrishna Ashramas and in the homes of many devotees, and Professor Traimbaka Sarma Bhandarkar's *Aṣṭottara satunāma stotram* and *Śrī Sārada-nāmāmṛtam*. Hindi translations of Sanskrit and Bengali verses have been given either as footnotes or as independent songs. A unique feature of the book is that musical notations of many of the songs have also been included in it.

S. B.

NEWS AND REPORTS

RAMAKRISHNA MISSION SEVASHRAM LUCKNOW

Report for 1982-83

Religious and cultural: In the Sevashram shrine daily puja and aratrika were performed as usual. Ramanama and Shyamanama sankirtanas were held on Ekadashi, fullmoon and newmoon days.

Discourses and lectures were given on the Gita by the Secretary on Sundays. Birthdays of Sri Ramakrishna, Holy Mother and Swami Vivekananda were celebrated with special puja, distribution of prasada and feeding of the poor. Durga puja and other festivals including Ramanavami, Janmastami, Shivaratri, Christmas Eve etc. were observed with usual enthusiasm and solemnity.

ness, in acquiescing to reactivity, is fragmentary and bound by the relation of before and after. It observes one by one a series of superficial configurations. Observation is thus made to coincide, as a consequence of passive reception, with the submergence of consciousness. It is a mode of identification with the object.⁷

In the passive state of ordinary sense consciousness, the object appears to threaten loss and aggression. Consequently, sense consciousness flees. The experience is of fleeting attention to sensory events, combined with a greater reliance on their remembered occasions. This is the state where objects served by impressions seem 'distinct existences', as Hume describes.⁸ Their apprehension leads him to conclude that there is no self-apprehension of greater duration than the momentary appearance of the object of sense consciousness taken in the impression. Hume's scepticism denies self-consciousness on the grounds that 'no connexions among distinct existences are ever discoverable by human understanding.' (THN, Appendix 635) Successive relations between representations of external things are thus exhaustibly the entire supply of relations. A complete system of mechanical associations between representa-

is aware of the impact of impressions; of external things as different, we might say. The latter is called perception of the equivalent word or name (*adhivachana-sanna*), and is exercised by the *sensus communis* (mano) when e.g., "one is seated...and asks another who is thoughtful: 'What are you thinking of? one perceives through his speech.'" *A History of Indian Philosophy* (Cambridge University Press, 1922), I, p. 96.

7. It is this line of thought that eventuates in Hume's declaration that the 'idea of external existence as something specifically distinct from ideas and impressions' is impossible. (I.II.6) Existence that is something represented in memory, but not immediately experienced in sense consciousness.

8. THN, Appendix 636.

tions can be given for Hume, in terms of 'resemblance' and 'contiguity in time and place'.⁹ The conceptualization of successivity gains an effective defence against the engulfing behaviour of the object. It partitions the impact. It is also as effective a barrier against the recognition of simultaneity of impressions as the inert, insensitive, receptivity it signals.

Locke's dumbness about sensation attests to this chain of events. Sensation 'is, as it were the actual entrance of any idea into the understanding by the senses.'¹⁰ The entry itself and the immediacy of sense consciousness are left blank. The question of clarity of sensation, as it is, by contrast wants to know about simultaneous relations: what is happening in the moment of its appearance. For, in the active state of sense consciousness, attention begins to include non-representationally what is in actuality being experienced sensately in the moment it is being experienced. Thus, the impression taken has added dimensions, both in sensation and in memory, though of course not in representational form. Without falling into a representational category, it is experienced as a unique perception, a singular occurrence. Observation, in the partial sense of British empiricism, i.e., classification of an object by use of cases and kinds, is rejected. As soon as simultaneity is recognized to be a part of proprioception,¹¹ observation means more than the remembered

9. *Ibid.*, I.III.2.

10. ECHU II.XIX, 'Of the Modes of Thinking'.

11. 'Proprioception', literally, 'one's own-ception', designates the body's internal perception of its own movement and distribution in space. Physiologically, it is grounded in distinct receptor organs ('proprioceptors') at fixed body locales. Any disturbance in physiological equilibrium is recorded proprioceptively. Hence, proprioception accompanies all sense-perception. The point in the present study is that evolution of proprioceptive awareness provides means for re-unifying consciousness in the light of sacrifice.

image, namely, the non-static, processual movement of sensation. Observation is fluid, particular, and non-discursive. It is also, as opposed to Locke's version, sensitive to the 'actual entrance' of the impression. Indeed, the moment of entry is its proper frame of reference.

It is necessary to return to an empiricism earlier in thought than that of Locke and Hume in order to reject the complex of externality and passive receptivity which belabours observation in their critical and reflective sense.¹² The primordial empiricism begins by locating the error of British empiricism, forced and constricted sense consciousness in the dysfunction which associated particular historical interpretations with sensations, concentrating on the former. To do this, it is necessary to enter more deeply into the impression before knowing more about the transformatory nature of observation. The active function of sense consciousness entails release from this interpretative element and its fixation of the past. Its opening to the current manifestation of sensation, its resensitizing, is the subject of the original empiricism which must now be examined.

III. *The Release of Manas*

When the object is external and observation confined to the external object, consciousness is largely submerged in the representations sensation calls up. The impression resulting may bear no correspondence to the world, if the memory associated with sense consciousness is only partially relevant. And, at best, it corresponds to a segment of the field as a whole. Per-

ception is as a modification of the field of sense consciousness (*vṛtti*).¹³ Moreover, so long as it identifies some segment with the whole, perception involves projection. Some name (*nāma*) or form (*rūpa*) is overlaid on the sensation. In the traditional accounts, this is described as *pratyakṣa*, going out through the sense-organ (*indriya*) and taking on the form of the object. Implicit reference is thus made to the passive role of *manas* as the normal course of sense-perception.

The recovery of consciousness, as has been seen, coincides with *manas*' active use of attention in 'conveying' the sense impression. In itself, *manas* carries no inherent tendency to malfunction. 'Manas is for men a means of bondage or liberation ... of bondage if it clings to objects of perception (*viśayasāngi*) and of liberation if not directed toward these objects (*nirviśayam*).' (MU VI.34) When the attention is no longer impressively spent on projection of a historical interpretation of sensation, and instead turns toward the current field *manas* functions without impedance, proprioceptively. The body 'sees' itself. The impression is grounded, sensate, and internal to the object. It clarifies the identity of consciousness as separate from that which it notices, the field from the segment. In this non-identifying capacity, *manas* is under direction of the impulse toward autonomy, which works to annihilate all historical interpretations linked to sense consciousness. By heeding what is presented (not represented in sensation) consciousness opens to the finely varied meanings which can appear only sensately, at that time relinquishing

12. Hume's aim is correct, to reject the position wherein 'the greatest part of mankind are induced to attribute objects to some impressions, and deny them to others.' (LIV.2) But his failure to uncover the autonomy of sense consciousness mars his account of an independent, self-supporting state of mind.

13. *Manas* is, properly speaking, the field of sense consciousness itself. Its extent, as well as the distribution of its segments, is normally (but not naturally) determined by volitional inclinations, via the *ahamkāra*. When made object of sacrificial consciousness, the stagnating effect on *manas* of these desires gives way to proprioceptive activity.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Non-violence and Strength

It cannot be denied that at present there is more violence in India than there is in many other countries of the world. Any hope that this is likely to be a temporary phase is receding day by day. The extent and intensity of violence may be gauged from the fact that the army has to be called out on several occasions as the situation goes out of the control of the police and even the paramilitary forces. The non-violent way the country achieved its independence and the moralizing done by its leaders in international forums have created for India the image of a non-violent nation. So any violent incident, which in other countries would be taken as something natural, appears shocking when it takes place in this country.

We would not, however, be shocked if we remembered our history. All through its recorded past, except perhaps for a brief interlude during the reign of Ashoka, India had been a land of violence with chieftains fighting chieftains, kings fighting kings, emperors conquering territories, thugs and dacoits plundering and killing people. Not many people have recognized that India has a great martial tradition going back to the time of Śrī Rāma and Śrī Kṛṣṇa, and kept alive through the centuries by warrior clans and classes whose descendants still constitute a sizable part of the Indian army. *Kṣātra-vīrya* (chivalrous valour) has always been as important a characteristic of the Indian ethos as *brahma-tejas* (spiritual brilliance). At any rate, the time has come for the nation to throw off its mask, its false image, and face with courage the unavoidable reality of violence.

There is one noticeable difference between the socio-political climate that prevailed in India during the freedom struggle and that prevailing now. The earlier period was marked by utter fearlessness. One of the great achievements of Mahatma Gandhi was the eradication of fear from the minds of the people. Now there is fear everywhere—fear of the so-called minority communities, fear of the so-called majority community, fear of other nations, fear of religious sentiments, fear of balkanization of the country, fear of dacoits and fear of politics. Fear makes the authorities dither, evade, dilly-dally, procrastinate—until it becomes too late and they find themselves with their backs to the wall. And then they react most violently.

Morality, non-violence and peace do not drop like a ripe fruit into the mouth of the nation, but are to be attained by an exercise of strength. To be virtuous, to be non-violent, to be peaceful we need great strength. Gandhiji could throw off the yoke of foreign domination by non-violent means because he was endowed with tremendous strength. The principle of non-violence no longer works, or is put to work, because there is none with the soul-force of Gandhiji to enforce non-violence upon the society. What the government, the leaders and the people now need most is strength to nip violence in the bud, either through dialogue or, if it fails, through firm and timely action. In this context it is good to keep in mind these words of Swami Vivekananda: 'Strength, strength for us... Everything that can weaken us as a race we have had for the last thousand years. It seems as if during that period the national life had this one end in view, viz. how to make us weaker and weaker, till we have become real earthworms, crawling at the feet of every one who dares to put his foot on us. Therefore, my friends, as one of your own blood... let me tell you that we want strength, strength, and every time strength.'