

"That Art Thou."

Chhandogya-Upanishad.

"This so solid-seeming world, after all, is but an air-image over Me, the only reality; and nature with its thousand-fold productions and destruction, but the reflex of our inward force, the phantasy of our dream."—*Carlyle.*

THE LIGHT OF THE EAST

Vol. II.]

APRIL, 1894.

[No. 8.

KEYNOTES.

IT seems that Swami Vivekananda has revolutionized the American world. After his lectures and speeches before the Parliament of Religions at Chicago, he is travelling over the whole of the United States as a Hindu missionary teaching the Western people the tenets of the Aryan Religion. An American paper draws a sketch of Swami Vivekananda in the following terms:

But no religion made so profound an impression upon the Parliament and the American people at large as did Hinduism. Among the Hindus of various schools who personally took part in the Parliament were Prof. Chakravarti, of Allahabad, Mr. Narasimachari of Madras, and Lakshmi Narain, of Lahore. Manilal N. Divedi, though not present in person, furnished several papers which were read and discussed, as was also a treatise on the Tengalai Sri Vaishnava theology sent by S. Parthasarathy Aiyangar, of Madras. The Brahma-Somaj was represented by

Messrs. Mazoomdar and Nagarkar, who were particularly welcomed by the American Unitarians, with whom they are in close doctrinal accord.

But by far the most important and typical representative of Hinduism was Swami Vivekananda, who in fact was beyond question the most popular and influential man in the Parliament. He frequently spoke, both on the floor of the Parliament itself and in the meetings of the Scientific Section, over which I had the honor to preside, and on all occasions he was received with greater enthusiasm than any other speaker, Christian or "Pagan." The people thronged him wherever he went, and hung with eagerness on his every word. Since the Parliament he has been lecturing before large audiences in the principal cities of the United States, and has received an ovation wherever he went. He has often been invited to preach in Christian pulpits and has by all who have heard him on any occasion, and still more

by those who have made his personal acquaintance, been always spoken of in terms of the highest admiration. The most rigid of orthodox Christians say of him: "He is indeed a prince among men," even when they find it necessary, for the sake of their time-honored prejudices, to add, "but he must be altogether an exception; of course there are no other Hindus like him."

As intense is the astonished admiration which the personal presence and bearing and language of Paramahansa Vivekananda have wrung from a public accustomed to think of Hindus, thanks to the fables and half-truths of the missionaries, as ignorant and degraded "heathen." There is no doubt that the continued interest is largely due to a genuine hunger for the spiritual truths which India through him has proffered to the American people."

* * *

Again: All the Hinduisng forces hitherto at work have received a notable impulse from the labors of Swami Vivekananda. Never before has so authoritative a representative of genuine Hinduism, as opposed to the emasculated and Anglicised versions of it so common in these days, been accessible to American inquirers and it is certain beyond peradventure that the American people at large will, when he is gone, look forward with eagerness to his return, or to the advent of some of his confreres of the institute of Sankaracharya.

* * *

It seems that some of the Theosophists labour under the wrong impression that the "Light of the East" is against the Theosophical movement in India. This is a serious mistake. For Theosophy unconnected with abnormal phenomena, we have the highest respect. Not that we do not believe in the possibility

of those phenomena, but because we can not believe that a Mahátmá like K. H. would condescend to play the part of Puck at the bidding of Madame Blavatsky and manufacture out of ether "tea-cups" and "brooch" for the satisfaction of a handful of European ladies and gentlemen. The picture of K. H. drawn in the Occult World is a caricature and nothing else. An ordinary Hindu *Yogi* will not condescend to perform the tricks which K. H. is made to do in the Occult World.

* * *

It is generally admitted that it was a great mistake on the part of the Founders to connect the movement with occult phenomena from its very beginning. We think that Theosophy would never have spread throughout the world so soon, had it not been for these so-called phenomena. Phenomena gave the first impetus to the movement and they will finally bring about its ruin. What is the cause of the almost phenomenal propagation of Theosophy throughout the world? Nothing but its connection with mysterious phenomena. What in the end will bring about its down-fall? The same mysterious phenomena.

* * *

Internal evidence clearly shows that Madame Blavatsky had no connection whatever with the Mahátmas when *Isis Unveiled* was written, though it is distinctly affirmed that she had such connection. In the *Isis* she tries to impress on the mind of her readers the fact that a human monad never re-incarnates. "According to Madame Blavatsky's present system of theosophy," says Mr. Coleman, "every human being is doomed to a long continued round of incarnation on this and other planets; on this earth alone during one round, each monad is re-incarnated

nearly 800 times (Esoteric Buddhism, 2d, ed., p. 51). But in *Isis Unveiled* the possibility of any individual being re-incarnated on the same planet save in a few exceptional cases, is denied. Read the following, derived, as Madame Blavatsky says, from an authority: "Re-incarnation, *i. e.*, the appearance of the same individual or rather of his astral monad, twice on the same planet, is not a rule in nature; it is an exception like the teratological phenomena of a two-headed infant. If reason has so far developed as to become active and discriminative, there is no re-incarnation on this earth. But when the new being has not passed beyond the condition of monad or when, as in the idiot, the trinity has not been completed the immortal spark which illuminates it has to re-enter the earthly frame, as it was frustrated in its first attempts. (I., 351). This is assuredly plain enough. No one is re-incarnated on this earth except certain infants and idiots. "*Isis Unveiled*" is said to have been inspired by Koot Hoomi, and this statement about re-incarnation is specially said to be derived from "an authority."

Note the rare consistency of Koot Hoomi and Blavatsky. In 1877 they authoritatively teach that on this planet on one incarnates except young infants and idiots, and those only once, so as to unite the spirit with the soul and form the trinity. In 1882, or earlier, these same illuminated sages the inheritors of the wisdom of the Gods, teach that every human soul (those of a few adepts excepted) is inevitably forced, to be re-incarnated 800 times on this earth and as often on each of the six other earths belonging to our planetary chain—all during the present round of creation only. Not only did Madame Blavatsky in "*Isis*" deny re-incarnation as a rule on this planet, but she went so far as to state in a number of passages in that book, that the Brahmans and Buddhists by their doctrines of re-

incarnation, transmigration, and metempsychosis did not intend, to teach the literal bodily re-birth of the individual into this world but it referred to the states of the soul after death in other worlds, heavens, or spheres. (I. 291, 292). She also says that the Kabbalistic transmigration did not involve re-incarnation, and she quotes from the *Sohar* in "proof that the transmigration of the soul does not relate to man's condition on this earth *after* death." (II., 152, 280). In 1877 she was saturated with anti-reincarnation; in 1882 she is saturated with re-incarnation. What is the cause of this great change? The answer is simple. Between the two dates she went to India and there established the Headquarters of the Theosophical Society. Numerous lodges were established composed of Brahmans in India and Buddhists in Ceylon, all of whom believe in re-incarnation on this earth an indefinite number of times. The great bulk of her followers being re-incarnationists the politic Blavatsky coolly threw over-board all her former anti-reincarnation fulminations inspired as they were by Koot Hoomi, and blossomed out into the most pronounced re-incarnationist, likewise under the inspiration of the God-like Koot Hoomi!"

* * *

A more forcible defence of Vegetarianism is hardly to be met with than the following out-pourings of Dr. Trail of New York: Give man the vantage-ground, free him wholly from the lusts of the flesh-pots; let him be purified entirely from the taste of blood; teach him that he was never intended to be the universal scavenger; that his stomach was never constituted to be the common sepulchre for the dead carcasses of animals; let him understand that, in his primal dignity and God-like attributes, he was made to be the lord, not the ravager of creation; that the

high office assigned him is that of protector, not destroyer of all that his Maker has pronounced "Very good"; that he was ordained to rule over not prey upon the creatures below him; that his mission is to subdue and cultivate the earth, not to breed the meaner creatures for the sake of devouring them; then will his body and his brain, his mind his soul—all the powers of his material and of his spiritual nature take the onward and the upward, the higher and the better direction.

* * *

Oh think not bold man, because thy punishment is delayed, that the arm of the Lord is weakened; neither flatter thyself with hopes that He winketh at thy doings.

* * *

What advantage is it that anything is hidden from man? Nothing is closed to God: He is present to our minds, and enters into our central thoughts.

* * *

A Jew, Mr. Jacob Voorsanger, draws the following picture of Jesus Christ:

Shorn of all theological attributes, divested of his Greek garments, disrobed and appearing in the strong light of history, the majestic character and figure of the Nazarene are intelligible enough to a Hebrew. The earliest Greek and Roman pictures of Christ represent him as bare-headed, crowned with the nimbus, enveloped in a long flowing robe,

bare-footed or sandaled, with a gentle, dreamy face, every line of which is an expression of deep spirituality. The Jews do not understand such a representation. It is an expression of Greek thought. The Jewish sculptor, Moses Ezekiel, born at Richmond, Virginia, has had another conception of Christ. He had chiseled out of the choicest marble the noble figure of a Jewish patriot, strong, sturdy, attired like a Hebrew of the period of the Galilean, a youth with *turbaned* head, and a face flashing with genius.

That answers more faithfully to the Jewish idea of Jesus. A son of his people, his heart aflame with great intents, his ambition wholly to restore the Law, his dream that of the prophets, to bring the kingdom of Heaven to the children of earth, he preached a millennium to men engaged in quarrels and contentions. If he failed, if his life paid the forfeit, it was the sorrowful consequence of troubled times. But his teachings, as they appear upon the face of his book, not as they are interpreted by hair-splitting metaphysicians, his teachings are the genuine echoes of the holy themes propounded by the old prophets. A life led in harmony with such teachings, the same teachings given to Israel in the Law and the prophets, must needs be pure and holy. This much we understand,—why cannot all the world thus read these teachings, and thus, to quote the great words of Sir Moses Montefiore, remove the title page between the Old and the New Testament? But that time has not yet come.

NATURE.

THERE is nothing, said Kant, which filled him with more wonder than the starry vault above and the moral sense within. And he spoke the truth. For what can be more awe-inspiring than the grand Law which on the one hand guides the movements of the celestial orbs and on the other the innate laws of the mental world. Everywhere in the *Phenomenal* world we trace the marks of a wonderful adaptation and design. We deny that there can be any purpose or design in the Eternal Substance (Brahm) which is above Space and Time, but as far as the Phenomenal world extends we meet with a Divine Purpose which betrays the existence of an Infinite Intelligence behind the veil. It is very difficult for the ordinary mind to obtain the idea of God by meditating upon bare metaphysical truths; but to infer the existence of an Intelligent Power from marks of design in Nature is not such a difficult task. From the simplest phenomena of nature to the most complex we detect the working of a great Purpose even to the minutest details. It is very true that great wonders have been debased by being constantly renewed. Is not the rising and the setting of the sun a great wonder? The diurnal and the annual motion of the earth and the regularity with which it travels through the ecliptic producing the regular succession of seasons, the waning and waxing phases of the moon controlling the action of the tides in regular harmony, the regular motion of the planets through the vast immensity of space, are these not great prodigies though custom has made them quite commonplace? Is not the machinery of the human body with its complex system of nerves and arteries and

systematic circulation enough to convince us that an Intelligent Law is at work even there? Could the lapse of thousands of years produce even a slight deviation in the course of a single planet so as to cause disorder in the solar system? If we look into the difference of the sexes we detect there also the hand of the Artist. The woman is made neat, elegant, and graceful endowed with every requisite to charm and to attract the other sex. Again the peculiarities of our environment are so devised as to allow us to hold our own against them. The dearth of oxygen in the atmosphere for a single minute can turn an animal into a corpse in a moment. The excess of heat or the abnormal decrease of temperature may put an end to our existence in an hour. But the laws of nature are so wisely arranged that we rarely suffer from our environment. The adjustment of our physical frame to external nature is so harmonious that we can not but admire the Intelligence which is its Author. If we look beyond the world which is within the ken of our naked eye we mean the world revealed by microscopes and telescopes we become confronted with the same order and arrangement which we detect in the world which is before our eyes. The tiniest animalcules have their characteristic actions and passions, their systems of nerves and their faculties of the brain. Not only this but the lower the animal is in the scale of creation the more is it placed under the guidance of an intelligent law which shapes its destiny as if according to a pre-arranged harmony. The following cases of animal instinct are in point:

1. "Thus, e. g., for the bird which has laid its eggs, the constant end is

to hatch the chickens ; accordingly, if the external temperature is insufficient it sits upon them, a proceeding omitted only in very warm countries, because the animal sees the goal of its instinct attained without its assistance. In warm countries many birds only brood by night. With us too, if by chance small birds have made their nests in hot forcing houses they sit but little or not at all. How repugnant is the supposition of a mechanism which constrains the bird to brood as soon as the temperature falls below a certain degree ; how simple and clear the assumption of an unconscious purpose which compels the willing of the appropriate means, but of which process only the final term, as a will immediately preceding action, comes into consciousness !

(2). "The eggs laid by the cuckoo always resemble in size, colour, and marking the eggs of the nest wherein they are laid ; i. e., in that of *Sylvia rufa*, they are white with violet spots ; in that of *Sylvia hippoleis*, rose-colored with black spots ; in that of *Regulus ignicapellus*, dark red ; and the resemblance is so perfect that the eggs are scarcely to be distinguished save by the structure of the shell. And yet Brehm enumerates some fifty species of bird in whose nests cuckoo's eggs were found.

(3). "Huber by special contrivances prevented bees from carrying on their instinctive mode of building from above downward whereupon they built from below upward and even horizontally. Where the outermost cells are attached to the roof of the hive or lean against the wall of the prisms, which are agglutinated together by their bases alone, are not hexagonal but pentagonal, far more durable fastening. In autumn the bees lengthen the existing honey cells if there are not enough of them ; in spring they shorten them again in order to obtain broader passages between the combs."

In the above cases we find the

working of an Intelligent Law in the animals in the form of instinct which is far above the brain-consciousness of the animal. In animal instinct we find the revelation of the same Intelligent Law which guides the motion of the Stars in their appointed paths. Here also we find the trace of a wonderful design which pervades the whole of Nature. If we look within into the facts of the inner world, viz., the human mind we find there engrained certain principles of morals which are common to all nations of the world. The first principles of morality, the distinction between right and wrong, the idea of God, these are common to the savage and the civilised alike. There are philosophers who deny, the intuitive nature of the moral principles. They say that there may be savage nations who make no distinction whatever between right and wrong. This is nothing short of sophistry. Even hardened robbers know the limits of their respective rights and they never fail to apply the standard of Justice when dividing the booty among themselves. On the other hand, mere experience can not give us any idea of right and wrong, or of justice and injustice. For, these principles are the innate principles of the human mind ; they are not material objects capable of being perceived by the senses. They form the very constitution of the human mind. Who then, has implanted these great principles of morality into our mind. Surely the Intelligent Nature. If there is no future for the human soul for what purpose has Nature introduced these laws into the very constitution of our mind ? If there is no God why the idea of a super-worldly immortal Being reigns supreme among all nations of the world ?

The moral law revealed in our consciousness is a decisive witness for the existence of God and for the continuance of the human soul after death. To such profound thinkers as

Kant and Sir William Hamilton the existence of the moral law in the human mind seemed to be sufficient evidence for the existence of the moral world.

Thus we see that Design is stamped not only on the beauty of external nature, but also in the mind of man. Everywhere we meet with the foot-prints of an Intelligent Law, which is governing the universe of mind and matter.

To what do all these lead us? Do they lead us to the existence of a Personal God as the ultimate author of the universe, who fashioned the solar systems by means of raw matter? No, they rather prove that Nature is intelligent, and that Nature *per se* is God. This grand Nature is neither personal nor impersonal but that it has a transcendental consciousness of its own which is not different from the *atma* of man. Let it not be supposed that we deny the existence of the personal God. The personal God of Hinduism is the highest and holiest entity in the universe. But even behind Him is the transcendental Nature, the all pervading, infinite Bramh. The ordinary man has nothing to do with this One Absolute Existence for It is beyond his reach. He should direct his whole attention to that phase of the Absolute Existence which is known as *Vishnu* and which is described in the Bhagabat gita as the "image" of Parambramh (Gita. Ch. XIV. 27).

We have, therefore, an Intelligent Nature working according to fixed laws to bring about a definite result. In every natural action which we daily witness, we detect the fulfilment

of some purpose, the revelation of some design. Our environment is so arranged and adjusted as to enable us to maintain the struggle for existence. The land in which we live is duly saturated with water for producing the necessaries of our life. An atmosphere extending about fifty miles from the surface of the earth surrounds us in order to supply us with all those elements which our blood requires. All these arrangements display the supreme wisdom of Nature, whose wisdom and intelligence no human intellect can gauge.

Nature is the veil which covers God. The mind of Nature is all-pervading and all physical phenomena are its obedient slaves. Thunder and lightning, the gaudy splendour of the rainbow and the glory the Milky Way,—what are these but the appearances of the Almighty God! In the above way we infer the existence of God from design; we rise to the conception of Nature's God from Nature herself. The idea of this omnipresent Being fills our little heart with wonder. Our finite existence sinks into insignificance before the grandeur of this august conception. How can we comprehend the Being who is omnipresent like Space and whose very garment is Nature? Have we not violated law upon law until we find ourselves standing amidst ruin? Does not our soul pine away in its little fleshy prison though surrounded on every side with the flood of ecstasy? Our love of self has torn us asunder from the bosom of the One Existence and we wander in the wilderness of the world homeless, clothed with rags.

BHAGABAT GITA WITH SANKARA BHASYA.

(Continued from page 92, Vol. I.)

THE Gita Shástra consists of 18 chapters and is divided into three parts, each part containing 6 chapters. The 1st six chapters treat of the word *Tvam* (That) and the 2nd six chapters of the word *Tat* (That) and the 3rd six chapters show the identity of these two. The main object of the Gita is to prove the *Mahábákyá-Tutwamasi* of the Sruti but other kindred subjects have also been taken up. "Self-knowledge is the means of *Kaivalya*" (final freedom) is the Keynote of this book and this has been taught throughout the whole of it. *Ananda Giri*.

SREE BHAGABAN SAID,

You are mourning for those who are not the object of sorrow, yet you are speaking wise words. The wise never grieve either for the living or the dead. 11.

Sankara. Bhagaban Basudeva, observing Arjuna to have lost his judgment in becoming unable to determine his duty and plunged in the ocean of grief, owing to ignorance and finding no other means of his delivery than by the instructions of *Atmá-gnán* takes pity upon him and introduces the subject in the following words. [Arjuna was blinded with two-fold ignorance. First, in common with others of the world, he identified the Self-luminous, Blissful and immaterial Atma with the three-fold Upadhis, Sthula, (physical) Sukshma (astral) and their cause *Avidya* or ignorance. Second, in particular, he was unwilling to do his duty for fear of killing. Bha-

bán dispels these two-fold—general and particular—ignorance in the following Slokas. *Madhhusudana*.] Bhisma, Drona &c. are not objects of sorrow, because they are righteous and really (the) immortal (soul). [Arjuna's grief begins from I 28.] But you are mourning for them and yet *talking* (not *meaning* what you say) like a wise man. [Vide I. 4. and the following Slokas in reply to Bhagabán.] Thus you are foolishly giving expression to self-contradictions like an insane person, as pandits (those who possess *Atmá-gnanam*) never mourn for the dead or the living.

It is not that I, you, and these Kings never existed, nor that all of us shall cease to exist hereafter. 12. 1

Sankara. What is the cause of thy grief? As space remains unaffected by the changes happening to the earthen vessel (which space pervades through) even so is it with the body and the soul. We are constant during the past, present and future. The plural 'we' is used to mean the bodies not the soul. [From this Sloka down to the 30th Bhagabán is engaged in dispelling the first sort of ignorance referred to as "general" in the note of the foregoing Sloka, and from the 31st to 38th the second sort spoken of as "particular." *Madhhusudana*.]

As childhood, youth, and age belong to this body so transmigration into another body belongs to the soul. The

wise are never confounded at this. 13.

Sankara. Bhagabán is showing by an illustration how *Atmá* is constant. One that *has* body (in contrast with one that *is* body) is called *dehee* (of the original.) As this *dehee* or *Atmá* remains unaffected by the three states of the body even so it does remain the same in another body. [The proofs that *Dehee* or *Atmá* remains unaffected by the changes of the body are the following: All of us can feel that "I who knew my father when a child now know my grand-children." Now it is evident that this my knowledge* as well as the sense of "ego" have remained constant amongst all those changes that the body has gone through. Had the *Dehee* been of the nature of the body, *i.e.* undergone any change, this could never have been the case. In dream and in the miraculous phenomena of *Yogavala* this difference between the *Dehee* and the *Deha* is markedly seen. In dream we discover ourselves assuming and creating numberless bodies while the 'ego' remains the same. Yoga phenomenon known as *Kaya-Booha* in which one individual can simultaneously reside in several bodies also prove the distinctions of the *Dehee* and the *Deha*. In *Rash-lila* Bhagabán displayed this phenomena; cp. Bhágabat, cp. also *Dattá-treya Samhitá. Madhusudana.*]

O son of Kunti! the con-

tact of the senses with their objects (matter) is alone the cause of cold and heat, happiness and misery; (they are) subject to growth and decay (and) are transient. O descendant of Bharat! bear them with peace. 14.

Sankara. Lest Arjuna thinks that though one need not fear death if one comes to know that the soul is immortal, yet that does not do away with the universally felt happiness and misery of the soul consequent on its contact with the pair of opposites, heat and cold &c., Bhagabán introduces this Sloka. The contact of the senses with material objects produces happiness and misery; they are not inherent in heat and cold &c., as it is seen that at one time heat becomes the cause of happiness and in another that of sorrow. *Atmá* is eternal and changeless. How can it be affected by phenomena that grow and die and are always changeful. Therefore do not regard them. [The object of addressing Arjuna by a couple of family names is to remind him of his wise and glorious ancestors who were possessed of *Atmá-gnán* and thus to persuade him to follow their path and shake off his folly. *Anandagiri.*] [Of the six systems of Indian Philosophy all others except Vedanta teach that the soul is different in each body, *i. e.*, every distinct body has a distinct

* The ego is distinct from the body because, (1), it is not due to a certain grouping of brain cells, (2), nor is it an innate attribute of physical matter either in the body or the brain. It is not the (1), because no single grouping of the cells remains unchanged, but that every thought which we have and which is accompanied by Self-consciousness is also accomplished by regrouping the cells in use: so that since my identity as the thinker is unchanged though the act of thought has changed their grouping, my sense of identity does not proceed from this source. Nor is it the (2), because the well-known fact that during a normal life the particles of matter in both body and brain are changed completely, not only once but several times shows that identity cannot possibly proceed from matter. For that feeling of self-hood of which we are so vividly conscious remains the same during all this time of change amongst the particles which it pervades and cannot, therefore, come from the physical body. If, now, this sense of self is neither due to physical matter nor to the grouping of the brain cells, and if as an object of immediate perception it is One and Indivisible as 'I am I' we must conclude that it comes from an immaterial Self-determining Ego pervading with its power of identity the physical body in which it manifests.

soul of its own. This doctrine is supported by the fact that the happiness or misery of a single individual is not shared universally. Had *Atmá* been one, the happiness or misery of one individual would have affected all. Lest Arjuna following this train of thought questions the unity of *Atmá*, Bhagaban introduces this Sloka to show that the *Linga Sharira* is the seat of feelings &c., not *Atmá*, which is beyond all material affections. *Madhusudana.*]

O best of men ! The wise *pu-rusha* (man) whom these cannot trouble and to whom happiness and misery are equivalent, is destined to enjoy immortality. 15.

Sankara. Hear, why should one patiently bear heat and cold &c. He that is not troubled, *i. e.*, finds himself to be beyond the affection of the pairs of opposites of this world as heat and cold &c., and realizes his constancy and reality by contrast with the unreality and transitoriness of these, becomes able to obtain *Moksha*. [Putting up with heat and cold &c. alone (*Titiksha* of the previous Sloka) does not make a man fit for *Moksha*; *Viveka* (discrimination) and *Vairágya* (non-attachment) are also necessary. Therefore have the adjectives 'wise' *Dheera* of the original (discriminating) and "to whom happiness and misery are equivalent" *Samadukshasuksham* of the original (indifferent) been used. The person possessing these is alone qualified to tread the path of *Moksha*. *Anandagiri.*] [In the preceding Sloka has been stated that the *Linga Sharira* is the seat of feelings, *i. e.*, it is the principle which acts and reaps the fruits thereof. It comes under thraldom and it is freed. If such be the case, then is not the theory of the existence of a soul apart from the *Linga Sharira* idle? What then is the place and action of the

soul? Lest Arjuna argues in the above manner, Bhagaban says that he that identifies himself with the self-luminous, blissful, *Atmá* which is only the witness of the *Linga Sharira* (intellect, mind &c.) and finds that happiness and misery cannot touch him, but that they can only affect the *Buddhi* which is the *Upádhi* (Vehicle) of *Atmá* gains *Moksha*. An *Upádhi* is that which saddles another with its qualities. *Atmá* is really the witness of the *Buddhi*, but it seems to identify the changes of the *Buddhi* with itself. This is bondage; the word *Purusham* (of the original) means that which lies in the *pura* or body, *Atmá* connected with a body. The real *Purusha* can have neither bondage nor freedom, it is ever the same. *Madhusudana.*]

The unreal never is, (and) the real never is not. Persons possessing the knowledge of the substance know these two conclusively. 16.

Sankara. In this Sloka is stated that it is proper to bear heat and cold, because they are unreal. An object which is the effect of a cause—any object which has a cause—never really is, and is an illusion. The cause only is true. The earthen pot has no existence apart from its cause 'earth.' Therefore we conclude that as all objects have their respective causes, as far as we enquire of their origin, all of them are false; the only reality being the original causeless Cause. If any one questions the existence of the causeless Cause the existence of the universe will amount to an absurdity and self-contradiction. We also see two sorts of *Buddhi* (understanding), *Sat* and *Asat*. *Sat-Buddhi* is that in which the impression of the understanding never changes, and *Asat-Buddhi* is that in which the impression is mutable. Our *Buddhi* is *Asat* regarding all objects which come in and go out

of existence. If it is argued that there can be no such absolute *Sat-Buddhi* in which an impression never changes, it is to be said in reply, that the *Buddhi* or understanding *per se* is *Sat* and absolute. If it had not been so, how could it detect the mutability and relativity of other objects. A changeful object cannot perceive change. The same law also holds good in regard to the relative. It is clear from the above considerations about *Atmá* that the body, as well as heat and cold &c., do not really exist and *Atmá* never ceases to be. A *Tatwadarshí* (of the original) is he who knows the '*tatwa*,' which means the nature of '*tat*' or *Brahm*. Bhagaban asks Arjuna to follow the path of *Tatwadarshis* and avoiding grief and the

intellectual coma he was labouring under, bear firmly the false mirage-like modifications of the pairs of opposites. [All things that are differentiated by Time, Space, and kind are *seemingly* real, not really so. The object of enumerating three sorts of differentiations is to meet dissenting philosophies. That which is subject to growth and decay is differentiated by Time and Space. Again the *bibhus* (that which spreads) of the above philosophers, Akasa, Time, Space, and Atma are indifferenced by kind. The *Sankhya* Philosophy also treats of these differentiations. Thus it is seen that which pervades all manifestations and is absolutely undifferentiated is the only Reality. [*Madhusudana*.

THE LIGHT OF THE EAST AND THEOSOPHY.

IT would have been better perhaps to name this article as "Words and Thoughts" or "Words and the Thoughts conveyed by them" instead of the one selected above. For it appears to us that the quarrel which has been going on between the *Light of the East* and the Theosophists has sprung from no other root than a mutual misunderstanding of the *right* significance of some words. However, in this our attempt to throw a bottle of oil on the troubled waters, we would request the favour of that learned body as well as our honoured friend the editor of the *Light of the East* to examine the following lines with an unbiased judgment taking everything in the plainest and most general acceptation.

The subject under discussion has been the nature of *Parambrahm* or

Chidákás, the Secondless Reality, *jato bácho nibartante aprápya manasá saha*—"unable to approach which" says the *Sruti*, "speech returns baffled with the mind"; *Naishá turkena matirapneyá*—"This understanding cannot be had by arguments"; *jashyá mátam tashya mutam matam jashya na brá sah*: *Abignátam bijánatám, bignátam abjúnatám*";—"it is thought by him that thinks It not; he that thinks It knows It not; It is unknown to them that know It; known to them that know It not"; *Náyam átmá prabachanena labhyo na mebharyá na bahuna srutena*—"The reading of the Vedas, high intellectual power, or knowledge of the *Shástras* cannot secure this *Atmá*." Nothing is more difficult to know but nothing is worth knowing save this. *Jadí manyase subedetí dabhramebápi*

noonam swam bettha Bramhano roopam—"If you think that you know Bramh well, you are certainly deceived." But the knowledge of this Atmá must be earned. The Mándukya Upanishad says, "*Sa átma sa bigneya*"—"That is Atmá, that is to be known particularly." The Kathopanishad says, "*Sreyohi dheero abhipreyaso brinecte, preyo mando jagakshemád brinecte*,"—"The wise accepts *Sreya* (Good or Bramh Vidya) knowing it to be better than *preya* (pleasant or worldly prosperity and the foolish accept the latter to earn and enjoy in the world.)" In the keynotes of the *Light of the East* for July '93 the learned editor says, "Bramh is unknowable, says Herbert Spencer. The Vedanta fully concurs with the above opinion of the greatest thinker of the age. The mind can never know Bramh, but it can become Bramh." "*Sa jo ha bai tat Paramambramh beda Bramhaiba bhabati*." (Mundak Upa. 3 M. II. 9.)—"He that knows that Paramambramh becomes Paramambramh." It is abundantly clear from the above quotations from the Sruti that though it is certainly hard to acquire *Bramh gnánam* it is by no means impossible and it must needs be acquired for freedom. So it is neither right nor reasonable to desist from attempts to know this Rootless Root nor is it right and reasonable to saddle it with anthropomorphic attributes. Mind and speech cannot reach It; It is known by Self alone. (Katha Upa. 2 B. 23). In Gita Ch. VI. 21. it is said to be *buddhi gráhyam atcendriyam*, approachable by the understanding but beyond the senses. To sum up: Its knowledge may be had by the absorption of the mind, but with mind it cannot be expressed; it is beyond language; we are sure no one can have any objection to this statement. Had it been otherwise, the Sruti would not have said, *sa átma, sa bigneya*.

Now let us see the difference be-

tween the Eshwara and Bramh of the Sruti. The Mándukya Upanishad says, "*jatra supto na kanchana kámam kámayate, na kanchana swapnam pashyiti, tat sushuptam. Sushuptasthána ekeebhostah pragná ghana ebánandamayo hyámaná bhuk chetomukhah prágnastriteeyah pádah*."

Esha sarbeshwara, esha sarbagna eshoantarjamyasha jonih sarbasya prabhakápyayon hi bhootanam."

"That state of deep sleep in which men do not think for desired objects nor dream is called Sushupti. That undifferentiated state of consciousness, where all divergences of the two other states (the experiences of waking and dream) unify, which is full of Bliss, which enjoys Bliss, and which enjoys by means of gnán, that Pragna (one having a special knowledge of things: dual) is the third páda (state of consciousness.)"

"He is *Sarbeshwara* (lord of all), He is all-knowing, He is the knower of an hearts, He is the mother of All, He is the cause of creation and destruction."

That is the Logos, Eshwara, or personal God of the Hindus. Again:

"*Nántah pragnam na bukih pragnam nobhayatah pragnam na pragnánghanam na pragnam ná-pragnam. Advistamabaháryam agráhyamalakshanumachintyam abyapadeshyamckátmya pratyaya sárum prapanchopasham shántam shibam adwaitam chaturtham manjante sa átma sa bigneya.*"

"That which is not the consciousness of dream, waking, or sleep (or that which knows no within and without or the intermediate between these two), that which is not the unified consciousness of the three states, that which is not relative or conscious of duality, that which is not the object of the senses of perception, that which is not of objective use, that which is not the object of the senses of action, that which has no marks and description for being

absolute, that which is unthinkable, that which is unspeakable, that which is felt as the one undifferentiated átmá (non-dual consciousness or objectless cognition) throughout all the three states, that which is beyond the five-fold states of matter, that which has no affinity for anything (or which is exceedingly calm), that which is absolute goodness and secondless, that is known by sages as the fourth, that is Átmá, that is to be known particularly."

That is the Paramambramh, the causeless Cause, the *Advaitam* of the Hindus.

It is very unfortunate that the English language has no word which signifies the nature of the Absolute in any sense. The cause of this is not far to seek. Hence all the misunderstandings and mis-statements. For example, let us take the word consciousness, which interests us most. Webster gives the following derivation and meanings: *Con*, with and *scire* to know. (1) The knowledge of sensations and mental operations or of what passes in one's own mind. The act of the mind which makes known an internal object.

"Consciousness is thus on the one hand the recognition by the mind or ego of its acts and affections. In other words the self-affirmation that certain modifications are known by me and that these modifications are mine."

Sir W. Hamilton.

(2) "Immediate knowledge of any object whatever.

"Annihilate the consciousness of the object, you annihilate the consciousness of the operations."

Sir W. Hamilton.

We have nothing else than relative consciousness in the above. Absolute consciousness, *gnah* as distinguished from *pragnáh*; objectless cognition is unknown in the English vocabulary; such is the case with the word *Sat*, which Madame Blavatsky has translated into *Be-ness*, rejecting

the word Existence (derived from *Ex*, and *Sistere*) which etymology means relative or second-hand existence.

Now we have seen it affirmed by the Sruti that Bramh is neither conscious of duality (*Pragna*) nor inanimate like a stone (*Apragna*). Then what is It? It is *Gnah* or *Chit*, the eternal objectless cognition, the absolute consciousness.

H. P. B. in the Secret Doctrine says, "The Absolute cannot be said to have a consciousness, or, at any rate, a consciousness such as we have. It has neither consciousness, nor desire, nor wish, nor thought, because it is absolute thought, absolute desire, absolute consciousness absolute all."

Now that is exactly what the Upanishads teach.

But when she says, in the same book, "The ceaseless eternal breath which knows itself not," it certainly seems as a self-contradiction. In his article the "Personal and Impersonal God" Subba Row says, "Similarly there are six states of differentiated *Pragná*, the seventh state being a condition of perfect unconsciousness." Is it what H. P. B. means by "which knows itself not" the same whom Subba Row calls "perfect unconsciousness"? Let us without passing any remark here first see what the word 'unconscious' really means.

Webster gives the following. (1) Not conscious, not having consciousness; (2) Not made the object of consciousness or of distinct perception; imperceptible.

Now if we take the above meaning strictly, we can have no objection to call Parambramh unconscious. For conscious means conscious of duality, and unconscious, therefore, means unconscious of duality. Therefore according to Subba Row, Parambramh is the seventh state of *Pragna*, which is unconscious of duality. Now that is what the Upanishads teach; but when it is asserted that "it knows

itself not," the question appears to wear another face. But we ask, does not the statement of H. P. B. present a deeper aspect of Parambramh than the perfect unconsciousness of Subba Row? "Absolute consciousness which knows itself not," is an evident contradiction. But is not Bramh the point where all contradictions meet? Is not Parambramh described by *neti, neti, not that, not that?* Self-consciousness or ego depends for its existence as such upon non-ego. In the first issue of the "Light of the East" (Sept. 1892) the learned editor in his able article "A study of Bhagabat Gita" says: All philosophies should start with the plainest facts of our consciousness,—I or 'ego' and not-I or 'non-ego.' Every one will admit that the sense of 'I' must have arisen in the presence of 'not-I,' because without 'non-ego' 'ego,' cannot come into existence. For similar reasons the *sense* of 'non-ego' depends for its existence on the *sense* of 'ego' or I."

Now then if Parambramh be absolute consciousness or the eternal objectless cognition, it certainly cannot know itself, *i. e.*, it cannot have a *distinct self-consciousness* of its own. *Nitya anityánám chetanas-chetanánám*, says the Sruti. It is the perfect non-dual consciousness. It is blasphemy and utter folly to call it inanimate or a non-entity like Zero.

Next we come to the consideration of the epithet *Satchidánanda*. In the fifth canto of the *Utpathy Prakarana* of Yogabasistha, Bhagaban Basistha Deva says, that He who survives Mahápralaya is really unnameable. Bramh, Atmá &c. are mere imaginary epithets; they fail to convey the idea of His nature. Now what the learned editor of the *Light of the East* contends is not that He can be named, but that among all the names that are used to denomi-

nate him, *Satchidánanda*, the epithet used by Sankara is the *best*. Not that *Satchidánanda* fully expresses the unspeakable, but that *Satchidánanda* is the highest abstract conception of the human brain, beyond which nothing can penetrate. "Not that Bramh *has* Satchidánanda" says the learned editor of the *Light of the East*, "but it *is* Satchidánanda. Why should the Theosophists then twist it to mean an attribute of Para-Bramh? Can any one fully realize Satchidánanda? Then what is the objection of calling the nameless by another name—yea, a better name than all others. Bramh signifies something growing, vast, but *Satchidánanda* signifies *Be-ness*, which is Chit, or non-dual consciousness, which is bliss. Has not H. P. B. fully explained the word *Sat* by translating it as *Be-ness* in preference to the word 'existence' which means, 'something appearing, being there where it was not before.'" Eshwara exists but Parabramh is *Be-ness*; Eshwara is *Prágna* but Parabramh is *Gnáh* or *Chit*. How can Eshwara be *Satchidánanda* when it is ever dual and relative? What unreasonable obstinacy is this to persist in calling Eshwara Satchidánanda against the direct teaching of the Upanishads and H. P. B.? It is but natural on the part of the Editor of the *Light of the East* to stigmatize this doctrine as "flavouring atheism." The Theosophists would call Eshwara *Satchidánanda*, but what can remain then beyond *Satchidánanda* besides "non-being" or "Zero." Let the Theosophists,—I mean such of them as consider Eshwara to be *Satchidánanda*, honestly think whether Parambramh does not become a non-entity if placed beyond *Sat* or *Be-ness* and whether this view is not in direct antagonism to the teaching of H. P. B.

Alpha.

THE CONNEXION BETWEEN INDIAN AND GREEK PHILOSOPHY.

(Continued.)

SCHOEDER proceeds with a few more analogies of lesser value and of doubtful nature, and finally he is certainly mistaken in the two following points; namely, he holds that Pythagoras acquired his knowledge in India itself,—an idea excluded at once by reference to the history of ancient traffic. † The only country in which Pythagoras could possibly have met his Indian teachers, is Persia, to which place I above found myself obliged to ascribe the eventual mediation between Indian ideas and the Greek physiologers and Eleatics. The other point is that of the connexion between the Pythagorean doctrine and the Sâmkhya philosophy, supposed by Schroeder. It may be that Pythagoras acquired his knowledge of theories of metempsychosis and of the five elements from adherents of the Sâmkhya system; but further relations are not to be discovered. Schroeder ‡ tries, on pp. 72-76, to bring the fundamental idea of the Pythagorean philosophy, that number is the essence of all things, into connexion with a *fictionous*, older form of the Sâmkhya philosophy. He says p. 74: "To me it appears to be evident from the name Sâmkhya, that number (*samkhyâ*) originally had a deciding, fundamental importance in this system, although the later system, the books of which appeared more than a thousand years after the pre-buddhistic Sâmkhya doctrine of Kapila, has effaced this characteristic trait and entirely lost it." In stating this Schoeder has overlooked the fact that

those Upanishads which are full of Sâmkhya doctrines and which must be dated only a few hundred years later than Buddha, are, in the passages in question, also wanting in what he calls the "original" characteristic trait, and that they are in harmony with that system which he calls the "later one." He himself declares this theory to be a very bold one, but in reality it is perfectly baseless. There is not the smallest particle of evidence for the hypothesis that there ever existed a Sâmkhya system different from that of our sources, which acquired its name from the mania for enumeration peculiar to it. On the contrary, weighty reasons speak against the supposition that our system has undergone noticeable changes in the course of time. If ever we should try to fabricate some historical link between the Sâmkhya system and the Pythagorean numeral philosophy, the following idea only could occur to us. The doctrines of Pythagoras: Number is the essence of things, the elements of numbers are to be considered as the elements of everything existing, the whole universe is harmony and number—these doctrines are unique in the history of human thought, and, if their meaning should be something else than "everything existing is ruled by the mathematical law," they might be regarded as unphilosophical. It therefore does not appear to me as a thing utterly beyond possibility, that those ideas took root in a misunderstanding of Pythagoras. It is poss-

† The Grecian tradition of Pythagoras having visited India did not arise before the Alexandrine time.

‡ As before him Sir William Jones; comp. 182 above.

ible that he misinterpreted the words of his Indian teacher: "The Sāṃkhya philosophy is named after the enumeration of the material principles" into: "Number is considered the essence of the material principles in the Sāṃkhya system." But this surely is nothing but a supposition.

It is Lassen who in his "Indische alterthumskunde" denies every Indian influence upon Grecian philosophy in ante-Christian times, but adopts it (III. p. 379 et seq.) for the Christian Gnosticism and Neo-Platonism. As lively relations between Alexandria and India are sufficiently attested for this time, it is indeed impossible to doubt Indian influence upon the doctrines of the Gnostics and Neo-Platonists.

Let us first dwell upon Gnosticism. Lassen holds that the Indian elements in the Gnostic systems were derived from Buddhism which (in the secondary, modified form it had assumed at that time) undoubtedly exercised a considerable influence upon the intellectual life of Alexandria. This influence is most clearly perceptible in the ideas formed by the Gnostics about the many spiritual worlds and the numerous heavens. These ideas are certainly derived from the fantastical cosmogony of later Buddhism. But I do not admit the great importance which Lassen attributes to Buddhism in the formation of the Gnostic systems. It is my opinion that, in Lassen's expositions the Sāṃkhya philosophy does not get all that is due to it. If we keep it in mind that the centuries in which Gnosticism was developed—that is, the second and third century after

Christ—are coincident with the period during which the Sāṃkhya philosophy flourished in India, many things will appear in a different light to us, than was the case with Lassen.* On p. 385 he establishes a connexion between the doctrines of Buddhism and the Gnostic contrast of soul and matter. But is it not more natural to remember here the ideas which form the foundation of the Sāṃkhya philosophy? Another point with which we have to deal is the identification of soul and light, met with among almost all Gnostics. Lassen has brought forward some remote and singular speculations from the misty and imaginative realm of later Buddhism, to make plausible the Buddhistic influence upon this Gnostic doctrine. I cannot say that this endeavour has been a successful one. How very simple and natural the idea appears with which a mere glance at the Sāṃkhya philosophy furnishes us! For there we are taught something which was evidently not known to Lassen, viz., that *the soul is light (prakāśa)*,† which means, that the mechanical processes of the internal organs are illuminated or made conscious by the soul. This idea of the Sāṃkhyas, that soul and light are the same, or[‡]—to put it otherwise—that the soul consists of light, we undoubtedly have to regard as the source of the similar idea of the Gnostics.

In regard to another point, Lassen (on pp. 384, 398 et seq.) has rightly acknowledged the influence of the Sāṃkhya philosophy upon Gnosticism. It was Ferd. Chr. Baur who even before him (in his work, "Die

* On the other hand, I must confess that I am unable to trace that resemblance between the Sāṃkhya philosophy and the doctrine of the Valentinians on the origin of matter which is stated by Lassen on pp. 400, 401. The agreements of the Sāṃkhya system with that of the Ophites, collected by Lassen in the following pages, likewise appear to me open to doubt.

† Comp. *Sāṃkhyasūtra*, I. 145: "[Soul is] light, because the non-intellectual and light do not belong together," and VI, 50: "Being distinct from the non-intellectual [soul] which has the nature of thought illuminates the non-intellectual." The commentator Vijnanabhikṣu makes the following remark on the first passage: "The soul is in its essence light like the sun," etc.

christliche Gnosis," pp. 54, 158 et seq.) had noticed the remarkable agreement of the classification of men into three classes peculiar to several Gnostics, with the Sâmkhya doctrine of the three Gunas. As I have entered in detail upon this theory in my forthcoming book on the Sâmkhya philosophy, I only wish to state here that in this system every individual is considered as appertaining to the sphere of one of the three powers, according as the luminous, serene, and joyful, or the passionate, fickle, and painful, or again the dark, motionless, and dull character predominates. There is also another interesting parallel to be found.* It is that between the Sâmkhya doctrine according to which the Buddhi, Ahankâra, and Manas, *i. e.*, the substrata of the psychic processes, have an independent existence during the first stages of the evolution of the universe, and the Gnostic tenet which allots personal existence to intellect, will, and so on. I am sure that those who are better acquainted with the Gnostic systems than I am, would be successful in finding some more points of contact, upon studying the doctrines of the Sâmkhya philosophy in detail.

In passing to Neo-Platonism, we find that here also Lassen has valued the influence of the Sâmkhya doctrines to its full extent. The views of Plotinus (204-269 A. D.), the chief of the Neo-Platonists, are in part in perfect agreement with those of the Sâmkhya system. The following sentences must be placed here: the soul is free from sorrows and passions, untouched by all affections; for the sufferings of the world belong to matter. By his philosophy Plotinus promises to deliver the world from misery, and this is the same purpose as that of the

Sâmkhya system which strives to lead men to discriminative knowledge and with it to redemption, that is to say, to absolute painlessness. Though all Brahman systems have made it their task to liberate mankind from the miseries of mundane existence by means of some special knowledge, yet none of them has so much emphasised the principle of this life being full of misery, as the Sâmkhya system; none of them has defined the word "redemption" with the same precision as "the absolute cessation of pain."

On page 428 Lassen establishes a connexion between a Vedântic notion and the sentence of Plotinus, that one may also be happy when sleeping, because the soul does not sleep. But there is no necessity for it. The same doctrine appertains to the Sâmkhya system.† Deep dreamless sleep is there, too, stated to be homogeneous with redemption, inasmuch as in these two states the affections and functions of the inner organs have stopped, and pain with them. Considering the many cases in which the dependence of Plotinus upon the Sâmkhya system is established, we need not hesitate to derive this idea from the Sâmkhya system as well. These numerous agreements must, however, make us doubly careful not to expand too much the limits of this dependence, and for that reason I am bound to say that the parallels which Lassen has drawn (p. 418 et seq.) between the theory of emanation, set up by Plotinus, and the doctrine of development in the Sâmkhya system appear to me out of place in the series of coincidences here treated.

Though there is a good evidence of harmony between the *pure* Sâmkhya doctrine and the Neo-Plato-

* Mentioned by Fitz-Edward Hall in his translation of Nehemiah Nilakantha Sâstri Gores *A Rational Refutation of the Hindu Philosophical Systems*, Calcutta, 1862, p. 84.

† See *Sâmkhyasûtra*, V, 116.

nism of Plotinus, there exists even a closer connexion between the latter one and *that* branch of the Sâmkhya philosophy which has assumed a theistical and ascetical character, and has, under the name of the Yoga philosophy, acquired an independent place among the Brahman systems. The morality of Plotinus is altogether of an ascetic nature. This feature might be explained, it is true, by an inclination towards Stoicism; but on account of its agreement with the Yoga system in the following points, this ascetic coloring, has, most probably, its foundation in the influence of this system. Plotinus pronounces all *worldly* things to be vain and void of value, and he, therefore, calls upon us to throw off the influence of the phenomenal world. If we keep off all external impressions and by way of concentration of thinking overcome the multiplicity of ideas, resulting from these impressions, the highest knowledge will fill our mind, in the form of a sudden ecstatic perception of God. There is not the slightest difference between this theory and the doctrines of the Yoga philosophy. The "union with the deity" mentioned by Plotinus is the *prâtibhâ* or the *prâtibham jnânam* of the Yoga system ("the immediate, universal knowledge of truth, which, after methodically exercising the ascetic Yoga-praxis, comes upon us unexpectedly").*

Besides Plotinus, we principally have to consider his most distinguished disciple Porphyry (from 232-304),† who, even more than his master, has followed the Sâmkhya philosophy. With him the Indian influence can be proved *directly*;

for he has made use of the treatise of Bardesanes, from which he copied an important passage about the Brahmans. And Bardesanes had acquired authentic information about India from the Indian ambassadors who were sent to the Emperor Antoninus Pius. In all principal points, Porphyry agrees with Plotinus, as, for instance, in his demand to give up the external world and to seek truth by contemplation; but Porphyry records in a purer way than his master the Sâmkhya doctrine of the contrast between the spiritual and the material world. His dependency upon the Sâmkhya philosophy is also to be noticed in his doctrines of the reign of the spiritual over the material, of the omnipresence of the soul when liberated from matter, and of the beginninglessness of the world.‡ Here we must also note the interdiction to kill animals, made by Porphyry, and his rejection of sacrifices. To be sure, Lassen says, on page 432, that Porphyry here followed the Buddhistic law; but as we are dealing with things which Buddha adopted from the Sâmkhya system § there is no reason why we should not derive them from the primary, instead of the secondary source.

I think we need not enter upon the resemblances which Lassen discovers (p. 434 et seq.) between Indian ideas and the later Neo-Platonist, Abammon, (about 300); for this fantastical and superstitious teacher, and the ideas peculiar to him, do not offer any but doubtful points of contact with Indian models. Only one opinion of Abammon comes into consideration, and that even was already suggested by his predecessors. It is the idea,

* See *Yogasutra*, III, 33.

† Comp. Lassen, p. 430 et seq.

‡ This last point is not mentioned by Lassen.

§ Compare the preface to my translation of Aniruddha's Commentary on the Sâmkhya-sûtras, etc., Calcutta, 1892.

that people who are filled with a holy enthusiasm attain miraculous power.* Herewe clearly perceive the coincidence with the conviction universal in India, that miraculous powers are to be acquired by the methodical exercise of the Yoga-praxis. The Yoga philosophy promises, as the fruit of such exercise, the acquisition of the faculty of making one's self invisible, infinitely large, or infinitely light, of assuming other bodies, of changing the course of nature, and the attainment of other supernatural powers.

I cannot take leave of Neo-Platonism without mentioning a highly important point of agreement with the Indian world of thought, which, it is true, neither concerns the Sámkhya philosophy nor Buddhism, but which nevertheless impressively supports our arguments, as it is a most significant link in the series of Grecian loans from India. In a little essay by Professor Weber, "Vâch and Logos indische Studien," Vol. IX, the author, with great caution—"without intending in the least to settle this question"—has put forward the supposition that the Indian conception of the *vâch* (a feminine noun, meaning voice, speech, word) may have had some influence upon the idea of the Logos which appears in Neo-Platonism and passed from there into the Gospel of St. John. Weber starts from the hymn, Rigveda X, 125, in which the Vâch already appears as an active power, and he refers to the personification of the "Divine Vâch" or language, as the vehicle of priestly eloquence and wisdom. He then traces the development of this idea through Brâhmana literature, where the Vâch becomes more and more similar to the Logos in the beginning of the Gospel of St. John. In the numer-

ous passages quoted by Weber, the Vâch appears as the consort of Prajâpati, the creator, "in union with whom and by whom he accomplishes his creation; yea, the Vâch is even ultimately the most spiritual beggetter, and now and then she is placed absolutely at the beginning of all things, even above the personal bearer of her own self." Weber concludes this pithy article with the following words: "There are certainly no difficulties in understanding the cosmogonical position of the Vâch which is simply to be conceived as the culmination of glorifying priestly meditation and knowledge, while the same position of the Logos, on the other hand, appears without any suggestion as to its origin or development." This idea of Weber's I hold to be an exceedingly happy one, and, in my opinion, it deserves another name than that of a mere supposition. Only I may be allowed, in this connexion, to set one point aright. It is not Neo-Platonism in which the idea of the Logos first appears, but it is derived there from the doctrines of Philo, which to a great extent are the basis of Neo-Platonism. Philo again adopted the doctrine from the Stoics, and they took it from Heraclitus, to whom the Logos already was the eternal law of the course of the world.† My opinion, mentioned above, of Heraclitus being influenced by Indian thought, meets, accordingly, with a welcome confirmation. If the whole theory is right—and I think it is—the derivation of the theory from India must be put more than five hundred years earlier than would appear from Weber's statement.

Among the Indian doctrines which we believed we could trace in Greek philosophy, those of the

* See Lassen, p. 438.

† Compare Max Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie*, Oldenburg, 1872.

Sâmkhya system occupy the first place; agreeably to their character, they presented the smallest difficulties, when transplanted to a foreign ground and embodied into a new world of thought. This influence of the Sâmkhya and Indian philosophy in general upon Occidental philosophy does not extend beyond Neo-Platonism. And—except the Buddhistic coloring of Schopenhauer's and Hartmann's philosophy—even in our modern time we cannot notice any real influence exercised by Indian ideas. Even in the compendiums of the general history of philosophy the Indian systems are usually entirely omitted. It now need not be proved that this is a mistake. An explanation of this indifference may be found in the fact that the Indian systems became known in Europe and America only in their roughest outlines in this century, and

that—with the exception of Deussen's excellent description of the Vedânta philosophy (Leipsic, 1883)—they have not been laid open to study by detailed works. I hope to contribute a little to fill up this gap in our knowledge of Indian philosophy, by my exposition of the Sâmkhya system which will appear in a few months.

I have [confined] myself [here] to seeking out, and so far as possible, to proving the *historical* connexion between Indian and Greek philosophy. But to follow up the *internal* relations of the Indian doctrines to the whole Occidental philosophy and to trace the *occasional* agreements in detail, that would have been a task, the performance of which surpasses the limits of this paper.

RICHARD GARBE.

KÖNIGSBERG, PRUSSIA.

LIFE OF JARA BHARAT.—A BHUKTA.

(Concluded.)

HERE I give the reader the direct words of Shukadeva, which he addressed to Parikshit in reference to this event. "O Vishnu dutta Parikshit! (Parikshit a gift of Vishnu. Krishna saved the life of Parikshit while in his mother's womb from the wrath of Ashwatthama)* do not be the least astonished at the fact, that *Mahatma* Bharat was not at all frightened to know that he will be killed by the robbers. Those who devote themselves to God get freed from the ignorance of placing their self-hood upon embodied existence. They are friends of all, so they have no enemy. Bhagaban himself, taking the shape

of Bhadrakali and others, always protect them with watchful care. In fact those who take refuge in the feet of Narayana, who is the shelter of all and destroys all fears, never incur any loss. On another occasion when the king of the land was travelling in a palanquin, his attendants finding Bharat a strong and stout man and of a dirty and mean exterior, idling his time away by the side of a stream, caught hold of him to carry the king some miles. In those times it was the practice to catch hold of low class people and labourers and force them to carry the palanquin of the king or his chief officer for some distance. *Ma-*

* Vide Mahabharat.

hatma Bharat, though by no means fit to do this, put in his shoulders under the bar of the palanquin as directed by the servants of the king and began to carry without showing any reluctance. Bharat had a peculiar habit of walking. Lest he should trample any creature to death, Bharat first used to look over a space of the length of an arrow before him and then place his foot upon the ground. Now as all other bearers of the Palanquin were running fast forward and Bharat kept his pace slow and steady within the bound of his discretion, it naturally became very unpleasant for the king to keep his seat. He called out angrily to carry carefully. The other bearers replied that they were all carrying in an even pace. Only the new man who was but then engaged was going in a measured pace of his own which caused the palanquin to move in that unseemly manner. The king on hearing this chided Bharat in a jeering tone reflecting upon his stout body and dirty appearance, but Bharat went on silently as before. The king did pass his days with many wise and old men and was at the time going to study the famous Sankhya-Shastra of Kapila. Still the influence of wealth and his position were not without their effect upon his temper and when the palanquins wayed again he could restrain himself no longer but thundered and addressing Bharat said "Villain! are you dead in life and, therefore, bold enough to disobey me? As death chastises people so will I chastise you." The king Rohugan considered himself a great sage and a god among men. In his vanity he insulted Bharat the beloved of God; he was ignorant of the ways and habits of *Yogeswaras* and therefore could not see in Bharat a perfected being who was the friend of all and held his existence in *Bramh*. Bharat took pity upon the king

and for the first time in his life opened his lips saying, "Oh brave warrior! if the bearer feel any weight and that weight be felt by me, if there be any path to be trodden and that path be mine, then whatever you have said is right. You called me stout and dirty, but wise men never say so. The body may be stout or thin, but the *âtma* is neither of them. Those who regard themselves to be the body are affected by its changes and attributes, but I have no such ignorance. You told me that I am dead in life. Well, you were right there, for the changeful body is dead in life. You also said, you are disobeying the orders of your lord; you were also not far from the truth there, for none is without dependence. But if you want to lord over me at the present time, it cannot be reasonable. The relation "master," and "servant" are of the false phenomenal world, they are not substantially true. Or if you desire to exert your power as a king over me, you may do so. Order me what shall I do. I have attained *Jivanmukti* and have become *Bramhswarupa*. I live in the absolute, how can you possibly teach me any thing?"

Here Shukadeva explained to Parikhit, that Bharat was exhausting his *Kriyamana Karma*. The *Avidya* which causes the idea of self-hood in body had long ceased to veil his intellect, so he had no sense of insult and respect and after this short speech began as before to carry the palanquin of the king.

I need not tell the reader that king Rohugan was startled to hear such words from the lips of a common labourer for which he took Bharat. He instantly came out of his palanquin and on looking close at Bharat found that he had the holy thread in his neck!

This was enough and he prostrated himself at Bharat's feet begging

to be forgiven for the great sin he committed. When he recovered a little from his surprise he faltered out, "Who are you that travel in this disguise? Are you the white *Rishi Kapila* or any *Abadhuta* of the rank of *Dattatreya*? Oh *Bhagaban*? I am not afraid of the thunder clap of *Indra*, or the Trishula of *Siva*; the wand of death I care but little and the power of the other gods I regard not; but my heart fails me when I hear that a *Brahman* has been insulted. Oh forgive me for my unwilling fault and disclose yourself to me that I may be saved from the perilous path of *Samsar*. In reply *Bharat* related to the king the various events of his previous births and pointed out the way by which he attained his present position. He said that man is but an earthly phenomenon. In this world he is called by various names as bearer, king &c. That phenomenon has the feet under the legs, the knees and thighs above them, the loins, the stomach, the breast, the neck, and the head in due ascending order—no other creature is seen like him. Upon his shoulders there is a woolen palanquin and within the palanquin is an earthly phenomenon bearing a name "the king." How can pure consciousness identify itself with earth? Forget your foolishness. The earth is but a name only. The atoms which foolish reasoners argue to be the origin and the end of matter have their existence only in the brain-land of such thinkers. Ignorance is the author of five things: variety, habit, desire, time and karma. Know this ignorance. That which has no within and no without, which is most full and which has no change or part, that pure consciousness is the truth and the Supreme Substance; sages call that consciousness both *Bhagaban* and *Basudeva*. Hear my advice, *Rohugan*. No amount of devotion and

purity of life in the world whether in the shape of worship or charity or other good acts can enable a man to get an insight into the nature of this consciousness; only the touch of the dust of the feet of *Moha Purushas* is the means to secure it. The *Moha Purushas* avoiding the vulgar affairs of the world always remain engaged in discoursing upon the pure subject of the infinite glory of *Basudeva* and the person desiring for salvation get his object by hearing them. *Mahamuni Bharat* concluded his speech with a charming and instructive parable—that of the forest of *Samsar*. The principal points of this parable are given below. The *Prabrittih Marga* (the usual way of the world) has been compared to the path which leads to this forest. The jivas to the merchants that trade in that forest; the six robbers to the six senses; the tigers and jackals to the wife and children; the venomous reptiles to the thieves and liars; the *Gandharba-nagars* and *Pishachas* to the imaginary happiness or air castles. The tempest and dust have been compared to woman and desires, the ominous shrieks of the owls and the piercing cries of the invisible insects to the harsh and cruel treatment of superiors and rivals, the dried up lake to the company of the wicked, and the fire that breaks out by the friction of wools to the house where the family lives in each other's company. The various duties of home have been compared to the climbing up to the summits of mountain. The company of cranes and vultures, and that of swans and monkeys have been compared to the worship of evil powers, the company of *Brahmans*, and that of the family and relatives, respectively.

Rohugan was satisfied and convinced beyond a shade of doubt as to the truth of the teachings of *Bharat* and carefully locked up his

instructions in his heart. A steady meditation on them and estrangement from the worldly affairs soon enabled him to pass beyond the manifold veils of *Abidaya* and get a look at the spiritual sun whose light illumines the intellect of man

as well as the distant stars and suns. After this Bharat went forth to wander over the face of the wide world until Nature herself tired out by his patience gave up her attempts to bind him altogether.

A. H. B.

PRANSNOTTARA.

(1). *What is the Hindu view regarding Fate and Free-will?*

Ans. Fate is defined by Bashista as the result of free-will. Every exercise of free-will in one incarnation is followed by a definite reward or punishment in the next. The latter is called Fate. Fate is, therefore, the consequence of a natural law, and nothing more.

(2). *What was the view of Gautama Buddha as to the Ultimate Cause of the universe?*

Ans. There is no question on which opinions differ so much as in this. Buddhism has various phases. The popular Buddhism current in China is theistic. Others hold the pantheistic view. A large section expound atheism. It is very difficult even for a thorough scholar of Buddhism to determine what was the doctrine of Buddha himself. Let us view the question from the Hindu stand-point. Buddha is regarded as an *avatar* by the Hindus. Now an *avatar* can never teach atheism. But it is very peculiar that Buddha is regarded by the Hindus as the *Chhal Avatar* i. e., an *avatar* whose mission was to mislead mankind. To us it seems to be rather a very strange theory. We can not conceive that the Supreme Being did not find any other means of reforming mankind than that of mislead-

ing them. In the second place, common sense tells us that a religious teacher to whom one-third of the human race owe their allegiance can never preach atheism. Atheism can not hold in subjection more than one-third of the human race. Who can deny that there is a kernel of Truth in all that Buddha taught?

(3). *What is the rationale of fasting?*

Ans. Conquest of the body and of the external senses enables the mind of man to work more freely in a higher plane. The passions become subdued and spirituality shines forth without resistance. Moreover there are certain days in the month when the moon sheds a peculiar influence on our physical body and produces a general torpor of its functions. For this reason fasting is enjoined on the New-moon, Full-moon, and Ekadasi days. Fasting should vary according to the constitution of different individuals and should in most cases be moderate. There is no use of lowering the vital powers by long-continued fasts. For the above reasons fasting contributes a good deal to the spiritual progress of a religious man.

(4). *What is the immediate cause of Mukti?*

Bairāgya (non-attachment) and *Gnān* (self-knowledge) are the two-

fold requisites of *Mukti*. The former makes our mind free from worldly attachment so that it may turn its attention to the inner world and attain freedom. The latter makes us realise the infinity of one's ego which fills every atom of the Universe. Non-attachment and self-knowledge are the two wings which lead a *jiva* to the abode of Bramh.

(5). What is the way to know the *truth* of things ?

Super-sensual intuition. By means of such intuition, the *Yogi* can perceive directly the noumena of things, the reality of which lies behind the veil. This is the only process by which the Truth of things can be known. It may be called hypersensual cognition.

THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

IN order to establish the Religion of Science it is by no means necessary to abolish the old religions, but only to purify them and develop their higher possibilities, so that their mythologies shall be changed into strictly scientific conceptions. It is intended to preserve of the old religions all that is true and good, but to purify their faith by rejecting superstitions and irrational elements, and to discard, unrelentingly, their errors.

The influence of Science is felt in our religious life everywhere, and its ultimate aim can but be a rationalising of the religious faith and a broadening of the sectarian creeds into one cosmical religion, the religion of truth, i. e., of scientific truth, the Religion of Science.

We must introduce, on the one hand, the warmth of religious enthusiasm into the province of philosophy and science, and on the other hand, the spirit of uncompromising criticism and scientific research into the domain of religious conviction. Religions develop naturally.

Religions of today are not the product of a supernatural revelation, but are based upon the science of the times when they were founded.

Our religion must embody the maturest, surest, and best established knowledge of today.

The Religion of science is still a voice crying in the wilderness. Yet it comes from the heart of mankind and cannot be suppressed. Should it remain unheeded, it will be repeated by others that shall come after us, until its warning be heard and obeyed.

Information can be had only through inquiry. We have to prove all things and hold fast that which is good. "Seek, and ye shall find."

Every religion is, or should be, a conviction that regulates man's conduct, affords comfort in affliction, and consecrates all the purposes of life.

Science is the methodical search for truth, and truth is a correct, complete, invariable, and comprehensive statement of facts.

The Religion of Science is that religion wherein man aspires to find the truth by the most reliable and truly scientific methods.

The Religion of science does not rely on human authority, even though that authority pretends to have special revelations from some supernatural source.

The Religion of Science accepts certain principles. These principles are:—

1. To inquire after truth.
2. To accept the truth.
3. To reject what is untrue.
4. To trust in truth.
5. To live the truth.

There is no difference between religious and scientific truth. There is a holiness about science which is rarely appreciated either by priests or by scientists. There is but one truth, which is to be discovered by scientific methods and applied in our religious life.

The faith of the Religion of Science is its trust in truth. It is the conviction that truth can be found and that truth is the sole redeemer. Faith is a moral attitude, creed is a mere belief.

The Religion of Science is not a religion of indifference; it does not proclaim that kind of toleration which allows every man to believe and act as he pleases. On the contrary, it proclaims most positive and stern doctrines.

Truth can be attained step by step. Inquiry into truth is not only a scientific necessity, it is also a religious duty, and no pious devotion is of the right kind, unless it be accompanied by the spirit of research.

The doctrines of the Religion of Science are the result of experience, not of one man only, but of the whole race.

Rituals and ceremonies are symbols instituted to convey in allegorical form religious doctrines. They express by visible signs and outward forms the invisible spiritual relations between men and God.

The Religion of Science attaches no intrinsic value to symbols themselves, but only to their meanings. There is no magic power in symbols.

The Religion of Science propounds the following main doctrines:

1. That every act has its un-

avoidable consequences, good or evil, according to the nature of the act.

2. That the moral commandments in which almost all the established religions agree are sound.

3. That which is good and that which is evil must be found out by scientific investigation.

Scientists, as seekers of truth, are prophets of the Religion of science.

Prophets and priests have authority in the measure in which they represent the authority of moral conduct. They have no authority of themselves.

Scientists have authority in such measure as they have investigated, found, and proved the truth. They have no authority of themselves.

It is true that we are surrounded by mysteries, temptations, and afflictions. These conditions of our life urge us the more seriously to search for the truth, lest we go astray and become the victims of our errors. There is certainly no other choice left for us than to take reality as it is, to understand it, and to *act in accord with its laws*. We cannot make the truth; we cannot fashion it at our pleasure; we can only accept it. But blessed is he who trusts in the truth, who hearkens to its behests, and leads a life in which obedience to truth is exemplified.

THE AUTHORITY FOR CONDUCT.

Truth is a correct statement of facts. We have to view facts so as to discover in them that which is permanent. We must dig down to that which is immutable and everlasting, that which will be the same in the same conditions; that which is beyond our control. We cannot alter or fashion it. It is as it is, and we have to mind it in all things which we do or aspire.

These wonderful features of facts, which we call laws of nature, have shaped the world and man, and the

moral ideals of man. They are the everlasting in nature. They form a harmonious system. They are all corollaries of an all-pervading regularity. A stringent and irrefragable order in constantly changing conditions!

The everlasting in existence is the ultimate authority for our conduct, and, as such, it has, in the language of religion, been called by the name of God.

The evolution of social beings takes place according to law, and this law is briefly called the moral law of nature. The moral law is as stern, implacable, and irrefragable as any other law. Wherever it is heeded it will bring blessing; wherever it is disobeyed, it will be followed by curses.

All religious commands are human formulas designed to inform people how to live in accord with the moral law. Not the authority of religious commands, but that of the moral law, is ultimate. Religious commands derive their justification from the moral law of nature.

Science does not speak of God; yet it teaches God; for every law of nature is a part of God's being. Every law of nature is in its sphere an authority for conduct; it is a power which can be adopted to our wants only when we adapt ourselves to it. It is independent of our wishes and cannot be infringed upon with impunity.

The various views of God are denoted by the following terms:

Theism, or the belief that God exists.

Atheism, or the view that rejects any conception of God.

Polytheism, or the belief in many gods.

Monotheism, or the belief that there is but one God.

Anthropotheism, or the belief that God is a personal being like man.

Pantheism, or the belief that identifies the All with God.

Deism, or the view that God is a personal being, the creator and legislator of the universe.

Entheism, or the view that regards God as inseparable from the world. He is the eternal in nature.

The Religion of Science is not atheistic, but theistic.

Number does not apply to God. God is one, not in the sense that there is one kind of Godhood. There is not one God-being; but there is divinity. God is one in the same sense that there is but one reason and but one truth.

The God of the Religion of Science is not a person. We should neither call God personal nor impersonal, but super-personal.

The Religion of Science does not accept Pantheism. It does not regard nature and all parts of nature or all aspects of nature as identical with God. The eternal of nature only is God. Those features alone are divine which serve us as authority for conduct. We do not look up with reverence to the forces of nature which we utilise, but only to that power which moulds worlds, which fashions our being, and which moves onward in the progress of evolution. This view we call *Entheism*.

Paul Carus.

THE SHASTRIC METHODS OF SUBDUING THE INDRIAS AND THE MIND.

ON this subject we will deal with the methods of restraining or subduing the Indrias and the mind. By Indrias we mean the five organs of action (*i. e.* the organ of voice, the hand, the foot, the organ of excretion, and the organ of generation), the five organs of sensation, (*viz.* those of hearing, seeing, smelling, tasting and feeling) and lastly the king of all the senses, we mean the *mana* or the mind.

The ancient Aryan authors classify the Indrias into two parts, the outer and the inner. By outer organs we mean the ten *Bahirindriasi. i. e.* the five organs of action, and the five organs of sensation. The four inner organs are the *Mana*, *Buddhi*, *Chitta*, and *Ahankara*. Now these four inner organs are nothing more than the different manifestations of *mana* or the mind; so *mana* virtually comprises all the inner organs of man. Some Rishes give it a different appellation, namely, *Buddhi* or rather the *Buddhi tatva*. The subjugation of the inner and the outer organs is termed "Sama" and Dama" in our Dharmashastras. So long as the Yogi could not perform the "Sama" and the "Dama" *Shādhana*s, he could not attain the highest bliss or the peace of mind. The great sage Sankaracharya says: "The unsubdued faculties of sensation and perception of man are his real enemies; when these faculties come under his control they prove themselves to be the greatest of friends. The man who conquers his mind conquers the world." It is for this reason the great sage Vashistha advised Rama to conquer his mind :

*Kevalam tunmano mātra jayena
sādhyate padam.*

Yoga Bashistha Ramayama.

(a). The great pada or moksha can easily be obtained by the subjugation of one's own mind only.

That the mind is the prime mover in all our voluntary actions either of the senses or of the organs, is acknowledged by all the Rishes.

Goutama in his Nyaya philosophy very rightly remarks that no organ of action or of sensation can ever work by itself unless mind acts through it. The ten outer organs of the Jiva can perceive and take hold of *sagun* objects, but the mind though material in its nature, can perform the double functions of perceiving both the *Sagun* and the *Nirgun*, we mean thing or things that cannot be perceived by the outer senses or organs. According to the theory of Yoga Shastra, Sankhya Darshana, and even Vedanta, the universal mind or the *mahat* which is analogous to the Brahma of the Puranas is the cause of this phenomenal world. The universal mind which though one and the same everywhere, appears as different in different Jivas owing to their respective diversified Karmas. Kapila says "*Baktivedah karma bishesāt*"

(b). The different Karmas make the one *mana* and the *linga sharira* appear as different in different beings. It is for this reason that respective individual exertion or *sādhana* is required for the subjugation of the mind and the organs of a particular man. It is an indisputable fact that if one can restrain his own mind the other organs

come under his direct control. Now let us see how the unsubdued senses and more especially the uncontrolled mind becomes the real enemy of man ; and how again do the same senses when restrained, prove to be the greatest of his friends. In the second chapter of Bhagabatgita. we find the following slokas.* "The man who meditates deeply on any object of the senses for which he has an inclination forms an interest, from interest or concern passion is created, from passion follows anger *i.e.*, when one's passion is not fulfilled anger is produced. Folly is the outcome of anger, in other words, the man then forgets the sacred teachings of the Acharjas and the Shastras. The loss of memory brings on the loss of reason, and by the loss of reason the man loses everything and himself. The mind following the actions of uncontrolled organs or moving passions carries away his reason as the storm carries the bark in the raging ocean. The man who has been able to subdue his passions is possessed of true wisdom. When a man subdues his mind he gets rid of all sorts of earthly desires enmity and wrath. The man of a governable mind forsaking the objects of the senses with all his faculties rendered obedient to his will and freed from pride and malice, attains supreme bliss"

The above and similar Slokas which we need not mention prove beyond the possibility of a doubt that our mind is the chief cause of our sorrow or bliss.

Now let us see how the Aryan Rishies define mind and its peculiarities. Bhagawan Vashistha says :—

"The mind is nothing more than the light or knowledge of good and evil. The Pundits call mind the manifestations of objects, for there is no such thing as mind save manifes-

tations. Sankalpa and Mana are not different things. By Sankalpa we mean the imaginative faculty. Where there is Sankalpa there is mind. Again sankalpa, Abidya-Sansara, Mana, and Bandhana are synonymous terms. The unsteady mind manifests itself in different ways ; it sometimes shreaks in delirium or acts like a mad man, sometimes it enjoys the objects of the senses, sometimes it roves in different places, sometimes it creates different objects in imagination and so forth."

From the above it is clear that the chief characteristic of an unsubdued mind is that it is unsteady and changeable. The great sage Vashistha advised Rama—that as heat is the inherent virtue of fire so is changeableness the virtue of mind.

Now let us see how this fickle mind is to be subdued and concentration is to be practised. We see that different writers have written different methods for the concentration and subjugation of the mind. Now if we go deep into the subject we can easily find out that though the various methods appear as different, they are either virtually all the same or one is the auxiliary of the other. For instance, let us quote the 4 Sadhanas of Vedanta philosophy viz., (1). The discrimination between the Nitya and Anitya *i.e.* real and unreal ; (2). The indifference to enjoyment whether in this world or in the next ; (3). To be possessed of the six qualities of Shama, Dama, Uparati, Titiksha, Sraddha and Shamadhan ; (4) the desire for Mukti or the final emancipation.

Now it is next to impossible for a Yogee to discriminate between Nitya and Anitya unless he masters the sixteen objects of Naya philosophy, in other words, unless he gets thorough knowledge of the Nayashastra. Indifference to enjoyment is nothing more than the Nishkam Karma or

the unselfish actions of Gita and other religious books. The six qualities of Shama, Dama &c., are virtually the Sadhanas of the Astanga Yoga. The desire for final emancipation can never arise in the mind of a Yogi unless there be Vichar (reasoning), Vivek (true knowledge) and Vairagya (dispassion) in the beginning. Then again unless there is Vivek and Vairagya, the non-desire for any sort of enjoyment, we can never perform Nishkam Karma. In this manner we can prove by various methods that the different methods prescribed by the different Rishis of old, are virtually the part and parcel of the one universal method for the concentration and the subjugation of the mind.

We will now describe some of the methods for the attainment of the above object. For instance in the Bhagabat Gita we find Arjuna saying:—

The mind, O Krishna! is naturally unsteady, turbulent, strong and stubborn; I therefore esteem it as difficult to restrain it as the wind. Then Sreekrishna answered. The mind, O Valiant Youth! is undoubtedly unsteady and uncontrollable, yet I think, it may be restrained by continued exercise and Vairagya or aversion to worldly enjoyments. The great Rishi Patanjali also recommends the above as one of the means for the concentration and subjugation of the mind. In the Yoga Shastra we find—

Abhāsa bairāgyābhāym tunni-rodha.

The suppression of the functions of the thinking principle is effected by exercise and dispassion. Aversion from sensuous object is produced by dispassion, resulting from a knowledge of the evil influence of those objects (on the thinking principle) and confirmed steadiness is acquired by exercise which makes it a source of happiness and quiet, and by the conjoined effect of the two, the func-

tions of the thinking principle are suppressed. Maharshi Patanjali speaking of exercise or *Abhyasa* says—

Tatra sthitou jatno bhayasah.

Exercise is the repeated effort by which the thinking principle remains in its functionless state. Now Stheti or functionless state is that condition of the thinking principle in which it abides in its own original form, free from all function; and the effort or endeavour repeated again and again to bring it to that condition is exercise or *Abhyasa*. Kapilacharya also expresses the same opinion with Patanjali and Vyasa when the says in Sankhya Darshana—

Bairagyādbhāsū sha.

Dispassion and repeated efforts are the means of attaining Yoga Siddhi. The great commentator Bigyan Bhikshu says that the meaning of the above aphorism is that though *Yama Niyama Ashana, Pranayama, and Pratyahara*, the five lower or outer *Angas* or parts of Astanga-Yoga are recommended by Patanjali and other Rishis, yet an *Uttamadhikari* or one who is highly qualified for Yoga, may not practise the lower five *Angas* and can take up the last three, viz., the *Dharana, Dhyān* and *Samadhi* as the means for attaining the end. It is believed by the Rishis that the *Uttamadhikaries* performed the lower parts of Astanga-Yoga in their previous births and so they need not minutely go through these *Angas* in their present lives. It is for this reason that the highly qualified Chela must practise concentration of mind by being guided by dispassion and then he is able to attain the *Gyanam* or true wisdom. Kapilacharya also speaks of *Pranayama, Asana* and other *Angas* of Astanga Yoga as auxiliary means for the concentration of the mind in the third chapter of Sankhya Darshana. Suffice it to say that *Kapil Deva* also admits with Patanjali and others that *Astanga-Yoga* helps in the

concentration and subjugation of the mind. Now it is a fact that though all the *Angas* or *Sadhanas* of *Astanga Yoga* may not be necessary for an advanced Chela, still some of the *Angas* or parts are necessary as the means for conquering the mind. It generally happens that the qualified *Yogi*, performs the lower *Angas* without making any conscious efforts for the same. For instance, at the time of *Dhyanam* or meditation, *Pranayama* or the regulation of the breath is performed unconsciously by the expert *Yogi*. We see that the outer means of *Sadhanas* act wonderfully as auxiliaries for the inner means of *Sadhanas*. Sree Krishna also recommends the following as the means of subduing the mind.* "The *Yogi* should constantly exercise his *Yoga* in private. He should live in a lonely place, where he should try to subdue his senses and the mind. He must be free from all sorts of hope and lovely objects. He should place his *Ashana* on a plot which is undefled and pure in atmosphere and which should be neither too low nor to high; he should sit upon a seat made of the sacred *Kus* grass covered with a skin

of a deer and a cloth. There he, whose business is the restraining of his passions, should sit with his mind on one subject alone in the exercise of his devotion for the purification of his soul, keeping his head his neck, and body steady without motion, his eyes fixed on the tip of his nose, looking at no other place around. He, the *Yogi*, by slow but steady resolution fixes his mind within himself, by slow but steady progress, and should think of nothing else. The *Yogi* of an humble mind, who thus constantly exercises in this way, enjoys the Supreme Bliss." Now the above clearly proves that most of the *Angas* of *Astanga Yoga* are recommended by the great *Yogeshwar* Sree Krishna. The *Gita* also speaks of *Pranayama* as one of the methods of *Yoga Sadhana*. The *Slokas* quoted above have connection moreover with the other methods for the restraining of passions as described by *Patanjali* in his *Yoga* philosophy of which we shall speak afterwards.

(To be continued.)

SHUNKERNATH PUNDIT.

THE LIFE OF SREE SANKARACHARYA.

(Continued).

IN the sixth Chapter, to which we now come, is described among other matters, the meeting with Siva, the composition of the *Bhasya* and other books and commentaries and the revival of the forgotten *Atma-Vidyá*.

When Sankara had lived some days in Kashi, there came a Bramhan's son from the land of Chole situated on the bank of the Kaveri and prayed to Sankara to take him as a *Shishya*.

Sankara, finding him of genuine worth initiated him in *Sannyas* and took him in his favor. This was *Sanbandana*, the first *Shishya* of Sankara. Here, also the other *Shishyas*, *Chitsukha*, *Anandagiri* &c., met Sankara and were initiated by him. *Sáyana* mentions here a peculiar way of Sankara of instructing his disciples. He says "*Byákyá monam anuttaráh*"—Sankara explained everything to his disciples without

* Vide *Gita*, Chapter VI, *Slokas* 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15.

opening his lips. To readers sufficiently acquainted with the *practical* part of our metaphysics,—I mean Yoga, the above sentence will have a double meaning. The esoteric meaning expressed in the book, being to the effect, that it was needless for Sankara to open his lips a second time before his disciples and that it was enough for them to have meditated upon his instruction *in the line* shown by him, so clear and invincible was his logic.

One noon while Sankara desirous of performing his bath and *ánhik of the hour* in the holy waters of Janhabí was going towards the river accompanied by his disciples he met in the way a *chandal* (a member of an exceedingly dirty and barbarous low-caste of the same name, almost outside the pale of Hindu Society, earning their livelihood chiefly by hunting and other *brutal* acts; they are so much hated—that they are almost regarded with fright, and it is a decided misfortune to confront one of them, while the touch of their shadow causes pollution only to be washed away by the holy and disinfecting water of the Ganges) surrounded by four fierce-looking dogs coming from the opposite direction, almost blocking the way. Sankara ordered him to move away but the *chandal* without heeding his words, boldly confronted him and spoke as follows: "The words you just addressed to me, viz., to get out of the way are exceedingly inconsistent in you. For you teach *unity* of the All and according to you there is no *bheda* (duality or substantial difference). The *Átmá* is one, destitute of all blemishes, inherently pure, without affection, *be-ness*, consciousness, and Bliss. You are a famous Vedantin, how could you think of duality and differentiation in the same Param-*átmá*. Oh, I see, there have arisen some *Yatis*, who are dressed in yellow rags, and hold in their hands, the wand and the *Kamandalu* and are

sharp-tongued, but have not a drop of *Gñán* (real knowledge) in their shaved pates; they assume this dress only to cheat the *Grihastas*. Oh sage, tell me the meaning of your words "get away." Is the *annamaya* (fleshy sheath) different from *annamaya*? Or is the *Sakshi* (witness) different from *Sakshi*? As the Sun remains unaffected, whether it be reflected in the wine, or in the Ganges, even so is there no duality or change in *Átma* which is the only reality within a Brahman and a Chandal. Then why this foolish fretfulness? Why this struggle to differentiate the one Eternal Infinite Fulness. How could you identify yourself—the unthinkable and unspeakable Infinite, whom no upádhí whatever (the dirt of matter) can even touch—with this transient body fickle as the elephant's ear? I am struck dumb at the sorcery of the great magician Paramatma that a man of your wisdom shall still remain drunk with the lethe of illusion and have a care for the guidance of the mass." Sankara, to say the least of it, was also struck dumb at these words of lofty wisdom of the chandal and suspicious of his personality admitted in suitable terms his error, remarking that the sense of duality was hard to be overcome. However he was ready to acknowledge him gladly as *Guru* whether he was a Brahman or a Chandal, who had realized his self and come to understand that the consciousness which shone in Vishnu, Virinchi, and Sankara was identical to the consciousness seen in the microscopic worm. While thus conversing with the Chandal, Sankara suddenly missed him from his presence and found before him standing in the Chandal's place the great Mahadeva whose forehead is adorned with the half-moon—surrounded by the four Vedas. Sankara instantly prostrated himself before Mahadeva and with tears in his eyes, for the fulness of his feelings—began

to sing a hymn in His praise, in which, of course, all "personal worship" was conspicuous by its absence and only the conclusions of the wisdom found their expression from the grateful heart of the devotee glorifying his higher self. The great Dhoorjati extended his favor to Sankara in the most flattering terms and said that he (Sankara) had reached their level, was His favourite as Vádráyana and had the fullest insight into the purposes of all the Shastras. He too ordered Sankara to compose a Bhásya of Brahmasutras and blessed that his Bhásya would expose the falsity of all other doctrines and would be regarded as authority, not only by men, but in the Sabha (court) of Indra and Bramhá. He also directed, that after the composition of his Bhasya, Sankara should undertake a tour having for its object the (intellectual) conquest of Bhaskara, who professed the reality of both duality and unity, of Abhinabagupta—the Sakta, of Nilkantha—the Saiva who professed the doctrine of duality, of Guru Pravakara, of Mandanmisra who followed Bhattapada and other principal sages of the time. When the object of his mission would be fulfilled, he should be withdrawn into Him; saying this he vanished with the four Vedas, before all.

After this, Sankara left Kashi with

his Shishyas and went to Vadarikáram, where at the age of twelve he composed his famous Bhásya after debating upon the true spirit of the Vedánta Shástra many times with the Bramharsis who practised Samadhí at that place. Here also he wrote out the Upanished Bhásyas, the Gita Bhásya, and his other commentaries.

Among the disciples of Sankara there was a hard competition for gaining the highest favor of their Guru. But Sankara admired Sanandan's guileless devotion and was very partial to him. One day Sankara called Sanandan on the farther side of Gangá where he was staying alone, and Sanandan obedient to his call, prepared to go down into the water and swim the river over to the other bank. As Sanandan stretched his foot into the water, a lotus supported it and at each step throughout the whole distance, and fresh lotuses reared up their heads—making a bridge of lotuses to carry the feet of Sanandan, the devoted Sishya, to his Guru. When Sanandan reached the other side, Sankara clasped him to his breast, seeing the miraculous result of his extraordinary devotion to him and from that time he called him by the name of Padmapád.

(To be continued.)