THE

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA

OR

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

A MONTHLY JOURNAL
DEVOTED TO

RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY, LITERATURE
AND SCIENCE

THE
LIGHT OF TRUTH
— OR —
SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL
DEVOTED TO
RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, &c.,

VOL. II.

JUNE 1898—MAY 1899.

MADRAS.

PUBLISHED AT "THE SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA" OFFICE,
BLACK TOWN MADRAS FOR THE SUBSCRIBERS
PRINTED AT THE C. PRESS BLACK TOWN MADRAS.

1899.

INDEX TO VOL. II.

TRANSLATIONS.

G.

	Pages.
Gleanings from Tamil Poets No. I. by N. B.	249
Do. No. II. do.	250

H.

Hymn from Devaram by N. B.	224

K.

Kaivalyopanishad by the EDITOR	199
Kaivalyopanishad by B. ANANTHAKRISTNA SASTRY, F. T.	201

S

Sivagnana Siddhiyar of Arul Nandi Siva Charyar, by J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B. A., B. L.	7, 33, 55, 104, 151, 176.
Sraddha and Bhakti	247

T

Thayumanavar's Poems-God and the world by P. A.	9, 57
Thayumanavar's Poems by R. SUNMUGA MUDALIAR.	11, 36, 82, 107, 128, 153, 177, 271
Tirumantra by Tirumular by the EDITOR	31, 80, 177
Thayumanavar's Poems by N. B.	222

V.

Vedanta-Sutras with Srikantha Bashya by A. MAHADEVA SASTRI, B. A., F. T. S	1, 25, 49, 73, 97, 121, 145, 169, 193, 217 241, 265.

ARTICLES.

A.

Analogies in Gita by the EDITOR	85
Ancient Tamilian Civilization by the EDITOR...	109
Atyasramam by the EDITOR	208
Age of the different Bhashyams on the Vedanta Sutras by the EDITOR	215

C.

Cameos from Tamil Literature	41, 67
Correspondence G. BARTOLI	44

E.

Evidences of natural Religion by the Rev. G. BARTOLI, S. J. D. D.	18, 40, 65, 89, 134, 229, 279

G.

God and the World by the EDITOR	37

J.

Justice Ranade on "South India" by the EDITOR ...	187

ARTICLES.—*(Continued.)*

	Pages.
K.	
Kamban by T. Chettyakesavarayya Mudaliar, M. A..	19, 42, 68, 91, 131
Kaivalya and Amirdabindu Upanishads by the Editor	181
Kalittokai Metres by T. Virabadra Mudaliar, B. A., B. L	225
Kundalakesi and Valayapathy by N. B.	225
L.	
Lord Sambandha and an unknown Tamilian Prosody by T. Virabadra Moodaliar, B. A , B. L.	114, 184
M.	
Modern Oriental Scholarship by V. V. Ramanan, B. A., C. M. M. S. (London) &c.	159
N.	
Notes by the Editor	203
O.	
Obsolete Syllables ஞெரி and ஈரடி in Modern Venbas by T. Virabadra Mudaliar, B. A., B. L...	129
Our afflicted Brethren by the Editor...	155
P.	
"Patriotism in the making of History" by the Editor	139
Poets of the Tamil Lands by the Rev. G. U. Pope, M. A D. D.	140, 166
Prof. Fairbairn on the Philosophy of Religion by the Editor	214
Purra-Porul Venba Malai by the Rev. G. U. Pope, M. A. D. D. Oxford	227, 256, 273
Poetry of Stephen Phillips by V. V. Ramanan, B. A., C. M. M. S. (London) &c.	231
Prophets and their Mission by V. V Ramanan, B. A., C. M. M. S. (London) &c.	277
S.	
Some Aspects of the God-Head by the Editor	252
Segregation from the Hindu Stand Point by J. V. Ramaswami Naidu, L. M. & S.	263
T.	
The Tamil Four Hundred Lyrics, Purra-Nanuuru by the Rev. G. U. Pope M. A. D. D Oxford	17
The Two Gems—(Sat and Satasat) by the Editor	61
The Theological Situation in India Do.	156
V.	
Vowels and consonants (Mind and Body) by the Editor	13
Vaccination by Ancient Hindus by Lieutenant colonel W. G. King, M. D., D. P. H., I. M. S. &c. ...	261
W.	
Week of great Promise by the Editor..	180

MISCELLANEA.

E.	
Extracts...	70, 117, 190, 238, 284
N.	
Notes and Comments...	23, 47, 71, 94, 119, 142, 216, 238, 263, 286
R.	
Rviews	23, 45, 118, 165, 216, 228

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science &c.

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897.

VOL. II. | **MADRAS, JUNE 1898.** | **No. 1.**

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SUTRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

Continued from page 270, Vol. I

Adhikarana—6.

As against this view, we hold that the A'nandamaya A'tman is the Parames'vara, because this A'nanda or bliss is repeatedly spoken of as unsurpassed. Beginning with 'there arises this enquiry as to A'nanda,'* the s'ruti speaks of several grades of bliss, ranging from human bliss to that of Prajapati, each higher grade being a hundred times superior to the below it, and then concludes with "that the unit of Brahman's bliss," thus declaring by repetition that Brahman's bliss stands unsurpassed at the head. The samsârin cannot be spoken of such repository of unsurpassed bliss.

As to the question how, if A'nandamaya be the Is'vara, to account for His prayer for purity,—the answer is as follows. Just as the highly lustrous moon attains clearness only on the disappearance of clouds which hide her, so, too, in the case of Him who is ever pure, purification consists in merely removing the *tirodhânu-mala*, the dirt which acts as veil concealing Him from our view. Wherefore Anandamaya is none other than Parames'vara.

(*Objection*) —A'nanda itself is declared to be Brahman; and A'nandamaya must be an effect emanating therefrom, since the suffix 'maya' implies change. If A'nandamaya be Is'vara, it would follow that Is'vara is different to Brahman, and thus, Is'vara is a mere vikara (effect, He) would also be non-eternal.

The sûtrakâra states and refutes the objection as follows:

If you hold it is not so because [illegible]
(we hold you are [illegible]
abundance.

(*Objection*) —[illegible]
vikaras [illegible]
also [illegible] like
[illegible]
form of [illegible]

* Tait. Upanishad 2 ..

ges as "from this world departing, he becomes united with the physical (*annamaya*) A'tman"* the 'annamaya' and others occur in connection with 'A'tman which denotes a sentient being, and are described as reachable one after another by the liberated soul departing from this world of samsâra. The Brahman who is known as Paramas'iva and who is the cause even of Sadâs'iva, *i. e.*, of the *A'nandamaya* who is the basis of the Annamaya and other A'tmans,—is spoken of as His (Sadâsiva's) basis. The A'nandamaya is not regarded as distinct from Brahman and is therefore spoken of as Brahman. Thus, all things considered, it may be concluded that A'nandamaya is Parames'vara.

Adhikarana—7.

It has been established that the definition—arrived at by an accordant construction of the scriptural texts—of Brahman, the Supreme S'iva, as the cause of the Universe, is not too wide as applying to Pradhâna and Jiva as well. Next the Sûtrakâra proceeds to discuss the passages which seem to declare that Hiranyagarbha, who is made up of the totality of Jivas is the cause of the Universe

Not the other, because of incongruity. (I. i. 17).

The following passage of the Mahopanishad forms the subject of discussion here:

"Whence proceeded the birth of the Universe, That Being, by water sent forth the (bodies of) souls on earth, and (it was that Being) which by plants, entered into men and beasts, into all beings moving and unmoving."†

The doubt arises as to whether the Purusha spoken of as the cause of the birth etc. of the whole Universe is the Paramesvara or some one else.

Pûrvapaksha:—It is the Hiranyagarbha, because of His characteristic marks described here.

From the puranic passage

"The three lokas having become one ocean, the Brahman in the form of Nârâyana reclines on the serpent-bed, expanded by the devouring of the three worlds."

we learn that Brahmâ lies in the ocean. This characteristic mark of His is found described in the passage:

Whom within the ocean the sages weave."‡

In the opening passage of the whole section "Prajapati moves in the womb within" * He is described as having entered into all beings, and in the conclusion the passage "the creator made the sun and the moon as before, also heaven and the earth" † declares that He is the cause. Wherefore it is but right that to the Hiranyagarbha who is thus referred to in the opening and concluding passages apply all the attributes described in the intervening passages. Moreover, reference has been made to the following passages which treat of Hiranyagarbha:

He was born of waters &c."
Hiranyagarbha at first was &c

In the section first referred to here, it certainly Prajâpati that is treated of; for, we find it said that Prajâpati moves in the womb within the unborn is born in many a form." In the section next referred to, it is said that "Prajâpati is verily the Hiranyagarbha." Therefore it is verily the Hiranyagarbha who is described here as the cause of the birth of the world and so on.

As against the foregoing view we hold as follows: It is not the Hiranyagarbha as distinct from the Paramesvara, that is treated of here; for, the attributes of Paramesvara—such as being the cause of the origin of the Universe—cannot apply to the Hiranyagarbha. The Being spoken of at the beginning as the cause of the Universe, as the being "whence proceeded the birth of the Universe" is described to be higher than all and far transcending the darkness or the region of Prakriti, in the verses beginning with the following:—

"There is verily none else higher and subtler than This which is higher than the high and greater than the great;—which is one, unmanifest, of endless forms, the whole universe, the ancient, beyond the darkness." ‡

This cannot apply to the Hiranyagarbha who is within the Mundane Egg. Moreover, moksha or immortality is said to result from a knowledge of Him, in the words

"They who know Him become immortal."

This, too, cannot refer to Hiranyagarbha, for, as a special distinguishing mark of Paramesvara, it

*Tait. Upanishad 3-10.

†Mahana. Up. 1.

‡i.e. whom the sages see forming himself the whole Universe as threads form themselves a cloth.

* Mahana. Up. 1.

† Taittiriya Aranyaka

‡ Mahanarayana Up. 1.

Accordingly since Parames'vara cannot be vikâra, A'nandamaya is none other than Jîva.

(*Answer*) :—No, because here the suffix 'maya' implies abundance. Only in the words 'annamaya,' 'prânamaya' and manomaya,' 'maya' means vikâra or modified form. Vijñânamaya is the Jîvâ in whom Vijñâna or intellection is in abundance, A'nandamaya is Parames'vara in whom A'nanda or bliss abounds.

(*Objection*) :—As occurring in a section dealing with vikâras or modified forms, it is altogether but proper that the suffix 'maya' should be taken to mean vikârr.

In answer, the Sûtrakâra says:

Also because of the mention of a reason therefor (I. i. 15.)

The passage He alone verily causes bliss"* declares A'nandamaya as the cause of bliss with reference to Jîvas. He alone who himself abounds in bliss can impart bliss to others. Wherefore A'nandamaya is none other than Parames'vara.

Objection :—Though it has been said that A'nandamaya is the Parames'vara in whom bliss is abundant, still, it will be found that He is quite distinct from brahman; for, the words "Brahman is the tail, the basis "† show that He has Brahman for His basis. If it be admitted that Brahman is distinct from the Parames'vara, the former becomes a dependent being and cannot, therefore, be the cause of the universe, and so on. Wherefore it is better to hold that Jîva is meant here.

In reply the Sûtrakâra says

And the very subject of the hymn is sung here.—(I. i. 16).

The very Brahman spoken in the words of the Mantra, "Truth, Wisdom, and Endless-is Brahman"‡ is described as A'nandamaya in the passage "Another inner âtman is A'nandamaya, § as abounding in bliss. In the passage Brahman is the tail, the basis, the word "Brahman" designates Pranava, which as the designation of Parames'vara, forms His basis

On this subject some hold as follows :—

It is the *Paramâkâs'a* or Supreme Light, the *Prakriti A'tman*, that is spoken of in the S'ruti as A'nandamaya; but not the Para-Brahman, that Cause which is beyond the Universe and described, as "Truth, Wisdom, and Endless is Brahman." A'nandamaya is the *Paramâkâs'a* described as the Prakriti or the material cause of the universe including akâs'a or ether, as stated in the passage "From this A'tman, verily, was akâs'a produced."* That the A'tman here spoken of is of the form of Paramâkâs'a is seen from the passage "If this akâs'a, the A'nanda, did not exist &c." † And the passage "Brahman is the tail, the basis" ‡ shows that Brahman is the basis of A'nanda-âkâs'a. Accordingly in the passage "That is the unit of Brahman's bliss" we find that the A'nanda rests in Brahman. This very A'nanda is again described as the prakriti of all beings in passages like

"He knew that A'nanda is Brahman, it is from A'nanda verily are all these beings born." §

And A'nanda is here spoken of as Brahman in the words "A'nanda is Brahman," because as an attribute of Brahman is is not quite distinct from Brahman. The passage "This wisdom of Bhrigu and Varuna is based on the Paramâkâs'a declares that Varuna's wisdom concludes with Paramâkâs'a, which is an attribute of Brahman, and which is of the nature of Supreme Bliss, the prakriti or material cause of the universe, otherwise known as the Supreme energy, the self-conscious A'tman. Wherefore it is the Supreme energy (Parama-sakti)—which is an attribute of Brahman, the A'tman which is the Prakriti or the material cause, the Supreme Light (Paramâkâs'a), that is spoken of as A'nandamaya. As the substance possessing A'nandamaya as an attribute, the Supreme Brahman is spoken of as its basis. And Vijñânamaya is the Jîva, the worshipper thereof. The Sûtrakâra has introduced the Sûtra 13, thinking that the A'nandamaya-A'tman is one with Brahman, because the former, the A'nandamaya, which is of the nature of an attribute (dharma) and energy (Sakti) cannot be thought of as distinct from the latter, the Para-Brahman, the basic substance wherein it inheres as an attribute and energy.

Others, again, hold as follows: these five A'tman, spoken of as *annamaya* and so on, are no doubt the five sentient Purushas or spiritual entities on the causal plane of being, designated as Brahmâ, Vishnu, Rudra, Îs'âna and Sadâs'iva and who are the impelling controllers of the five bhûtas or cosmic elements hinted at by *anna* (food) etc., inasmuch as in such passa-

* Tait. Upanishad 2

† Tait. Upanishad 2 p. 2-1.

‡ Tait. Up. 2-5

* Tait. Upanishad 2-1.

† Tait. Upanishad 2-7. Tait. Upanishad 2-5.

‡ Tait. Upanishad 3-6.

§ Tait. Up. 3-6

ges as "from this world departing, he becomes united with the physical (*annamaya*) A'tman"* the 'annamaya' and others occur in connection with 'A'tman which denotes a sentient being, and are described as reachable one after another by the liberated soul departing from this world of samsâra. The Brahman who is known as Paramas'iva and who is the cause even of Sadâs'iva, *i. e.*, of the *A'nandamaya* who is the basis of the Annamaya and other A'tmans,—is spoken of as His (Sadâsiva's) basis. The A'nandamaya is not regarded as distinct from Brahman and is therefore spoken of as Brahman. Thus, all things considered, it may be concluded that A'nandamaya is Parames'vara.

Adhikarana—7.

It has been established that the definition—arrived at by an accordant construction of the scriptural texts—of Brahman, the Supreme S'iva, as the cause of the Universe, is not too wide as applying to Pradhâna and Jiva as well. Next the Sûtrakâra proceeds to discuss the passages which seem to declare that Hiranyagarbha, who is made up of the totality of Jivas is the cause of the Universe

Not the other, because of incongruity. (I. i. 17).

The following passage of the Mahopanishad forms the subject of discussion here:

"Whence proceeded the birth of the Universe, That Being, by water sent forth the (bodies of) souls on earth, and (it was that Being) which by plants, entered into men and beasts, into all beings moving and unmoving."†

The doubt arises as to whether the Purusha spoken of as the cause of the birth etc. of the whole Universe is the Parames'vara or some one else.

Pûrvapaksha:—It is the Hiranyagarbha, because of His characteristic marks described here.

From the puranic passage:

"The three lokas having become ocean, the Brahman in the form of Nârâyana reclines on the serpent-bed, expanded by the devouring of the three worlds."

we learn that Brahmâ lies in the ocean. This characteristic mark of His is found described in the passage:

Whom within the ocean the sages weave."‡

In the opening passage of the whole section "Prajapati moves in the womb within" * He is described as having entered into all beings, and in the conclusion the passage "the creator made the sun and the moon as before, also heaven and the earth" † declares that He is the cause. Wherefore it is but right that to the Hiranyagarbha who is thus referred to in the opening and concluding passages apply all the attributes described in the intervening passages. Moreover, reference has been made to the following passages which treat of Hiranyagarbha:

"He was born of waters &c."
Hiranyagarbha at first was &c

In the section first referred to here, it is certainly Prajâpati that is treated of; for, we find it said that Prajâpati moves in the womb within the unborn is born in many a form." In the section next referred to, it is said that "Prajâpati is verily the Hiranyagarbha." Therefore it is verily the Hiranyagarbha who is described here as the cause of the birth of the world and so on.

As against the foregoing view we hold as follows: It is not the Hiranyagarbha as distinct from the Parames'vara, that is treated of here; for, the attributes of Parames'vara—such as being the cause of the origin of the Universe—cannot apply to the Hiranyagarbha. The Being spoken of at the beginning as the cause of the Universe, as the being "whence proceeded the birth of the Universe" is described to be higher than all and far transcending the darkness or the region of Prakriti, in the verses beginning with the following:—

"There is verily none else higher and subtler than This which is higher than the high and greater than the great;—which is one, unmanifest, of endless forms, the whole universe, the ancient, beyond the darkness." ‡

This cannot apply to the Hiranyagarbha who is within the Mundane Egg. Moreover, moksha or immortality is said to result from a knowledge of Him, in the words

"They who know Him become immortal."

This, too, cannot refer Hiranyagarbha, for, as a special distinguishing mark of Parames'vara, it

*Tait. Upanishad 3-10.
†Mahana. Up. 1.
‡i.e. whom the sage forming himself the whole Universe weaves form themselves a cloth

* Mah. Up. 1.
† Tait. Aranyaka.
‡ Mahâ. Up. 1.
Mahânârâya

declared that He is the source of immortality in the following passage.

> When like leather men can fold ether, men alone without knowing Siva there can be an end of pain." *

It is of no use to say that He (the Hiranyagarbha) is referred to in the opening and concluding passages. As inapplicable to Hiranyagarbha, the words "Prajâpati" and "Dhâtâ," denote the Parames'vara who is literally the Lord of creatures and the supporter of the Universe In both the sections referred to—Taittiriya A'ranyaka 3-13 and Taittiriya Samhita 4-1-8—it is the Parames'vara Himself that is spoken of, because of His characteristic attributes—that He is the Lord of the Universe and far beyond it—described thus.

"Who rules this, the two-footed and the four-footed"† "The sun-coloured, beyond the darkness." ‡

Wherefore He who is spoken of as Prajâpati and the cause of the world is the Parame'svara, not the Hiranyagarbha.

As against the view that the Hiranyagarbha is the cause of the Universe since there is no distinction between Him and Parames'vara, the Sûtrakâra says:

And because of the mention of a distinction. (I. i. 18).

A distinction between Parames'vara and Hiranyagarbha as cause and effect, is made in this Mahopanishad in the following passage:—

> "The Rudra, the Great Sage (Maharshi) transcending the Universe, first saw Hiranyagarbha, the first of the Devas then being born." §

Wherefore it may be concluded that the Iśvara is the cause of the whole Universe including Hiranyagarbha.

The Sûtrakâra refutes another possible objection thus

And in spite of his desire, no ground for inference. (I. i. 19).

Everywhere in the Sruti Hiranyagarbha's desire concerning the creation of the Universe is spoken of in the words "Prajapati desired, may I produce the creatures," still there is no ground for the inference that he is the cause of the universe, for his desire concerns itself with the minor creation. Even this minor creation pertains to the Parames'vara Himself who takes the form of Hiranyagarbha as the Sûtrakâra will say in the Sûtra II. iv. 20.

The Sûtrâkara now proceeds to consider view that the identity of Parames'vara and Hiranyagarbha should be admitted inasmuch as it is declared in the passage.

"Entering in the form of this Jîva, the Atman, the name and form will I differentiate,"* that Parames'vara who has entered into the universe as its soul in the form of Hiranyagarbha is the creator of names and forms.

And herein (it) declares his relation to Him (I. i. 20).

Herein, in the science of this very Upanishad, the mantric texts declare the Hiranyagarbha's subordinate relation to Parames'vara, in the words "Brahman is the Lord, the Lord of Brahmâ"†. Wherefore, it follows that none but Parames'vara is the cause of the universe and that the Hiranyagarbha is subordinate to Him.

Adhikarana—8.

By means of arguments adduced in the foregoing adhikaranas it has been established that Para-Brahman is the Being called Siva who is distinct from *chit* and *achit*, spirit and matter; who is omniscient, ever-contented, of beginningless wisdom, independent of never-failing power, of infinite potentialities, the two-fold cause of the whole universe; who can be revealed only by the one accordant interpretation of the whole science of the Upanishad; who, by nature is without a second, self-luminous, and conjoined with the whole Universe; who is the existence, Intelligence and Bliss in essence; who constitutes the means by which to cut asunder the bond of samsâra. The next adhikarana proceeds to point out that form of His on which to concentrate the mind and which constitutes for the aspirant an antidote for samsâra

(He who is) within is Paramesvara because of the declaration of His attributes. (I. i. 21).

The following passage in the Chhândogya forms the subject of discussion here:

"Now that Golden Person, who is seen within the sun, with golden beard and golden hair, golden altogether to the very tips of his nails, whose two eyes are like white lotus."‡

---

* Śvetâśvatara Up. 6-2.
There can be no end of pain without a knowledge of Siva.
† Tait. Sam. 4-1-8.
‡ Tait. Aranyaka. 3-13.
§ Mahanârayana Up. 12.

* Chhandog. a-Up. 6—3.
† Mahâna. Up. 21.
‡ Chh. Upanishad 1-6.

The doubt arises as to whether this golden person within the sun is Parames'vara or any particular Devatâ.

Now, Parames'vara who is the basis of all and who is everywhere, cannot be the person who is within the sun and of golden form. If it be held to be the form assumed by Him of His own accord, it must necessarily be the form containing three eyes. Such a form is not found here: we find described here only two eyes which are like blue lotus's.

Or, even if it were the body assumed of his own accord, it would certainly produce pain even in the case of Parames'vara as much as in the case of samsârins. Even in the case of a voluntary contact, it is in the very nature of fire to burn the thing in contact. Thus it is not proper to suppose that Parames'vara becomes united to body. Wherefore the person (spoken of in the passage under discussion) is some Devatâ, not the Parames'vara. This is the argument that may be adduced on behalf of the *Pûrvapaksha*.

The *Siddhânta* maintains that it is the Parames'vara Himself —Why so?— Because of the mention of his attributes. In the passages "He is the master of all worlds and of all desires" and "His name is the 'Above', He has risen above all sins" * it is the attributes of Parames'vara, the attributes of sinlessness and of mastery over all worlds and desires, are spoken of; for, it is revealed that

> One indeed is Rudra,—they are never for a second,—who rules these worlds by His ruling energies."†
>
> The One who to many ordains the objects of desire." ‡ and so on.

As to the contention that He who is the basis of all and who pervades all cannot be a dweller within the sun, we reply that the Parames'vara who is the basis of all and who pervades all things assumes some golden form in consideration of the devotees and dwells in the solar orb. Unlike us, by such a connection with the body the Is'vara does not become subject to the evil of samsâra. The blessed s'ruti itself declares both his connection with the body and his freedom from all sin. In fact, dependant as we are on the authority of s'ruti, we do not hold analogical reasoning very high. Even fire cannot burn those things in contact which are too powerful. The mention of two eyes of the three-eyed Parames'vara is meant merely to show its resemblance to white lotus: it does not mean the absence of a third eye. When we say, for instance, of a man having three sons, that two of his sons are like fire, the mention of the number 'two' does not imply the absence of the third," but it is meant to show the resemblance of the two sons to fire. So also here. Two of Parames'vara's eyes shine like the white lotus which has been blossomed by the sun, whereas the third eye, which is naturally closed, does not resemble the fully-blossomed lotus; it is like a closed lotus.

(*Objection:*) In the following passage,

"This Being who moves, the Dark-necked Nilagriva) and Red, whom the cowherds and the water-carrying women have seen, and whom all beings see, He, when seen, makes us happy." *

we are given to understand that the dark-necked Parames'vara is visible to all beings. And from another passage "The three-eyed sun who by his splendour has pervaded the orb on all sides" we learn that he possesses three eyes. Therefore A'ditya Himself is the Parames'vara visible to all and residing in the middle of the shining orb. Otherwise, how can the Sruti speak of the sun as dark-necked and three-eyed or designate Him a Brahman in the words "This sun is Brahman"? † Wherefore it is the very Sun-god residing in the orb, spoken of as he "who is within the sun," that is referred to as the golden purusha or spirit.

Against this view the Sûtrakâra says:—

And because of the mention of a distinction, He is another. (I.i.22.)

The Parames'vara of golden form is quite distinct from that sentient A'ditya, the personal soul of the solar orb, because of the distinction made in the s'ruti.

Who dwelling in the sun, inner than the sun, whom the sun knows not, whose body the sun is, who within controls the sun,—he is thy A'tman, the Inner Regulator (Antaryamin), the Immortal." ‡

Here the word "immortal" denotes S'iva, because it is said in the Jâbala Upanishad in praise of S'atarudriya that "these verily are the designations of the Immortal." § From the attribute—described of Para-

* Chh. Upanishad 1—6.
† S'veta Upanishad 3—2.
‡ S'vet. Upanishad 6—13.

* Tait. Samhitâ 4-5-1
† Tait. Aranyaka 2-2.
‡ Br. Upanishad 5-7.
§ Jâbâla. Up. 3.

mes'vara—that He is unknown to the sun, we should understand that the Parames'vara is distinct from the Jîva. Wherefore it is the Parames'vara dwelling within the sun, the golden Is'vara,—it is the Parames'vara as distinguished from the sentient sun that is spoken of here as "dark-necked, blood-red." * As the indwelling soul of the sun, he is spoken of by the sun.

(*Objection*:) The "dark-necked" dwelling within the sun is not the Parames'vara; on the other hand He is Nârâyana. Accordingly the lay poets, everywhere, declare:—

> "To be always meditated upon as He, Nârâyana, who, dwelling within the sun's orb, is seated on the lotus-seat."

He alone can properly be said to have two eyes like the white lotus, because He is well-known as "the Pundarikâksha or the lotus-eyed." Why all the trouble of explaining it otherwise?

(*Answer*):—No; because the special characteristic marks of the Parame'svara which are found described in connection with the Golden Spirit (Hiranmaya Purusha), cannot be explained when applied to Nârâyana. Now it is proper to determine the drift of this passage of doubtful signification,—referred to in the Sûtra,—by collating it with other passages which admit of no doubt.

In the Mahopanishad there is the following passage:—

> "It is verily the sun (âditya) that burns this orb, etc." †

Here the sun, the personal soul dwelling in the orb, is spoken of in the words "the person who is in this shining orb"; then the Golden Spirit, the Regulator within the sun, is referred to in the words "This Golden spirit who is within the sun." *; then again His vibhûti (glory) as the sun is spoken of in the words "The sun is the vigor, energy, strength and fame." *; then he is referred to as the Lord of all beings in the words "He is the Spirit, the Lord of all Beings." * then again in answer as it were to the question who He is, He is again described in the section which begins with "All is Rudra..." * and concludes thus "to Him who is Golden-armed the Golden-Lord, the Lord of Ambikâ (the mother), the Lord of Umâ." †. As the mention of 'arm' in this description stands for other features as well, we should understand that it means the golden-coloured. Therefore it follows that it is He whose colour is like gold, who is the Lord of Umâ, that is spoken of as the one dwelling within the sun. Here His characteristic marks are: He is Nîlagrîva or dark-necked, He is the Lord of Umâ. These cannot be ascribed to any being other than the Parames'vara. The possession of eyes like lotus is a general mark, applicable to other beings besides Nârâyana. We speak of a woman or a man having eyes like lotus. When the two marks are mentioned together, the special mark should prevail in our determining of the exact being spoken of here. The passage cited above to show that Nârâyana should always be meditated upon as the deity dwelling within the sun should be understood in a figurative sense. Wherefore it follows that the Being who has to be meditated upon as dwelling in the sun by seekers of Moksha is none but the Blessed Parames'vara described in the Sâvitrî or Gâyatrî-Hymn—of golden form, having three eyes, dark-necked the Lord of Umâ, the Lord of all regions and all desires, untouched by any evil whatsoever.

A. MAHA'DEVA S'A'STRI, B. A.

(*To be continued*).

* Tait. Sanhita 4-5-1.
† Maha. Up. 13-14.

* Maha. Up. 23.
† Mahana. Upanishad 18.

SIVAGNANA SIDDHIAR
OF
ARUL NANDI SIVA CHARIAR.

(*Continued from page* 272, *Vol. I.*)

PRAPAKARAN'S STATEMENT.

1. We will state to the world wherein Prapakara differs from Bhattacharya in the exposition of the Doctrines held by that austere ascetic Jaimini Bagavan from a diligent study of the Vedas.

2. Such a thing as *Apurva* arises after a man has performed austere sacrifices, and it (Apurva) again produces fruits, (in the next birth) after its past Karma has been performed by the body in conjunction with the intelligent Soul. When the Soul has attained to a condition of freedom from all action and results, and remains quiet like a block of earth or stone, then it is that the soul has attained Mukti. This is his statement.

HIS REFUTATION.

1. The Vedas assert that it is the past Karma that produces fruits and you now set up against the authority of the Vedas some new thing as *Apurva*. If the fruits are not the result of the past Karma but derived newly from *Apurva*, then we may assert that the flowers of the sky acquired their fragrance, after they were worn on the head.

2. The Vedas speak of *Ananda* in Mukti, and what you state therefore is erroneous that cessation of intelligence and action is *Mukti*. As well could you say that the man in a swoon is in *Mukti*. Fire deprived of its redness (heat) loses its identity. Your assertion that the soul can subsist in Mukti after it loses its intelligence cannot be admitted by us.

SABDA BRAHMAVADI'S STATEMENT.

1. It is *Sabda* (sound) which is delusively understood as the Universe. The substance postulated by the ignorant, (as different from sound) is a mere myth. The right understanding of this doctrine is real Mukti. So says the Sabda Brahmavadi, without a proper study of the nature of the Universe.

2. This delusive perception is caused by the differentiation and increase (*Parinama of Sabda*); and this results in the seen Universe. As such the only real entity is *Sabda*. What is called the substance (meaning) is merely the product of *Sabda*. If you assert otherwise, then no substance does exist without sound name[3].

3. In two such words 'மலர்' and 'மலர்' meaning respectively flower and Lakshmi at one time and earth and animal at another time, the words (sound) remain the same though the meanings differ. As such it is the words (Sabda) that we lovingly utter that contains the concept meaning different things. This is similar to rice becoming fried rice.

4. It is after we utter a word, we become conscious of the substance; as such, understand that the word (sound) is the only real substance. If you say that the word and its meaning are related together conjointly, then, even when you give the meaning, it is a word.

HIS REFUTATION.

1. If you say the Universe was formed by the delusive differentiation of *Sabda*, then you had better admit also as a substance this delusive differentiation. If believing in *Sabda* as a reality is itself *Mukti*, then you conflict in this matter with the express teaching of the Vedas which insist upon the performance of rites and the attainment of knowledge as the means of salvation.

2. As the Sabda is formless, it could not think of attaining forms when becoming the Universe. If you compare this change to the change of milk into curds, then curds could not become milk and the world could not be reduced back to *sound*, and your *Sabda* (sound) will perish.

When you predicate change by *Parinama* and *Vivarthana*) of *Sabda* you must admit at the same time that Sabda is perishable, as the substance indicated by sound is everywhere, the words sound become merely the symbols of the things when we wish to know them.

4. You said that the substance has no form except from sound, and that therefore sound is the real substance. The word (sound) அரி has two meanings

2. The Prapakara sets up a new postulate calling it *Apurva* to explain the Karma being undergone in one's life time, and he does not try to explain it as the effect of past Karma. Apurva means something which did not exist before. The explanation is as much no explanation at all, and naming such notion is like explaining the effects of opium by saying that it is due to its somnolent power.

3. Says a commentator "If the thing is the Parinama of sound, then when we utter the name fire, fire must be produced. If the thing is *Vivarthana* then when we utter the name fire, our tongues must be scorched. As such the thing cannot be derived from *Sabda* by either mode. The word is a mere symbol or mark (குறி), by which we have learnt to call the thing.

'Vishnu' and 'monkey.' Then can you say that Vishnu is monkey if sound be the real substance?

5. Rice requires fire to become fried rice (so the analogy is fallacious). As a number of meanings is united in a word, the learning to know the meanings is knowledge of *Sabda*; and real knowledge consists in learning to know the distinct *Padârthas* (things). As such the knowledge of things (substance) is of greater importance than the knowledge of Sabda.

6. The name indicates the thing we have already perceived or about to perceive. As such the substance is really the thing perceived and not the name (sound). Where did you learn to say that Sabda is substance and not the thing.

7. Perception (knowledge) of a thing is induced when the soul is in conjunction with the internal and external senses and their cause (Prakriti) and the thing perceived and the light of God. In such a perception or knowledge there is no name but only the thing or substance.

1. As a lamp lights the things lying in darkness, so *Sabda* is an instrument or aid for understanding the substance. The Sabda is not eternal; it will perish. This Sabda was produced by the Almighty God and as such the Sabda cannot be God.

NOTES.

As thus explained and exposed, it might be thought that the system deserves very little consideration, that this represents an effete and obsolete system. But the fallacies inherent in this system are so deep-rooted that they can be detected in many a subtle reasoning to-day. Many of the word-juggles existing in the Vedanta philosophy can be traced to the influence of this system, such as the myth of the *Nama Rupa Prapancha*, as illustrated by the simile of the sea and the wave and the foam and in many an other argument. The names or sounds are themselves taken for things and hence the confusion in thought. It is forgotten that a name is 'merely a mark attached to a thing to enable it to be spoken about,' and that there may be knowledge without language and things without names. Says Dr Bain, "The knowledge that guides the lower animals is unconnected with language. They observe by their senses the things about them; and the observations are remembered in sensible forms. The bush that gives shelter, the herbage for food, the animals to be preyed upon, are known and sought after, by the sole guidance of sense-impressions."

"Human beings have numerous experiences of the same kind involving the order of nature, without being connected with words. The child has a large stock of sense-knowledge before it can understand and employ language. The skill of the artizan consists, for the largest part, in associations between sensible appearances and movements; to the stone polisher the sight of the surface at once suggests the next blow. Even in a highly intellectual profession, as the practice of Physic, the consummation of skill requires a large sense knowledge passing beyond the scope of language. The physician learns from books, everything that can be expressed in words; but there are delicate shades of diagnosis that no language can convey, stored up without verbal expression, in the eye, the ear and the touch." "And there are numerous sources of error, pitfals and snares in the use of names, and mostly in the abuse of abstract names, which is exemplified in the almost irresistible tendency they have to suggest the existence of things in the abstract." The other branch of the Sadba Brahmavadis, believe in the Vedic mantra (sound) as all powerful and that no higher power like God is at all necessary to explain the existence and origin of the Universe and that *Sabda* is itself God. There are believers in the Veda like Jaimini and his pupils and in the efficacy of Vedic rites and ceremonies, and yet who believed in no God. Among the modern-day brahmins, many may be found who strictly adhere to the belief that the Vedic mantra alone is all powerful and *Siddhis* &c. can be acquired by the power of the mantra without belief in God. The phrase 'Mantric Power' embodies the fallacy of the whole system, as opposed to Divine Power. Consider the following quotation from Barth, "Sacrifice is only an act of preparation, it is the best of acts, but it is an act and its fruits consequently perishable. Accordingly although whole sections of these treatises (Upanishads are taken up exclusively with speculations on the rites, what they teach may be summed up in the words of the Mundaka Upanishad, 'Know the Atman only and away with everything else; it alone in the bridge of immortality.' The Veda itself and the whole circle of sacred science are quite as sweepingly consigned to the second place. The Veda is not the true Brahm; it is only its reflexion. And the science of this imperfect Brahm, this *Sabda Brahm* or Brahm in words only is a science of a lower order. The true science is that which has the true Brahm, the Para Brahm for its subject." The Rishis of *Tarukavana* were votaries of the *Sabda*

Brahm and they believed that they could effect their salvation by the Vedic Mantra alone and thought, like Indra and Agni of old noticed in the Kena Upanishad that they acquired all their powers by their own will and independent of the Divine help, and became thoroughly filled with Egoism (Ahankara). This Ahankara had to be destroyed. Their power and sanctity had to be put to the test. Their power was so frail that their sanctity left them the moment they and their wives saw the form of *Mohini* and *Bitchadana*. Then they tried their powers to destroy these Beings. The Veda is often symbolised by the deer, மான்மறை chiefly as the sound uttered by it is supposed to resemble the Vedic Chant and the Rishis created a gigantic deer and sent it out to kill Siva. It raised such a tremendous bleat as to reach the uttermost regions and yet it affected not the Supreme; and the One took it in its hands and held it quite close to its ear. This allegory truly illustrates the principle that however loud we may shout out the name of God, we cannot reach him and know him, unless we do it in all love and in all spirit. One other remark and we close our notes. In regard to Bhattacharya's system, that the Veda is unrevealed (*Swayambu*) it will be interesting to note that of the present day Hindu systems, except Saivism, all the other schools hold to this doctrine and Saivism alone believes in the Vedas as revealed and God as the revealer. If other schools, hold that the Veda is not revealed, it is because the Beings they believe in are not expressly mentioned in the Veda itself as the revealer or they have not ascended to the true idea of God as the revealer of all knowledge out of His Infinite Grace. In any view, it cannot be true that the Veda was self-caused. It must either have an human author or a Divine author and it can only be an euphemism to call it *Swayambu*.

J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B. A., B. L.

(To be continued).

TAYUMANAVAR.

GOD AND THE WORLD

This poem of the Saint Tâyumânavar, remarkable alike for beauty of ideas and of setting, and to which no translation can do justice, describes (as far as words can) God, the only reality, and by contrast the World, with its "lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life," clinging to the pleasures of the senses as heaven and as real, only to find its mistake when in the throes of death and to learn too late that God is the only help and should have been the only goal. Not that the Saint altogether condemns sensuous enjoyments. He has elsewhere explained in what spirit they should be enjoyed.

கொந்தவிழ்மலர்ச்சோலை சுனீழல்வைகினும்
குளிர்த்திப்புனற்கையள்ளிக்
கொள்ளுகினுமந்நீரிடைத்திளைத்தாடினும்
குளிர்சந்தவாடைமடவார்
வந்துலவுகின்றதென முன்றிலிடையுலவவே
வசதிபெறுபோதும்வெள்ளை
வட்டமதிபட்டப் பகற்போலிலகுதர
மதிழ்போதும்வேலையமுதம்
விந்தைபெறவறுசுவையில் வந்தெனவமுதுண்ணும்
வேலையிலுமாலைசந்தம்
வெள்ளிலைய டைக்காய் விரும்பிவெண் டியவண்ணம்
வினையாடுழிதியினுஞ்
சந்ததமுனின்னருளை மறவாவரந்தந்த
தமியேனைரகூபுரிவாய்
சர்வபரிபூரண வகண்டதத்துவமான
சசிதானந்தசிவமே. (5)

"Whether in grateful shade I dwell of groves
Rich in clustered blooms, or cool sweet draughts
I quaff from limpid stream,
Or in its waters bathe and sport,
Or, fanned by fragrant breezes fresh that
Like maidens in the court yard play,
I revel in the full moon's day-like splendour,
Or on dainties I feast wherein ocean's ambrosia
Haply hath wondrous entered, or in garlands,
Perfumes, betel, I joy, or rest in sleep,—
Thy Grace may I never forget! This boon
Unto me grant and from the world guard me,
O Sivam, all-pervading, infinite, true,
That art the Only Reality, Pure Knowledge, Bliss!"

யான்னாம்.

அருவென் னனவுடன்றி யுருவென் பனவுண்டி
அசமும் பறவுண்டிருமுறைபிறழாது
குறியுங் குணமுமன்றி நிறைவுங் குறைவுமன்றி
மறையொன் றிறைவிளம்பவிமலமதாகி
அகலம் பெறவுயர்ந்து விபுலம் பெறவளர்ந்த
சகலஞ் சகலமென்றளறிவினர்காண
ஞானவெளியைடமெவருமிராப்—

அகலொன் றிடவொன்று புகைமண் டிடுவதன்று
புனலொன் றிடவழிந்து மடிவிலதனை
சருவும் பொழுதுயர்ந்து சனனம் படுவதன்று
சமர்கொண் டழிவதன்றேரியல்பினராகும்
அவனென் பதுவுமன்றி அவளென் பதுவுமன்றி
அதுவென்பதுவுமன்றிமொழில்கொடுலாவும்
அருமையறியாதபடியே— (ல)

இருளென் பதுவுமன்றி யொளியென் பதுவுமன்றி
எவையுந்தழுவிடுகவொருமுதலாகும்
உளதென் பதுவுமன்றி யிலதென் பதுவுமன்றி
உலகந் தொழுதிருத்த வயன்முதலோர்கள்
எவரும் கவலைகொண்டு சமயங் களில்விழுந்து
சுழலுட் டொழுதிரங்கி உருள்செயுமாறு
கூறரியசகமாயைபறலே— (வஹ)

எகதென் பதையகழ்ந்த வதிவின் றிரளின்று
மதிவொன் றெனவிளங்குமுபயமதாக
அறியுந் தருமமன்று பிறியுந் தருமமன்று
அசாஞ் சமிரண்டிலொருபடியாகி
எதிசந் ததநிறைந்த தெதனிற் தனையிறந்த
தெதுமங் களகபங்கொள்சுகவடிவாகும்
யாதுபரமதைநாடியறிநீ. (ழ)

பருவங் குலவுகின்ற மடமங் கையர் தொடங்கு
கபடந் தனில்விழுந்து கெடுகீனனாகி
வலையின் புடைபடமிந்த மதியென் றவசமுண்டு
வசனந் தாமுமின்றியவரிதழூறல்
பருகுந் தொழிலிணங்கி யிரவும் பகலுமின்சொல்
பகரும் படிதணிந்து குழலுமாக
மாலைவகைபலசூடியுடனே— (ஹஹ)

பதுமந் தனையைசந்த முலையென் றதையுகந்து
வரிவண் டெனவுழன்றுகலிலெனவாடுஞ்
சிறுகிண் கிணிசிலம்பு புனைதண் டைகண்முழங்கும்
ஒலிநன் றெனமகிழ்ந்து செலிகொளாகி
பசுமஞ் சளின்னியந்த மணமும் மிடமுகந்து
பவமிஞ் சிடவினைஞ்சி வரிசையினூடு
காலின்மிசைமுடிசூடி மயலாய்— (ஜ)

மருளுந் தெருளுமவந்து கதியென் பதைமறந்து
மதனன் சலதிபொங்க விரணமதான
அளிபுண் டனைவளர்ந்து விரல்கொண் டுறவளர்ந்து
சுகமுஞ் சுகமிதென்றுபரவசமாகி
மருளுந் தொழின் மிகுந்து தினமுந் தினமும்விஞ்சி
வளரும் பிறைகுறைந்தபடிமதிசோர
வானரமதெனமேனிசிரையாய்— (ஜஹ)

வயதும் படிமெழுந்து பினியுந் திமிதிமென்று
வரவுஞ் செயலிழந்துளிருமலுமாகி
அனமுஞ் செலுதலின்றி விழியுஞ் சுடர்களின்று
மூகமுங் கனைகளினுறசரியெனநாடி
மனையின் புறவிருந்த வினமுங் குலைகுலைந்து
சுகங்ஞ் செயவிநண்டையமன்வரும்வேளை
ஏதுதுணைபழி காரமனமே. (க)

To be gain, pure gain,
Life pervading Spirit-Space
Not to be burned by fire nor whelmed by smoke,
drowned in water nor raised
Nor moved by force of wind, nor
killed in battle; of nature ever one;
Not he, not she, not it,
walking in beauty, understood by none;
Not darkness nor light; all-embracing substance,
not being nor not-being;
Piercing in pity the Mâyâ-universe,*
gracious to help what time"
Brahma and others the world adores
are tossed in care;
In intelligences rid of 'I' and 'Mine' standing,
yet as One Intelligence shining.
Not to be known as two, not to be sundered,
the same in lifeless and living things;
What is That which is ever full, [Peace?
which is dead to thought, which is pure Bliss and
What is the Supreme?
Seek thou THAT and know.

In lovely woman's wiles fallen,
on evil thoughts intent,
Caught like deer in toils,
of speech unsteady,
Ever sipping her lips, drinking
sweet prattle night and day,
Decking her locks with varied wreaths,
to lotus-buds her breasts likening, on them doting,
In the tinkle of her anklets delighting,
that like bees make music and dance around,
Her sweet perfume enjoying,
worshipping her to thy ruin,
Crowning thy head with her feet,
with delusion and darkness seized,
Forgetting thy goal,
Cupid's sea overflowing,
Rubbing the ripe sore with the finger,
saying "This is bliss, This is bliss,"
Mad acts of passion growing, intellect
daily waning like the waning moon,
Body growing grey like an ape's,
years advancing,
Diseases in hosts tramping,
coughing, coughing,
Limbs not moving, food not eating,
eyes lacking light, face lacking lustre,
Kinsfolk in hot haste arriving
and making uproar "It is all up, all up,"
Thus when dread Death comes,
who will help thee, O Mind, you sinner?

P. A.

Not form or formless, not in, not out,
swerving not from order,
Not mark nor quality, fulness nor defect,
declared by the Vedas to be One, pure,
Rising aloft, spreading forth majestic,
seen inwardly by the wise

* i. e. The Absolute becoming conditioned and manifest.

TAYUMANAVAR'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page 276, Vol. I.*)

எங்குநிறைவினைறபொருள்

காகமான திகோடி கூடிநின்றுமோரு
கல்லின்முன்னெறிந்திற்குமோ
கர்மமான திகோடி முன்னைசெய்தாலுநின்
கருணைப்ரவாகவருளைத்
தாகமாய்க்கூடினரை வாழ்ச்சுவல்லதோ
தமியனேற்கருட்டாமோ
சத்தமிகுவென்பதவும் வெளியச்சுவினையெலாஞ்
சாந்தசமாய்க்கூடியே
தேகமானதைமிகவும் வாட்டுதேதுன்பக்கள
சோமலியோகமார்க்க
சித்தியோவரவிக்கு சகசநிட்டைக்குமென்
சிந்தைக்கும்வெகுதூரமா
னேகமாய்நின்னெடிருக்குநானெஞ்சா
னிந்தாளின்முற்றுருதே
யிகபரமிரண்டினிலு முயிரிலுக்குயிரா-இ
யெங்குநிறைவின்றபொருளே (கூச)

94. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions!

Though innumerable crows are flocked together in a place, yet in a single pelting with a stone, they are all made to disappear at once. Likewise, the immense accumulations of Thy devotees' past *karma* must completely dwindle away if they should feel an unremitting thirst for Thy Boundless Grace.*

So I have to determine that I have not yet entertained a vehement taste for Thy Heavenly Grace: The gathered effects of *my* past karma do, as well, harass me and I am unable to free myself from the wordly tumults and remain fixed in yoga of peaceful concentration of mind. My heart is still very much unsuited to the true meditation of Divine Bliss.

O for that day, my Lord, on which I will be *one with Thee* in blessed *advaita* union.

ஒருமைமனதாகியே யகலாதநின்னருளி
லொருவனுனக்கிருக்கி
லுலகம்பொருதேதோ மாயாவிசித்தமென
வோயுமோலிடமில்கூயோ
வருவுடையகின்னன்பர் சங்கைசெய்திவரோ
வலதுகித்தியகர்தனா
யகிலம்படைத்தெமை யாள்கின்றபோகில
ரடாதென்பரோவகன்ற
பெருமைபெறுபூரணங் குறையுமோபூதங்கள்
பேய்க்கோலமாய்விதண்டை
பேசுமோவல்தானபரிபாகசாலம்
பிறக்கவிலையோதொல்கியா

மிருமைசெறிசடவினை யெதிர்த்தவாய்பேசு
மோ கேதுளதுசிறிதுபுகலா
யிகபரமிரண்டினிலு முயிரிலுக்குயிராங்
யெங்குநிறைவின்றபொருளே (கூடு)

95. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions! What will it matter to Thee if Thou would let me, a single soul,* also seek Thy Blessed Grace and, with oneness of mind, be in Thy Happy contemplation? Cannot the ethereal region † sustain me? Or will the phenomena ‡ of *maya* disappear with me, having no

* The Saint alludes to the existence of an infinite number of souls and the Moksha state of a soul being. c. f. also Thiruvarutpayan chapter II. 1st couplet "பிரத்த மான பேதன பிரக்ருத மான பிரளய தத்தி தோன்றி யுள்ளன." (The number of liberated souls and of those yet to be liberated will equal the number of days that are past since this creation and of the days that are yet to come; *i. e.*, their number is endless). It is practically impossible to conceive or talk of God *alone* except in connection with plurality of souls, or *jivas*, or *logos*, or *atmas*, by whatever name we call them. "The knowers of Brahman dub, shadow and light." Section III (1) Katha Upa. c. f. "Though all individual souls came from the Over-Soul (God), yet It (God) remains undiminished." The Peace Chant:—"Om! Whole is *That*, Whole is *this*; from whole, whole cometh; take whole from whole, (yet) whole remains. Om; Peace! Peace! Peace! Harih! Om!"—Isha. Upa. c. f. Mr. Subba Row's discourses on the Bhagavad Gita, p. 9. edition of 1888. "It (Logos) has consciousness and an individuality of its own. I may as well say that it is the only *personal God*, perhaps, *that* exists in the cosmos. But *not to cause any misunderstanding*, I must also state that such *centres* of energy are almost *innumerable in the bosom of Parabrahmam*. It must *not* be supposed that this *Logos* is but a *single* centre of energy which is manifested by Parabrahmam. There are *innumerable* others. *Their number is almost infinite.*"

† *ethereal* intelligence—perfect in the ethereal region which occupies everywhere and is occupied by Supreme Parabrahmam or Siva with no contradiction to conceive of. **In as much as we see it as a fact ever that liquid permeates the solid, gas the liquid, air the gas, ether the air; so the Parabrahmam (Sukshmachit) permeates the souls (Sthulachits) as well as the ether. Hence the Parabrahmam is called The Great Akas** (c.f. "O! The Great Akas where the ether rests"—23rd verse *supra*).

‡ **Here the Saint refers to the distinct entity of the illusory and changeable matter called** *maya* or nature or Prakriti. The maya is as a fact ever controlled by the Parama-Siva and made to serve for **Him as the material** cause (pradhâna) with which to give *Thanu* (body)—**Karana (senses)**—*Bhuvana* (world) and *bhôga* (sensations) *for souls to undergo evolution towards spiritualization. c. f.* Sivagnana Siddhiar [illegible] ... *i. e.*—We see that causes are always threefold to effect a thing like a pot. For instance, *God* being the (1) First Cause (Potter) wills the whole world (pot) to come into a manifested existence out of (2) the material cause, *suddha* and *asuddha* maya (mud) by the aid of (3) the Instrumental Cause, *His own Arul sakti* (potter's wheel).

We see that our Saint in this verse (95) points out the *co-existence* of the *Three Padarthas*, *Pathi* (Lord), *Pasu* (souls including, of course the muktas, devas *Brahma &c.*), and *Pasa* (maya or matter) and does, indirectly, reveal the possibility of such *co-existence* without any contradictions. For, there is not wanting the *unity* of ABSOLUTE LORDSHIP or control or government of the eternal Supreme Siva-Lord of *subjective nature*, over the *individual souls* and *maya*, both which being of *objective nature* are ever inseparable with and subordinate to Him either in *bhanda* or *moksha* states; and they can never affect His Omnipresence or Omniscience or Omnipotence &c. He has such *power* and *nature*. Who is to question it? When a soul becomes a mukta it assumes its subjective nature so far as pasa (master) is concerned only. Even in its *moksha* state with pathi (Lord), the soul's nature is objective only.

** The Saint points out in this verse the extremest difficulty of procuring God's Grace and its supremest power solely to destroy our *Karmic* effects.

other work to do? Or will Thy beloved *mantas* raise any objection to it? Or will the Trinity gods who have to create and preserve the universe counsel against it? Will Thy great ubiquity be affected by it in any way? Or will the elements counterplead against Thee in a malignant spirit? Have I not yet reached the equality of my good and bad qualities? And consequently will my good *Karma* and bad *Karma* be bold to countermand your Supreme Will?

O Benefactor, let me know the real secret of it.

நில்லாததேக்மெனு நீனேவண்டுதேகநீலே
நின்றீடவுமெளனியாகி
நேரேயுபாடமொன் றருளினையேவிதனை
நின்றனுட்டிக்கவென்றற்
கல்லாதமனமோ வெடுத்தியுபாதிபெறக்
காணிலியாகையாலே
கையேற்றணும்புகிப் பொல்வாதனாருமுன்
காட்சியிலிருந்துகொண்டு
வல்லாளராயியம தியாதினேற்கொண்ட
மாதவர்க்கேவல்செய்து
மனதின்படிக்சலாஞ்சித்திபெறலாஞானம்
வாய்க்குமொருமனுவெனக்கிலு
நில்லாமையொன்றினையு மில்லாமையாகவே
மிப்போதிரங்குகண்டா
யிகபரமிண்டினிலு முயிரினுக்குயிராகி
யெங்குநிறைன்றபொருளே. (கூசு)

96. O Thou All-filling intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions!

I know, indeed, the fleeting character of my physical body Thou as *mauni* didst reveal to me the artifice of preserving it in tact for ever. And should I think of practising this artifice, I could not befit myself to it by controlling my mind which tends always to concern itself in the *prapancha*.* I should no more, therefore, addict myself to the mundane habit of food-taking. But I must endeavour to place myself at the service of Thy austere devotees, who, resting themselves in Thy Holy Presence, keep self-controlled always in the Siva-Raja-Yoga of eight parts, † *yama, niyama* &c. And I will, then, be able to merit myself with the desired *siddhis* ‡ and the Supreme Sivagnana.§

Hence, O The Supreme, do Thou at once grant me the only thing I am in need of:—*Thy unbounded Grace of Blessedness.*

மலரியுத்தமிலை வனநெற்கொறித்தமுதிர்
ணைசருகுவாயில்வத்தால்
வன்பசுதவிர்த்தமனங் வெயிலாதிமனையால்
வருந்தியுமூலவலவேச்
சிமலவெழுப்பிய நீரினைழுழ்கியச்
சேசுமதல்லவெனறு
சிற்சுதவபேசுகூயிர் நின்னன்பர்யோகஞ்
செலுத்தினரியாம்பாவியேம்
விரவுமறுசுவையினேனேவேண்டுவபுசித்தரையி
ல் வேண்டுவெலாமுதித்தி
மேடைமாளிகையாதி வீட்டினிடைவசியே
வேறொருவருத்தமின்றி
யிரவுபகலேழையர்சன் சையோகமாயினே
மெப்படியிழைப்பதரையா
யிகபரமிண்டினிலு முயிரினுக்குயிராகி
யெங்குநிறைன்றபொருளே. (கூவ)

97. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions!

Thy devotees in the forest who bathe themselves in water and sit in Thy blessed contemplation, arousing upwards their innermost fire, would use barks of trees for their coverings and get their pain of hunger allayed by nibbling the wild-grown rice or with whatever dry leaves they might come across, and also undergo severe hardships through inclemency of weather such as heat and rain.

But, alas! we, the helpless, out of ignorance, *simply* yield ourselves to the pleasures of the best nourishment of six tastes * and of fanciful dresses and clothing and of the *sex*, enriching ourselves with storied *palatia* where day and night are seldom felt and *poverty* does make no appearance.

O God, how can we, except by Thy worship, get over these *incidental* luxuries † of this life?

R. SHANMUGA MUDALIAR.

(*To be continued*).

---

* Prapancha = world.

† Vide 'Ashtanga yoga' under 61st verse.

‡ i. e., powers.

§ c. f. 36th verse *supra*.

* The 6 tastes are:—(1) கசப்பு or கசப்பு (bitterness), (2) இனிப்பு (sweetness), (3) புளிப்பு (sourness), (4) உவர்ப்பு (Saltishness), (5) துவர் (astringency), and (6) காரப்பு (pungency). These six tastes when combined in a fixed proportion produce best deliciousness for man.

† *Incidental luxuries of this life.* The Saint points to the fallacy of misunderstanding the truth 'அணுவன்றி சோராணு மசையாது' (Not an atom moveth but by Him) to the effect that even our evil acts are ascribable to the Perfectest Lord. According to the Saiva Siddhanta School, each soul has its own consciousness and a moral responsibility, and it cannot shift itself from such responsibility by blindly attributing every one of its acts (including the diabolical murder) to God and escaping under the above saying 'not an atom moveth but by Him' misconstrued as above. Just as, in pursuing the Siva Rajah Yoga, though the eight siddhis or powers incidentally arise, still the Yogi is warned and enjoined not to indulge himself in them and lead himself astray from the Highest Goal to be aimed at; so also in the course of incarnation or evolution of souls, which is indispensable for their attainment of *mukti* the evils thereof due to *this pasa* world (*maya prapancha*) are incidental and must not be permitted by them to over-come their moral faculty and retard their acquirement of the Divine Gnana. For, otherwise, your life will end in the miseries of a boatman, who, instead of rowing it, out of sportive mischief, bores the bottom of it, c. f. 89th verse *supra*.

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, JUNE 1898.

VOWELS AND CONSONANTS.

[MIND AND BODY.]

"Of letters, the letter A, I am." Gita.

"There is an alliance with matter, with the object or extended world; but the thing allied, the mind proper, has itself no extension and cannot be joined in local union. Now, we have a difficulty in providing *any form of language, familiar analogy*, suited to this unique conjunction; in comparison with all ordinary unions, it is a *paradox* or *contradiction*."—Bain.

The quotation we give above is from Dr. Bain's remarkable book 'Mind and Body,' and the several chapters comprising the book are worth close study even though we are not bound to accept the learned Doctor's conclusions and share in his hope that the philosophy of the future will be a sort of qualified materialism. The important thing is to get at his facts, as far as they can be arrived at by close observation and experiment and such inference as are warranted by strict logic, which have been most thoroughly sifted and about which therefore there can be no doubt. We will enquire therefore what are the proved facts concerning the nature of mind and body and their characteristics and the nature of their connection so far as they can be ascertained. Now as regards mind, it is analysed into Feelings (including emotions), Will and Intellect. "These are a trinity in unity; they are characteristic in their several manifestations, yet so dependent among themselves that no one could subsist alone; neither Will nor Intellect could be present in the absence of Feeling; and Feeling manifested in its completeness carries with it the germs of the two others." The ultimate analysis of a Feeling being either a pleasure or a pain, it is seen, however, that volition or thought could not in any sense be confounded with Feeling. What Dr. Bain however means in the above quotation is that without the acquisition of feelings, no volition or thought could arise first, that feelings are primarily all derived through the sensory organs and centres. And a pleasure is seen to be connected with an activity which tends to promote life (உயிர்க்குதவுஞ் செய்கை) and a pain, to destroy life (உயிர்க்குதவாதசெய்கை) which determine also in ethics, the nature of right (good) and wrong, *Papam* and *Punyam*. This principle is stated as the law of self-conservation. But there is a limit to all pleasures; and even a pleasure may become painful, if only carried to excess. Another law exhibited in feelings, which applies also to thought is what is called the law of relativity, namely that "change of impression is necessary to our being conscious." Either a feeling or a thought only too long prolonged becomes feeble and feeble till it is blotted out altogether and we are no more conscious of such feeling or thought; and to become conscious again we soon change this train, and then revert. The Tamil philosophers state this principle in the axiom 'கினைப்புண்டேல், முறப்புண்டாம்,' 'If there is thought there is forgetfulness also.' Dr. Bain almost confesses that both on the mental and physical side, the reason for this exhibition of this law is not very explicable. But Hindu philosophers take this fact as showing that man's intelligence (அறிவு) is weak (சிற்றறிவு) and it can become stronger and stronger and become all thought by practice (Sadana). In Yogic practice, what comes first is more darkness, oblivion than light but continuing in the same path, there dawns true light in the last resort, and the nature of the light is so often mistaken in the interval so many shades of it breaking out.) And our volition (இச்சை-Ichcha) determines our actions as impelled by Feeling or Intellect. Intellect is analysed into a sense of difference and sense of similarity and Retentiveness or Memory. What are called variously as memory, reason, judgment, imagination, conception and others are all resolvable into these three kinds. And difference lies at the very basis of our intellect. No knowledge and no intellectual operation is possible, if there is no difference in the constituent elements, if there is a mere sameness. If there was only one colour, the art of painting will be an impossibility; if there was only one sound or tune, music we could never hear. As it is, the law of relativity governs our very being. Sameness could give knowledge, only if there was difference and hence the sense of similarity is also accounted an intellectual function; and a great function it performs in the field of invention. And no high degree of intellectual

power is possible if we do not possess the power of remembering our past experiences and impressions. And one peculiarity of the human mind, may we call it a defect, may be also noted here, as based on the law of relativity already stated. The mind is not conscious of all the impressions through all the sense organs all at once. A man does not become conscious of a sight, a touch, a sound, or a smell all at once. There must be a transition from one to the other however momentary it might be. And the case of an *Ashtavadani* is no exception to this. Assisted by a good memory, the more *avadanam* he performs the more time does he take. It will be noted that in this analysis of mind, no distinction is drawn between a feeling and a consciousness of a feeling, a volition and a consciousness of a volition, a reasoning and the consciousness of reasoning. Both are taken to be identical and therefore needing no distinction. In Hindu philosophy, they are distinguished, and a mere feeling or willing or thinking is separated from consciousness of such functions, and the pure consciousness is taken as the soul or Sat, and the rest classed with body and the world as non-soul or Asat (other than Sat). And we will speak of this distinction more further on. From these mental functions however are contrasted the body and its functions and the so-called external world. This collectively called matter or the non-ego or the object possess certain characteristics and properties which are not found in mind at all, such as breadth and length (order in place, extension hardness and softness (inertia), weight (gravity) colour, heat, light, electricity, organised properties chemical properties &c., &c., and the most important of this is *extension* Matter is *extended*, Mind is *unextended*. Says Dr. Bain,

"We are in this fix—mental states and bodily states are utterly contrasted; they cannot be compared, they have nothing in common except the most general of all attributes—degree, order in time; when engaged with one we must be oblivious of all that distinguishes the other. When I am studying a brain and nerve communications, I am engrossed with properties exclusively belonging to the object or material world, I am unable at that moment (except by very rapid transitions or alternations) to conceive a truly mental consciousness. Our mental experience, our feelings and thought have *no extension*. No place, no form or outline, no mechanical division of parts; and we are incapable of attending to anything mental until we shut off the view of all that. Walking in the country in spring, our mind is occupied with the foliage, the bloom, and the grassy meads—all purely objective things. We are suddenly and strongly arrested by the odour of the May-blossom; we give way for a moment to the sensation of sweetness; for that moment the objective regards cease; we think of nothing extended; we are in a state where extension has no footing; there is to us place no longer. Such states are of short duration, morcels, glimpses; they are constantly shifted and alternated with object states, and while they last and have their full power, we are in a different world; the material world is blotted out, eclipsed, for the instant unthinkable. These subject-movements are studied to advantage in bursts of intense pleasure or intense pain, in fit of engrossed reflection, especially reflection on mental facts; but they are seldom sustained in purity, beyond a very short interval; we are constantly returning to the object side of things—to the world whose basis is extension and place."

However widely these may differ, there is this remarkable fact about them that they are found united together in a sentient being—man or animal. And the exact correlation, correspondence or concomitance in these two sets of phenomena is what Dr. Bain takes very great trouble to show in several chapters. This we need not deny as Dr. Bain fully admits that this conjunction and correspondence do not warrant us in stating that mind causes body or body causes mind; but his position is that mind-body causes mind-body. There is a duality in the very final resort and ultimate analysis but a disembodied mind cannot be thought of and he uses various expressions such as, an 'undivided twin' a 'double faced unity,' 'one substance with two sets of properties.' &c. And we don't see why Dr. Bain should ally himself with materialists if he is not going to call this *one substance* not as matter altogether but as only matter-mind or mind-matter; unless it be that he is unable to prove himself the existence of mind except in conjunction with an organised body. This latter circumstance again causes no difficulty to the Siddhanti who postulates 'முத்தியிலும் மும்முதலுண்டு,' 'Even in Mukti, none of the three *padarthas* are destroyed,' and who no more believes in a disembodied mind than Dr. Bain, unless a body or an organism be taken to be the body composed of all the 25 lower tatwas. From the table given in No. 10 of the first volume of this magazine, it will be seen that even the most spiritual beings have a body composed of Asudda or Sudda Maya and we have also remarked, cautioning against the common mistake of calling matter dead, that these higher aspects of matter are so potent and active as to be often mistaken for God Himself. Passing from this point however, we now come to the question as to the nature of the union between this mind and body. And when we talk of union, the suggestion that it is *union in place* that is most predominant. And Dr. Bain lays great stress on the fact that such a local conjunction is not to be thought of, is impossible. There can be no union in place between an unextended thing (as

Chit) and an extended thing (as Achit) ; and all such expressions external and internal, container and contained are also misleading and mischievous. The connection is not a causal connection. It is wrong to call such conjunction as one acting on the other, or as one using the other as an instrument. (The theory of occasional causes and of pre-established harmony are also antiquated now. The phenomenon is a most unique one in nature; there is no single similar conjunction in nature, so that we may compare it by analogy and there is no fitting language to express such conjunction either. The only adequate expression to denote a transition from an object cognition to a subject one is a *change of state*. Language fails, analogy fails, to explain this union though in itself a fact; and it remains a mystery in a sense, though to seek an explanation for an ultimate fact can in no sense be logical; and all that we can do has been done when we have tried to generalize the various sets of phenomena into the fewest possible number and if we cannot pass to a higher generalization than two, we can only rest and be thankful.

We are sure that this is a perfectly safe position to hold and our object in penning this article is in no way to differ from this view; only we fancy, we have an *analogy* in Tamil, which will exactly answer the point and make the union more intelligible, besides bringing out the nature of mind and matter, in a much more favourable light, than from the stand point of a mere materialist, qualified or otherwise ; and we fancy we have been almost every day using language to describe this union, though the name in itself is a *puzzle*, and embodies both a *paradox* and a *contradiction*. Before we state them however we will state one or two facts so far as they bear upon the relation of mind and matter, and which Dr. Bain states more fully in his *Mental Science*. It is that all objectivity implies the subject-mind at the same time. "All objective states are in a sense also mental." Unless the mind is present, though unconscious, you cannot have object knowledge at all. We cannot have a pure objective condition at all without the subject, supporting it as it were, though for the time being, it is non-apparent, is entirely blotted out. (*Sunyam*) Or rather shall we say, though dissimilar the mind has become thoroughly identified with matter. But mind can ascend to pure subjectivity and it does not imply the presence of objects, as the object does the subject; and in such a pure subjective state, where is the object? It has become also non-apparent (*Sunyam*). Regarding the possibility however of matter being the primary element, there is the fact. matter is found both as organic and inorganic, and what a world of difference is there between these conditions of matter? Is the peculiar organization given to it by the presence for the time being of mind in it or is it derived solely by its inherent power. We have admitted that the so-called dead matter might possess potentialities without number. Still is there any sort of similarity between the inorganic properties exhibited by matter and the organic or vital properties. However this be, we will now proceed to state our analogy. It is the analogy of vowels and consonants. We have quoted the Gita verse, but we look in vain even in Sankara's commentary for the meaning we have tried to give it. Possibly Sankara would not give such an explanation as it would conflict with his preconceived theory. So if there was truth in it, it remained locked and the key altogether remained with the Siddhanta writers. The most familiar example of the analogy occurs in the sacred Kural, in the very first verse of it.

"அகரமுதலவெழுத்தெல்லா மாதி
பகவன் முதற்றுயுலகு."

"As 'A' is the first of all letters,
So the ancient Bagavan is the first in this world."

We might fancy an alphabet, in which the letter "A" is not the first, and if the point of comparison is merely to denote God's order in place as the first, so many other analogies might be thought of. And Parimelalagar accordingly notes that the order is not order in place but order in its origin. It is the most primary and first sound that the human voice can utter, and it is also the one sound which is present in every other sound vowel or consonant. All other vowels are formed by modifications of this sound. And what are vowels and consonants pray? A vowel is defined as a sound that can be pronounced of itself, without the aid of any other sound. And a consonant is one which cannot be sounded except with the aid of the vowel. Let us look more carefully into the nature of these sounds. We every day utter these sounds, and yet we fail to recognize the mystery in their connection, solely on account of their familiarity. We try to utter 'A.' It comes pure and simple, by the mere opening of the mouth, without any modification whatever, and requires no other aid. But let us pronounce say 'K.' It is 'Kè' in English,

in Tamil it is 'Ka' or 'Ik.' There is a vowel sound present in it, 'ஃ' or 'a' 'i.' Let us eliminate this vowel sound and try to pronounce the consonant. Well, the task is impossible, you don't get any consonant sound at all. In the consonant therefore there is always a vowel sound present, though we never consciously recognize its presence, though in Tamil, the symbolism is so highly philosophical that we invariably mark its presence even when we write purely consonants. We dot all our consonants as 'க்,' 'ச்,' &c. and the dot or circle represents in Hindu symbolism the letter 'அ.' This dot or circle begins almost every one of the twelve vowels in the Tamil alphabet, and as to what the other curved and horizontal and perpendicular lines mean we will take another opportunity to explain. When we write 'க்' therefore, the framers of the alphabet meant to represent how the vowel sound underlies the consonant and supports it and gives it its very being and existence. Such a mark is unnecessary when we write the vowel-consonant 'ka' 'க' as we are fully aware of its presence. In the pure consonant therefore the vowel is implied and understood though for the time being its presence is not detected and it is completely identified with the consonant itself. We have been considering at learned length the nature of the union between mind and body but have we ever paused to consider the nature of the union of the vowel and consonant? Is there any such unique conjunction anywhere else in nature, where one subsists not, except in conjunction with the other. Except the inseparable conjunction, as above stated we see that the consonant (pure) is no more derived from the vowel than the vowel from the consonant. There is much wider contrast between these than between any two things in the world. The place of origin is distinct. 'A' is pronounced by the mere opening of the mouth. The tongue has to be brought in contact with the palate to pronounce 'k' and this same act cannot produce the vowel. So the vowel cannot be said to cause the consonant, nor the consonant the vowel. Nor can we call the consonant and the connection themselves as false and as a mere illusion or delusion. So neither the principle of Parinama nor Vivartana can apply to this connection. All that we can say of it is that they are so connected and inseparable and that no language can be possible, by vowels alone nor by consonants alone, and every consonant is at the same time a vowel-consonant, in which the vowel is apparent or non-apparent, and though we can conceive of the vowels standing alone, to think of consonants as existing by itself is an utter impossibility. Now apply all this to the case of mind and body. Mind is the vowel, and the body (matter) is the consonant. Mind and body are as widely contrasted as vowel and consonants are. One cannot be derived from the other by *Parinama* or *Vivartana*. Yet both are inseparably united and though the mind occupies an independent position, can be pure subject at times, the body cannot subsist unless it be in conjunction with mind. Mind is always implied in body; mind underlies it, supports it and sustains it, (if all this language derived from material cognition is permissible). When the mind is pure mind, the body is not, it is *asat* (*Sunyam*). When it is pure body, mind is present but non-apparent, it has become one with the body. The mind is there but it conceals its very self, its very identity and it is as good as absent. And except at rare intervals, our whole existence is passed in pure objectivity, without recognizing the presence of the true self, the mind. The whole truth of these two analogous, cases, the only two, are brought out in Tamil in the most beautiful manner by the same words being used to denote vowel and consonant as also mind and body. See what a light bursts when we name 'உயிர்,' 'மெய் (உடல்). The word 'உயிர்' mean both a vowel and mind (soul); and 'மெய்' both body and consonant. Dr. Bain observes that the sense of similarity is the sense of invention and true discovery. The greatest discoveries in science have been made by catching such resemblances at rare intervals. And when the very first Tamil man called his vowels and consonants 'உயிர்' 'மெய்' was he not a born philosopher and had he not comprehended the true nature of the union between mind and body and vowels and consonants. The simile recieves its best exposition for the first time in the hands of Saint Meikanda Deva, (*vide* Sivagnanabotham, II. 1. *b.* and notes pp. 12, 19 and 20), and his followers (*vide* Light of Grace pp. 7 and 8); and Saint Meikandan gives a name in the same verse for denoting this connection. This one word is *Adwaitha*. This word has been a real puzzle to many; and so many renderings of it has been given. The Tamil Philosopher, however, explains it as meaning "ஒன்றுகாமல், இரண்டாகாமல், ஒன்றுமில்லாமலும்," (neither one nor two nor neither), and which fully and beautifully brings out, therefore the meaning of Dr. Bain's words that the connection is both a *paradox* and a *contradiction*. Very few outside the circle of

Siddhanta school could be made is to comprehend the truth of this paradox, more so when their mind is prepossessed with the truth of their own views. But we have always used the analogy of vowels and consonants with very great effect, and it has tended to make the subject much clearer than many a more learned argument. We have confined ourself in this article to deal with the last two sets of phenomena in nature, mind and matter and we will reserve to a future article, the nature of the Higher powers, we postulate and their connection with the lower ones; and a further amplification of the subject, together with the history of the question in Indian systems of thought.

THE TAMIL FOUR HUNDRED LYRICS PURRA-NANNURU.

The Chieftain 'Strongbow.'

One of the seven celebrated generous chieftains of the old Tamil country was Val-vil-ori, or *Athan-ori* ('Strongbow'). His title expresses his special characteristic: he was a Nimrod, 'a mighty hunter.' His hill was *Kolli*, on the Malabar coast—a hill from which the Cera (or Malabar) kings take one of their titles. He was also celebrated for his lavish gifts of richly caparisoned elephants. Three songs are inscribed in his praise (152, 153, 204).

This chief is mentioned in the Pattu-pattu as having fought with another of seven liberal kings, Kari (of whom we shall hear by-and-bye). He is also named in 158, but simply the 'Lord of the gleaming hill of *Kolli*.'

His especial bard was *Oon-Paranar*, whose lyric we translate in a somewhat condensed form. It is doubtless a fair picture of the old Tamil highland chiefs before the Muhammadan invasions.

The Generous Archer (152.

What artisan thy arrows excellent
Fashioned with many a stroke, O thou, in chase
Victorious ever with thy mighty bow
Low lay they mighty elephants and slay
Tigers with wide cavernous jaws,
And spotted antelopes with branching horns
Before them falls the woodland bear's huge head.
The ghaun, neighbour of the lowly
They kill. Yet Ori hunts not for mere gain,
Destroyer mighty though he be; for he
Reigns the right wealthy Lord of *Kolli's* fruitful hill
Around whose base the mountain streamlets flow,—
Whose mighty breast chaplets of pearl adorn.
O minstrel maid, sing thou a triumph-song!
And ye, bear burthen with your tambourines.
Make ready lute and lyre, tabor and drum,
And every instrument of joyous melody!
Then will we pass from land to land and say,
There is no huntsman like to him; in war
No arm so strong as his to guard and rule—
The lord of *Kolli's* hill, *Ori's* proud height;
The brave one, loved and loving, rich in gifts!

Another bard, whose epithet was 'Owner of the elephant that chews the sugar-cane,' and who is otherwise unknown, has composed an interesting poem in his praise. (204.)

The Sea and the Streamlet.

'Tis shame to say to wealthy men, 'Give ye'
Sorer disgrace when these say, 'We give not':
To say, 'Take this my gift, is excellent;
To say, 'I take not,' is more excellent.
Who thirst for water will not stoop to drink
On the sea's marge where sparkling wavelets spread
Of water crystal clear. Though cows and sheep
Thick thronging make the banks one muddy mass.
And though the streamlet trickles scant and slow.
There's well-trod path to where sweet waters flow!
If thou give not, thy suppliants blame the time.
And inauspicious signs, but blame not thee;
For thou art liberal as the o'ercharging heaven.

This story gives a mere glimpse of the mighty Tamil archer. For twelve centuries it has existed in South India, and has been the source of many legends other literatures, and is mixed up with traditions of the Pandiyan kings of Madura, who, being supposed to be incarnations of Siva, had the bow and arrows as their special attributes. But all that is received and accredited tradition about *Ori* is contained in these lyrics.

Indian Institute, Oxford. G. U. Pope M.A., D.D.

EVIDENCES OF NATURAL RELIGION.

THE DIVINE PERFECTIONS.

(*Continued from page 259, Vol. I.*)

In the south of Italy, on the shore of the bay of Naples, casting its dim shadow into the azure waves of that enchanted gulf, stands a city about two thousand five hundred years old. It is the historical town of Pompei, only of late years taken out of the grave into which its dangerous neighbour Mount Vesuvius had buried it under a deluge of burning ashes. It is still now a deserted town, silent are its streets, lonely its basilicas, solitary its theatres, empty its houses, void of clients its forum, even many of its tombs are empty of the mortal remains therein of old interred. Travellers only from all quarters of the world, walk across the silent streets and take their luncheon under the broken arches of the stately temples, of the half-ruined basilicas. But: however deserted, solitary and devoid of inhabitants Pompei may be, you cannot mistake its nature, its origin, its end. It was a town, built for human accomodation, and as such you are sure it did not spring up of itself, but it was the slow work of art and time. Accordingly you inquire about the architects that raised those lofty buildings, the painters that covered with frescos those main walls, the sculptors that enriched those halls and gardens with statues so delicately wrought, the masons, the artificers, whose hands were, so to say, the living origin of the ill fated town. From the mere inspection of its mighty ruins you rightly argue that a host of different artificers took part in its building and from their works you qualify the artists, from their works you appreciate their respective style, and give sentence upon their relative worth.

The Universe the great building of God.

Now, this Universe is the house, the palace, the great building of God. No very careful inspection of it is needed to see that its builder, its architect, its Maker must be intelligent, Wise, All-Powerful, Just, Good, Immense, Eternal, Infinite, One. Every created thing asserts with unrivalled eloquence that God the Creator is endowed with all these attributes.

In our last lecture we saw at some length that God our Creator, our Maker is endowed with the attribute of Personality, that He is an Intelligent and Personal God. But we must not stop there. We must go further. We must search more deeply into the attributes of the God-head. Almighty God, it is said, abides in inaccesible light which man's eyes cannot bear, whereto man cannot come up; but we shall ask for divine help, we shall humbly pray to Him to reveal Himself to us, we shall beseech Him to the effect, that we may be admitted to some knowledge of Him, to some friendly intercourse with our Father, our Creator, our God. "The works and the designs of the omnipotent Creator," says Admiral William Henry Smith, "are inscrutable to the most brilliant human intellect, yet enough is revealed, both with regard to the wondrous universe and our own mental capacity, to convince the reflecting mind that it is a mark of devotion which we owe to our Maker to study with earnestness those beautiful and harmonious works around us, however their immensity may at first bewilder us. He who zealously applies himself will verify the sacred promise. "Those who seek shall find."

Let us therefore apply ourselves to seek with earnestness what God is, in the hope that we shall attain to some knowledge of his divine nature.

God's nature or Essence.

God's nature or essence may be briefly described as follows There is one self-existent living and true God, Creator of heaven and earth. Omnipotent, eternal, immense, incomprehensible, infinite in intellect in will and in all perfection, who being One, separate, absolutely simple and unchangeable spiritual substance or person, is to be regarded as distinct really and in essence from the world, most blessed in and from Himself and unspeakably elevated above all things that exist, or can be conceived except Himself! (Denz. 1631. The Decree of the Vatican Council of 1870).

To proceed with some order we shall begin by showing that God is the only self-existent or necessary Being, as this attribute is so to say the fruitful source whence the rest necessarily flow, and embraces in its comprehensiveness the nature or essence of God.

God self-existent

In the probable year of the world 2513, and 1491 years before Christ, God appeared to to Moses the great prophet of the Jewish people, and commanded him to go forth and deliver the children of Israel out of the hands of the Egyptians who held them under the most degrading and tyrannous bondage. Moses accepted the perilous mission, but he asked of God one thing only Moses knew too well, that, the divine Being he was speaking to, was the God of his fathers, the God of Abraham of Issac, of Jacob, but he wanted to know something more about his nature, about his characteristic attributes, and accordingly he ventured to ask of God His name. And Moses said to God:

Lo! I shall go to the children of Israel, and say to them The God of your fathers hath sent me to you. If they should say to me "What is His name? What shall I say to them?" Now let us hear the divine answer! God said to Moses: "I am who am God said: Thus

thou shalt say to the children of Israel: He who is, hath sent me to you": Exodus. ch. III, 13. 14—God therefore is He who is, that is, He is that only person to whom existence is nature, who owes his own existence to none. who is uncreated, unborn, eternal, self-existent, independent, infinite, without beginning, end or change, the first Being, the only necessary Being, the primary cause and the source of all other things. Good heavens! how this idea of God's nature raises him in our eyes above every conceivable thing! Before we were born, before the forefathers of the Hindus crossed the sapta-sindu, before the creation of man, before the combining of earthly elements, before the shaping and moulding of the primeval chaos, before the time when heaven and earth sprang into existence out of nothing at God's command, God existed, most blessed in Himself and from Himself, eternal, infinite, unchangeable and such as he even exists in this moment of time. Why so? Because God owes his existence to none: but He is the only self-existent, the only necessary Being; that is, so He exists that he cannot but exist, as he possesses in Himself the necessity of his existence. Who can grasp adequatly this infinitely comprehensive idea? Who can fathom this abyss? If we look around us, we find no creature in the Universe but finite. but contingent, namely which so exists as not exclude the possibility of not existing. and which actually once did not exist. Self existense is the absolute characteristic of the First Cause. God exists really. and creatures also exist really; God is, and the creature also is. Yet the divine Being and the created being differ infinitely from one another, in that the former is independent, the latter dependent; the former uncaused, and the latter caused the former has all things of itself and the latter has absolutely nothing of itself, but is itself an effect produced out of nothing according to a preconceived idea derived from the Divine essence. This infinite difference is indicated by saying that, God not only is, but is of Himself in virtue of his own essence; in a word; He is self-existent. (1) c. f. B. Boedder. S. Y Natural Theology page 331.

Indeed, everything that can be and not be, that is, which so exists as not to exclude the possibility of not existing. is contingent, namely it does not exist of absolute necessity, but has a cause of its existence and depends for its existence on a cause outside itself, because whatever does not exist of absolute necessity and in virtue of its own essence, is, in itself, indifferent to being or not being, and is in consequence indebted for its actual existence to a cause or agent outside itself. But in this case the agent or efficient cause to which it owes its existence is prior to itself, as the efficient cause is always, some way or other, prior to its effect. Thus a house for instance, is of itself indifferent either to being or not being. namely it exists so as not to exclude the possibility of not existing, and as it was reared on its ground, it might also not have been reared, and consequently, its existence is limited, finite, caused or contingent

But if it be so, the efficient cause of the house or the architect must be prior to the house itself, as the first condition of a cause is its priority in regard to the effect.

G. BARTOLI, S. J., D. D.

(To be continued.)

KAMBAN.

(Continued from page 262, Vol. I.)

Pugazhendi was fully aware of the first rate intellectual powers of Kamban and respected him as his superior. Pugazhendi was like Cowper and Goldsmith a homely poet. Kamban was Miltonic in diction and delineation and was Shakespearian in thought. He would have been a Homer if he had lived in earlier days Otta was only a star of the first magnitude before the other two luminaries. He was in fact a Southey with vast labour and erudition but little endowed with poetic genius of a very high order. He was, however, not a scholar and poet of a very ordinary type. But the brilliancy and grandeur of the others hid his diminished head. The genius of these poets moved in special grooves. *Venba* was the favorite metre of புகழேந்தி. Otta was dexterous in composing கலம், உலா and அந்தாதி. Kamban soared while chanting in விருத்தம்.

The probable Literature available to and availed of by Kamban:—Before proceeding to analyse the genius of Kamban let us take a rough glance of the literature that was available to him, and see what part of that literature shaped his genius and how far he was indebted to his predecessors. We have already seen that he lived in the 11 century. It is plain, therefore, that all literature then extant was before him The பத்துப்பாட்டு, எட்டுத்தொகை and பதினெண் கீழ்க்கணக்கு பாரதவெண்பா and தக்கயாகப்பரணி and முத்தொள்ளாயிரம் and other works and commentaries of the last Madura College were available. He might have read all or at least some of the Major Five Epics and the Minor Five Epics. The தேவாரம் of சம்பந்தர், அப்பர் and சுந்தரர், and the திருவாசகம் and திருச்சாழல் of மாணிக்கவாசகர், the பெரியபுராணம் of அருண்மொழித் தேவர், and the ஸ்கந்த புராணம் of கச்சியப்பசிவாசாரியார் and other important works of the Saivas were ready to his hand. திரு

மல்லைமுதூர் being the contemnorary of சம்பந்தர், and being also the last of the twelve ஆழ்வார், the whole of சாலையப்பிரபந்தம் he could have perused. There was the great grammar தொல்காப்பியம் with its commentaries of இளம்பூரணர், பேராசிரியர் and கல்லாடர். We are not sure whether சேனாவரையம் had its birth as yet. There was இறையனாரகப்பொருள் and நக்கீரர்'s commentary thereon. There was also the வீரசோழியம் of Buthamithiranar, and யாப்பருங்கலம் and காரிகை with their commentaries. We are not in a position to affirm who the commentator of திருக்கோவையார் is and so we cannot state whether the commentary on it was in the time of Kamban. The commentators of சாலையப்பிரபந்தம் were all in and after the time of Ramanuja, whom we have already seen coming after Kamban. From a reference to ஆளவந்தபிள்ளையாசிரியர் (*i. e.*, ஆளவந்தார் or யமுனைத் துறைவர்) in the commentary of மலைபடுகடாம், it is apparent that நச்சினார்க்கினியர் lived after ஆளவந்தார் *i. e.* in the 13th century. Hence it follows that நச்சினார்க்கினியர் lived at least about two centuries after Kamban and that, therefore, the commentaries of நச்சினார்க்கினியர் and பரிமேலழகர் (contemporary of நச்சினார்க்கினியர்) were not seen by Kamban. The commentator of சிலப்பதிகாரம், *viz.*, அடியார்க்குநல்லார் evidently criticizes நச்சினார்க்கினியர் about the antiquity of காப்பியம் in Tamil in the opening lines of his commentary, and therefore should have lived after நச்சினார்க்கினியர். There difficulty about நச்சினார்க்கினியர். Scholars believe that he should have lived prior to Kamban and Kachiyappa, as he has not in his voluminous commentaries made any reference whatever to these very famous authors, and has not made any quotation from their works in illustration of any grammatical or literary point. Mr. C. W. Damodaram Pillai believes (page 22 preface to கனித்தமிழ்) that Nachinarkiniyar lived about 1,200 years ago as he belonged to the times of the Shamanals. We are of opinion that Nachinarkiniyar from the tone of his commentaries seems to have had reverence only for the works of the Madura College and those of some authors immediately following such Manickavasagar; and that object was to commentate upon works which were being neglected on account of their difficulty and to adopt them to the rules of the only comprehensive grammar தொல்காப்பியம். His object in commentating upon தொல்காப்பியம் too might have been to further the utility of the work and to throw light upon the many inexplicable passages of the works of the Madura College. So cared not to quote from the authors Kamban and he others who were his immediate predecessors. From such evidence before us we are led to think that Kamban read barely the text of his favorite Kural or some one or more of the other eight commentaries on Kural which was or were available to him. We have thus roughly noted what works might have been and what might not have been available to Kamban.

But to state exactly the works he might have perused with interest and the works which shaped his genius is not an ordinary affair. This requires a very careful study of the whole Ramayan and various other works of its kind which existed before Kamban, and a very careful collateral comparison of the thoughts and language of the different poets with Kamban. This is not a task which can be performed in a few days or weeks or months, only years of patient study will settle this most knotty question. We confess we have not devoted any part of the limited time at our disposal in studying this most difficult and yet interesting question. We have been able to gather some points during our leisure moments, and these we will specify here. Tradition says that when the Tamil Ramayan was subject to the approval of the learned assembly, some of the hearers asked the author how he was able to bring in so many fine thoughts in his work, and that the author said "I took a ladle from each of the epics சிந்தாமணி, சிலப்பதிகாரம், மணிமேகலை &c. &c. The following stanza is attributed to அம்பிகாபதி the son of Kamban.

காதன் மடந்தையர் வையறுங்காலையு மெய்யகலா
தோதகுநாண் மெலியவன்றே ழ்ழிபோலு நெய்தற்
பூவிழிவெண்மலர்ப் புன்னையங்கானல் பொருந்து
மிந்த
மாதவிபெற்றமணிமேகலை கம்பமாழ்விட்டதே.

Ambiganathy was sentenced to death while Kamban was yet alive. The above stanza is in praise of மணிமேகலை. There is no doubt that the father also was familiar with the work whose praise was sung by the son. His contemporary Pugazhendi is said to have made a popular metrical paraphrase (to be read to or by females) of சிலப்பதிகாரம் under the name of சோலைவண்பதை, of course varying the plot as best suited his age and hearers and readers. If this paraphrase which is to hand now is really from Pugazhendi there is no doubt that சிலப்பதிகாரம் was a popular work in the time of Kamban. From a

perusal ot குரைமணி we find that Kambar had either no acquaintance with it or did not borrow anything from it. From this we conjecture he had not much to do with its sister minor epics

The 15th stanza of காட்டுப்படலம் of பெரியபுராணம.

" கரும்பல்ல செல்லென்கை கழுகல்ல கரும்பெண்ணைச்
சரும்பல்ல குடைநீலத் தகளல்ல பகலெல்லாம்
அரும்பல்ல முகிலென்ன அழுதல்ல மொழியென்ன

seems to have suggested the 47th stanza of காட்டுப்படலம் of Ramayan

" நெல்மலி யல்லன கிளைவரு நரளம்
சொன்மலி யல்லன தொகுகட லழுதம்
கண்மலி யல்லன கதிதரு கிதியம்
பொன்மலி யல்லன மணிபடு புளினம்

and again the 17th stanza of the former "காடெல்லாம் கழைக்கரும்பு...தலமெல்லாம்" might have given rise to the 2nd stanza of காட்டுப்படலம் of Ramayan

"வரம்பெலா முத்தந்தத்து முடையெலாம் &c.," The style of பெரியபுராணம் is like the smooth flow of a gentle river while such is not the case with the Ramayan.

The 17th stanza of ஆற்றுப்படலம் of the Ramayan.

" முல்லையை...செல்லுறு கதியிற் செல்லும்
வினையெனச் சென்ற தன்றே

reminds us of 31st stanza of ஆற்றுப்படலம் of ஸ்காந்தம்–

பாலிடை...அந்தத் தாருயி ரிணைத்துச்
சந்த மருவிணக் கமைந்த நீராற்
சேருறு கதிக ளென்ன &c.,

The 6th stanza of ஆற்றுப்படலம் of Ramayan.

" தலையு மாகமும் தாளுந் தழீஇயதன்
கிலை நிலாநிறை நின்றது போலவே.
விலையின் மாதரை வோத்ததவ் வெள்ளமே.

seems to be an improvement on the 32nd stanza of ஆற்றுப்படலம் of ஸ்காந்தம்.

" கால்களர் இன்றநீத்தம்...யால்களர்
கணிகை மாதர் மனமெனப் போயிற்றமால்.

The last two lines of the 6th stanza of திருநகரப்படலம் ஸ்காந்தம்

இப்படி...அப்படியே யதனுக்கிணை
யன்றிச் செப்பரிதாற்பிரீர் கேழகாஞ்சி

might have been adopted in 3rd stanza of நகரப்படலம் of Ramayan.

"உமைக்கொரு...இது வலாதினுக்
கெம்பலா முலகெம்மற் றியாதோ"

The 7th of அரசிலல் in Ramayan.

நேமி மால்வரை மலையாக &c. "recalls to mind நிறையும் வார்கடல் சுற்றிய நேமியும் &c." 14-திருநகரம்-Scandam. A careful examination of Scanda convinces us that Kamban had a thorough familiarity with the work though he has not borrowed either the diction or sentiments of Kachiyappa. Though these two poets come near eachother in many respects, there is no denying the fact that the language of Kachiyappa is more polished than that of Kamban. Kachiyappa does not seem to be beaten down by Kamban; on the other hand, he rather seems to have been an indirect tutor of the latter.

Let us now see whether Kamban has anything from Chintamani. In the 33rd stanza (Bower's Edition) the clouds poured down like rods of silver on the mountain. In the 4th stanza காட்டுப்படலம் of Ramayan, the clouds poured down as it were rods of silver in order to adorn the mountain top which was a bare sheet of gold. In the 51st stanza Chintamani has

கண்ணென குவளையுங் கடல் சோம்பினர்
வண்ணவான் முகமென மலரி னுள்புகார்.

The same thought is better handled in the 10th of the same padalam of Ramayan

பண்களவாய் மிழற்றுமின்சொற் கடைசியர் பரந்தீண்ட
கண்களால் முகம்வாய்ஒக்குங் கனையலாற் கனிபிலாமை
உண்களவார் கடைவாய்மள்ளர் கனிகளோ துலாவிநிற்பார்.

The last line of the 98th stanza of Chintamani

மட்டவர் தப்பலிற் பரவையேர் தல்குல்
அட்டொளி யரத்தலாய்க் கணிகை யல்லது
மட்டிடை மனமகள் மலர்ந்த போதினுல்
கட்டிடைக் காவலிற் காமர் கன்னியே.

is borrowed in the 14th நகரப்படலம் of Ramayan " அன்னமாட அகழி, பொன்விலைமகளிர் மனமெனக் கீழ்போய்ப் புன்கவியெனத் தெளிவின்றிச் கன்னியால் தூற்றடமென யாரிக்கும்படி வருங்காப்பினதாகி &c." The style of Chintamani is not so strong as the Ramayan but the genius of the First Tamil Epic poet in the Sanskrit mode is in no way inferior to that of Kamban "The Tamil Ramayan," says Caldwell, is undoubtebly a great poem, and in this department of composition the Chintamani alone can dispute with it for the palm of supremacy."

We will now see how much he owes to the Kural of திருவள்ளுவர்

1. " தங்கன் காயகரிற் றெய்வம் நலம் பிறவிலவென தெண்ணும்" (16 வேல்விபடலம்) is evidently the purport of " தெய்வத்தொழான் &c." (5, VI).

2. " வெளளியைபோத &c. இவ்வுலகியல்பை, கொள்ளுதல்தித் தொகுப்பதன்றுல" (29, வேல்வி) is parallel to " வல்லாளனினும் செல்வத்திற் சிறந்தவனில்லை மிக்கெனினும் பிற வேண்டா" (2, XXIII).

3 புக்குநின்று தன் &c. ஊற்முறையல்லது வலிய தொன்றில்லென வுணர்வுற்றான் (215 ஊர்தேடுபடலம்) is from ஊழிற்பெருவலியாவுள் &c" (:0 XXXVIII).

4. முகமிற் றெரிந்தாங்கு &c. என்பிற் றெரிதாயா தொருத்தமுண்டென்ன லாமோ, அன்பிற்றெரிதாவதொரு பூசனையார்களுண்டே (61, கடருவுபடலம் (the minds of us அன்புடையாரென்பு முரியர் பிறர்க்கு (2, VIII).

உதவாம லொருவன்செய்த உதவிக்குக் கைம்மாறுகதியாதினு யினியமைத்த மற்றமுண்டாகவற்றே &c (66, இட்டிக்கைப்படலம்) is no other than செய்யாமற் செய்த உதவிக்கு வையகமும் வானகமு மாற்றலரிது.

6. சிலதவகல் காதற்றுயை &c உதவிகொள் யார்க்கென்றேனு மொழிலாமுபாடமுண்டோ" (62, இட்டிக்கைப்படலம்) is undoubtedly from எக்கன்றிகொன்றார்க்கு முய்வுண்டாம்

7. ஊருணி நிறையவுமுகவு மாடுபேர்பார் கெழுபழமறம் பழுத்தற்றாகவும் (82 மந்திரப்படலம்) is an adpatation of ஊருணிநீர்நிறைந்தற்றே &c & பயன்மரமுள்ளார் பழுத்தற்றால் &c 5 & 6 XXII).

8. எவியெலிமிப்படை அரவம்யானென (10 குகப்படலம்) seems to be borrowed from ஒலித்தக்கா லிப்பதை நாகமுயிர்ப்பக்கெடும் (3 LXXVII).

9. "வன்றெறு .....ஒன்றரைத் துயிரினும் ஒழுக்கம் கன்றென &c" (24 இலங்கைகண்டு மீண்டுதல்) is an echo of ஒழுக்கம் விழுப்பந்தரலான் ஒழுக்கமுயிரினு மோம்பப்படும் (I XIV.)

10. "வேண்டின வேண்டினர்க்களிக்கு மெய்த்தவம்" (8 அகத்தியப்படலம்) is only வேண்டிய வேண்டியாங்கெய்த லெற்செய்தவமீண்டுமுயலப்படும் (5 XXVII).

11. "உயர்ந்தவர்க்குதவிய வுதவிபொப்பவே" (34 வேள்வி) is from "உதவி.....உதவிசெய்யப்பட்டார் சான்பின்வரைத்து" (5 XI.)

12. மானநோக்கிற் கவரிமாவினைய நீரார் is in other words மயிர்நீப்பின்வாழாக் கவரிமாவன்ன குயிர்நீப்பர் மானம் வரின் (9, XCVII).

The author who borrowed the sentiments and the language of திருவள்ளுவர் must be supposed to have drawn a good deal from the same author in his delineation of the ministers of Dasaratha, stanzas 6 to 10 மந்திரப்படலம். We have carefully read the ten chapters on ministers by திருவள்ளுவர். Kamban enumerates about a score of qualifications. In his fine stanzas of four lines each, *i. e*, in 20 lines he has said more than what திருவள்ளுவர் has said in his 100 couplets *i. e.*, 200 lines. And it should be borne in mind that திருவள்ளுவர் makes a regular code of the requirements of ministers while Kamban only describes the qualifications possessed by Dasaratha's ministers. The reader, however, seems to know a minister better from the description than from the code. Kamban has actually borrowed some sentiments here from திருவள்ளுவர் and yet he excels his master. Kamban's actual observation in the royal court has given him a better idea of a minister.

From the above examination, we find that the passages referred to are not so much borrowed (except in the case of Kural) as are bettered. They seem rather parallels than imitations. Even where he seems to borrow, the thought is couched in such improved garbage that his sentiment and language seem rather to be originals than plagiarisms. But there can be no doubt that he studied very carefully Skanda and Chintamani as far as we are able to judge. In the abundance and fertility of his genius his plagiarisms and borrowed sentiments seem like trinkets and trifles borrowed by a rich man from his neighbours for a grand feast or entertainment.

Tamil Poetry :—Before entering into an examination of the salient features of Kamban's Ramayan which is a standing monument of the greatness of the poet and his genius, it is indispensable to have an idea of the main characteristics of Tamil poetry. The great grammarian Tholkappyan only analyses the mechanism of poetry but does not make any definite statement of the nature of poetry, எழுத்து முதலா வீண்டிய வடியிற், குறித்த பொருண் முடியநாட்டல், யாப் பெனமொழிப யாப் பறிபுலவர். This is what may be taken as a definition of poetry from the great grammarian, Pavananthy, a grammarian of logical accuracy only defines and explains poetry by a comparison The human body is a mechanism of various elements accomodating life: so is poetry an embellished composition of words embodying (பொருள்) matter. In this comparison, Pavananthy at least seems to hint that unless there is life in it a poem rarely deserves the name. The goal of all knowledge, the Tamils say is salvation—the attainment of Heavenly bliss. This inconceivable and inexplicable bliss requires three necessary preliminaries, viz., duty (அறம்), wealth (பொருள்) and worldly enjoyment (இன்பம்). A discourse, therefore, on these three items, should be the object of literary works. This is the chief end in view especially of the epic.

T. CHELVAKESAVARAYA MUDALIAR, M A.

(To be continued).

REVIEWS.

THE VIVEKACHINTAMANI SERIES.

Life of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, Empress of India.*

We do not know if Englishmen fairly realize how vast a hold Her Most Gracious Majesty has acquired in the hearts of the Indian People. In one respect indeed they go much further than the British people in the veneration of their Beloved Empress. They are so prone to Heroworship, and so imaginative, that they think, in the words of His Holiness Sri Sankaracharia Swamigal of Sringeri, that "so many good qualities would not concentrate in one woman unless she be an incarnation of the Great Almighty." Her life of genuine sympathy and love, true modesty and purity, real nobility and greatness will always be beacon light for generations untold. And though there are two are there lives in Tamil already of Her Majesty, yet we welcome this new Life from our friend Mr. C. V Swaminathier's hands as it is in no way superfluous. The Life also contains an useful appendix describing the constitution of the Government of India and of the India Office, London. We have already spoken of the great work M.'. C. V. S. is doing and we earnestly hope that such work will duly be crowned with greater and greater success.

THE STORY OF THE LIFE OF BUDDHA.†

It was purely through historical circumstances and from the nature of the travestied Buddhist propaganda after the time of Buddha and from its pronounced antagonism to Hinduism that the prejudice has long lingered in the Tamil land against Buddha and it is time therefore that the Tamil people understand the true greatness of Lord Gautama Buddha and as such we give a hearty welcome to the volume before us. As we have elsewhere remarked, he was a Hindu of Hindus himself and the best and noblest of them. He preached a simple and pure life, shorn of all hypocrisy and deceit and ostentation, and such a life has always been the ideal of the devout Hindu. The mischief, however, is in its one-sidedness, and even those of to-day who wish to emulate him, would hardly keep themselves aloof from dogmatic Buddhism.

* C. V. Swaminathier. D. K. Agency, Madras, 1898. 293 p. Full cloth. Ornamental sides, gilt back, Price Rs. 1—4—0

† (Same Series, Price 14 annas).

THE VIVEKA MANJARI.*

We owe an apology for not noticing this miscellany earlier to the Secretary of the D. K. Agency. The volume is tastefully got up and we have already noticed the first two stories. The Life of Sivaji is new and it contains very many valuable lessons. The author does full justice to the greatness of this Indian Hero, though he, in no way, conceals his blemishes About his time was established the Mahratha Dynasty in South India, and their rule was always popular. As the heavens have willed it, a nobler and superior rule has been set up in the land and we have no cause to regret it. We know the Secretary was delaying the publication of the book owing to current events in the Western Presidency And it is only to be hoped that no sinister meanings be ascribed to books of this sort.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

OURSELVES.—With the aid of God's grace, we have been able to bring the past year to a successful termination. When we proposed the undertaking, more difficulties were suggested to us than encouragement, and now though we have had to contend with difficulties, we are glad to say we have got on. The success is due to a great extent by the generous support of the public, and to the kind help of several friends in South India and Ceylon. We take this opportunity of thanking our contributors, who amidst their own onerous duties and avocations, have been good enough to devote a portion of their time in the service of their country and their God.

***

We beg to thank the Rev. Dr. Pope, also for the very great interest he evinces in the cause of Tamil and the Tamil people and for the special interest he evinces in the cause of our Magazine. By the last Mail he kindly sent us several reprints of several of his contributions to the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, and which have already appeared in these pages. He has also sent us the History of Manikka Vachagar, the paper that was read before the Victoria Institute, with a very kind letter, which we take the liberty to publish.

* Containing the story of Colbert (1), Fairy tell-tale (2) and Life of Sivaji (3).

The Rev. Dr. Pope writes as follows:—

Indian Institute,
OXFORD,
28th May 1898.

It is some time since I wrote to you or heard from you, but we have neither of us I fancy been idle. We are both working for Tamil and the Tamil people. I have sent you a series of papers published in the *Asiatic Quarterly*. You can use these as you like, and if you can suggest any works that should be included in my sketch, I will try to include them.

I have also sent you the life of Mânika Vâchagar with notes. These notes contain the summary of reading carried on for about fifteen years. These notes may be of some use, but of course you know more of these things than I do.

I have also sent you a piece or two from the Pura-Pânûnûru. This very fine work I have finished, and translated all that seemed to me of any real value. I have also finished and sent to the Royal Asiatic Society a summary of the Purra-Porul-Venba. I have nearly finished the Pattu-pattu. I am still in want a good edition of Aingkuru-nuurru, and Pathittu-Pattu, Paripadal, and Aganaanuurru. If these are published I must have them.—I think I have got all else that I am ever likely to use. I think I prefer the old edition of the Siddhanta works to the new. I am beginning to get despairing about the publication of my edition of the Tiruvachakam. I have revised and re-revised, and annotated from a variety of sources these remarkable lyrics, and with lexicon, concordance, translation, notes &c, all is ready and type-written.

You were good enough to send me an edition, which I very much value, by unknown editors. It only says 'some learned men.' I find that my own rendering *in almost every case* coincides with theirs. In some cases I have been able to set myself right. In one or two *I think they are wrong.*' I would ask them carefully to reconsider the printing of the text which should be divided, I certainly think into metrical feet. And I am quite persuaded that *there are errors in the text*, which an attention to metre might set right. They are not certainly of any great importance. I note in குயிற்பத்து number 18, line 2, read

பாதம் [illegible] வி[illegible]வித்
பாலும் எழுத்துச் சுப்பால

By all means let us have a carefully edited text.

And it grieves us sorely to say that the Rev Doctor's call for help for the publication of our Beloved Tamil Upanishad should not have commanded a ready response. It is not a very great matter if only our South Indian Zemindars and Matadhipaties would think of doing their duty. If their devotion to Sri Manikka Vachakar and his sacred lyrics is not mere lip-deep, the publication would have been already an accomplished fact. We will once more appeal to their sense of patriotism to come forward and help the undertaking.

***

The Rev. Father Bartoli is another of our contributors, for whom we have to be very thankful. His lectures are very learned and suggestive, and liberal, and we are glad to say, we agree with him in the main. If his remarks about Idolatry had been somewhat distasteful to some of our readers, we have only to assure them that the Rev. Father does not mean any offence and his remarks are couched in the best of spirit. Here are his own words, "In future I promise you I shall altogether abstain from the obnoxious word Idolaters, which displeases your kind readers. However as I have told you in one of my letters (He signifies his agreement with us with regard to symbolism) I am fully convinced that educated Brahmins or Hindus generally cannot be called idolaters because they are not so. But what of the common people? Learned Brahmins testified to me that when the ignorant crowd venerate their idols, they really believe that the deity himself, or a particular God lives and resides in that block of stone or wood. At any rate let it be what it may. If this is not true, so much the better, and I thank God for it."

***

"Talking of devotion, he (Dr. Johnson) said, 'though it be true that 'God dwelleth not in temples made with hand,' yet in this state of being, our minds are more piously affected in places appropriated to divine worship, than in others. Some people have a particular room in their houses where they say their prayers; of which I do not disapprove, as it may animate their devotion."*Boswell*

Perhaps this latter custom has fallen into desuetude in England, in these days of extreme civilization, even among the minority, but the '*Puja room*' is a common feature in every Hindu household, even in Bungalows built up and furnished according to the latest fashion.

***

The 13th anniversary of the Trichinopoly Saiva Siddantha Sabha was celebrated on 19th and 20th of this month. The boys of the Sabha's Sunday School were awarded prizes on the first day. Pandit S. Saravana Pillai of Salem lectured to very select audiences on both days, on topics, in which he may truly claim to have received new light namely the "Relation of the Mathematical Sciences to Hindu Metaphysics." Srila Sri S. Somasundara Nayagar was unable to attend, owing to delicate health and his absence was very much regretted.

MADRAS:—Printed by P. C. KALLIANA SUNDARA NADAR, at the C. N. PRESS, and Published by J. M. NAGARATHNAM.

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897.

VOL. II. } MADRAS, JULY 1898. { No. 2.

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page* 6.)

Adhikaranas 9, 10.

Having mentioned that form of S'iva—the Para-Brahman possessed of omniscience and other attributes—which is to be worshipped as the source of supreme good, the sûtrakâra introduces the next section with a view to answer a possible objection that the given definition of Brahman is too wide inasmuch as the same names which are applied to Brahman are by usage applicable to other things as well.

Akasa (is Brahman), because of His characteristic marks. (I. i. 23). For the same reason, Prana (is Brahman). (I. i. 24).

The subject of discussion in this section is a passage in the Chhândogya-Upanishad, which reads as follows:

"All these beings, verily, take their rise from âkâs'a, and return into âkâs'a."*

"All these beings, verily, merge into Prâna alone, and from Prâna they arise."†

Here a doubt arises as to whether the terms "Prâna" and "âkâs'a"—which denote the cause from which all beings take their arise and in which they attain dissolution—point to Parames'vara, or to bhûtâkâs'a (âkâs'a as one of the rudimental elements) and to prâna (vital air).

The *prima facie* view may be stated as follows: it is prâna (vital air) and bhûta-âkâs'a that are treated of here, since they are spoken of as the cause of all beings in the following passages:

From prâna alone, verily, are these beings born, by prâna do these born creatures live; into prâna they go and enter."

"From âkâs'a is the air born" etc.‡

Against the foregoing view we hold as follows. It is Parames'vara who is referred to by the terms "prâna" and "âkâs'a, because of His characteristic

* Chhâ. Upanishad 1-9-11.
† Tait. Upanishad 3-3.
‡ Tait. Upanishad 2-1.

matters, such as His being the cause of all. Prâna (vital air) and the bhûta-âkâs'a cannot indeed be the cause of all. Now such passages as "From prâna alone, verily, are these beings born," only inculcate the proposition that Brahman, who is bliss in essence, is the cause. They do not teach that prâna etc., are the cause. On the other hand, they form mere anuvâda, *i. e.*, the s'ruti merely repeats what has been thought by another. A'kâs'a being one of the *bhûtas* or rudimental elements, it is included in the term all 'bhûtas'; and the rise of "all bhûtas" can be from Parames'vara alone, as the s'ruti says "From A'tman is âkâsa born."* Wherefore it should be concluded that the material âkâsa (bhûtâkâsa) and prâna are not the causes of all beings.

(*Question*) What is the use of the qualification "bhûta" (material) in "bhûtâkâs'a"?

(*Answer*) The epithet has a purpose to serve, inasmuch as there exists another âkâs'a *viz.*, the Paramâkâs'a or transcendental Light, the Parâ-Prakriti or the Great Cause, the cause of all bhûtas.

(*Question*) Then how to conclude that âkâs'a is Parames'vara?

(*Answer*) Because there is no distinction between the two, between Parames'vara and Paramâkâs'a.

Adhikaraṇa. II

In a former section it was shewn that the solar orb is the abode of Parabrahman, the Lord of Umâ, the Lord of the whole universe, free from all taint and from all latent tendencies of evil, the repository of of unsurpassed good. Here, then, the, sûtrakâra refers to another abode of the Lord:

(Brahman is the) Light, because of the mention of the foot. (I. i. 25).

The subject of discussion here is a passage in the Chhândogya-Upanishad which reads as follows

"Now that Light which shines above this heaven, higher than all, higher than everything, in the highest world, beyond which there are no other worlds, that is the same light which is within man."†

Here a doubt arises as to whether the Supreme Light which is said to be in heaven, pervading all worlds, is Parames'vara or some other being?

(*Pûrvapaksha*): The word 'dyu' stands for heaven, and the light which is said to be "above this heaven" may therefore here mean the sun himself. Or, as the words 'the light within man' point to the light being within man, it may be that the digestive fire in the stomach is here referred to.

(*Siddhânta*) The words "the light which shines above this heaven" refer to Parames'vara Himself who is the Supreme Light, higher than all; for, in a former passage, "All creatures form a foot of His" all creatures are said to be a part of this light. This cannot apply to the sun and digestive fire in the stomach, whose range of action is limited.

(*Objection*) In a former passage, Gâyatrî is described to be all-pervading in the words "Gâyatrî, verily, is all this existence."† As occurring in the same context, the passage All creatures form a foot of His" teaches only that the universe is a part of Gâyatrî.

This objection is thus answered:

(If you say it is) not so because of the mention of the metre, (we say) no, because (it is) the meditating (of Brahman) in that way (that is) taught; so, indeed, there is an instance. (I. i. 26).

(*Objection*): Because of the mention of the metre in a former passage, "Gâyatrî, indeed, is all this existence," the same thing is spoken of here, not the Parames'vara.

(*Answer*): It cannot be that Gâyatrî, a mere metre, is all-prevading. On the other hand, we are taught to contemplate Parames'vara who resembles Gâyatrî: just as Gâyatrî is made up of four feet containing six syllables each and is four-footed, so Brahman too is four-footed. Accordingly, elsewhere, a word denoting metre is found applied to a different thing in virtue of some point of resemblance; as for instance, in the Samvarga-Vidyâ where the s'ruti beginning with the passage, "These five and the other five make ten, and that is the *krita*"‡ says "these are again the Virâj." Wherefore in the determining of the subject propounded in the passage in question, the characteristic mark of Parames'vara, *viz.* all-pervadingness, should prevail as against the argument derived from the fact of the passage occurring in the section treating of Gâyatrî.

* Tait. Upanishad 2-1.
† Chha. Upanishad 3-13.

* Chha. Upanishad. 3-12.
† Chha. Up. 3-12.
‡ Chha. Up. 4-3.

And because of its congruity with the description of creatures etc. as feet, (it should be) so. (I. 1. 27).

The statement that it is four-footed by creatures, earth, body and the heart, cannot apply to the metre called Gâyatrî. It applies only to Parames'vara.

The sûtrakâra again raises and refutes an objection:

If (you hold it is) not (so) because of a diversity in the teaching, (we answer) no, because there is no inconsistency in either case. (I. 1. 28).

(*Objection*): It is not right to hold that, because there is a reference made to a connection with heaven in the passage "All creatures form one foot of His; His immortal three feet being in heaven,"* Parames'vara is described in the passage which speaks of 'light'; for, the two being quite distinct from each other as shewn by a diversity in their teaching, there can be no reference to the one by the other. In the passages "His immortal three feet are *in* the heaven," and "The Light which shines *above* the heaven," † the word denoting 'heaven' occurs in two different cases, (*i. e.* in the locative and the ablative cases), and therefore there is a diversity in the teaching. Hence the mutual opposition of the passages in question.

(*Answer*): No, for there is no diversity between the two passages, just as there is no difference between the following two statements: "There is a hawk *on* the top of the tree;" and "There is a hawk *above* the top of the tree." Wherefore in either case it is intended to declare that the light is above the heaven. By this characteristic mark, it may also be concluded that it is Parames'vara who is the Purusha spoken of in the Purusha-Sûkta, inasmuch as there, too, it is taught that "A foot of His are all the creatures."‡ Hence the conclusion that the Supreme Light which shines in heaven and of which the whole universe forms only a part is none other than Parames'vara.

Adhikarana 12.

In the last adhikarana it has been shewn that the Parames'vara, referred to as the main object of worship in the orb of the Blessed Sun, Himself constitutes the whole universe. The present section proceeds to show that other beings form object of worship as ensouled by Him, and not otherwise.

So if prana, because of the occurrence (of His attributes). (I. 1. 29)

The passage which has to be discussed here is the Indra's speech occurring in the Kaushîtaka-Upanishad;

"I am Prâna; do thou meditate on me as the conscious A'tman, as life, as immortality."*

The doubt arises here as to whether the being referred to as an object of worship and put in apposition with the word 'prâna' is Indra or Parames'vara.

(*Pûrvapaksha*:) Here in the passage "I am prâna, the conscious A'tman, and me etc." we see that the word 'prâna' is evidently put in apposition with 'Indra.' The passage, "worship me," clearly states that the injunction of worship refers to none but Indra. It is but proper to speak of him as prâna because he supports all beings by means of rain. As possessed of supreme power, he may also be spoken of as the object to be worshipped by all. Accordingly the s'ruti says "Indra is the king who rules the world"† and so on. Wherefore Indra himself is here spoken of as the object of worship.

The *Siddhânta* maintains that it is the Parames'vara—Why?—Because His peculiar attributes—such as, He is the Bliss, He is without decay, immortal, He is the conscious Self—are found described when speaking of the being referred to by the word prâna:

"He is none other than prâna, conscious A'tman, the Bliss, without decay, immortal." †

In the passage "Indra is the king" we should by the context understand the word "Indra" to mean I's'vara.

Again an objection is raised and refuted:

(If you say it is) not (He), because of the speaker's reference to himself, (we reply that) there is indeed in this (section) a preponderance of attributes of A'tman. (I. 1. 30.)

(*Objection*): The being here referred to as the object of worship is not Parames'vara; for, in the opening sentence such as "know me alone.....the three-headed son of Tvashtri did I slay."‡ Indra who is well-known to be a jiva is spoken of as the object of worship. And the concluding passage of the section should be interpreted in accordance with the opening passage.

(*Answer*): It is not right to say so: in this section, from the very commencement, Parames'vara's charac-

* Chha. Up. 3-12, 13.
† Chha. Upanishad 3-12, 13.
‡ Tait. Aranyaka 3-12.

* Kaushîtaka-Upanishad 6.
† Tait. Aranyaka 3-11.
‡ Kaushîtaka Upanishad 3

teristic attributes are found in great preponderance. Thus, the opening passage proposes to treat of the most beneficial worship in the words "That which thou thinkest the best for man."* This, indeed, is a characteristic property of Parames'vara, His worship alone being the most beneficial as a means of attaining moksha. In the middle of the section, too, He is spoken of as the impelling agent of others in all their actions, in the following passage :

> "For he makes him, whom he wishes to lead up from these worlds, do a good deed; and the same makes him, whom he wishes to lead down from these worlds, do a bad act." *

So also he is spoken of in the following passage as the basis of the whole universe made up of both the sentient and insentient existence :

"As in a car the circumference of a wheel is placed on the spokes, and the spokes on the nave, thus are these external objects placed on the subjective states of consciousness and these states of consciousness are placed on the prâna."†

And this, too, being a characteristic property of Parames'vara Indra cannot be the being here spoken of as the object of worship.

(*Objection*) :—If, as a Jîva, Indra is not the object of worship, then how is it that he inculcates the worship of himself?

The sûtrakâra thus answers :

(It is) from the standpoint of the scriptures that he inculcates it, like Vamadeva. (I. 1. 31).

From the standpoint of such passages of the scripture as "In the form of this Jîva entering, I shall differentiate name and form," ‡ Indra saw that Parames'vara was the being denoted by all words and that therefore Indra himself was His body; and he accordingly refers to Parames'vara by his own name 'Indra' and inculcates Him alone as the object of worship. Hence the reference to Parames'vara by the word 'Indra.'

The sûtrakâra quotes an example, "like Vâmadeva." Vâmadeva saw that Parames'vara was none but his own A'tman and exclaimed "I have become Manu and Sûrya." Just so is Indra's declaration.§

Or thus: When, by the contemplation of the harmonious nature of Brahman and A'tman brought about by Vedântic knowledge, Vâmadeva attained to the state of Brahman and was freed from all the imaginary limitations due to the identifying of himself with the human body and so on, and his mighty ego expanded so as to embrace the whole universe, he saw that he was present everywhere and accordingly spoke of himself as one with the whole universe including Manu and Sûrya. So, it may be concluded, it was in the case of Indra. In the passage "I am prâna, the conscious Atman,"* Prâna refers to Para-Brahman, inasmuch as He, blissful by nature, is the cause of all life, as said in the s'ruti "Prâna is the conscious self, the Bliss, undecaying and immortal." Accordingly it is from the standpoint of Brahman that Indra taught "I am Brahman," "me do thou worship" So, too, Krishna taught to Arjuna, and so several others.

Again an objection is raised and refuted :

(If you say it is) not (so) because of the characteristic marks of Jiva and prana proper, (we reply) no, because, His worship being threefold and He being their basis, it is explicable. (I. 1. 32.)

(*Objection*): It is but proper that Indra should speak of himself as the object of worship and as an all-pervading being, when, having attained by the contemplation of Brahmajnâna to the condition of Brahman, he was freed from the condition of jîva and spoke from the standpoint of Brahman. Here in the passages "I killed the three-headed son of Tvashtri"† and "till prâna dwells in the body, till then there is life,"† the characteristic marks of jîva and prâna proper are evident. So this teaching is not explicable.

(*Answer*): You should not say so. It is but proper that Parames'vara is spoken of as a jîva and prâna; for there is a threefold worship. Here it is intended to teach a threefold worship of Parames'vara,—in His own form, in the form of Bhoktâ or jîva, in the form of Bhogya or the object of sense. This may be explained by the fact that He is the basis of Bhoktâ and Bhogya, the jîvas and objects of sense. The worship of Parames'vara in His own form leads to immediate salvation, whereas the other two do so in course of time. Wherefore we conclude that as a form of Parames'vara who dwells in him as his A'tman, Indra forms an object of worship.

Thus ends the commentary of Srîkantha-Sîvâchârya on Pâda i. e., of the Adhyâya i., of the Brahma-Mîmâmsâ.

* Kaushîtaka Upanishad 3.
† Kaushitaka Upanishad 3.
‡ Chha. Upanishad 6-3.
§ Brihada-Upanishad 3—4.

* Kaushîtaka.—Upanishad 6.
† Kaushitaka-Upanishad 3.

SECOND PA'DA.

Adhikarana. I.

Owing to the endlessness of vedântic passages treating of Brahman, it is not possible to discuss every one of those passages. By a discussion therefore, of some only of those passages, the meaning of others have to be determined on the same principles of interpretation. Thus, a few only of the passages are dealt with in the Sûtras by way of determining that those passages treat of Brahman as shewn by a concurrence of the marks which serve to determine the main drift of the passages.

In the first pâda have been discussed a few of such passages as contain clear hints shewing what the main drift of the passage is. In the second pâda will be discussed a few of such passages as contain hints which are not quite so explicit.

(The passage refers to Parames'vara) as teaching of Him who is present everywhere. (I. ii. 1).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Chhândogya-Upanishad and reads thus:

> "The manomaya, whose body is prâna, whose form is thought, whose will is unfailing, whose nature is like A'kas'a, from whom all desires proceed.. .... He is myself within the heart."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the being spoken of as *manomaya* and so on is Parames'vara or Jîva.

(*Pûrvapaksha*. It is Jîva.—Why so?—Because he is more proximate. In the passage which just precedes the one under discussion, *viz.*,

> "Now man is a creature of will. According to what his will is in this world, will he be when he has departed this life. Let him therefore have this will and belief;"†

Jîva is spoken of as wandering in this and in the next world under the influence of karma. Then comes the passage commencing with "*manomaya*." Wherefore we conclude that it is Jîva who is referred to as "manomaya." These attributes—that he partakes of the nature of manas and that he has prâna for his body—belong to a samsârin: they are not attributes of Parames'vara. When this interpretation is accepted, the epithet "satyasankalpa" may be applied to a samsârin or jîva by interpreting it to mean "*sati asankalpa*, he whose thought is not directed to the Real (Sat)." Wherefore it is Jîva that is spoken of as 'manomaya' and so on, not Parames'vara.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows:—It is Parames'vara that is spoken of as 'manomaya' and so on. Why?—Because it is the Para-brahman, the Parames'vara, that is spoken of as the cause of all and as the object of worship in the opening passage:

> All this is Brahman, as beginning, ending, and breathing in Him; and therefore let a man meditate on Him."

This passage may be explained as follows: The origin, existence and end of all this depends on Brahman. All this, both the sentient and the insentient existence, is verily Brahman, and therefore let a man meditate on Brahman, tranquil in mind. Just as water-bubbles which have their origin, existence and end in the ocean, are found to be only forms of that ocean, so, too, that which depends for its origin etc. on Brahman associated with s'akti must be made up of Brahman and nothing else. Nothing distinct from Him is ever perceived. Accordingly in the Atharva s'iras it has been declared by Îsâna as follows:

> "Alone I was at first, (alone) I am and shall be; there is none else distinct from Me."‡

And then was declared by Him in the words "I am Brahman,"§ that the whole universe is His own form. And in the words "He entered the more hidden from (or *than*) the hidden one" etc.,* His entering into the universe is given as a reason for the whole universe being His own form. Thus, this universe having no origin, existence or end outside Brahman, it is not a quite distinct thing from Brahman. Accordingly the learned say:—

> His s'aktis or energies (form) the whole world, and the Mahes'a or the Great Lord is the energetic (S'aktimân). Never can energy exist distinct from the energetic. Unity of these two is eternal, like that of fire and heat, inasmuch as an separateness always exists between energy and the energetic. Wherefore the supreme energy belongs to the supreme A'tman, since the two are related to each other as substance and attribute. The energy of heat is not conceived to be distinct from fire" and so on.

Vâyu-Samhitâ, too, says

* Chha. Up. 3-14.

† Chha. Up. 3-14.

"From S'akti up to earth, (the whole world) is born of the principle S'iva. By Him alone, it is pervaded, as the jar etc. by clay. His variegated supreme S'akti, whose form is knowledge and bliss, appears as one and many, like the light of the sun."

The following passages of the s'ruti speak of Para-brahman as possessed of infinite powers of creating, ruling and maintaining the world, all inherent in Him:

"His supreme S'akti is spoken of as manifold, inherent, endued with the activity of knowledge and life."*

"One verily is Rudra,—they were not for a second—who rules these worlds with the powers of ruling."†

In short, on the authority of S'ruti, Smriti, Itihâsa, Purâna, and the sayings of the learned, the Supreme S'akti—whose manifold manifestation this whole universe of chit and achit is, whose being is composed of Supreme Existence, Intelligence and Bliss, and is unlimited by space and time—is inherent in the nature of S'iva, the Supreme Brahman, and constitutes His own essential form and quality. Apart from S'akti He cannot be the Omniscient, the Omnipotent, the cause of all, the all-controlling, the all-adorable, the all-gracious, the means of attaining all aspirations, and the omnipresent; and, moreover, such grand dêsignations as '*Mahes'vara*' the Supreme Lord, '*Mahâdeva*' the supreme deity, and '*Rudra*' the expeller of pain, cannot apply to Him. Thus it is Brahman whose body is the whole sentient and insentient universe, and who is denoted by all words. Just as the word 'blue' denotes not the blue colour only, but also the lotus which is of blue colour, so does the word 'universe' also denotes Brahman. Therefore, such passages as "All is Rudra verily" teach that Brahman is denoted by all words. Accordingly the passage "All this, verily, is Brahman" refers to Brahman whose body the whole of the sentient and unsentient universe is. The universe being thus a form of Brahman and being therefore not an object of hatred etc., let everyone be peaceful at heart and worship Brahman. This doctrine is clearly expounded even in the puranic texts such as the following:—

"The body of the God of Gods is this universe, moving and immoving. This, the Jîvas (Pas'us) do not know, owing to the mighty bondage. They say sentiency is Vidyâ, and insentiency Avidyâ. The whole universe of Vidyâ and Avidyâ, is no doubt the body of the Lord, the Father of all; for the whole universe is subject to Him. The word 'sat' is used by the wise to denote the real and the good, and 'asat' is used by vedic teachers to denote the contrary. The whole universe of the *sat* and the *asat* is the body of Him who is on high. Just as, by the watering of the roots of a tree, its branches are nourished, so by the worship of S'iva, the universe which is His body is nourished. A'tman is the eighth body of S'iva the Parames'vara, pervading all other bodies. Wherefore the whole universe is ensouled by S'iva. If any embodied being whatsoever be subjected to constraint, it will be quite repugnant to the eight-bodied lord; as to this there is no doubt. Doing good to all, kindness to all, affording shelter to all,—this, they hold, is the worshipping of S'iva." And so on.

Brahman being all-formed, it is but right to say "all is Brahman" and "let every one be peaceful and worship Brahman." Wherefore it is Brahman who in the opening passage is stated to be the object of worship, that is also spoken of as manomaya, as partaking of the nature of manas, and so on. Neither should it be supposed that the partaking of the nature of manas is a characteristic mark of a samsârin; for Brahman may limit Himself by assuming a shape which can form an object of worship.

As to the contention that because Jîva, is a creature of his own will it is Jîva who is spoken of as 'manomaya,'—we say that such a contention is untenable; for, since the upâsanâ has to be construed as having for its object Brahman who is mentioned as such in the sentence where the upâsanâ is enjoined, it is impossible for that upâsanâ to have again for its object Jîva who is but incidentally mentioned; as in the case of *âmikshâ*,* which has been proved to appertain to Vis'vedevas who have already been mentioned in connection with it, not the *vâjina* which belongs to vâjins. Wherefore it is Brahman who is to be worshipped as possessed of attributes mentioned in the passage commencing with 'manomaya'

A. MAHA'DEVA S'A'STRI, B. A.

(*To be continued*).

* Sveta. Upanishad 6-8.

† Sveta. Upanishad 3-2.

* See Jaimini. Mimamsa. 2-2-23.

TIRUMANTRA BY TIRUMULAR.

Continued from page 173, Vol. I.

தொடர்ந்துநின் றூனைத் தொழும்மின் றொழுதாற்
படர்ந்துநின் றுன்பரி பாரக முற்றும்
கடந்துநின் றுன்கம லம்மலர்மேலே
யுடன்திருந் தானடிப் புண்ணிய மாமே. (உசு)

26. Worship Him who is ever with you. Then the Omnipresent Lord will remember you. Beyond all thought, He yet dwells in our Lotus Heart. This fortune is from His Grace.

சந்தி யெனத்தக்க தாமரை வாண்முகத்
தந்தமி லீசனரு ணமக் கேயென்று
நந்தியை நாளும் வணங்கப் படுமவர்
புந்தியு ளுள்ளே புகுந்துநின் றூனே. (உள)

27. The *Nandi* dwells in the hearts of those who considering that the grace of the Eternal Lord whose brilliant Lotus Face resembles the evening sky, will ever be with them, worship Him every day.

இணங்குநின் றூனெங்கு மாகிநின் றூனும்
பிணங்குநின் றுன்பின்பு னேகுநின் றூனு
முணங்குநின் றூனம ராபதி நாதனை
வணங்குநின் றூர்க்கே வழித்துணை யாமே. (உஅ)

28. The God of Gods, He is ever inseparably in you. He is in all. He is near you. He is before all, and He is after all. He is concealed in all. He is the guide to those who worship Him.

காலைநின் லாயுட னேற்குரு வாருள்ள
நாலைநின் லேனுன்னை நான்றழு வித்தெழுள்ளத்
தோணைநின் லாத குணத்தடி யாரெனைத்
தாணிய னெங்கு மாகுந்துநின் றூனே. (உக)

29. O Thou Lord who art forced in the heart of the sinless Devotees, as is the iron nail in a green tree, Let me behold Thee! Who but thee is my kith and kin? I will not be ashamed to embrace Thee.

வானின் றழைக்கு மழைபோ லெம்மைவணங்
தானின் றழைக்குங்கொல் லென்று தயங்குவ
ரானின் றழைத்த மதுபோலென் னாத்திரை
கானின் றழைப்பது நாலைய றியே. (உஎ)

30. People despond if God will call out to them as with the voice of thunder from the sky. The world is witness to my calling out to Him as the cow after its first calf.

மண்ணகத் தாலெக்கு மவ்வானகத் தாலெக்கு
விண்ணகத் தாலெக்கு மேவதத்தி னூலெக்கு
பண்ணகத் தின்னிசைப பாடலுற் றூனுக்கே
கண்ணகத் தேநின்று காதலித் தேனே. (உக)

31. He dwells in Bhuloka (earth) Bhuvar loka (middle regions) and *Sutarloka* (highest regions) He dwells in the Pranava. He sings the song of triumph with the lute (when everything is resolved). Him I love in my heart.

தேவர்பி ரானம்பி ரான்றிசை பத்துதாயு
மேவர்பி ரான்விரி நீருல கேழையுங்
காவலி ரான்றன்மை தானறி வாரில்லை
பாவலி ரானுட பாடலு மாமே. (உச)

32. The God of God is our Lord. He spreads on all the ten sides. He transcends the vast seven regions. None know His real nature. If we sing His praises, we will deserve His Grace.

பதிபல வுண்டு பண்டிவ் வுலகம்
விதிபல செய்தொன்று மெய்ம்மை யுணரார்
துதிபல தோத்திரஞ் சொல்லவ லிலாரு
மதியிலர் நெஞ்சினுள் வாழ்கின் றூரே. (உஎ)

33. Many Gods have they in this world. Many Vedic rites they perform, yet they know not the Truth. They are proficient in singing the various Vedic Hymns, yet they suffer pain in the hear, without knowing the Truth.

சாந்து கமழுங் கவரியின் கந்தம்போல்
வேந்த னடிநினை வுருவிய மெய்த்திறம்
பாந்த ளடியன்ன வாயிர நாமமும்
பேசுந்து ணருமும் புகழ்வென் றூனே. (உசு)

34. The King of Kings who is united in all like the smell of Kasturi (musk) in sandal paste commanded the Gods to follow the true path by repeating the glorious thousand names of His, while sitting or walking (at all times).

ஆற்றுகி லாவழி யாரு மிறைவனை
போற்றுமி னென்றிப் புகழ்மின் புகழ்ந்திடில
போற்றியு ளுள்ளுறு தூதினை யோட்டுக்கு
மாறுவ னிப்படி மாடமு மாமே. (உஎ)

35. If you want to pursue the easiest path (of knowing Him), worship Him and sing His Glory. Then your own glory will grow over you lifting its head over the West and the East and on all sides.

ஒப்பனை நந்திபா தாரா வழுதினை
மெய்ப்பிரி வள்ளலை யூழி முதல்வனை
யெப்பரி சாயினு மேத்துமி னேத்தினை
லப்படி சிச னருள்பெற லாமே. (கூஎ)

36. He is Our Father, Nandi, the never failing Ambrosia, the incomparable Benefactor, the eternal Lord; Him adore ye in any manner; and in the same manner will you reap His Grace.

நானுகின் றேத்துவ னுடொறு நந்தியைத்
தானு நிற் முன்றழற் போலொக்கு மேனியன்
வானுணின் முர்மதி போலுட லுள்ளுவக்
தானினின் முங்கே யுயிர்க்கின்ற வாறே. (கூஏ)

37 I will adore the Beloved Lord every day. He showed Himself to me with the Body resembling fire. He manifests Himself in our heart as the Full Moon in its splendour in the Heavens.

பிதற்றெழி யேன்பெரி யானரி யானைப்
பிதற்றெழி யேன்பிற வாவரு வானைப்
பிதற்றெழி யேனெங்கள் போக்கந்தி தன்னைப்
பிதற்றெழி யேன்பெரு மைத்தவன் முனே. (கூஅ)

38. Him, the great and subtle I will not fail to blabber about; Him with the Form uncreate, I will not cease to speak about; Him with the beloved name Nandi I will not cease to think about. Him, the great Yogi I will not fail to adore.

வாழ்த்த வல்லார் மனத்துள்ளு றுசோதியைத்
தீத்தினை யங்கே நிலாய்நின்ற தேவனை
யேத்தியு மெம்பெரு மானெனு றிறைஞ்சியு
மாத்த ருசெய் தீச வருட் பெறலாமே. (கூகூ)

39. The Light that shines in the heart of His worshippers, the immaculate God who is enjoyed therein, Him, if we worship as our Lord and love him we will deserve His Grace.

குறைத்தடைந் தீன்முலை யூறுசு
நிறைத்தட செய்பொனி னேரொளி யொக்கு
மறைந்திடஞ் செய்யாது வாழ்ந்த வலையாய்க்குப்
புயற்படஞ் செய்யான் புகுந்தின்ற னுனே. (கூ0)

40. In true humility, approach His Feet. Then He will fill your heart with the splendour of molten gold. Those who adore Him without forgetfulness, He will not deceive He will dwell in them.

கினஞ்செய்த நஞ்சுண்டதேவர்பிரானைப்
புனஞ்செய்த நெஞ்சிடைப்பிரி வற்றவல்லார்க்குக்
கனஞ்செய்த வானுதற்பாகனுமாங்கே
யினஞ்செயத மான்போலிணங்கின்றனே. (கூக)

41. The God of Gods who drank the fearful poison if, in their cultivated hearts, they will cherish, the Partner of Her, the adorable and beautiful Uma, will join them (fast), as the separated deer its herd.

போயரன் றன்னைப் புகழ்வார்பெறுவது
நாயகனென்முடி செய்ததுவேநலகும்
மாயவர்சூழ்ந்துவர வல்லராகிலும்
வேயனதோளிக்கு வேந்தொன்றுந்தானே. (கூஉ)

42. Those who praise the Lord Hara will deserve His Highest Crown Others, though they, the world circumambulate, will they ever deserve the union with Uma's Lord.

போற்றியென்பா ரரசர்புனிதன்னடி
போற்றியென்பா ரசுரர்புனிதன்னடி
போற்றியென்பா மனிதர்புனிதன்னடி
போற்றியென்னன்புள் விளங்வைத்தேனே. (கூங).

43. The Devas cry, 'Glory O Glory to the Feet of the Pure Being.' The Asuras cry 'Glory O Glory to the Feet of the Pure Being.' The Men cry 'Glory O Glory to the Feet of the Pure Being.' These Feet I also Glorify and make manifest in my love.

விழுவழியல்ல நிவ்வேலையுகம்
விழுவழியின்பம் விருத்தமில்லை
துழிவழிந்றனும் சோதிபபியாலும்
பழிவழிபாட டெம் பசலைறுமே. (கூச)

44. By following the Vedic law, this seagirt world derives its pleasures and pains. To those following the *Bhakti Marga*, The Effulgent Lord will become the Sun to light the *Pathi-Marga*.

(To be continued)

SIVAGNANA SIDDHIAR
OF
ARUL NANDI SIVA CHARIAR.

(*Continued from page* 9.)

MÂYAVADI'S STATEMENT.

1. We will state the system promulgated by the Mâyâvâdi himself, who incorrectly believing that he is himself God and all the world is a whirl-car, and yet dwelling in the body, professes to initiate other Jivas in his path.

2. This *Brahman* is the cause of all the worlds, the limitless bliss and intelligence, is formless, omnipresent and eternal, is true and pure, free from all marks and attributes, and is the measure of the Vedas, and is without distinction of Gnathuru and Gnana.

3. As the one Sun shining in numerous pots of water leaves its reflection in each and yet passes beyond, so this one God lives in each body and yet is imperceptible to the senses and *antakaranas*. Accordingly God cannot be known by the 6 kinds of proof such as observation &c.

4. The rope appears as snake in darkness. When light dawns, the rope appears as rope and the snake disappears as a delusion. Similarly, the world appears as Sat when deluded; in spotless wisdom the true Chit appears as Sat; and all the world's allurements will appear mad.

5. The world appears derived from the *Nirvachana* Brahman. If not, it cannot come into being at all. If it is an independent material cause, it must exist for ever. (The reason why it changes is) because it is a delusion. When both the shell and the silver piece are thrown into the furnace the silver comes out bright but the shell is destroyed. So, in *pâramarthika*, the changeless God appears as true and the world disappears as false.

6. The material cause of the world is the Sat. As the spider produces from itself the thread and works it into a web and then takes it back into itself, so God, originates the world as real, and sustains it and when he resolves it, it becomes unreal again. Looking to its place of origin, the world and all its appearances are also Sat.

The course of evolution is this. From Brahm was produced Akas, from Akas air; from air fire; from fire, water; from water, earth; and from these elements, plants, and from plants food, and from food the body and its six component parts.

8. The above mentioned six parts constitute *annamayakosha* when the air vitalizes these, they constitute the *pranamayakosha*; with the *manas*, they form the *manomayakosha*; with *buddhi* and *gnanendriyas* they constitute the *vignanomayakasha*; with the above and *karmendriyas*, they constitute the *anandamayakosha*.

9. This Brahman appears united in this visible body composed of the above mentioned *Panchakoshas*. The way in which he so appears is similar to the rays of the Effulgent Sun which is difficult to be reached in the sky becoming reflected in several pots of water. Yet God does not become tainted by such contact, as Pasa cannot bind God.

10. As the same thread strung through countless beads of different colours appears also as particolour-

---

1. Some uncomplimentary epithets are applied to the Mayavadi, as he mistakes the Jiva subject to karma, birth and death and suffering, who has no independence (*Aswatantra*) and is of imperfect intelligence with the Being, who is eternally free and intelligent, and omniscient, self-dependent (*Swadarne*) and self-luminous (Swamprakasa) and all powerful and the inconsistency of his position is brought out that while he professes to be himself God he could not avoid dwelling in this body of sin and sorrow and while he professes to reject the whole world as delusive, he believes in the authority of the Vedas and the rules prescribed therein.

3. The 6 kinds of logical proof admitted by the Mayavadi are observation, inference, *Agama*, *Upamana*, *Arathapatti* and *Abava*.

The being above the andakaranas is God, Jiva being also above the andakaranas Jiva and God are identical. Professors of this school however quibble and differ a good deal about the precise meaning of the Jiva or Atma or Purusha or soul. One learned Swami defined it as a combination of Brahman's shadow, a bit of andakarana and a bit of Avidya! Another talented lady when we asked for a definition, and we expected more light from her, gave an answer of the type of the old schoolmaster's definition, 'refer to the dictionary' and we were told to refer to the Gita and Brihadaranyaka. We will discuss these definitions and others later on.

Will any Sanscrit Pundit tell us in which of the 108 Upanishads this illustration occurs? Whether it occurs in any of the 12 Principal Upanishads?

7. These parts are skin, bone, blood, nerves, flesh, and semen.

8. Kosha means an organ or part.

9. If so, we have asked, to whom is Bhanda, birth and death, sin and sorrow, to whom is moksha? Do all these happen to the Atma or to the body? If to the body, and the soul does not suffer, why care we to attain freedom from death and birth? Why reck we if the body suffers all this? Are we really seeking moksha for the flesh and not for the soul? Are all these things delusions merely? If so will not the attempt to free one from delusion be itself a delusion? And then why should it not remain in eternal delusion? Are there any defects attached to remaining in this state of delusion and what are they? These question and more have been asked again and again, and except the honest reply that they are not answerable, no reply has ever been forthcoming. And yet the tide rolls on for ever and how many get plunged under its blinding waves!

10. To whom does he appear as different and as undergoing different experiences To himself or to others? If to others, who are they?

ed, so the one God dwelling in different bodies appears as different beings and appears as undergoing different kinds of enjoyments without in fact undergoing such.

11. The one Brahman is known by different names by its union in different bodies and appears to undergo enjoyments of pleasure and pain. It undergoes in the body the four avasthas, *Jagra, Swapna, Sushupti* and *Thuriya*. In Jagra it is in conjunction with the organs; in Swapna with four; in Sushupti one; and in Thuriya all these organs, and the resulting enjoyments vanish.

12. To identify all the bodily organs as the self is Bhanda; when this false knowledge is destroyed, mukti is attained. The seed of Bhanda is in avidya; and by its acts, maya and its products attach to the Brahman. When avidya is destroyed, maya also vanishes, when this happens, wisdom (gnana) is secured, and Bûtha knowledge disappears.

13. By practice of Karmic rites andakaranas get purified. This purification will induce Gnana (wisdom). This Gnana will induce the knowledge of 'Aham Brahmasmi' 'I am God.' When this 'Ahambrahma' knowledge attains perfection, the self can be perceived in maya as the Moon's reflection is seen in still water.

14. Brahmagnana is knowledge that the Ego is Brahman. And when the self becomes self, and enjoys the self in the self, and when such things as body, senses, prana, lose their form and name, when the great elements are destroyed and the self remains unchangeable, this knowledge is possible

15. When we understand the Mahavakyas such as 'Tatva masi' &c. enshrined in the Vedas, they teach us no more truth than that thou art God. Those who do not attain this knowledge perform worship on the five *Asanas* (postures) and eight kinds of yoga, for the purpose of attaining this *soham* knowledge.

11. The five external senses, eye, ear &c., and the five sensations saoda &c. and the four andakaranas are the fourteen organs active in Jagra; the four active in Swapna are the four andakaranas; and the one in Sushupti is chitta.

13. Who attains Gnana, Brahman or something else? Is this attainment real or false? Why should this be possible by the purification of bodily senses? Cannot the Brahman see his form except in Maya and before he attains Mukti?

15. The five asanas are Kurmasana, Anantasana, Sihmasana, Padmasana, and Yogasana. Eight minds of Yoga are Iyama, Nyama, Asana, Prânâyâma Pratyâkâra, Dharana, Dhyana and Samadhi.

Mayavadi's Refutation.

1. The confusing statement of the Mayavadi that he is god and that jivas should attain Mukti by attaining *Ahambrahma gnanam* does not explain the true meaning of Soham Bavana and *Mokshananda*. His statement is like that of one who says that the barren crow picked a piece of rock flesh, and with it fed its young ones, to satisfy their hunger and thirst.

2. If it is true that the Veda states that there is only One, (without a second Padartha), then as the same Veda states that there are *gnathuru, gnana* and *gneya* the statement that there is only one becomes refuted. Besides the statements being contradictory, the value of the Vedic authority will suffer (or that statement of Ahambrahmagnanam is inconsistent with the Vedic doctrine of 'Tatvamasi'). As you do not postulate an intelligence as the soul, separate from God, *Anubhuti* (enjoyment) in Bliss is rendered impossible.

3. Your postulate of the only one Existence cannot be true, as, following the analogy of one Sun shining in many pots of water, the one (God) is formless (unextended) and it cannot unite with a body with form (extended) and cannot produce reflexion (extended form); and no reflexion is also possible, as there is no second thing in which the reflexion can be

2. Gnathuru or the knower is the soul. Gnana is the chit sakti of God whereby the soul knows. Gneya, the known is God. *Anubhuti* implies both perception, knowledge and enjoyment. Unless difference lies at the root, such perception or knowledge is not possible.

3. Other objections are taken as follow. How can the limitless and formless and eternal Being originate in a finite and changeable and extended body? The sun is limited and extended, its reflection is further limited and extended, and the pot of water is also limited and extended. What is reflected is not the sun but one only of its countless rays. There is as such division of the one God involved. And no one mistakes the reflexion itself for the sun.

The real fallacy in the use of the analogy consist in ignoring that in the *Upameya*, thing compared, elements corresponding to a reflecting or refracting medium is positively ignored. And there is also the fallacy of mistaking the reflexion of God for the jiva instead of for God Himself: If we take the sun as God, the reflexion as God's presence in man (soul) and the water, in which the presence is felt as the jiva, and the binding element, pot, as maya and karma then the whole analogy comes off quite correct. For a full discussion and elaboration of this analogy, see my edition of Sivagnanabotham pages 110 and 111. The analogy may also be viewed in another light. The reflexion or image perceived in the water is only a delusive appearance. The real image is formed only in the retina of the eye, and without such perceiver, no reflexion is again possible. Though the sun or moon might shine on a whole sheet of water, no image will be formed unless the eye becomes focussed at a certain point where the light falls We have frequently watched how this image follows one's eye, as one sits watching in a moving train, the moon shining on the tank or sheets of water lying by the road side. So also without a knower, soul, God will only be a nonentity or as good as nonentity. In Bhanda, God is as much Asat to the soul, as the world is Asat in moksha.

formed; and as it also follows that some one else is required to see the reflexion of the Sun (God) formed in the water (body.)

4. The being dwelling in the body does not understand except in conjunction with the different senses enternal and internal; shastras also support such view; and yet you assert like the man who asserts the existence of hare's horns, that the One Brahman in union with the body knows by itself. And then the *Brahma-Gnana* said to be attained by your One Being cannot be of much real import. Difference does exist between the Supreme spirit and the human spirit.

5. If you compare the oneness to the unity of the ruby and its brilliance, you only destroy the oneness. Besides, the ruby and its light are related as guni and guna. If you deny even the attribute of *Ichaha, Gnana* and *Kriya* to the One, then the One cannot create this world and It cannot be intelligent.

6. You state that the world is produced from sat as when the straw sticking out of an ant-hill is fancied with great fear to be snake. If so, the person, becoming so deluded must also be the *Vikara* or modification of your Brahman. Such doctrine will only induce deluded knowledge and you will never attain Divine Bliss.

J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B. A., L.

(To be continued).

4. In this verse, a fact is appealed to as proof, besides authority. The fact is that human intelligence is found to be possible in manifestation only when in conjunction with the bodily organs. Between the human mind and the body there is an exact correspondence, correlation and connection and the one rises or falls with the development or decay of the bodily organs. If the being is a *vibhu*, the bodily powers tend to limit this intenigence and it becomes an *anu* (அணு). This fact is either real or not. If real, it requires an explanation. Which is the being which is so limited by the body or which grows or decays with the growth or decay of the body itself? Which is it therefore which is in Bhanda? We point to a being which is in Bhanda; and which is this Being? It cannot be God or Brahman, as the very idea of God is opposed to all sense of limitation, growth and decay. What else is it that is in Bhanda? The Siddhanta view that it cannot be God and that it is the soul different from God that is actually in Bhanda becomes irresistible. If the soul is not postulated, the *Bhanda* will and must surely be ascribed to Brahman. If the idea of Bhanda is itself declared unreal, then the idea of seeking liberation from it, the usefulness of Tapas, Sadana, Sadushtaya and Yoga and Gnana the idea of moksha are also delusions and we will be landed in a practical absurdity, and moral suicide. We need not quote more than verses 36 to 38 in Gita chap. 3, to strengthen the position that man is really dragged into the mire and made to commit, as it were by will constrained (*Sankara* explains as a servant by the king) and Avidya and Maya becomes the King as the Jiva becomes the servant. (See the whole note in pp. 24 to 32 in my edition of Light of Grace). What can it else be but blasphemy to call 'this' that is smoke-enveloped and rust-covered and sin-subjugated, as the one Supreme Light which is '*Svampara Prakasa*,' '*Svadarshne*,' and '*Sva Yasase*', '*Siva, Sivam*' and '*Sva Yasya*'?

The brilliance in the ruby is only a separable accident. In darkness it has no brilliance. The brilliance is really derived from external light. As God is nirguna, His relation to the soul or world as *guni* and *guna* cannot be postulated. The Mayavadis would deny to God, Will, Intelligence and Power, his authorship of the world and would interpose a lower brahman, who possesses these attributes; and South Indians who belong to this school regard this lower brahman as asat or no *Brahman* at all, whereas those in the north of Swami Vivekananda school (the editor of the *Light of the East* asks why should we distinguish between Brahma, Vishnu, Rudra because all these are only asat) fully identify the two, saying the distinction is without difference. Some in the South again would deny that this one is Satchidananda, while those in the north admit it to be such. Under any system of theistic philosophy Indian or foreign, the only proof we have of God is because we require an intelligent and an all powerful Being who is the author of the origination, sustentation and resolution of this world and if God is therefore no creator and protector of this world and possesses neither gnana and kriya, the position of the Lokayitha is only thereby strengthened and we cannot prove the existence of such a god. We have elsewhere stated our reasons why the brahman referred to in the second of the Brahma Sutras, cannot be regarded as the lower one in addition to the reasons pointed out by Dr. Thibaut.

6. The fallacy in this simile is in omitting the seer in the Prameya to whom God appears falsely as the world. There being merely God it is unintelligible how any *bethu* knowledge will arise at first unless the one himself became a *Vikari* modified by delusion. When He clothes himself in delusion the world would result, when he did not choose, the world will not result. As such, maya becomes a real Bhanda of Brahman? Fancy how it looks that this Brahman should forget himself and mistake himself for what he is not. In our human experience and in the illustration of rope and snake, it always happens that when such illusions are caused, the very thing involves the existence of *two real* things and of these two one is mistaken for the other. Both snake and rope are real things. Both of them we know independently. We mistake the rope for the snake. Why? Because our eyesight is dimmed by darkness or weakened by some nervous condition of the system. With perfect vision and in light, we will never make the mistake. The real cause of the mistake is thus traced to an *imperfect* intelligent mind and does not exist in the rope or snake itself. So the question resolves itself into this. Why is the human mind imperfect? If it was ever perfect, why did it become so? This question is fully discussed in the article 'Another Side' printed in No. 3 of Vol. I of this journal and need not therefore be discussed by me at length here.

That the simile involves a real difference of *padarthas* combined with a mistaken similarity is well pointed out by Sri la Sri S. Somasundara Nayagar in his numerous works. The two things will not be mistaken for each other if there were no points of similarity between the two. The snake will only be perceived in a rope twisted as a snake is. It will not be perceived in a piece of rock or clay, or shell or silver or any other dissimilar thing. The snake perceived will be of the same dimensions as the original rope. Are all these circumstances present in the *Prameya*. God is Sat, Intelligent and Ananda. The world is asat, unintelligent and sorrow-producing. Is there any point of contact between the two?

TAYUMANAVAR'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page* 12.)

முத்தினையமுதமு மலைவாரின்சொலு
முகத்திலருபசமஞ்சரு
மூச்சிக்கலிசன் னதமேற்றவிருகும்ப
முலையின்பவெம்மாலுகால
வைத்தெமைமயக்கியிரு சன்மகிலையிலேயே
மாயாலிலாசமோக
வாரிதிவாழ்த்திலிம் பாழானசிற்றிடை
மடக்கைபர்கள்சிற்றின்பமோ
புத்தமிர்தபோகம் புசித்துவிழியினையாத
பொன்னுட்டெம்மந்தனென்றுற்
போராட்டமல்லவோ பேரின்பமுத்திபிப்
பூமியிலிருதலான
வெத்தினைவிகாதம்வரு மென்றுகர்சென்றதெதி
யிவ்வுலகமதியாததோ
விகபரிரண்டினு முயிரிலுச்சுயிராகி
யெல்குலிறகின்றபொருளே (கஎ)

93. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions!

Insuperable are *here* * the damnable pleasures of the sex. Their pretty pearl-like teeth, their sweet words passing through their coral lips, their bright shining countenance fresh with saffron yellow, their swelled breasts prominent with strings of gems glittering on and seeming too heavy for their slender waists—all these do excite a violent lust in men and, having wrapped them in the snare of their fierce eyes and lock them up, as it were, in the trance of charms, nay, they plunge them deep in the ocean of the libidinous *maya** Not free from their influence even the celestial beings, who wink not their eyes and live by the sweet and pleasant drink of ambrosia.

Therefore, to seek for emancipation from this world will be simply to employ ourselves in conscious struggle. That was reason why, we know, the great sage *Sukha* began to run up to the top of the Nidathia mount at once he was dropped from the womb.

R. SHANMUGA MUDALIAR.

(*To be continued.*)

* The Saint wants to impress upon his followers or readers the plain fact of *sexual love* in this life being the strongest of evils the man is heir to and the consequent lesson for us, that we should try and try again all our life time to estrange ourselves from *it* by declaring and declaring in verse and prose *its* vicious results. Hence even the typical Saints like Appurswami &c., have often sung the injurious consequences of yielding ourselves to sexual appetite in us.

* *Libidinous maya* is according to this school, an entity (matter with its own attributes or qualities illusory in their nature or kind, but the attribute (illusion) is often confounded by the orthodox Vedantins with the entity possessing such attribute. It may be asked here 'what is then meant by a Saiva Siddhanti calling the maya to be false'? The Siddhanti fairly and without any fallacy answers the question thus:—'A Siddhanti calls 'maya' an entity and says it is false because it is literally false *i.e.* false=deceitful (Latin '*falsus*'=deceived), while an orthodox Vedantin calls 'maya' *false* (not an entity) because it is an illusion. I would ask any disinterested inquirer to ponder over here and answer me fair *which* must be correct. (Correctness means logical precision, absence of any fallacy and not open to reasonable questionings nor hostile to reason and experience). If the maya which is false (*deceitful*) is to be understood as a *non-entity* (which no best lexicon seems to support), then why are the systems of Prayer or Guru Darsana or Guru seeking or the doctrine of Divine Arul or the inspiring Mahatmas, or the temple worship or Vedic learning or the Vedas themselves, enjoined as necessary to remove our ignorance, since ignorance due to mayaic means cannot then arise at all? They are sometimes followed and adopted even by the orthodox Vedantins. If everything is non-entity, except their own 'Self', then their 'Self' can with safety damn these systems as they (Vedantins of this type) will have no things or entities to contend or struggle against with the weapons of the prescribed modes of *Sadhana chathushtaya, Sariya* &c. They preach against these systems and yet themselves adopt them.

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, JULY 1898.

GOD AND THE WORLD.

THE ADVAITA

"The Vedic Texts '*Ekam evadwithiyam Brahma*,' '*Ekam Eva Rudro Nadwitiyya thas teh*' mean that there is only One Supreme Being without a second. And this One is the *Pathi* and not the soul. You, who say ignorantly you are One with the Lord, are the soul and are bound up with *Pasa*. As we say without the (primary sound) 'A' all other letters will not sound, so the Vedas say, without the Lord no other things will exist." Sivagnanabotham (ii. 1. *b*).

"ஆணவத்தோடு இரண்டு மில்லாத சுத்த
சதசிவமே நான் என்றிரண்டு மாமே"

"O for the day when I will be in advaita union with the unchangeable One as I am now in union with *Anava* (*Pasa*)"!

Says Count Tolstoi, "Religion is a certain relation established by man between his separate personality, and the endless universe, or its source; morality is the perpetual guiding of life which flows from this relation." And as we have explained in our previous article, even knowledge of a thing means knowledge of its difference and similarity with other things, its relation to things which are dissimilar, and to things which are similar and from the knowledge of such relation, our further acts are determined. Say, if the object be a new fruit we had not seen before, if we find it related to the edible species, we try to eat it; if not, we throw it away. If one should make however a mistake in the identification, from imperfect experience or knowledge, or misled by the nice and tempting appearance of the fruit, woe befalls him when he partakes thereof. All our good and evil flows accordingly from our understanding right or wrongly our relation to men and things and society. And the highest philosophy and religion accordingly mean also knowledge and knowledge of the relation of the highest postulates of existence; and different systems arise as different kinds of relationships are postulated; and in determining the respective views, imperfect observation and experience, passion, and prejudice, trammels created by heredity and society, have all their play; and we have different moral standards followed by men, consciously or unconsciously, as resulting from their already formed convictions.

Proceeding on our own lines of discovering these relationships, we took with us Dr. Bain to help us on to a particular stage. He is a most uncompromising agnostic and materialist (qualified) and yet we were in perfect agreement with him all the way he took us, and if he refuses to go with us further and sees pitfalls and dangers in such a path and is not willing to brave such, we can quite understand his motives and can only admire his honesty. So far as we went with him also, it was perfect sailing. We were well aware of things we were talking about, there was no mistaking them, the facts were all within our experience, and there was nothing in them which contradicted our experience and we were not asked to believe things on credit, by appealing to intuition or authority. When reason failed, we were not referred to *Sruti*, and when *Sruti* failed, we were not referred to their own individual yogic experience, and when all these failed, no verbal jugglery was adopted; and nothing was made to look grand by making it a matter of mystery. Our meaning is quite unmistakeable, and we use plain language and if it is not plainer, we shall try to make it so.

We found accordingly that our present experiences and facts of cognition resolve themselves into two sets of facts, two grand divisions, totally distinct, and yet in inseparable relation, and we called them respectively mind, and matter, ego and non-ego, subject and object, atma and pasa, chit and achit, sat and asat. We noted their inter-dependence and inter relation; as regards the nature of the relation itself, it was in a sense inexplicable. We could say positively that the relation is not one of causation or succession, not mere order in place and it could not be that of the whole to its part, nor one acting on the other, or using the other as its instrument, nor that of container and contained, nor no relation at all; and we could not thus picture this relation in any one of the modes known to us in our actual experience; and the only analogy available to us in nature, namely that of vowels and consonants helped us a good deal to have some idea of this relation. It is not one, it is not two, and our Acharya asks us to keep us quiet, "ஈரிரண்டுமல்ல சன்மத்தை" but still even this posi-

tion requires a naming, and for want of a better name too, we use the word 'Advaita' to such relation. The word Advaitam implies the existence of two things and does not negative the reality or the existence of one of the two. It simply postulates a relation between this two. The relation is one in which an identity is perceived, and a difference in instance is also felt. It is this relation which could not easily be postulated in words, but which perhaps may be conceived and which is seen as two (Dvaitam) and at the same time as not two (Na Dvaitham); it is this relation which is called Advaitam (a unity or identity in duality) and the philosophy which postulates such relation is called the Advaita Philosophy; and it being the highest truth also, it is called the *Siddhanta* (The true end). This view has therefore to be distinguished from the monism of the materialist and idealist, and from the dualism of Dr. Reid and Hamilton. But Dr. Bain and others of his school would regard themselves as monists, but in that case, the distinction between this monism, may we call it qualified monism, and the monism of writers before the advent of the present agnostic school must be carefully observed. There is no wrong in using any name for anything, but when particular associations have been already established, it serves no purpose except to confound and confuse to use old words with new meanings introduced into them. In a sense, this view is also the true monistic view. Say from the individual standpoint, when the man is in a pure objective condition, his mind becomes merged in the body; the mind identifies itself thoroughly with the body and is not conscious of its own distinction from the body. By this process of merger and complete identification, the apparent existence is only one, that of the object; when the mind is free from all object consciousness, the object world vanishes as it were, and there is only one fact present and that is the mind, and nothing else. Without mind however nothing else can subsist, and when the mind is in its own place, nothing else is *seen* to subsist. And how appropriate does the interpretation of that oft-quoted and oft-abused Vedic text, '*Ekam evadvitiyam Brahma*' by Saint Meikandan seem now! When we arrive at the postulate of God, we arrive at the third padartha, and no body has yet been found to postulate an existence higher than these three. And these constitute the thri-padartha of most of the Hindu schools. They differ no doubt in the definition and description of these three entities as also in the pescription of their relationships. This third postulate could not be arrived at by direct perception, observation and experiment. We think however it can be proved by strict logical methods, by such proof as is possible, and we are at liberty to postulate it to explain the residuary facts unexplained by the Materialists and Idealists. If this postulate will explain facts left unexplained by these people and if it will not contradict any of the facts of human nature and probabilities, there is no harm in having It for a workable hypothesis. We believe also that the Materialists and Idealists leave many facts unexplained and that this third postulate is necessary to explain these facts. We, however, do not propose to go into this wide question now. We only propose to discuss God's relation to mind (soul) and matter just at present. And the relation we postulate is the same as between mind and body which we have already postulated and we call it by the same name '*advaita*' And the couplet we have quoted from Thayumanavar conveys the idea most beautifully, and the merit of expounding this beautiful view of '*advaita*' must in the first place be accorded to *Saint Meikandan*, whom *Saint Thayumanavar* himself extols as the "பொய்கண்டார் காணும்புணர்த மாமதியில் மெய்கண்டான்," The Seer of *Advaita* 'Truth'. God is related to the soul as the soul is related to the world. God is the Pure subject, the Pure Ego and the Soul is the pure object, non-ego God is Sat (the true existence), Soul is Asat. As however we have called the world Asat, we are not willing to extend the term to soul also; and it, besides occupies a peculiar position between God, Sat, on the one hand and the world, Asat, on the other hand; and hence the term *Satasat* has been applied to it. The term means that which is neither God nor the world (maya) but which when joined to either becomes completely identified with each. When united to the body, it is completely identified with the body, and when united to God, it is completely identified with God. We have already observed that when the soul is united to the body it is completely identified with it, it has not ceased to exist, as the body ceased when the soul was in its own plane The very existence of the body implied the existence of the soul, though for the nonce the soul was not conscious of its separateness and individuality and distinction from the object or body. Just in the same way when the Jiva is in the Highest union with Sivam, the Jiva is not conscious of its separateness, and individuality and distinction from God. If this consciousness was present there will be no union; and if the soul was not itself present,

to speak of union in Moksha and Anubhava and Ananda will also be using language without meaning. And this characteristic of the soul is very peculiar. It is named சார்ந்ததன் வண்ணமாதல் or அதனதனாதல், 'becoming one with that to which it is attached.' The Hindu Idealists try to arrive at the postulate of the soul precisely by the same mode of proof as is furnished in sutras 3 and 4 of Sivagnanabootham, and arriving at this postulate which is found to be above the 24 tatwas, above the elements, above the tanmatras, above the Gnana and Karmendriyas, above the four andakarana, they have not paused to discover its further nature and characteristics, and have straightway proceeded to identify it with God whom they have read of in the Srutis, and have not tried to learn the relation between these two; and all the absurdities of the Mayavada school are clearly traceable to not understanding the nature of the soul aright. These further aspects of the soul and its relation to God are therefore well brought out in sutras 7, 6 and 5. And how this Jiva can possibly become Sivam and in what sense, is beautifully brought out in 6. 2. (*e*).

அதுவெனவு மொன்றன்றி அதுவன்றி வேறே
யதுவென்றறி யறிவுமுண்டோ—அதுவென
அதுவதிரண்டலனுங் கதிவுணிற்றல்
அறியுமறிவே சிவமுமாம்.

God is not one who can be pointed out as "That." If so, not only will He be an object of knowledge, it will imply a *Gnatha* who understands Him as such. He is not different from the soul as an object of knowledge. He becomes one with the soul pervading its understanding altogether. The soul so feeling itself is also Sivam.

Chapter II of Light of Grace has also to be read in this connection; and Saint Umapathi Sivacharya asks a question to bring out the importance of this great characteristic of the soul. "Are there not objects in this world which become dark in darkness and light in light?" he asks, and the answer given by himself elsewhere is "the eye, the mirror and akas are such objects." The eye loses its power of seeing in darkness, and recovers it in light; and the others become dark or bright as darkness or light surrounds it. Saint Thayumanavar also refers to this peculiarity in several places and calls the soul யாதான்று பற்றின தனியியல்பாய் நின்று பந்தமும் பளிக்கினையொத்த ஈ. 'You who are like the mirror or crystal removed of dust, becoming of the self same nature of one to which it is joined.' Here the Light is God, darkness is Maya and the Mirror or Eye or Akas is the soul. We all feel that there is a sentience which suffers this change from light to darkness. If this sentience is identified with God himself, surely the change must descend on his head. We have not yet been able to understand (of course we are ready to confess we do not belong to the superior class of mortals said to possess 'the sharpest intellects, a bold understanding' to which ranks our brother of the *Brahmavadin* elevates himself—*vide* p. 749 current volume) how when they postulate only one padartha, One self, and no Jiva, how God can be saved from all the impurity and sin and ignorance present in nature. To say that the Sruti says that God cannot be tainted by such contact is only begging the question and is no answer. To assert that the Infinite God by this false imposition, Avidya had become divided into millions and millions of finite beings and without stopping to make good this statement itself by proof except by giving an analogy (which analogy is found to fail most miserably in most important details) and to assert with the same breath, that this sub-division is false is a mere myth, a dream, that there is no universe, men or Gods, you or I and then to say further that you and I, gods and men and the world are all God seems to be the height of absurdity and not born of 'the sharpest intellect, a bold understanding.' If so, we must have altogether a different definitions of these terms. We will close this paper by quoting two verses from Saint Thirumular and we challenge comparison with them with anything else found in any writing ancient or modern to express the truth of the double aspect and relation we have been describing above with the same aptness and richness of illustration.

மரத்தை மறைத்தது மாமதயானை,
மதத்தின் மறைத்தது மாமதயானை,
பரத்தை மறைத்தது பார்முதற்பூதம்,
பரத்தின் மறைந்தது பார்முதற்பூதம்.

The tree was concealed in the mad elephant:
The tree concealed the mad elephant.
The Supreme was concealed in the world;
The Supreme concealed the world.

(Here tree means a wooden toy elephant).

பொன்னே மறைத்தது பொன்னணிபூடகம்,
பொன்னின் மறைத்தது பொன்னணிபூடகம்,
தன்னே மறைத்தது தன்கரணங்களாம்,
தன்னின் மறைந்தது தன்கரணங்களாம்.

The gold was concealed in the golden ornament
The gold concealed the golden ornament
The 'I' was concealed in its own senses;
The 'I' concealed its own senses.

These two verses though they look similar are not the same and we will expound their meaning in our next.

EVIDENCES OF NATURAL RELIGION.

THE DIVINE PERFECTIONS.

(*Continued from page 19.*)

Now, as it was above shown, all the beings of which we have experience are contingent, namely, are effects of other causes, and in so far they are posterior to them. But who will venture to say that something is prior to God? Who will be so bold as to assert that something is prior to the first cause? Who will be able to maintain that some one stands to God in the relation of Maker or Architect of his existence?

The primary idea that all men entertain about God is that He is the first Being, the first cause of all other beings the first source, the only fountain of created existence. If therefore, God is the first Cause of every thing, the first source of every existence, He is also the only self-existent, the only necessary Being: that is, so He exists that He cannot but exist, as he possesses in Himself the necessity of his existence; in a word, He is self-existent. This truth is in itself so clear, that neither materialists, nor evolutionists nor pantheists are bold enough to give an explanation of the origin of the present world, without supposing an eternal and self-existent Something, either "Maker" or 'the Unknown,' or the so-called Absolute, or the pure Ego, or anything else. This goes to show that the originator, or the First Cause of the Universe must exist of itself, and not be indebted for its actual existence to some other thing, that it must be self-existent.

Picture then to yourself that abyss of eternity when nothing was as yet created, but God alone existed happy in himself and from Himself. Then there was no sun, no moon, no stars, no vaulted heaven, no earth, no trees, no animals, no men, nothing whatever. Yet God existed. Do not ask when He was created or born. *When* implies time, and God is the Creator of time also. God is neither created nor born. God forever was, is and shall be: self-existence is His nature, his property, his characteristic. As the characteristic of light is to shine, the characteristic of heat to warm, that of food to nourish, so God's characteristic is to be, self-existence is His nature, his essence, his character, the root of all his other attributes and perfections.

God the First Cause of everything.

God being the necessary, the self-existent Being, it follows that He is the First cause of everything that comes anyway to existence. Creatures do really exist: but their existence is limited, finite and caused. They exist, but they are not self-existent. They only partake of existence. They all rank, though in different degrees in the scale of created existence. Senseless matter exists but its existence ranks lowest in the scale of creation. Next comes vegetable matter, still higher stands the animal kingdom, but the summit of this visible world is the domain of man, its king, its lord, its most perfect representative. But the scale does not end there: higher it ascends into the world of the spirits, into the world of disembodied souls, into the world of pure minds, not entangled with matter, rising higher and higher towards that infinite minence where in the sunshine of self-existence and immortality, almighty God abides for ever and ever. All these creatures material and spiritual are not self-existent but partake, though in different degrees, of created existence. Now to whom should they owe their existence but to God, the first source, the only fountain of existence? It belongs to beauty itself to make everything beautiful, to wisdom itself to render everybody wise, and to the self-existent Being to draw from an ideal state into the state of real existence, everything that anyway really exists. But who, save. God, could confer on any one the gift of existence? Who but God could cross the infinite abyss that divides nothingness from existence? Who but God should be that self-existent first cause to whose power the origin of all things is rightly ascribed? We readily grant a certain power of production has been communicated by God to all secondary active causes: but that power must be derived from the same source, whence the contingent being itself is derived, namely, from the self-existent first cause.

In France some years ago, a young man, a native of one of the provinces, was sent to Paris to complete his studies. Like many others he had the misfortune to meet with bad companions. His own passions together with the impious language of his comrades soon led him to a forgetfulness of the pious lessons of his mother, and to a contempt of Religion. He came to the point of wishing, and at length of saying, like the senseless creatures of whom the prophet speaks, there is no God, God is only a word. Incredulity always begins by saying these things as it were in a passing way; it is a plant that takes root only in corruption. After many years' residence in the capital, the young man returned to the bosom of his family.

He was invited one day to a very respectable house. There was a large company assembled. Whilst every one talked about news, pleasure or business, two little girls, each twelve or thirteen years of age, were reading together, seated in the recess of a window

G. BARTOLI, S.J., D. D

(*To be continued.*)

CAMEOS FROM TAMIL LITERATURE.

HEREWITH we present a few more pictures, which in their naturalness, and exquisite beauty challenge comparison. How often do men forget, engrossed as they are in their various worldly pursuits, that they leave behind them, in their homes, one heart whose sole occupation is in fondly doting and in anxiously brooding over the return of her absent lord?

1. வேலி முழந்த வதிமுயங் கோய்களிறு
வாலிக்கு வைப்பின் வழங்காத்தேர் நீர்க்கவாங்,
கானங் கடந்தி ரெனக்கேட்பின் யாஞ்னது
சாவுகோ வையு நிறிது.

நீயே, செய்வினை மருங்கிற் செலவயாந்தியாழநின்
கையுறை வல்லின் ஞாளர் நியே,
இவட்கே, செய்வது மண்டில மையாப் பதுபோன்
மெய்யில் வாண்முகம் பசப்பூரும்மே

நீயே, விணைமாண் காழகம் வீங்கச் கட்டிப்
புணைமான் மரிஇய வம்பு தெரிதியே
இவட்கே, சுணைமா னீலஞ காரெதிர் பலைபோல்
இணைகோக் குவ்கண் னீர்நில் வாவே.

நீயே, புலம்பி னுள்ளமொடு பொருவயிற் செலிஇய்
வலம்படு திகிரி வாய்நீ வுதியே,
இவட்கே, அலங்கிதழ்க் கோடல வீயுகு மலைபோல்
இலங்கேரெல்வளை யிறைபூ ரும்மே.

எனநீன்,

செல்லலை யரவத்து மினையல னீப்பின்
தன்னலங் கண்டகொளப் பதலின் மற்றிவள்
இன்னுயிர் பிதலும் மாற்றுமோ
முன்னிய தேசத்து முயன்றசெய் பொருளே.

The Maid.—"Scorched by the summer sun, reduced in body and panting for water, the wild elephants run after the mirage in the rainless desert. This desert, I hear you speak of crossing; my dear sir, will you let me ask of you this, a little.

"You bent on the preparation for your journey are straightening the bowstring with your hand; whereas,

She, like the moon crossed by the clouds over the clear full moon, has her unspotted face crossed by the shade of sorrow.

"You, strapping tight your strong belt,
are choosing the best arrows fit for your purpose; whereas

She, like the bright blue lily filling from the shower of rain, has her eyes overswing with tears.

You without any tender thought, and solely bent on acquiring wealth, are brightening your victorious disc free from dust; whereas,

She, like the large stamens and petals falling from the white Gloriosa tree, has her bangles loosened from her wrists.

"Therefore, when her condition is such, at hearing the noise of preparation, where will life be, when you desert her? And then, can all the wealth brought from foreign land, bring back her sweet life?

2. The following piece continues the same subject introducing some fine similes, and some moral sayings on the duties of kings, and the change of fortune.

The Maid.—"Scorched by the Sun's angry rays, as by the cruel misrule of the king, advised by his minister, who could neither uphold justice nor possess grace, the elephants which formerly shed its juice, over which the flies swarmed, now shorn of their beauty and their strength, fall down flat on the desert sand planting their tusks right into the ground, like the plough driven into dry soil.

Such a desert covered with smoking hill sides you resolved on crossing though even without intimation to us.

I have a word to say to you, my dear Sir, will you hear me.

The seven strings of the lute which gave pleasure to its hearers suddenly snap and the lute becomes useless.

Wealth less stable than this lute, can any one ever desire?

"The Goddess of fortune abandons its quandom favourites in more pitiable plight than before.

Wealth less stable than this Goddess can any one ever desire.

The minister, forgetful of his own interests, and ever intent on securing the glory of his master, suffered ignominy and death at the hands of the angry and ungrateful king.

Wealth, less stable than this king's rule, can the ever desire?

"O my Lord, don't desire such wealth, abandon your journey, I pray you. No harm will result. Honor your guests and enjoy the sweets of home. Wealth consists in no other course.

கலிகெழ் தொழிலி னமைவில்லான் வில்லைவாங்க
கொடிதோர்த்த மன்னவன் கோல்போல ஞாயிறு
கதிரு கதிர்மூட்டிக் காய்சினைக் தெறுதலின்
உறலுறு கமழ்கடாத் தொல்கிய வெழில்வேழம்
வறனுறு காஞ்சில்போல் மருப்பூன்றி நிலஞ்சேர
விறன்மே வெம்பிய போக்கரு வெஞ்சுரம்
சொல்லா திறப்பத் தணிந்தனிர்க் கொருபொருள்
சொல்லுவதடையேன் கேண்மினம்ம றைறிய,

வீழுநர்க் கிறைச்சியாய் வீழ்வார் பிசைக்குங்கோல்
ஏழுந்தம பயன்கெட வீடின்றி நறம்புரி உம்
யாழினும் கிளியிலாப் பொருளையும் கச்சுபவோ.

மரீஇத்தாங் கொண்டாரைக் கொண்டக்காற் போலாது
பிரியுங்காற் பிறகொள்ளப் பீடின்றி புறமாறும்
திருவினும் கிளையிலாப் பொருளையு கச்சுபவோ ?

புரைதவப் பயனேக்கார் தமமாக்க முயலவாரை
வரைவின்றிச் செறமபொழுதிற் கண்ணேடா தயிர்
வெளவும்,
அரைசினும் கிளையிலாப் பொருளையு கச்சுபவோ ?

எனவாங்கு,

கச்சல் கூடாத பெருமை விச்செல
வொழிதல் வேண்டுவல் சூழிற் பழியின்று
மன்னவன் புறந்தர வருவலுந் தோம்பித்
துன்னகர் விழைய கூடின்
இன்றுறல் வியன்மார்ப வதுமலும் பொருளே.

KAMBAN.

(*Continued from page 22.*)

The canons of Tamil epics put special stress on this head. The poetry of the modern school especially in exact accordance with the mechanism of poetry as expounded in the grammars. But of the art of poetry, the Tamils seem not to have a definite idea, of the true nature and functions of poetry they appear yet to be in the dark. The poetry of the moderns has become a purely mechanical affair. To take hold of a hero, invoke a special deity, to open the poem with a description of the heroe's country and of the capital where he supposed to have reigned or flourished, and to narrate the history of the hero in a few chapters and close the work with the heroe's achievement of heaven, are the be—a l and end—all of epic poetry. The puranic literature has dwindled down to such a stereotyped formula that the rishis of Naimisaranyam and the great sage Sûda are a matter of absolute necessity even for a half true and half mythical incident only a few centuries old. The author of மாறனலங்காரம் in the 59th and 60th sutrams of his பாயிரம் advises students anxious of acquiring the art to read aloud standard authors, to be an amanuensis to poets, to practice the composition of poetry by completing a poem when the subject and first line or lines are given, and to drill in the acquisition of the mechanism, no matter of the soundness of the thought and other embellishments, and to study carefully the strong old poets. After all this drill, he assures the student, of the excellent poems he will compose. What a practical lesson on the inimitable art!

In analysing the art of modern poetry, the Rev. Father D. J. Leschi states that the Tamil poets use the genuine language of poetry "for (1) they rarely mention any object to which they do not couple some ornamental epithet, (2) they are exceedingly fond of metaphorical expressions, (3) the Tamils make use of allegories (and in their application their extreme passion for hyperbole often leads them into extravagance), (4) they delight in similes (which are not unfrequently strained and such as the better judgment of Europeans would not approve, though they often make them a vehicle for moral instruction—which is esteemed a peculiar excellence) and (5) we find many good instances of the figure hypotyposis or vision, in which the subject is placed before the eyes in minute and faithful description. In the same breath he condemns them :—"The Tamil poets indulge in the boldness of fiction, and employing their deities, pay little regard to the laws of nature. The learned have been at much pains in defending Homer, who has, on one occasion, introduced a horse speaking: but the Tamil poets constantly attribute the power of speech to animals. In their use of this licence, however, they are so consistent, that a fiction employed in one place, is connected with those which follow; and they insert them so skilfully, that the vulgar look upon the dreams of the poets as real histories; and hence the numerous false notions which are prevalent in this country and again, the Tamils maintain, that every kind of poem should commence with an invocation..... The precepts which have been laid down on the subject of invocation are numerous and absurd."

The old school of poetry paid more attention to the goodness of the matter than to the form. They rather subjected metre to matter. Metre was a secondary matter to them. There was much of domestic love and the dearness of home. There was more of every day life in them. The moderns have subjected matter to metre. Subject-matter is only a matter of insignificance. What now passes for poetic taste is a childish delight in riotous imagination. Of some of the works of the old school Mr. Sundram Pillay Avargal of Trivandrum College writes on page 661, March number of the *Christian College Magazine* for 1891:—"They are charming portraits of nature in some of her pleasant and striking moods and for soberness of thought and accuracy of representation they will bear comparison with anything in the whole realm of literature. In them critics will seek in vain for that idle accumulation of hyperbolical conceits which characterizes the Tamil poems of modern times." The late Rev Bower of Madras who of course had much acquaintance only with modern poets says, "Pathos and sweetness rather than vigour are the characteristics of Indian Poetry. They are not 'thoughts that breathe and words that burn' so much as thoughts that please and words that charm." Of Dravidian Poetry in general Bishop Caldwell writes:—"Whilst an elevated, a natural expressive description, a pithy sententious maxim or a striking comparison may sometimes be met with, unfortunately elegance of style has always been preferred to strength, euphony has been preferred to truthfulness, and poetic fire has been quenched in an ocean of conceits. Nothing can exceed the refined elegance and 'linked sweetness' of many Telugu and Tamil poems; but a lack of power and purpose, and a substitution of sound for sense, more or less characterizes them all." We now see that, though the primary object of all Tamil poets is salvation in due course, the old school cared more for the substance and the modern school care more for the shadow.

Kamban's poetry:—Kamban shared the defects of the modern school, while evincing signs of the excellence of the old school. It is quite true that not Tamil poet has the fire of Burns and the simplicity and plainness of Chaucer. There was neither a Scott nor a Goldsmith, neither a Shelley nor Browning among the Tamils. That Kamban was miltonic we cannot doubt. That he had the germs of the genius of Shakespeare we cannot doubt. But he was Milton seen through a microscope, and Shakespeare viewed through a telescope. Of the modern school he was the only poet who understood poetry to mean "the art of employing words in such a manner as to produce an illusion on the imagination, the art of doing by means of words what the painter does by means of colours." But his hero is the All-in-all in human flesh. Kamban believed that Rama was the great God on earth for a special purpose. Ravana was for him a very Rakshas as with ten heads and twenty shoulders. The account of the hero supernatural conquering monster extraordinary cannot pretend to be true nature. Rama is only man in his dealings with other men, and there Kamban is quite true to nature. But in the field before the Rakshasas he is a prodigy and Kamban piles hyperbole upon hyperbole. But it is to be remembered that he closely follows the original in such affairs and that Valmiki is more responsible than our author, who, however, is bold enough to vary the plot of the original in some places which shall notice further on in the proper place.

The dark-side of the picture:—An English man remarks that "the Tamil imitation never condescends to be natural, much less prosaic, but is always elaborately rhetorical and ornate. It piles up epithet on epithet, simile on simile till the thought is obscured and the narrative interrupted and almost forgotten." This remark is of course true of the passages which describe the march of armies generally, the வரைக் கடலிற் பூக்கொய்த, கிட்கிந்தையர்ப்படு, உண்டாட்டு, &c. of Balakandam, the description of the rainy season in Kishkinda, and a very great part of the seats and scenes of Sunderkanda. Yuthakanda of course a climax. But Kamban was so much at home with the kings when at home and abroad that he was thoroughly familiar with and accustomed to the confusion and great array of the march of the armies while ranging his exile through thick forests and large mountains and vast countries, he saw nature his naked luxuriant beauty; his imagination was besides strong and so well developed that he could philosophise and moralise, be it a tree or river, the whole day without getting tired. The result is that a bit of a story gets entangled among the foliage of his descriptions and musings on nature, and his work cannot be enjoyed but by advanced scholars who read and understand many hundred stanzas in one breath. Students who cannot in the course of one lesson read at least a

fifty stanzas cannot appreciate him and they cannot be considered competent to meddle with the work; such scholars as can read and understand easily will find no monotony in persuing the Ramayan. Even in a prose version, Kamban can be appreciated only by those who read at least a dozen pages at a time.

Pedants appreciate what are called Kambasutrams. With these weapons they puzzle and befool many scholars otherwise able. The mystery of these Kambasutrams is, that there, syntax is bad. Unfold the proper syntax, lay bare the ellipses, and the matter lies in a nutshell. Only the initiated are aware of these sutrams. Their Key is the only "*Sesame*" which can open these caverns: others will only be *oats* and *barleys*. Besides the sutras, there are also certain stanzas pointed out whose meaning, it is said, not one scholar of the day understands. Such sutrams were not consciously composed by Kamban. Such problematic stanzas were not wilfully set in numbers by Kamban. He never intended them to be gordian knots. He went on composing the Ramayan at such a headlong speed at the rate of about 3,000 lines a day that he probably paid very little attention in many places to bad syntax which crept in, unseen. But he explained or untied these knots in his own time, and his explanations have been handed down from generation to generation. There is also no indication that he revised and polished his work.

P. CHELVAKESAVARAYA MUDALIAR, M A.

(To be continued).

CORRESPONDENCE.

To

The Editor of the *Siddhanta Deepika*,

Madras.

DEAR SIR,

In reference to the article "The Nature of the Divine Personality" which appeared in the *Siddhanta Deepika* for May, I beg leave to make the following observations.

Two points are in dispute in the learned article. First as to the name Saguna and Nirguna, which of the two namely may be said of God. Secondly as to the definition and meaning of the word Person. To-day I shall attempt to clear up the first question only.

I need not say that the word "Person" may be said of God by analogy only not by identity, its name "Person" being primarily applied to man and not to God. We say that man is a person, and to this word we connect a corresponding idea, which we likewise and by analogy apply to God. This word person is to be found in every language, and Sanskrit is no exception to the rule. Now, most Sanskrit scholars speak of man as Saguna, or endowed with qualities, and by that they mean to say he is a Person. Are they wrong in so doing? We think not. For, the import of the term Guna is quality or accident; hence Nirguna means want of properties, or also of good properties (cfr. Colebrooke on the Philosophy of the Hindus page 258; Benfey Sanskrit English Dictionary; Monier Williams. Religious thought etc. page 31.)

That Sanskrit scholars are right in rendering the word Human Person" by Saguna, it may be thus proved. According to the Sankhyan theory, the same thing must be said of the individual soul or Purusha and of Prakriti since the same theory has been applied to the evolution of matter as to the evolution of the soul. Prakriti in itself is a mere blind and dark force, nor, if left alone, does it produce anything. In order that creation be apparent, Prakriti must unite itself with the three Gunas-Satva, Rajas and Tamas. Thus Prakriti, fecundated as it were, by the three qualities, brings forth Buddhi *i. e.*, the intellect or intelligent perception; and next the faculty of self-consciousness or personality, called the I-maker Aham-kara. In like manner, Purusha in itself neither thinks, nor feels, nor is conscious. It is when in composition with the three Gunas that Purusha becomes Jiva or Jivatman the personal soul or spirit. So far goes the Sankhyan theory. Nor is it wrong, if we take it in its main features only. For, a person, in the common opinion of mankind is a being that lives, thinks, feels, and is self-conscious. Now all this stands to the soul, as qualities or gunas stand to matter or prakriti. As matter cannot exist without quantity and yet quantity is not matter, so also the human soul cannot exist without the faculty of thinking or mind, and yet mind is a faculty of the soul, not the soul itself. Therefore in regard to the human personality, Saguna and not Nirguna is the word to be used, as a human soul altogether devoid of qualities cannot exist, may it is in no way conceivable. However I do not wish to be misunderstood. When I render the word person by Saguna I take the word in its original meaning *i. e.*, endowed with properties or qualities," without reference to the three specific Gunas-Satva, Rajas and Tamas. These three specific gunas are the out-come of a philosophical system, which however good it may be, cannot stand fully the test of

But when we speak of Almighty God, the thing turns out to be altogether different. God is infinitely simple namely, not only is one undivided Being, but indivisible. If we consider the immaterial soul of man alone, we have

a being not composed of substantial parts, and therefore rightly called a simple substance. "Nevertheless even the soul is not exempt from all composition. It is liable to accidental composition. For, it is changeable in regard to its thoughts and volitions, so that we can distinguish these and it, as component parts of a whole. More over the self-same faculties of the soul are qualities of the soul not the soul itself, and we call them real or physical composition. Not so with God. In God neither of them exists, because no *substantial* or *accidental* composition is conceivable in the Divine Being. Indeed, how could it be? An accident, Guna for instance or quality, is a perfection or modification added to the nature of a substance. But to the nature of the divine substance no perfection or modification can be added. Any addition made could not be the addition of anything self-existent, because what falls under the conception of self-existence belongs to the Divine Nature itself. Nor again, could it be the addition of any thing not self-extistent; because what is not self-existent cannot be found in the Divine Nature. Hence in God there are no accidents, no qualities, no properties, no Gunas whatsoever. Hence the Divine Mind does not need any determination from without to enable it to know all truth, and God's knowledge is His substance. Hence God's Essence is to Him, by identity, intellect, object of thought, and mental representation; so that God in His infinite simplicity is self-conscious, and His infinite simplicity is self-conscious, and His infinite knowledge is attained by one all-embracing act of intuition and this one act is nothing else but the Divine Essence itself, just as the sun illuminated itself by that very light with which it lightens up the whole world" cfr. B. Boedder S. J., Natural Theology, page 92; 258— Therefore I answer to my learned opponent that God described by him at page 278 "as the supporter and spectator and seer, transcending both Prakriti and Purusha and Gods and Ishwaras" is undoubtedly the true God, and as such can be called Nirguna Being according to the meaning stated above. I cannot however agree with him in the description of God as Nirguna, Being such as is found in the Gita, chapter IV. verses 5 to 18. For in this chapter the Author of Gita follows the Vedanta theory according to which God is essentially devoid of qualities, inert, unconscious, neither existent nor non-existent. This being, or rather Non-Being is the God of the Vedantists, and as such it is neither Saguna nor Nirguna. It is not Saguna, because, as it was said, such a Being, is essentially devoid of qualities; it is not Nirguna, because this supreme soul or spirit of the Universe (Atman, afterwards called Brahman) does not enjoy a separate and independent existence, and it exists only in so far as it begins to exist in any object, to think about anything, or to be joyful about anything, and it does so by associating itself with the power of Maya and investing itself with three corporeal envelopes. Therefore arguing against the Vedantists I should say that God is Saguna *i. e.* a Being endowed with qualities, which however are not really distinct from His Divine Essence and therefore God may be rightly called in the sense of my learned opponent Nirguna Being.

MANGALORE, *July 3rd*, 1898. G. BERTOLI. S. J.

REVIEW.

THE LAY OF THE JEWELLED ANKLET.*

A curious Tamil poem called Silappathigaram: 'the chapter of the *Silambu*' (an anklet worn by dancers) —hollow and filled sometimes with pebbles, sometimes with choice gems, which give forth a tinkling sound, has long been known to a few Tamil scholars. It is in three books and eighty cantos.

This is an elegy, but comparatively little known composition, one of the five ancient Tamil poems, being a romantic story like 'The Lady of the Lake,' and not rising to the dignity of an epic. It is often obscure sometimes very tedious; but it is full of genius.

The following is a specimen of its style. It is the dedication of the first canto to the Sora king:—

1. Praise we the MOON! Praise we the MOON
It affords grace to the fair and spacious world, like the cool
White umbrella over the flagrant-flower-garlanded head (of the king).

Praise we the SUN! Praise we the SUN!
Like the chariot of the lord of Kaviri's† domain
It wheels around Meru's golden heights.

3. Praise we the vast CLOUD! Praise we the vast CLOUD!
Like his grace it pours down blessings on the world
Begirt by the fearsome sea.

4. Praise we flowery PUGAR! Praise we flowery PUGAR!‡
It uplifts itself, and spreads, and grows together with his (*the king's*) clan,
Above all the world surrounded by the swelling ocean's tide.'

Of this work a very complete edition has recently been published by that admirable Tamil scholar, V. Swaminathaiyar, Tamil Pandit of the Kumbakonam College. (Madras 1892).

The author was a prince of the Sera roya' family, hence often called Seraman, who became an ascetic, and is commonly known as *Ilanko-Adigal* (the young prince-ascetic). The religion of the poem is a strange

* Edited by V. Swaminathaiyar, Madras, 1892.

† The river Cavery.

‡ The capital at that time Pumpattanam (See my Tul. Lex.)

confusion of Jainism Hinduism, and pre-historic Demonism.

There is an exhaustive commentary by Adiyarkku Nallar, of whom nothing more is known.

The poem is divided into three books, which bear the title of Pugar (Kaveri-pattanam) Madura and Karur, being the chief cities of the Sora, Pandiya and Sera kingdoms respectively. In Pugar there lived a merchant whose name was Macattuvan, who had a son called Kovalan, married to a most beautiful and excellent lady whose name was Kannagi. This young couple lived in a splendid palace, and had great stores of wealth, which they employed in acts of piety and beneficence. Unhappily there was a great festival held in Pugar in honour of Indra, which was wont to be celebrated with surpassing pomp by all the citizens. At this festival there appeared a female musician and dancer of surpassing beauty and accomplishments. This stranger diverted the affections of Kovalan, and in her society he squandered away the whole of his property. When he at length broke loose from her, and returned penniless to his patient wife, he found her worn away with sorrow and distress. Filled with compunction he resolved to leave the city, repair to Madura, and try to retrieve his fortunes. Kannagi, whose lovely character is exquisitely drawn, has an anklet (*Silambu*) filled with precious stones of great value, and with this, which she gives him, as his capital, he hopes to regain his lost fortune. She consents to accompany him, and that very night, in the midnight darkness, they set forth unknown to any of their kindred; and, going along the north bank of the Kaveri, proceeded westward till they reached a park-like enclosure, where a number of Jain mendicants were performing penance; amongst these was an old lady whose name was Gaunthi, who, learning that they were on their way to the renowned Madura, resolved to accompany them, that she might hear the wonderful lessons of virtue taught by the Madura sages. They proceeded onward till they reached *Arangam*, near Trichinopoly, where, in a boat, they passed over to the southern bank of the Kavèri and entered a thicket full of blooming flower plants. Of course, every portion of this history of their pilgrimage is filled with descriptions and digressions,—sometimes very beautiful, and often not a little tedious,—throwing light upon the life of South India in the olden time.

The second book, which is entitled 'Madura,' relates how they passed on towards the south. There a messenger finds them, giving them tidings of the sorrow which their sudden disappearance had given to their kindred. By that messenger Kovalan sends suitable greetings to his father and mother and all his relatives. They then pass on till they come to the river Vaigai, which they cross on a raft, and arrive at the huts of some ascetics outside the walls of Madura. The next morning, arising early, our merchant commits his wife to the care of *Gaunthi*, and after a touching farewell (one of the gems of Tamil verse) proceeds to Madura to begin his commercial enterprise by disposing of the precious anklet.

In the street of Madura he meets a company of goldsmiths, at the head of whom was the King's head jeweller. To him Kovalan shows the jewelled anklet, and asks him to estimate its value. Now this jeweller was an arrant rogue, and had recently made away with a similar anklet belonging to the Queen, and was living under daily apprehension that he might be called to account whenever the precious trinket should be missed. To him, therefore, the sight of Kovalan's treasure suggested a way of escape. He bade the stranger wait awhile until he should show the anklet to the King, who might very probably purchase it; and then, making his way to the palace, exhibited it, saying, 'There is a thief, whom I have detained yonder, and on whom I found this anklet which is one missing from your Queen's trinkets.' The King enquired, and found that an anklet was really missing; and, blinded by the influence of unpropitious fate, bade his guards go and bring the thief. This king was called Nedun-Seriyan, and renowned for justice; but alas! no one, least of all a despotic Asiatic sovereign, is at all times wise. The guards went, and seeing Kovalan, whom the goldsmith asseverated to be a thief, one of them despatched him with his sword.

Soon the intelligence is brought to where his unhappy wife (the virtuous Kannagi) is awaiting his return, and she rushes forth to the city, making the streets resound with her cries. She finally finds her husband and embraces his dead body, when he opens his eyes—restored for a moment to life—and after tenderly bidding her await reunion, closes them again, and is received into Paradise. She rushes away filled with fury, tears off one of her breasts, and flings it with curses over the guilty city, and then makes her way to the King. 'You have slain my husband,' she said, 'who never did wrong or injustice. What gems were in your Queen's anklet? for in mine are rubies.'

So saying she broke the anklet open and exhibited them to the King. 'Ah!' cried he, 'in my wife's anklet were only pearls. I have slain an innocent man; and am I worthy to be a king? May I this day perish!" So saying, he fell dead at her feet. Kannagi, raging in her despair, cries upon the god of fire, who immediately appears: 'O virtuous matron, who hath wronged thee? The instant thine husband was unjustly slain, I had the command to consume the guilty'—Slay not Brahmans, or the virtuous, or kine, or women, or the aged, or infants; but consume the rest.' So the conflagration raged till guilty Madura was wrapped in flames. Then appeared the guardian goddess of the city and thus addressed the raging widow: 'I am the goddess of this city. No king before this vas ever guilty of the least injustice, and in this case will tell thee the secret of thy suffering. In the town of Singapuram there was a king who slew a merchant named Sangaman, accused by one Barathan of being a spy His wife was called Nili, and she wandered long on the mountains, praying that he who had caused her grief might in another birth suffer as he had caused her husband to suffer. Kovalan was that Barathan, and was therefore born again as you know him, and has suffered for his crime committed in that former birth. On the fourteenth day from this thou shalt join thine husband.' Thus comforted, Kannagi left Madura, went to the mountain country, and on the hill of Tiru-chenkunrru under a *Vengai* tree waited till, on the fourteenth day, Kovalan appeared in a celestial body, and bore her away to Paradise. Here ends the story as connected with Madura.

The last book connects the history with Vanji or Karur and is evidently composed to account for the worship of Kannagi, as it is now performed in a multitude of temples in the West. Her image is to be seen with the lacerated bosom, and she is adored under the name of the 'Chaste Matron Deity.' The idea that any one cruelly wronged becomes after death powerful demon, inflicting sore calamities unless propitiated, is at the very foundation of the superstitions of the South and West, as indeed of all India. The people who dwelt around the hill upon which Kannagi went up in the chariot, forthwith instituted a solemn dance in honour of the new Divinity, and hastened to inform their king, who came to the spot and erected an altar and ordained sacrifical rites. He then proceeded to the north, and after a variety of wild undertakings brought back a huge stone from the Himalayas, out of which the statue of the Demoness was cut. This worship is still paid. It is said that the son of the king who so cruelly murdered Kovalan offered in sacrifice 1,000 goldsmiths to propitiate the Demoness, and instituted the Feast still celebrated in her honour. It was only then that the plague of drought was removed and the Pandyan land again became fertile. There are doubtless some grains of historic truth here, and it would be very interesting to have the matter scientifically investigated.

G. U. POPE, M.A., D.D.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Says the *Indian Social Reformer*:—

We have often had occasion to notice favourably the *Siddhanta Deepika* in these columns. We are glad to see that it has completed its first year, and we congratulate the conductors on the able way in which they have been conducting the Magazine and wish them every success in the future. We must, however, take this occasion to warn them of the danger they run in regard to the prime object of their magazine, by admitting translations and commentaries on Sanskrit works in their pages. Their object seems to us to be the elucidation of moot points in Tamil sacred and philosophical literature. The facination of Sanskrit is so strong on even those who might be expected to feel none of it, that the Vedanta Sutras are being regularly translated in the pages of this magazine. We again say we regret the deviation. Not that we hold lightly the treasures of Sanskrit literature, but we do not like the tendency everywhere to tread its well-trodden paths.

We are grateful for our contemporary's remarks and quite appreciate his anxiety that we should not deviate from our devotion to the cause of Tamil. But a reference to the first number of our Magazine where we set forth 'Our Aims' will show that the translation of *rare* Sanskrit works was not without our scope. In fact, in the short memorandum which we originally circulated to our friends, Srikanta's great work was expressly included in it. About Srikanta's work, itself, by an irony of fate which we could not understand, it has been left unnoticed by every European Scholar of note, though Indian Scholars admit that it is the most ancient commentary on the Vedanta Sutras now extant. This is the commentary followed by all the Tamil people, and this fact will serve to explain what was meant by Vedanta, which is approvingly alluded to and distinguished at the same time from Siddhanta, in Tamil works and to explain that leaven Brahminism in the Tamil race. The translation of this work will, we are sure, throw further historical light on the much debated question, whether Sankara's interpreta-

tion of the Vedanta Sutras is the correct and ancient one or the of other schools. The following quotation from Dr. Paul Duessen will show to what extremes enthusiasts of Sankara's school can go. Say she, "It is true that even here, in the sanctuary of Vedantic metaphysics, the realistic tendencies, natural to man, have penetrated, producing *the misinterpreting variations of Sankara's Advaita* known under the name of Vishistâdvaita, Dvaita, Siddhâdvaita of Ramanuja, Madhava, Vallabha, but India till now has not been seduced by their voices." The *italics* are ours, and if the statement is true, Srikanta must have attempted the impossible. We will examine the learned German Doctor's figures as regards the numerical following of each school later on.

***

We regret very much that the Hon'ble Justice M. G. Ranade's proposition before the Committee of the Bombay University Senate *re* the recognition of the vernaculars should not have been carried, by the mere casting vote of the chairman.

***

A Reverend Doctor observed at the meeting that the study of vernaculars should be encouraged and voted against the proposition. How does he hope to achieve his object when no body thinks the study of the vernacular of any use to him to pass his examination and earn a living?

***

Another Hon'ble Gentleman preferred the classics to the vernaculars. The question is not one of individual taste nor of comparative merit of two languages and literatures. The real question is as Mr. J. Kapadia put it to make the vernacular a proper and fitting vehicle for conveying and spreading Western knowledge and Western culture among the masses.

***

One of the arguments adduced against the recognition of vernaculars is, that it does not want encouragement, and that there is already a good vernacular literature in it and scholars well versed! This suicidal argument would involve and require the non-recognition of every popular language, European or Indian.

***

To the credit of the Madras University and Government be it said, every one of the chief vernaculars of the Presidency have been recognized from the beginning and we are now engaged in agitating for a further extension. Only the examinations and rules instituted by the late Director of Public Instruction revolutionized the mode of non-collegiate education obtaining in the Presidency before his time to a considerable extent.

***

And the result of this has been, as was well pointed out by our old Professor, a high educational authority, the almost total abolition of the purely indigenous vernacular schools, thereby taking the bread out of the hands of the old class of *athiar* pundits, and who had around him the nick of his pupils to impart the knowledge of the higher departments of vernacular literature. With the loss of all hope of securing a Government situation, have vanished also all the chances of pursuing a pure vernacular education.

***

It has pained us to see some of the old class of pundits literally starve, those who had not the good fortune to secure a Munshi's place in an English school, or felt it *infra dig* to accept such a place. These men in the olden days would have had rich pupils and patrons to help them and to appreciate their labours. In a few years, we are quite sure we would have seen the last of the race, which Heaven forbid somehow.

Our contemporary of the *Indian Social Reformer* (following the *Madras Mail*) would not admit that the system of education has any thing to do with the decadence of Tamil literature, but would trace it to the peculiar Social conditions prevailing in Southern India, namely that the literary class, the Brahmins, have never owned, though they had adopted, the vernaculars as their mother tongue. He asks also how many Tamil classics are the work of Brahmins. The reason and the question conflict among themselves. If the Brahmins are the sole literate class, and some only of the Tamil works were written by the Brahmins, how does he account for the mass of Tamil literature ancient and modern that is now extant? Of course this results from forgetting that Brahmins have not been the only literary class in Southern India and that most of the old indigenous schools and learning were in the hands of non-Brahmins, who number of course more than 90 per cent of the population. It might be quite true that the Brahmins who never owned the Tamil and who therefore had very few authors among them completely began to neglect the vernaculars, but the question remains why did the Tamilians themselves neglect their own mother tongue? We wish we could get an explanation from our contemporary for this phenomenon. He cant say that they have all begun to study Sanskrit.

But we dare say even this cannot but be more than partially true. The traditions of the Tamil language are always most gratefully connected with the Brahmins. That Arch-Brahmin Agastaya was almost the founder of the Tamil literature, and he had a large number of Brahmin pupils, and some of the greatest of Tamil writers such as Tolkappiyan and others. They were most numerous among the poets of the Sangam. Nakkirar, Kabilar, Sambanthar, Manikka Vachakar, Sundarar, and Kachiappa, Arul Nandi, Umapathi, Parimelalagar, Nachinarkiniyar were some of the most able yielders of the Tamil language and no more revered names are to be found throughout the Tamil country. The fact however cannot be ignored in the present day that Tamil is not so much studied for its own sake and Sanskrit has become a greater favourite to than ever.

Madras:—Printed by P. C. Kalliana Sundara Nadar, at the C. S. Press, 39, Godown Street, Black Town, and Published by J. M. Nallaswamy.

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897.

VOL. II. | **MADRAS, AUGUST 1898.** | **No. 3.**

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(Continued from page 30.)

(*Objection*):—If it be held that it is Brahman mentioned in the opening passage who is spoken of as manomaya etc., the reference to jîva who is mentioned incidentally would serve no purpose.

(*Answer*) The Sûtrakâra says:—

And because of the appropriateness of the qualities intended to be taught. (I. ii. 2.)

Since the qualities intended to be taught,—namely, that He is of unfailing will, that from Him all desires proceed,—can be applied only to Brahman, He alone is the object to be worshipped. And jîva who is incidentally mentioned is the worshipper, there being a necessity for the supply of that factor to complete the injunction.

Adhikarana 2.

In the last adhikarana it has been shewn that jîva in general cannot be an object of worship but that he can be only a worshipper. Now again, the next section proceeds to establish that even Nârâyana, who is the upâdâna or material cause of the Hiranyagarbha, the aggregate of all jîvas, is only a worhipper of Brahman who is above all universe, but not an object of worship.

Owing to incongruity, the embodied is not (meant) (I. ii. 3).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Mahopanishad:

"The Lord of the universe, the A'tman, the I's'vara, the Eternal, the Good, the Indestructible, Nârâyana, the Great one who was to be known, and so on.

Here a doubt arises as to whether it is the embodied entity, or the Parames'vara, or some one else, who is spoken of as Nârâyana and described as the Lord of the universe and so on.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—It is Nârâyana, the embodied entity, who is spoken of as the Lord of the universe, firstly because Nârâyana, the embodied entity, is repeated as the subject, of whom thousand-headedness etc. are

to be predicated, in the section beginning with "The thousand-headed Deity," * secondly because of his characteristic marks—such as lying in the ocean—spoken of in the section; thirdly because of the use of the synonymous terms, *Achyuta, Hari* applicable to him alone.

Siddhânta, however, maintains that it is Mahes'vara, the Supreme Lord, the A'tman of Nârâyana—How? Because such attributes of Parames'vara as the lordship of the whole universe cannot be applied to any other being such as Nârâyana. Lordship of the whole universe is predicated of the Parames'vara alone by repetition in the words "to Him who is the Lord of cattle, the Lord of trees, the Lord of the worlds, I salute." † That no other being than Rudra is the Lord of the universe is declared by the following passage:

"One verily is Rudra,—they are not for a second,—who rules these worlds by the powers of ruling" ‡

And the s'ruti "Rudra is high above the universe" § teaches that it is Rudra who is high above the universe. Wherefore it is but right to say that the Being spoken of as the Lord of the universe is the Parames'vara, the A'tman of Nârâyana.

(*Objection*):—To speak of Him as the Self of Nârâyana is to imply that Parames'vara is the *Antaryâmin* or the Inner Regulator of Nârâyana: which is not right. In the words "Nârâyana is the Supreme Brahman," the s'ruti declares that Nârâyana is the Supreme Brahman. Then the passage beginning with "like unto the lotus-bud" speaks of Purusha as located in the heart-lotus; then jiva is described in the passage beginning with "in its midst is the flame of fire", and then in the words "in the middle of that flame is the Paramatman established," Nârâyana is spoken of as the Paramâtman, as the Antaryâmin or Inner Regulator of the jiva. Thus, we see that He (Nârâyana) is the object of worship. The passage "He is Brahmâ, He is S'iva" and so on declares that Brahmâ, S'iva and other beings are His vibhûtis or glorious emanations. Wherefore Nârâyana Himself is the Lord of the universe, the very Supreme Brahman and is to be worshipped as the Antaryâmin or Inner Regulator of jivas. It is therefore unjust to hold that the Parames'vara is Nârâyana's A'tman, and that as such He is above Nârâyana and to be worshipped by him.

In reply the Sûtrakâra says:—

Because of their mention as the object and the agent. (I. ii. 4.)

There, the Parames'vara and Nârâyana are mentioned respectively as the worshipped and the worshipper, as the object and the agent.—How?—The passage "like unto the lotus-bud" describes the heart of Nârâyana who has been just spoken of; and the passage "Paramâtman is established" declares that the Parames'vara who is himself the Paramâtman is the object of worship as dwelling within Nârâyana. Thus, Nârâyana is spoken of as the agent, as the worshipper; and Parames'vara as the object, as worthy of being worshipped. Wherefore the Paramâtman who is to be worshipped is some being other than Nârâyana. The passage "He is Brahmâ, He is S'iva" and so on teaches that Parames'vara manifests His own glory in the form of the universe comprising Brahmâ, Vishnu, Rudra, Indra and the like. Though Vishnu is not mentioned here (as the Parames'vara's vibhûti), He is mentioned as such in the Kaivalya Upanishad. After speaking of the heart-lotus, the upanishad says:

"Him whose help-mate is Umâ, who is the Supreme Lord, who is Mighty, Three-eyed, Dark-necked and serene; having meditated thus, the sage reaches Him who is the womb of all beings, the witness of all, transcending Tamas. He is Brahmâ, He is S'iva, He is Indra, He the Indestructible, the Supreme, the self-luminous. He Himself is Vishnu, He is Prâna, He is Time, "He is Fire, He the Moon," and so on.

The same principle should be applied here. The following passage from the Atharva-upanishad should also be taken into consideration

"That Lord who is Known Rudra, He is Bhûh, Bhuvah, Suvah as well as he who is known as Brahmâ; to Him we bow. That Lord who is known as Rudra, He is Bhuh, Bhuvah, Suvah as well as he who is known as Vishnu to Him we bow. That Lord..... as well as he who is known as Mahes'vara;....." and so on

The omission of Vishnu between Brahmâ and S'iva in the passage quoted from Mahopanishad is to be accounted for by the fact that Vishnu has been spoken of as the worshipper. Hence no mutual contradiction among these passages.

* Mahanarayana Upanishad.

† Taittiriya—Samhitâ 4—5.

‡ S'vetâsvatara Upanishad 3—2.

§ Maha. Upa. 10.

(*Objection*):—The Being (Purusha) spoken of in the Purusha-sûkta which begins with "Thousand-headed is Purusha" is said to be endued with a world forming a part of Himself, as declared in the s'ruti "A foot of His do all these creatures form." The same Being is treated of here—in the passage under discussion—under the name "Nârâyana." The same Being is designated by the name Brahman in the passage "Nârâyana is the Supreme Brahman" Indeed it is Brahman who is to be worshipped by all. How can it be that such a Being is the worshipper of another?

The Sûtrakâra answers the objection as follows

Owing to the specific word (I. ii. 5).

The specific text "Brahman is above Nârâyana" declares that Brahman is higher than Nârâyana. Wherefore the Supreme Brahman who is distinct from Nârâyana is to be worshipped, inasmuch as the Parabrahman Himself puts on the form of the thousand-headed Purusha and forms the upâdâna or material cause of the universe. In II. 23 we shall show that Nârâyana, having Parabrahman for his A'tman or the Impeller, assumes the form of the universe.

The sûtrakâra adduces another sort of evidence to prove that Nârâyana is an upâsaka or worshipper:

And because of smriti. (I. ii. 6).

From the following passage of the smriti,

"Having thus spoken, then, O King, Hari, the great Lord of Yoga, showed to the son of Pritha the Supreme Form of I's'vara."*

it is evident that Nârâyana, the great Master of Yoga is engaged in Yoga or samâdhi, *i. e.*, in the contemplation of Parames'vara, the Supreme Lord. Bearing on this subject there is the following speech of the Parames'vara addressed to As'vatthâman:

> I am duly worshipped; by Krishna who is unwearied in action; therefore none else exists who is dearer to me than Krishna."

Wherefore the Supreme Brahman who to be worshipped is different from Nârâyana.

The sûtrakâra again raises an objection and refutes it:

If (you hold it is) not (so) because of His having a small abode and being so designated, (we say) no: He is so (designated) because He is to be worshipped; and He is like a'ka'sa. (I. ii. 7).

(*Objection*): The Being here spoken of cannot be the Parames'vara who is all-pervading, since the former is described in the following passage as dwelling within the small flame of fire and so having a small resting-ground and is denoted by terms implying smallness

"There is (a streak of light) which is as fine as the bristle of a Nîvâra grain, which is yellow in colour, the standard of things that are fine: Within that flame does Paramâtman abide."

(*Answer*):—Not so. He is so designated because He is here described as an object of worship. Not that He is small in himself; for it requires no proof that He is infinite in Himself, like the âkâs'a which when conditioned by an upâdhi such as a jar is said to be small, and which is said to be infinite when regarded in itself. Hence no inconsistency.

Again the sûtrakâra raises an objection and answers it:

If (you say that this) necessitates enjoyment, (we say) no, because there is a difference. (I. ii. 8).

(*Objection*): It is the same Being spoken of as higher than Nârâyana and therefore as the object of worship is the Being described as "Honest and True, the Supreme Brahman, the Purusha dark and brown, whose semen is held above, of divers eyes"* and so on. Here the Parabrahman is described as *dark and brown* because of His being tinged with Mâyâ, the Supreme S'akti or Power; He is described as one '*whose semen is held above*' because of His having Fire for His semen: He is '*of divers eyes*' because of His having three eyes: He is *Purusha* because He lies in the lotus of Dahara, the âkâs'a in the heart; He is "*Honest and True*" because in him there is no inconsistency between speech and thought. Wherefore as possessed of a form containing three eyes, etc. He is subject to enjoyment of pleasures and pains pertaining to the body.

(*Answer*):—No, because there is a difference. There exists, indeed, a difference between Brahman's body and the bodies of jîvas, which latter are meant for the enjoyment of pleasure and the suffering of pain; for, He has assumed the body at His own will, whereas their bodies have been brought into existence by their respective *Karma*. Wherefore the s'ruti describes Parames'vara as "free from sin, free from old age, free from death and grief, from hunger and thirst, desiring nothing but what He ought to desire, and imagining nothing but what He ought to imagine,"†

* Bhagavadgîtâ. 11-9.

* Mahanarayana Upanishad 11.

† Chhandogya-Upanishad 8-7.

and thus devoid of the attributes pertaining to the body of a samsârin. But not so is jîva, the samsârin. Therefore it is that in the passages like "with perfect limbs He is many-formed and fierce,"* the Parames'vara's voluntarily assumed forms of great beauty —the divine forms which are free from sin, old age, death, grief and so on—are declared to be perfect and eternal. Wherefore, the Parabrahman, the Supreme Lord, being different from jîva, He cannot be tinged with any of the defects pertaining to the body. The *Upakrama* and other test-passages point to the conclusion that the divers-eyed Brahman is the highest of all and is the Being who ought to be worshipped. To explain in the Upakrama or opening passage beginning with "Subtler than the subtle,"† the Lord has been described to be a very glorious being, as dwelling in the caves of the hearts of all creatures, as also being cognized by that person who, by the great Grace of the Lord, has been freed from all grief. Again in the passage "the seven prânas arise from Him" the same Being endued with the Supreme Sakti is described as the upâdâna or material cause of the universe which is composed of prâna etc. Then in the passage, "That great sage, Rudra, who was the first, before all gods, above all universe, saw the Hiranyagarbha being born," He is referred to as the cause, as being above all universe, as being omniscient, as being the generator of the Hiranyagarbha, the first of all emanations. The same Being, dwelling in the cave of the Supreme A'kâs'a, is described to be attainable as the Supreme Immortal Being by those aspirants who perform all acts without longing for fruits, who know the drift of the Vedânta, who have subdued their senses. Then as the question arises as to the way by which to reach Him, contemplation in Dahara is recommended. There it has been said—but only in a general way—that the Being who dwells in the lotus of *Dahara* ought to be worshipped. Then the question arising as to who that Being is, the s'ruti says that it is He who is the Supreme Being called Mahâdeva. Then again the question arises as to what His form is; and in answer to this question the s'ruti concludes by saying that He is possessed of a form containing divers eyes and so on. Nârâyana who is incidentally mentioned in the chapter referred to should be construed as the worshipper, on the principle explained in the preceding adhikarana. Though all have to worship Parames'vara, Nârâyana is specially mentioned here, because he is the highest of the worshippers. We can justify the description of Nârâyana here by Brahman's attributes,—regarding Nârâyana the worshipper as not distinct from the divers-eyed Brahman, the object of worship,—on the ground that it is a description of Nârâyana who is the upâdâna or material cause of the universe and who is ensouled by Him the Supreme Brahman.

* Rik-Samhita 2-7-17.

† Mahanarayana-Upanishad 10.

Adhikarana 3.

(He is) the Devourer, because of the mention of the moving and the unmoving. (I. ii. 9.)

The passage which is to be discussed here occurs in the Kathopanishad and reads as follows:—

"Who then knows where He is, He to whom the Brâhmanas and Kshatriyas are (as it were) but food, and death itself a condiment?"*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the Being who is described as the devourer of the whole universe of sentient and insentient existence—which is referred to by the mention of Brâhmanas and Kshatriyas and which forms as it were a morsel of food mixed with the condiment of death—is the Parames'vara or some other being.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—The highly Merciful and all-Gracious Being cannot be the devourer of all. It is cruel to put an end to other's lives. Anger is the sprout from which springs up the act of cruelty. The root of anger which is an evil passion is none other than Moha or delusion. The cause of delusion which is the source of all destruction is *Tamas*. Wherefore the devourer of all is a Tâmasic Being. Tâmasic nature consists in being devoid of all light, the light of knowledge etc. being enshrouded by Tamas, the darkness of ignorance. To speak of Brahman as the destroyer of all is to attribute ignorance, darkness, delusion, anger and other evil qualities to Him who is ever pure, who is the repository of unmixed good, who is free from all taint of samsâra. Then such attributes, as omniscience and ever-contentedness, which have been conclusively shown to form the characteristic marks of His essential nature, would be meaningless. Therefore some other being distinct from Brahma and possessed of the attributes referred to must be the destroyer.

(*Siddhânta*):—It is Brahman who is spoken of as the all-destroyer.—Why?—Because of the mention

* Kathopanishad. 2-25.

the moving and the unmoving. As to the contention that it is not right to regard Brahman as the devourer of the whole universe of moving and unmoving objects, we say that that very description marks the characteristic nature of Brahman, inasmuch as a Jîva who is of limited powers has not got the power of destroying all the moving and unmoving objects. "To that Destroyer, to that great Devourer, I bow," thus is Parames'vara described in the Atharvas'iras as the all-destroyer never as a Jîva so spoken of. "Who all these worlds sacrificed,"* thus Brahman is described as offering all the worlds as an oblation in the fire of His own Light. A Jîva who is classed as an oblation can never possess this power. When the Supreme Lord remains alone, having absorbed into Himself the whole universe, everything other than Himself, moving or unmoving, sentient or insentient, then all luminaries such as the sun and the moon being absent, all division of time into day and night being done away with, all forms and names having disappeared, all this universe remains as mere Tamas (darkness), there being no perception of gross and subtile objects, of men, Devas, or other beings. Even then remains He alone, the Supreme Lord, of infinite Light, the Witness of all. Accordingly the s'ruti says,

"When the light has risen, there is no day, no night neither existence nor non-existence; S'iva alone is there."†

Here the words "neither existence nor non-existence" do not preclude even the bare existence of Jîva and bondage—of *pas'u* and *pâs'a* spoken of as *existence* and *non-existence*,— but they only indicate that these are not gross enough to be invested with distinct forms and spoken of by distinct names.

Objection :—Despite the existence of the ever-luminous S'iva, the Supreme Brahman, how can the universe be mere darkness?

Answer :—No. How can it detract from the self-luminous S'iva, the all-witness? There can be no perception of the universe by Jîvas whose body and senses are powerless with regard to sense-objects which, as having then no forms nor names, are beyond perception, while their faculty of spiritual wisdom (Jñana) is overpowered by original sin (*mala*). Even the self-luminous S'iva does not perceive (the universe) as before. Wherefore this grand state of Supreme Sushupti or Sleep, when there is no cognising whatever of created existence in any particular aspect of its manifestation is spoken of as Tamas. Accordingly the smriti says:

"This was mere Darkness, unknown, without any characteristic marks."*

S'iva is said to have existed *alone*, possessed of the potency of the universe, of sentient and insentient existence in its subtlest form, undistinguishable by name or form. Again, at the time of creation He manifests His Primal S'akti or Energy and then creates from out of Himself and brings into manifestation all sentient and insentient beings,—each with its own form and name—by His own mere thought, without having recourse to an external material cause. Hence the saying of the learned:

"The Deity, the self-conscious A'tman, brings, like a Yogin, the whole existence which lies within, into manifestation without, by means of His will (Ichchhâ), without an upâdâna or material cause."

Objection :—Mâyâ and Purusha are spoken of as the upâdâna or material cause in the following passages of the s'ruti:

"Let him know Mâyâ to be Prakriti and the Possessor of Mâyâ to be the Mahes'vara."†

"From Him Viraj was born."‡

How can it be said that no upâdâna or material cause existed?

Answer :—True. In the production of a jar by a potter, the clod of earth is found to be distinct from the body of the potter and is the material cause of the jar; not so, however, is Mâyâ and the like—which are held to be the upâdâna of the universe—found to exist distinct from the Parames'vara, inasmuch as it is from out of the Parames'vara Himself who puts on the form of Mâyâ that the universe is evolved. Hence no incongruity. Wherefore the Supreme Purusha Himself whose subtle Mâyâ has no independent existence apart from Himself, is said to be also the upâdâna or material cause of the universe. Accordingly the Atharvas'ikhâ says

Whatever has to be contemplated, let him contemplate it as the Lord. Brahmâ, Vishnu, Rudra, Indra,—all these are born as well as all the sense-organs and the elements of matter. The Cause of causes is not a contemplator. On the other hand, the

* Âdik-Samhitâ, 8-3-16.

† S'vetas'vatara-Up. 4-18.

* Manu-Smriti. 1-5.

† S'vetas'vatara-Up. 4-10.

‡ Purusha-Sukta.

Cause is ever to be contemplated, He who is endued with every kind of power, the Lord of all, the source of all Good abiding in the middle of Light."

Thus, where all beings undergo dissolution, thence only is the origin of all beings, and therefore so long as these beings which are infinite in number are held in dissolution, they abide there alone, in S'iva, of infinite potencies (S'aktis). So it is S'iva, the all-destroyer is the Being denoted by the word 'Brahman.'

As to the contention that, because destruction is an act of cruelty, Brahman becomes tinged with anger, the cause of the cruel act, and other evil qualities, we merely answer that this contention arises from absence of enquiry the quality of Tamas, which is the root of anger and other evil passions, being an attribute of Prakriti. As to the Parames'vara being above all darkness, the divine s'ruti itself is the authority which says,

"Umâ being His help-mate, the Supreme Lord,... the Witness of all, above Tamas (darkness)."*

The Purânic saying given below also declares that the Parames'vara is ever possessed of Jñâna etc. which prevent delusion and other like sources of evil

"Knowledge, indifference to worldly objects, lordly power, austerity, truth, forgiveness, fortitude, creative power, spiritual wisdom, and mastery—these ten ever exist undiminished in S'ankara."

The Purâna says also

"He whose pure unfailing intelligence comprehends all objects of knowledge; He is a youth who delight in the joy arising from the tasting of the nectar of His own S'akti."

It is indeed the Parames'vara of infinite glory who, desirous to create, resorts to His own S'akti,—to His Mâyâ, to His Will (Icchchhâ),—with a view to become the manifold universe, said in the s'ruti, "He desired, may I become many." Then, as the s'ruti says "He brooded over Himself,"* He thinks of the materials, by which to bring into existence bodies suited to the different Jivas according to their respective Karma, by His power of knowledge (Jñanas'akti) spoken of as *tapas* (penance) in the s'ruti. And having thus brooded, He rouses into being the whole panorama of the universe on the wall of Mâya or Icchchhâs'akti by resorting to his Kriyâs'akti which is quite capable of accomplishing all that He has thought of, as declared in the following passage, "He created all this."* Then, as the s'ruti says, "Having created it, He entered into the same,"* He enters the whole creation, and in association with these three S'aktis He becomes the whole universe including the three Mûrtis—the three embodied manifestations of the Lord as caused by the three gunas *satva*, *rajas* and *tamas*—and other beings. So, who here can gauge the greatness of the omnipotent and omniscient S'iva Wherefore we may conclude that the all-destroyer is the Parames'vara.

And because of the context (I. ii. 10.)

The passage under discussion occurs in a section devoted to Parames'vara, as the following texts in the same section show

"The wise who knows the A'tman as great and omnipresent does never grieve."*

"That A'tman cannot be gained by the Veda."†

For the foregoing reason also it is evident that the all-destroyer is the Supreme Brahman, the Parames'vara, and none else.

A. MAHA'DEVA S'A'STRI B. A.

(To be continued.)

* Kaivalya-Upanishad.

* Taittiriya-Upanishad 2 6.

† Katha-Upanishad 2—22. 23.

SIVAGNANA SIDDHIAR
OF
ARUL NANDI SIVA CHARIAR.

(*Continued from page* 35).)

MAYAVADI'S REFUTATION.

7. How do you make out that the world is *Nirvachana*? Can any fool talk of a thing which is existing and not existing at the same time? If it has an orgin, then it must have an existence. If it does not exist, it will never come into being. When we, however, ordinarily speak of its non-existence, we simply refer to its resolution into its invisible primordial cause.

8. If you say that God and the world bear some resemblance to each other though different like the shell and silver, then we may mistake the world also to be God or an illusion. If you say that Maya was only real when we mistook it for God but became unreal when we saw otherwise, this cannot be. The world in spite of its changes remains unchangeable. Earth cannot become air or fire or *vice versa*. So the world is real both in *Vyavakara* and *Pâramartha*.

9. If you state that the false world arises out of Brahm as the threads which came out of the spider, then it must follow that (the changeless and formless) Intelligence becomes changed and formed into the visible world and corrupted and deluded. If you reply that the spider is not caught in the toils of its own web; but, (then the change would otherwise be impossible), as no cloth can come out of mud.

10. You say that God manifests Himself in different bodies. If God, is so present, then why does He not manifest Himself when the body undergoes various avasthas, such as Swapna, Sushupti, &c., (or in dead bodies). If you explain, that it is so, as *manas* and other karanas are not active, then, it must be, that either God became non-intelligent at times, or with all His presence, the senses became dead.

11. You assert that Brahman is present in these bodies, without any attachment. Yet this Brahman, would not leave the body even when it becomes

---

8. The argument contained in this verse is more pithily expressed in the following couplet.

"இருபொருளுண்டேல் மருளினிற்கும்
ஒருபொருளிற் றோன்றுதென்றோர்."

"If both things exist, then will arise illusion;
Not, when one alone exists."

For an illusion to be called an illusion, there must be a reality underneath the illusion. When all are illusions, the dividing line between an illusion and a reality is destroyed, and the illusion itself becomes a reality. So it is that the Mayavadi is able to perform the remarkable somersault, that while he loses no moment, no opportunity to call everything but his Egoism—we beg pardon—his Ego to be false, he is as much rooted to the things of this earth as anybody else.

9. These two quoted by Gnanapragasar contain the same arguments in simpler language.

"வெம்மை தூல்போலச் சகம்பரத் தின்றென்றின்.
மலம் பரத்தின் டேமதி."

"If as web from spider, from God the world appear,
Sin is present in God, it is clear."

இன்றேற் சடமண்ணினையும் பரதிதழ்
இன்றே படமன்னினே;

"If not, the achit world will not from God arise
As cloth from mud you can't in any way surprise."

Of course, some belonging to this school, possessed of a 'sharp intellect and bold understanding' do not pause to assert the identity of God and Maya, but we need not be forced into such absurdity if we understand the simile aright. The Mayavadi understands the spider to produce the web which did not exist before or to produce from the same substance as itself. If, however, we distinguish the spider into its life principle, the being with intelligence, volition, judgment &c., and its body, from the shapeless secretions of which the beautiful web is designed, no better simile can be thought out for describing God's creation of the world. The world and creatures stand to God as the body to the soul. From out of His body, from out of the shapeless Maya, He wills that these worlds should arise. The intelligence and design apparent in creation is all his own and can no more be due to Maya, than the beauty and design and judgment displayed in the web can that of the web itself. The material of the web was neither non-existent before nor after. And it cannot be said to be of the same nature as the spider's life-principle. So all this material cause of this world was neither non-existent before nor after and cannot be of the same nature as God's. But as in popular language we always identify the soul and body together, our poets and philosophers always sing of the identity of the worlds and God; though they at the same time take care to assert their difference. Even the insignificant spider has a purpose in making its web; but by denying the existence of the separate souls, Mayavadi's would deny to God that He has any purpose in creating and resolving these worlds. *c.f.* Swetas Upanishad vi 10. "May the One God who, spider-like, enwinds Himself with threads spun from Pradhana, following His nature's law, may He bestow on us regression into Brahm."

10. The Purvapakshi cites as an example the presence of Akas in different pots. To this, the following objections are taken. Why does Brahman leave the dead body? Even when Brahman is present, why do the senses become active and inactive? If the same Being is present in all bodies, why do you hate some people and love others? Why is one of different thinking from another? Why is one an athiest, and another a theist? Why does one undergo misery, when another undergoes pleasure? Is the person suffering in hell, the same as one entering Moksha? Are the King punishing, the felon punished, and their respective capacities the same?

sinful and deceased by old age &c., and shudders at the very thought of such leaving! Though you are fully aware that your Brahman (soul) is attached, it is your vain hope that it be not so.

12. You spoke of the beautiful beads strung on one string, and of these beads being different and yet resting on the same string. You are no doubt correct in comparing the different worlds to the beads and the one unchangeable God to the string. So the worlds change but God remains unchangeable; but that does away with your doctrine of *Abétha*.

13. Hear O, madman, who say that God is covered by aviddei and maya in union with the body and undergoes pleasures and pains, and yet at the same time assert that He has no attachment, This only appears from your statement that the doctrine of non-attachment cannot be true. If not, why do you undergo pleasure and pains from attachment in actual life. If you say that this is only a *barana* of the Jiva, then you must have really no shame to say that the Brahman has no attachment and that the Supreme is past thought and speech and that this Supreme Being is yourself.

14. If the A'tma fills each and every body entirely then it cannot undergo the *avestas*, and become inactive. If you say that it is not the A'tma but the *andakaranas* that undergo the *avestas*, then where did your God who was present in the body hide Himself? If God was present, the *Karanas* could not become inactive. If you compare God's action on the andakaranas to that of the magnet on a piece of iron, then the same analogy does not explain how the andakaranas become inactive.

12. The Siddhanti accepts the simile, and no wonder, because the simile occurs in the Gita, a non-mayavadu work. "There is naught whatever *higher* than I, O Dhananjaya. All this is woven in me, as multitudes of jewels on a string." (viii. 7).

15. If we can see to-day a sun veiled by darkness, then may a Brahman exist veiled by ignorance mistaking its body and senses for itself. The statement that the soul having its ignorant covering, attains knowledge by clearly perceiving itself to be God, and enters moksha, where the soul becomes itself the only Sat, can only be ridiculous as it involves the proposition that the *amala* (Pure) God can, at the same time, be impure, to necessitate its removal.

16. Purity cannot become an accident of the Supreme Param. It is an eternal attribute of Him. You ascribe impurity to the chit (soul) derived from Brahman, and in consequence, you impute impurity to its cause, Brahman also. You do not understand the nature of the soul and *mala* and *karma* and *maya* and their First Cause, the Supreme God. If you instance the analogy of fire latent before and now manifest in wood, this only applies to the case of body and soul, and implies duality.

17. When you speak of the self enjoying in the self, duality is clearly involved. If you say that you do not perceive yourself on the enjoyer, then the person enjoying himself is gone. If you say that Moksha is merely removal of ignorance, even then there will be sentience present. If you deny this sentience and say that conscious sentience is only Maya, then your Brahman itself can only be all Maya and be therefore destructible.

18. Understand well the meaning of the Vedic Text '*Tatvamasi*' (Thou art that). Knowing well the distinction between yourself and the Supreme Cause, practice *Soham barana*. To approach the Feet of the Lord difficult to be thought of by the Gods, practice the beautiful Sadanas and attain Yoga and Gnana.

J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B. A., B. L.,

(To be continued).

ODE TO SAKTI,

UNIVERSAL MOTHER.

When the Absolute becomes manifest, it is as Force, *Sakti*, of which the universe is the product, being from cycle to cycle evolved by Force from cosmic substance (âkâsa) and again involved. "'All the choir of heaven and the furniture of the earth' are the transitory forms of parcels of cosmic substance, wending along the road of evolution from nebulous potentiality, through endless growths of sun and satellite, through all varieties of matter, through infinite diversities of life and thought, possibly through modes of being of which we neither have any conception nor are competent to form any, back to the indefinite latency from which they arose." *

Not brute and blind but full of intelligence and grace is the Power which thus makes and unmakes, and which by the Sages of India is accordingly regarded as the Universal Mother, and being inseparably inherent in God, is also called the Consort of God.

"Mother of millions of world-clusters, yet Virgin by the Vedas called."

மலர் விரையுங கதிரொளியு முயிருடலுமணியின்
வளர்தேசு முருகெழுமலிபொருளோடுறையுமை
நிலவுதல்பேரிற் கனத்தைப பிரியாது மருவி
நிகழ் சகளத்தப் பத்தி நிறைமணியாய மன்னி
உலகுயிர் மைந்தர்கள் பிறவிப் பிசிகெட வெந்நாளு
மோவாதாநந்த வழுதளிடை யவ்வீட்டிருத்தும்
இலகுதற் சிவகாம சுந்தரியார் பாதச்
செங்கமலந் தலைமிசைற்றிகழுற வைத்திடுவாம்.

"My head I crown with lotus feet of Sivakâma Sundari
Who with the Absolute inseparably is blended
As flower and scent, as sun and ray, as life and body,
As gem and lustre, form and shadow, word and meaning,
Who to the manifested Lord as Consort shines,
Who ever cures the life-hunger † of her children, all living things,
With ceaseless bliss ambrosial feeding
And in Freedom's mansion establishing." ‡

What do we see or know save this Power? The opening rose bud, its form, scent, colour, the lark "at break of day from sullen earth arising and singing hymns at Heaven's gate," the leaf rotting on the highway, Bill Sykes on his burglarious errand, the hardness of the coal-scuttle that makes his shins tingle, the loving soul that toils among the lepers and seeks a leper's grave, the seer proclaiming the truth "till the world is wrought to sympathy with hopes and fears it heeded not,"—all, all is Force, the Divine Emanation.

The various manifestations of Force are grouped by the Saiva Siddhanta school under five heads which are deemed the principal aspects of the Great Mother. Evolution (srishti), maintenance (sthiti), involution (samhâra), obscuration (tirobhâva), grace (anugraha). The evolving Sakti (Brahma) evolves for each soul according to its deserts body (tanu), organs of knowledge (karana), pains and pleasures (bhoga), and spheres (bhuvana) to experience them in. The maintaining or preserving Sakti (Vishnu) maintains them for a time and enables the soul to experience them. The involving destroying Sakti (Rudra) withdraws them and makes them disappear. The obscuring Sakti (Mahes'a) entangles the soul in them so that, unable to distinguish the real from the unreal, it identifies itself with its fictitious envelopments, calling the body and organs of knowledge 'I' and the pains and pleasures and spheres 'mine.' The Gracious Sakti (Sadâs'ivam) enlightens the soul, delivers it from its delusion and bondage, and establishes it in union with God, the ultimate goal.

The earliest manifestations of Sakti are Vibration (Nâda) and the Word. Among the later manifestations the most venerated in India is gentle, benign Umâ, beloved of Siva (Siva-Kâmi), "mother that yields all the heart desireth" According to an ancient tradition she appeared response to the prayers of a Himalayan king as an infant floating in a golden-lily lake and was thence taken and reared by the king until given in marriage to the Lord Siva who came to claim her.

Hence the refrain of the Ode,

"Lady Uma who lovest mountain haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye."

* Huxley 'Evolution and Ethics.'

† Liability of the soul to reincarnation, until it becomes pure and fit for union with God.

‡ Chidambaraswami, 'Panchadhikâravilakkam.' (பஞ்சதிகார விளக்கம்).

In this character of the Highland Maid, under the name of Malaivalar Kâtali (மலைவளர்காதலி) she is worshipped at Tevai* (near Ramnad in the Madras Presidency) where the Saint Tâyumânavar sang this beautiful hymn which recalls the choral odes of Sophokles and, I think, excels them. The translation which I have added does scant justice to it.

மலைவளர்காதலி.

பதியுண்டு நிதியுண்டு புத்திரர்கள் மித்திரர்கள்
பக்கமுண டெக்காலமும்
பவிசுண்டு தவிசுண்டு திட்டார்ந்த மாகயம
படரொளித் திமிரமணுகாக்
கதியுண்டு ஞானமுங் கதிருண்டு சதிருண்டு
காடகித் திகளுமுண்டு
கறையுண்ட கண்டர்பா லம்மைகின் ரூளிற்
கருத்தொன்று முண்டாகுமேல்
எதியுண்ட டலெனச் சமயத்தை யுண்டபர
ஞானவா னந்தவொளியே
நாதாந்த ரூபமே வேதாந்த மோனமே
நானெனு மகந்தை தீர்த்தென்
மதியுண்ட மதியான மதிவதன வல்லியே
மதிசூ டனன்றங்கையே
வளராச னுக்கிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலே
வளர்காத லிப்பெணமையே.

Mansion and wealth, children and friends around,
Splendour ever and throne, the certainty
That Death's dark messengers draw not nigh,
Wisdom's light, purity, wondrous powers,—
All these are mine, so with Thy feet
My thought be one, O Mother that hast
Thy seat beside the dark-throated Lord†!
Light and Bliss of Knowledge Supreme, that
Swallowest religions as ocean rivers!
O Stillness, the Vedas' goal,
Thy form seen where vibration ends!
O Wisdom, me of 'I' and thought ridding!
Lady, beauteous as the moon, Madusudana's sister,
Uma who lovest mountain haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye!

பதட்டமே வலியாட்டமா, சீவாய வேடிமே
சிற்சினடையி லேதனடையிலே
சேலொ தவிழியிலை பாலொத்த மொழியிலே
சிறுபிறை நுதற்றிலை
பொட்டிலே யவாச்டு படிலே புனைகந்த
பொடியி லே டமயிலேமை

பூரித்த முகியிலே நிற்கின்ற நிகியிலே
புத்திதனை மூழ்கவிட்டு
நெட்டிலே யகியாம லறிவிலே பொறையிலே
நின்னடியர் கூட்டத்திலே
நிகபெறற வன்பிலே மகிவற்ற மெய்ஞ்ஞான
ரூபத்தி லேயுனிருதாண்
மட்டிலே மனதுசெல னினதருஞ் மருள்வையோ
வுளமருவு தேவையரசே
வளராச னுக்கிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலே
வளர்காத லிப்பெணமையே.

From the elements to Vibration Thou showedst
To me as false myself to me unveiledst.
In the core of my intelligence standing,
"Stand still, free‡ in Spirit-space all-filling,

* "The city of the Lady" from Tevi (Sans. Devi).

† Siva, also called Nilakanta (dark throated), from his throat having been stained with a dread poi on which he is said to have swallowed in order to save the celestials from imminent destruction by it.

‡ Vishnu.

* Literally "like the self-fish."

† Lit. "milk-like."

‡ i. e. free from thought and sleep a state of 'pure consciousness.' See note to v. 24 of 'A Revel in Bliss.'

Without beginning, without end," Thou saidst,
And skilfully establish'dst me, O Mother,
Who vouchsafest pure knowledge and bliss,
Yielding all the heart desireth.
Forgetting Thee can I, poor wretch, live?
Darling of the three-eyed Lord*, of all ills
The panacea, beyond the reach of them
That lack the inner eye which illumineth
The Vedas and excellent Agamas,
Beyond the deaf who hear not the praise of Thy might,
Beyond the stricken with the plague of controversy!
Lady Uma who lovest mountain-haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye!

மிடியிட்ட வாழ்க்கையா லுப்பிட்ட கலமெனை
மெய்யெலா முள்ளு டைத்த
வீறிட்ட செல்வர்தந் தலைவாயில் வாசமாய்
வேதனை யுற வேதனும்
தடியிட்ட வெவ்வினை யேழினுன் பாலிரான்
தொடரிட்ட தொழில்க ளெல்லாம்
தண்மட்ட சாண்சும்பி யின்பொருட்டயதன்
றொண்டர்பணி செய்ய தென்றே
அடியிட்ட செந்தமிழி னருமையிட் டாருரீ
லரிவையோர் பாலை வாயில்
அம்மட்டு மடியிட்டு கடைகடந் தருளடி
னடியீது முடியீ தென
வடியிட்ட மறைபேச பச்சைவெள் ளின்னாயே
வளமருவு தேவை யரசே
வரைராச னுச்சிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலை
வளர்காத லப்பெணுமையே.

Body all broken inwardly with life of affliction,
My days in pain to spend at the gates of the proud rich,—
Brahma thus my cruel fate hath ordered.†
All I do and toil, poor wretch,
Is for a ragged span belly's sake.
When, oh when, Thy servants shall I serve?
Green,‡ gentle parrot whom the Vedas pure
Declare to be the base and crown
Of the Lord who at A'rúr gracious paced*
The peerless woman Paravai's door,
To pity melted by His servant's strains
Of rare, pure Tamil! Queen of fertile Tevai,
Lady Uma who lovest mountain haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye!

பூரண புராதனி சுயம்பூ சுதந்தரி
புராந்தகி நிரியம்பகி யெழிற்
புங்கவி வளர்குவ சங்கரி சகலாதார
புட்பமிசை வீற்றிருக்கும்
நாரணி மனோன்மணி நாயகி குணாதீத
நாதாந்த சக்தி யென்றுன்
காமமே புச்சரித்த நிர்மலையர் காமமே
நானுச் சரிக்க வசமோ
தூணி தூடைக்கடவு ளாரணி வெனப்புகழ
வகிலாண்ட கோடி யின்ற
அன்னையே பின்னையுன் கன்னியென மறைபேச
மாமாத ரூப மயிலே
வாரணிய மிருகொங்கை மாதர்முகிழ் கங்கைபுகழ்
வளமருவு தேவை யரசே
வரைராச னுச்சிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலை
வளர்காத லப்பெணுமையே.

All-filling, Ancient, Auspicious, Independent,
Destroyer of the Triple city,† Three-eyed,
Beauteous, Excellent, Blissful, Causing bliss,
Nârani on thousand-petalled lotus ‡ throned,
Sovereign Lady beyond the ken of thought,
Cosmic Force transcending quality,
Manifest there where Vibration ceaseth" :—
Of Thy servants who thus chant Thy names
Am I worthy even to utter their names?
As Mistress of the Vedas hailed by Him §
Whose locks are wreathed with a'tti flower,—
Mother of millions of world-clusters,
Yet Virgin by the Vedas called!
O Swan || whose form is bliss! Fertile Tevai's Queen,

* Siva. The third eye is the eye of wisdom, located between the eyebrows and closed except in the Jnâni. Its site is indicated by the spot of sandal or other paste which Hindus usually wear on their forehead to remind them of the latent power of vision which it should be their endeavour to awaken and master.

† Hardly to be taken literally, for the poet was an honoured prime minister blessed with nearly all the good things mentioned in the 1st stanza. The allusion is to the troubles and distractions of political and court life, usually fatal to spiritual growth.

‡ Exoterically the Sakti is represented as of dark green colour.

* Siva is said in the 'Periapurâna' to have acted as an intermediary to effect a reconciliation between his dêvotee Sundaramurti and his wife Paravai. For the Lord is "the servant of His servants." Much more then should others serve His servants.

† Three strongholds of Asuras (Titans), enemies of the celestials.

‡ Siva.

§ Literally 'pea-hen.'

|| According to the *Raja Yogi* there runs through the spinal cord a canal called the *Sushumna*, at the base of which is a plexus called the *Mûládhâra* (basic) and at the crown in the brain the plexus called the *Sahasrâra* (thousand-petalled lotus). In the *basic* plexus is stored the cosmic energy an infinitesimal fraction of which is distributed throughout the body by the sensory and motor nerves, and mainly by the two columns of nerves called *Ida* and *Pingala* on either side of the *Sushumna* canal. This canal, though existing in all animals, is closed except in the Yogi. He dispenses with sensory and motor nerves, opens the canal, sends through it all mental currents, makes the body a gigantic battery of will, and rouses the vast coiled up power (usually called the *Kundalini*) from the basic plexus to the 'thousand petalled lotus' in the brain. As the power travels up the canal, higher and more wonderful powers of vision and knowledge are gained till the goal is reached of union with God.

Praised of Ganga in whose waters maidens sport!
Lady Uma who lovest mountain haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye!

பாகமோ பெறவுனைப் பாடவறி யேன்மல
பரிபாகம் வரவு மனதிற்
பண்புமோ சறுமிகே கியமோ செய்திடப்
பாவியேன பாப ரூப
தேகமோ டிடமிலே ஞானமோ சவலியுஞ்
சிந்தியேன் பேரின்பமோ
சேரவெ ரூத்சள மனதுமோ மெத்தவுஞ்
சிந்திக்கு தென்செய்குவேன்
மோகமோ மதர்மமோ குரோதமோ லோபமோ
மூற்றுமாற சரிய மோதான்
முரியிட் டெனைக்கொன்ரு நிதிடமோதேட வெனின்
மூசுவரி வண்டுபோல்
மாசுமோ டலம்வலல னெனையாள வல்லையோ
வளமருவு தேவை யரசே
வரைாச னுக்கிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலே
வளர்காத லிப்பெணுமையே.

To qualify for Thee I cannot sing Thy praise.
To be ripe for Thy Grace, taint all washed away,
My mind hath not one jot of goodness.
To make it pure this wretch sinful body
Has not the strength. I think not of wisdom
Even in dream. To seek the Infinite Bliss
My roguish mind ponders much and vacillates.
Alas! What shall I do? Lust, pride, avarice,
Hatred, envy,—of these I am the bond-slave.
In search of wealth the whole world I dare traverse
Like bee ever on the wing. Will Thou not me
Thy vassal enrol, Queen of fertile Tevai?
Lady Uma who lovest mountain haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye!

தூளேறு தூசுபோல் வினையேறு மெய்யெனுந்
தொக்கினுட் சிக்கிநாளும்
சுழலேறு சாற்றினை யழலேறு பஞ்சனைச்
சூறையி டறிவுவையெல்லாம்
காளேற நானேற வார்த்திக மெனுங்கூற்றி
னட்பேற வுள்ளு மடர்த்து
நயனங்களற்றதோ ரூரேறு போலவே
காணிலந் தனிலேயவோ
வேளேறு தந்தியைக் கனதந்தி யுடன்வென்று
விரையேறு மாலரூட
விண்ணேறு மேகங்கள் வெற்பேறி மறைவுற
வெருட்டிய கருங்கூந்தலாய்
வாரேறு கண்ணியே விடையேறு மெம்பிரான்
மனதுக் கிசைந்த மயிலே
வரைாச னுக்கிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலே
வளர்காத லிப்பெணுமையே.

With the accumulating dust of deeds
In this body choking,—intelligence
Daily ravaged like bale of cotton
Whereon wind-fed fire hath seized,—
Death-demon, old age, more and more
Affectionate daily growing,—shall I
Wander this earth a blind ownerless bull?
Lady, whose dark locks wreathed with fragrant flower
Excel the blackness of night, Cupid's charger,
And drive rain-clouds to hide in shame
Over the mountain-tops! Bright eyed Uma,—
Near to the heart of Our Lord* that rideth the Ox,—
Who lovest mountain haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye!

பூதமொடு பழவிள ரிந்திரிய மாம்பேய்கள்
புந்திமுத லானபேய்கள்
போராடு சோபாதி ராகூசப் பேய்களென்
போதத்தை யூடழித்து
வேதனே வளர்த்திடச் சதாவேத வஞ்சன்
விதித்தானி வல்லலெல்லாம்
வீழும் படிக்குனது மௌனமந் த்ராதிய
வித்தையை வியந்தருள்வையோ
நாதவடி வாகிய மஹாமந்த்ர ரூபியே
நாதாந்த வெட்டவெளியே
நற்சமய மானபயிர் தழையவரு மேகமே
ஞானவா னந்தமயிலே
வாதமிடு பரசமய மாவுக்கு மூணர்வரிய
மகிமைபெறு பெரியபொருளே
வரைாச னுக்கிருகண் மணியா யுதித்தமலே
வளர்காத லிப்பெணுமையே.

The devils, organs of sense and action,
Comrades of the five elements,†
The devils, mind-organs,
The furious warring demons, anger and the rest,
Have bred woe, my intelligence destroying
Thus hath Brahma willed.
To end all this woe, wilt Thou vouchsafe
The knowledge of Thy Word of Silence,
Thou whose form is Vibration and the great Word?
O Pure space there where Vibration ceaseth!
O Rain-cloud that maketh true religion thrive!
Mighty Substance beyond the ken of all
Brawling religions! Swan ‡ of wisdom and bliss!
Lady Uma who lovest mountain haunts and wast born
Dear to the Mountain-king as the apple of his eye!

P. A.

* Siva who rideth the Ox (pasu, also=the soul) and is called Pasupati, Lord of Souls.

† The organs of sense and action (Jnanendriya and Karmendriya) —not the visible organs but the brain-centres—spring, according to Hindu psychologists, from, and are maintained by, the subtle elements (Sukshma bhuta): hence called their comrades.

‡ Lit. 'Pea-hen.'

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, AUGUST 1898.

THE TWO GEMS.

(SAT AND ASATSAT).

"எவ்வெவர் தன்மையும் தன்வயிற்பிரிதலும்
தானேயாகிய தயாபரன் எம்மிறை."

"To each and every one, His own nature imparting
Our Lord stands alone, Supreme, full of Grace

Thiruvāchakam.

We proceed to explain the two verses we quoted from Thirumular at the close of our last article. The two verses seem so like that unless they are looked into more closely, their meaning is likely to be lost. These verses explain in fact the *Bhanda* and *Moksha* conditions of the soul, and the soul's ascent through various stages, called *Tatwa Darsanam*, *Atma Darsanam* and *Siva* or *Para Darsanam*. The verse, "The gold was concealed in the golden ornament &c." has to be taken first. The object before the seer is a golden ornament. The thing can be looked at from two different points of view, in two different aspects. It can be viewed as merely gold, and then we are solely engaged in looking at its colour, its fineness, specific gravity &c., and while we are so engaged, the other view of it, whether it is a brooch, or medal or a bracelet &c. is altogether lost to view. And in the same manner when we are viewing the object as a mere ornament then all idea of the gold, its fineness &c. is lost. This happens when the object before us is one and the same, and neither the gold as gold, nor the ornament as ornament can be said to non-exist, in either case, can be said to be unreal or a mere delusion. We merely change our point of view, and we are ourselves under no delusion at either moment. The delusion is neither in the gold nor in the ornament nor in ourselves. The object before us is so made that it possesses this double nature or aspect so to say, and our own Psychological structure is such that we can change from one to the other point. And each point of view has its own vantage ground. A person going to a jeweller's shop cannot afford to lose sight of either point, and if he does, he is sure to make a bad bargain. What would we think of this man if he goes into the shop with the firm idea that of the jewel he is going to buy, the gold is a mere name, and delusion, or the ornament is a mere name and delusion. When bargaining, however, after he had once tested the fineness of the gold, and colour, he need trouble himself no more about it, and he can proceed to examine the shape of the ornament, its size &c.

Taking this analogy, Thirumular proceeds to point out the same relation between the individual ego, the subject, and its objective senses. The word used is தன், standing as it does for the individual ego, jiva, soul, pasu, or chit. The phrase 'தன் கரணங்களாம்,' also brings out the meaning of 'தன், and it cannot refer to the Supreme Brahman, as was interpreted by a Hindu Idealist. Of course he could not help saying so, as the being which he postulates above 'its senses' (தன் கரணங்கள்) is God, the Supreme. Saint Thirumular was prophetic enough to see such a misinterpretation of his words, and it is therefore why he sung the next verse, "மரத்தை மறைத்தது," 'the tree was concealed &c.,' In our article on 'Mind and Body' we have fully discussed the relation which Saint Thirumular perceives between the Individual Ego, the soul and its body and senses. When the individual *pasu* lives a purely objective existence, by caring for his body, his comforts, his wealth, his pleasures, &c, his true self, the mind, is altogether identified with the world; and he himself lies buried, concealed. Look at the words our Saint has selected. He does not cry false, false, delusion, delusion at every turn. He actually uses 'மறைத்தது,' 'மறைந்தது,' "concealed" and "is concealed"? Neither the soul nor the world is a myth, a delusion; but only when the mind was in an objective condition, it was concealed by the object. When the soul regains its own self, by forgetting the world, the world has not become a myth, only it lies concealed, merged in the soul itself. The thoughtless critic is apt to consider such distinctions, as mere wordy warfare, but no student of philosophy can easily afford to ignore the first principles of correct reasoning, by choosing his words, each one to express one particular idea and no other; and many a specious and delusive argument has had its genesis in such ignorant and ambiguous use of words. To proceed, when the soul lies so concealed in the world, this constitutes its *bhanda*, bound condition, and the thing so concealing is called

bhanda or *Pasa*. When the soul learns to discriminate between its own nature and the nature of the world, and to rate the lower as its own worth, then its attains to *Tatwa Darsanam and Atma Darsanam*. And the whole field of Ethics is evolved from our perception of these relations aright. When man perceives that the more he is attached to the world, the more his own faculties get clouded and he is led more into sorrow and suffering, and the more he frees himself from such attachment, the more he frees himself from sin and sorrow and developes in himself his higher spiritual nature, then it is that his moral faculties are developed and in course of time strengthened by constant practice. But then there is this peculiarity about the mind of man, which is nowhere noticed in any other system that we know of and which we have already referred to in our last article, its intermediate nature between *Sat* and *Asat*, and which therefore gives it its name of *Satasat* and which peculiarity *Kanmudaya Vallalar* (author of Ozhivilodukkum) emphasises by using the expressive name of அலி, or Hermaphrodite, neither male nor female, neither Sat nor Asat. But the rule in Tamil grammar for determining the sex of the hermaphrodite is "ஆணு றப்புமிகுத்தால் ஆணுகும். பெண்ணுறப்புமிகுந்தால் பெண்ணுகும்." 'The sex follows the more predominating organs present,' and so a hermaphrodite person will always be called either he or she and not it. The life of the individual soul is as such passed either as Asat or as Sat, and it has no life of its own. That is, it cannot exist by itself, independent of its relation with either Padartha. If either God or the world did not exist, the existence of the soul would be an impossibility. Saint Meikandan uses two analogies to illustrate the position. The soul is compared to an object suspended air, and a flood of water. We cannot imagine an object suspended in air without a support. If the support removed, the object falls to the ground. Saint Meikandan had as such distinctly before him the question "why does an apple fall to the ground." The actual example he had before him was a swing attached by a rope to a tree. The tree holds up the object by its own force. When this force is weakened and loosened, another force is brought into place, the force of the earth, gravity. The object was in fact held in between these two forces. The object must either be attached to the tree or to the earth. In spite of the enormous power of gravitation exerted by the earth, the tree was able to hold up the object for a time. Only for a time, for when the fruit matures, the tree cannot hold it up, however it may will to do so. The same act accomplishes the severence from the tree and the bringing it to the earth. Just so, in the case of the soul. It is bound to Maya and Mala, so long the soul is not ripe. Before it is ripe, we do not perceive its brightness and sweetness. When the soul perfects itself, fed by the juices from the earth (the Grace of God) it finds its resting place in God. When it so finds itself, united, it becomes one with God, as the fruit itself when left alone becomes one with the earth. The flood again cannot stand still unless it is held by an embankment. When this embankment is breached, it will run on and on till it finds its resting place in the broad arms of the ocean. Without either of these means of support it will be difficult to restrain the fleeting soul. The embankment or the flood gates are the Maya support of the soul. The ocean is God. This support is called in Tamil பற்று, a support, a bond of attachment, a rest, desire, love. It is this peculiarity which Saint Thiruvalluvar expresses in the following couplet,

பற்றுக பற்றற்றான் பற்றினை, யப்பற்று
பற்றுக, பற்றவிடற்கு.

which again is the mere echo of our Saint Manickavachaka's words.

"சுற்றிய சுற்றித் தொடர்வறப்பான்றெரல் புகேழ
பற்றி யிப் பாசத்தைப் பற்றற நாம்பறவான
பற்றிய பேரானந்தம் பாங்கும் சாங்கமாஞ்ஞ்."

This peculiarity of the soul we have been discussing above has a tremendous bearing in connection with various philosophical schools. The ancient Buddha and the modern Agnostic would not postulate this other support and resting place of the soul. And we find they are landed in Nihilism accordingly. The moment of perfection is the moment of annihilation to the Buddhist. Nay, with his modern Apostles, Mrs. Annie Besant for example, the cry of the Vedas, 'whence there is no return, there is no return" is merely a vain cry. There is no such thing as final perfection, beatitude or Moksha. The soul must roll on ever and anon, subject to the never-ceasing and ever-recurring evolution due to "the moral necessity connected with the central and most precious doctrine of the exoteric Vedanta, the doctrine of Samsara." Here of course we see the phenomenon of extremes meeting. The Vedantist could not deny the possibility of the soul attaining the so-called moksha, re-

curring back into the cycle of evolution, as the original retrogression of Brahman into Gods and men, brutes and worms is itself not explicable by him. The Agnostic not believing in God, examines into the nature of the mind or soul and perceiving how intimately it is connected with matter, denies of course, its separate personality and independent existence; and hence his denial of the soul's immortality and future existence, when once its mortal coil is broken. In the case of the Vedantist, however, this peculiarity of the soul will alone furnish the excuse for his theory. And we have heard honest Vedantists admit this as the only explanation of Sri Sankara's otherwise untenable position. When in union with God, the soul has lost not merely the consciousness of the world, the Asat, it loses also its self-consciousness, (not be it remarked its self-being) it loses also its consciousness of difference from God &c. and the only perception that remains is the bare perception—the bare enjoyment of God,—the full manifestation and Presence of God as Love and Bliss alone is felt; and in such a condition, Sankara could say there is no second thing.

"சென்று சென்றணையத் தேய்ந்து
தேய்ந்தொன்றும்"

Sankara's experience will therefore be only one-sided one, and the statement cannot stand as a matter of proof. The state in union with God is called Thuriya or Para-Avasta, and in this condition, though the conscious perception of the world and soul may not be possible, their be-ness (existence) is not gone. And it is this condition, Saint Thirumular expounds in his next verse.

மரத்தை மறைத்தது மாமதயானை,
மரத்தின் மறைந்தது மாமதயானை,
பரத்தை மறைத்தது பார்முதற்பூதம்,
பரத்தை மறைந்தது பார்முதற்பூதம்.

The tree was concealed in the mad elephant;
The tree concealed the mad elephant.
The world concealed the Supreme,
The Supreme concealed the world.

The Supreme is concealed in the world (not non-existent), the world is concealed in the Supreme (not non-existent). In the sentences, 'I was concealed by the world, the world was concealed in me, note the fact that there are only two names, two categories involved, namely I and the world, soul and maya. For an intelligent understanding of the proposition no other category is required. But consider well the propositions, 'the world concealed the Supreme, the world is concealed by the Supreme. These propositions could not be true as they stand, unless both these stand as objective to the seer, as in the illustration of the wooden-toy itself. The wood of the toy cannot be conscious of its being concealed or not by the elephant form, nor the elephant of the wood. In human language and expression and argument there is always an ellipsis and the suppression of the middle term. The first two propositions relating to the wooden-toy cannot be true as they stand but is only intelligible, when we supply the factor of the seer. So also, the propositions that follow though they only contain the two categories Sat and Asat, involve the presence of a third, the Satasat. What we have stated above will explain the Sivagnanabotha Sutra,

"யானையுஞ் சூனியம் சத்தெதிராதலின்
சத்தேயறியாது, உசத்தில்லது அறியாது,
இருதிறனறிவுள திரண்டலா ஆன்மா."

That we are concealed by our Maya covering is a fact, the sharpest intellect and the boldest understanding cannot get over it, quibble and juggle as it may, and this being a fact, "that we are here in ignorance, sin, misery, and that we know the way out of them, but the question of a cause for them is senseless."* For nothing can be more senseless to ask for an explanation, when the fact to be explained is itself an ultimate fact. An ounce of fact outweighs a pound of probabilities, say the lawyers. And they only express a logical truth. But the proposition advanced by the Purvapakshi is that the jiva, being neither a part nor a different thing, nor a variation of Brahman and must be the Paramatman fully and totally himself, and as such is, clothed with such attributes as all-pervadingness, eternity, almightiness, exemption of time, space and causality, and that this jiva is hidden by the world † (maya and avidya) as the fire in wood, (or as Saint Thirumular would put it, wood in the elephant) and he asks what is the cause of this concealment? Why should the perfect become deluded into the imperfect by avidya and ignorance? Dr. Paul Deussen admits that here all philosophers of India (of his ilk—Sankara included) and 'Greece and everywhere have been defective, until Kant came to show us that the whole question is inadmissible We say 'ditto' also, whatever might be the learned Doctor's understanding of Kant. The whole

* Paul Deussen's *Elements of Metaphysics*. p. 334.
† *Ibid*. p. 334.

question is inadmissible, nay the whole proposition of the Purvapakshi on which this question is based is inadmissible, it is untrue, is not a fact. The fact is not true that the Supreme Brahman is concealed by Maya and Avidya. Dr. Deussen would put his unfortunate Brahman into the dock and arraign him of high crimes and misdemeanours (our friends are never conscious of what gross blasphemy they are guilty of—our mind is extremely pained that we should even write so, for argument's sake) and before proving his guilt, with which he charges him, he would indulge in irrelevant and irreverent talk, as to why and wherefore this Brahman committed these crimes. Any ordinary judge would rule his talk as senseless; also, such talk from the accused's counsel, kindly engaged by the crown, would be ruled as senseless, when the accused admits the charge, and there is besides overwhelming testimony as to his guilt, leaving no room for doubt. The case contemplated by the learned Doctor will find a parallel in some of those occasional cases of judicial murder. A great crime had been committed, there is a great hue and cry, some body ought to be punished, ought to suffer for the unknown criminal. The Police run down some one they have long known, an old offender, witnesses (Pseudo-gnanis, with their Swanubhuti and esoteric experience) only flock in overwhelming numbers to prove the prisoner's guilt the weight of testimony is only crushing, the poor prisoner at the bar is simply dumb-foundered and cannot find speech to exculpate himself, however innocent he might be, and his silence counts for confession and he is condemned to die. Before his bones are whitened however, the real criminal turns up, confesses his crime, and the first conviction is found after all to be based on a case of mistaken identity. We have already shown how liable is the soul to be mistaken for God, to mistake itself for God. Saint Meikandan even where he teaches the initiate to practice Sohambavana, cautions him before and after not to mistake himself for God.

'ஞானவயும் சூனியம் சத்தநிர்.' 'In the Presence of the Sat, all else is Sunyam.' Why, because, 'before the Perfect and Eternal Intelligence, (Truth) the imperfect and acquired intelligence, (the semblance) is shorn of its light,' answers our Saint, and he illustrates it by saying that the Evil Asat ceases to exist before Him, as does darkness before the sun and explains that Hara cannot know them as objects, as nothing is outside Him. How well this explanation fits in with the vedic text, "There shines not the sun, nor moon, nor stars, neither these lightnings, much less this earthly fire. After Him, the Shining One, all things shine, by His Light is lighted this whole world."* And when before this shining One, even the suns and moons pale, they dare assert that darkness, maya, and avidya can dare lift up their heads and veil and conceal and dim His brightness, and that on account of this veiling, the shining One can become deluded and fancy Himself as Asat, this body and these senses, and this world. Well does the Siddhanti ask, can you show me a sun covered by darkness, for me to believe in a Brahman veiled by Maya or Upadhi.† No doubt the blind man says, the sun is hid by darkness; he would not confess his own blindness and darkness and transfers his infirmity to the Effulgent Sun. "After Him, all things shine, by His light is lighted the whole world." Yes, O Lord, we are but broken lights of Thee. The little light that shines in each one of our souls is simply borrowed from Thee. Without this light, we are but the pieces of diamonds lying in darkness. In bandha, before the diamond is cut and polished, we cannot reflect Thy Glorious Light. We are the diamond crystals, Thou, the light shining in them: வெண்பளிங்கின் உட்பதித்த சோதியானே! As crystal, we become light in light, and dark in darkness. யாதொன்று பற்றினதன் இயல்பாய நின்ற பந்தமறும் பளிங்கினையம்மா. Thou art like the Light from the emerald, மரகதம், lighting and colouring everything it touches after itself.

எவ்வெவர் தன்மையும் தன்வயிற் பிறித்தும்
தானேயாகிய தயாபரா!

The Diamond crystal (சாந்ததன் வண்ணமாகும்) *and the gem Emerland* (சாந்ததன் வண்ணமாக்கும்) *these are the symbols used by the Siddhantis for the Soul and Sivam.* Students of Science know the structural difference between those two bodies, as mediums or distributors of light. This Divine Light is Uma, (literally wisdom or light) that Lady wondrous fair who showed to the astonished immortals, Her Royal Consort, and her colour is green emerald, and we will

* Swetas. vi. 14.

† *c.f.* "இருள்பெறுத்த பாலுவனதேல் உடலியானென,
மருள்பெறுத்த சித்தனிம்மன்."
If there is a Sun by darkness veiled
Then may a chit exist by ignorance veiled.

"நின்மலமென்றெயதே நிகழ்த்திலுயதற்குப்
பின்னிற்கை யுன்டென்கைபித்து."
Having called Him Ninmala
It is madness to impute to God Avidya.

close this article by invoking her aid and quoting this passage from Kumaraguruparа which is poetic and philosophic at the same time.

பண்ணுறு மிழிமொழிப் பாவைநின்றிருமேனி பாகொளி
விரிப்ப வுற்றன்ன,
பவளச் செழுஞ் சூமர் பச்சிளஞ் சொடியதாய், பருமு
த்தம் மரகதமாய்,
தண்ணுறு மல்லற்றுறைச் சிறை யனங்களி தழைக்கும்
சலா மஞ்ஞையாய்
சகலமும் நின்றிருட் சொரூபமென் றோலிடும் சதுர்
மறைப் பொருள் வெளியாகும்.

O Thou parrot-tongued Maid, The emerald Light from Thy sacred body spreading,
Converts the red coral reefs into green and the big pearls into so many emeralds,
And the winged swans floating on the cool waves into so many sporting peacocks
And thus explain the truth which the Vedas proclaim,
'That after you, all things shine.

EVIDENCES OF NATURAL RELIGION.

The Divine Perfections.

(Continued from page 40.)

The young man approaching, said What romance, ladies, are you reading with so much attention

"We are not, sir, reading any romance" they replied.

"Not a romance! What book, then, pray?

"We are reading the History of the people of God.

"The History of the people of God! Do you then, also believe that there is a God?"

Astonished at such a question the young girls looked at each other, their faces covered with blushes And you sir" said the elder, "do you not believe it?"

I believed it once" replied the young man, but since going to reside in Paris, where I have studied philosophy, mathematics, medicine, and politics, I have been convinced that God is only a word. As for me, sir" answered the little girl, I have never been in Paris; I have never studied philosophy, or mathematics, or those other fine things which you know I know little more than my catechism. But since you are so learned, and say there is no God, will you tell me, what does an egg come from.

The child pronounced these words in so clear a tone of voice as to be heard by a portion of the company. A few persons drew nigh to know what was the matter; others followed; and, finally, the whole company assembled round the window to hear the dialogue. "Yes, sir," continued the child, "since you say there is no God, be so good as to tell me what does an egg come from"?

"An amusing question! An egg comes from a hen."

"And what does the hen come from"?

"The young lady knows as well as I a hen comes from an egg."

"Very well, but which of the two existed first? the egg or the hen"?

"I certainly do not know what you want to make of your eggs and your hens; but, in a word, that existed first was the hen." "There was, then a hen which did not come from an egg"?

"Oh! pardon me, miss, I was not paying attention: it was the egg that existed first." "There was, then, an egg which did not come form a hen? answer me, sir."

Ah—if -pardon me--I mean--because--you see—

"What I see, sir, is that you do not know whether the egg existed before the hen, or the hen before the egg.

"Well! I say it was the hen."

"Be it so. There was, then, a hen which did not from an egg. Tell me, now, who created this first hen from which all other hens and eggs have come"?

With your hens and your eggs, you seem, to take me for a girl from a poultry yard.

"Pardon me, sir, I merely ask you to tell me, whence came the mother of all hens."

But, to end the matter--"

"Since you do not know, permit me to tell you. He who created the first hen, or the first egg, which ever you please, is the same being that created the world, and we call him God. You cannot, sir, without God explain the existence of an egg or a hen, and yet you pretend, without God, to explain the existence of the world!

The young infidel asked no more questions, he steadily seized his hat, and disappeared. As much ashamed remarked one of the company, as a fox had been caught by a hen. (Gaume Catechism, Vol. I. Les. III.)

Now, what we say of an egg or a hen we must also repeat of that primeval chaotic or elementary matter, from which some scientists are wont that first the moneron, then all forms of life up to man are derived. let it be granted for a moment, that all things came by evolution from that primorial matter or Pradhana but whence did that matter itself come? Did it exist of itself in virtue of its own essence from all eternity, or did it arise by chance? The first cannot be true, for, if it were so, matter itself would be at the same time God and not God. If matter were self-existent from all eternity it

would be the only and real God, because self-existence as such is the chief characteristic of the Godhead: but at the same time it would not be God, because to change and develop into higher forms is the chief characteristic of material nature as distinct from the unchangeable God. Neither can we say that this primordial matter arose by chance, and that higher forms of existence again by chance developed from it, because every sensible man knows that nothing arises by haphazard, much less a settled order of organic and inorganic beings. Therefore we must conclude that every existing contingent being is derived from God as the self-existent First Cause of the whole Universe.

Likewise we see that all things in the world are respectively to one another, causes and effects, so as to form an uninterrupted chain or series of contingent beings. But from whom will the first link of the chain be but from God? On whom consequently will the whole succession or train of things depend but on God the creator of that first being that headed the series or succession, the creator of the first link that started the chain. God from nothing created the first man, the first animal, the first tree, the first herb, the first element of matter, the first atom, the aggregation of which has formed the plastic root of the material world.

God infinite.

God therefore is the first cause or the creative power and energy of the Universe: and as such He is infinite. God is an infinite Being, without bounds, without limits of any kind whatever. There exists no perfection in the spiritual and material world that is not found in Him, just as there is no drop of water in the rivulet that is not found in its mother spring, no perfume in the air that is not found in the flower, no light in the atmosphere that is not found in the sun. All creatures outside of God are limited to one species, to one kind of things, or at least to the perfections of one individual. A tree has not the perfections of an animal, an animal has not the perfections of man, man has not the perfections of pure spirits, a spirit has not, at least, the perfections proper to the whole community of spiritual Beings. But not so with God. God is the unlimited the never-fading source of all possible perfection, and as such his simple unity he comprehends either formally all perfections that severally are the characteristics of all creatures.

God a simple spiritual Being.

God is infinite yet his infinitude does not exclude the most perfect simplicity. God is infinite, namely, his Being has no limits to perfection not to matter. God eminently precontains in His most simple Being all perfection that is included in matter, just as a golden coin includes all value contained in silver coin, not being silver itself just as man contains all the vegetative powers of the vegetable kingdom, himself not being a vegetable. On the other hand, infinitude as to matter involves contradiction, because the infinite cannot be measured and matter is measurable, the infinite cannot be greater or lesser and matter is divisible in different proportions, finally matter is necessarily limited by three dimensions without which not only it cannot exist nay, even it is altogether inconceivable. Regarding therefore God's infinitude, perfection not matter, it may be easily understood how God is an infinite spiritual Being, and yet simple. For, what is composed has parts and is capable of division into parts. But parts must exist before they can be put together, or at least may be thought of as existing before they combine together to make the whole they are destined to. But if the parts must exist before they are put together, they are prior to the whole, and must have a cause of their union. Building materials are not the house, and they exist prior to the house, and require an architect, namely a cause of their combination, and orderly arrangement. But who will assert that something is prior to the first cause? Who will venture to affirm that some one stands to the first and self existent Being in the relation of maker or architect of his existence? Is it not this a flat contradiction? Therefore let us conclude. God the most high is a spiritual, personal, self-existent, infinite, simple Being.

God immense.

God being infinite, it follows that He is immense, namely without limits of any sort as to space. God is above any boundary of space, namely, is Immense, because by his activity God is present everywhere and by his incorporeal presence He is wholly everywhere. In virtue of this perfection, God exists everywhere in space, without consisting of parts corresponding to parts of space, and without being limited to any extension of space. God exists in corporeal things not being Himself a corporeal Being God exists spiritual beings, being Himself infinitely above the rank of any created spirit. He exists everywhere, in His entirety, without suffering the slightest change. He is present to every created thing, and the divine substance is such that it would be present to any possible world, supposing that world to start into existence. He is present everywhere by his presence, power, and essence, therefore we must say that the Divine substance has an existence eminently equivalent to any possible extension whatever of corporeal worlds, namely that God is really immense I reserve for my second lecture on creation to explain more fully the three modes of God's existence in corporeal things, whereby He is said to be in each of them, by essence, presence, and power."

G. BARTOLI, S. J., D. D.

(To be continued.)

CAMEOS FROM TAMIL LITERATURE.

1. வறியவ ரினமைபோல் வாடிய ரிலையலாய்
சிறியவன் செல்வம்போற் சோர்ந்தார்க்கு நிழலின்றி
யார்கண்ணு மிகந்தசெய் நிசைகெட்ட வினநிபோல்
வேரோடு மரமுலீய்ந்து வரிசுதர் செறுதலி
னலவுற்றக் குயக்வ வாறின்றிப் பெருவேலிக்
கொலையஞ்ச விறைவரா ற்கோல்கோடி யுவனிழ
னலருபோ லுலறிய வயர்மர வெஞ்சுரப்;

இடைகொண்டு பொருள்வயி னிறத்திரீ யெனக்கேபி
னுடைபுதெஞ்சுக வாற்சே யொளியோ டிறபாண்மன்னே
படையமை செக்கையுட் பாயலி னறியாய்நீ
புடைபெயர்வா யாயினும் புலம்புகொண் டிரீபவள்.

முலிவின்றி முயல்பொருட நிறத்திரீ யெனக்கேட்பி
பனியகண் டடலொல்லா படாகூர்கிற் பாண்மன்னே
நனிகொண்ட சாடலா ணயத்திரீ நகையாகத்
துனிசெயுத நீடிலுந் நறப்பஞ்சிக் கலுழ்பவள்.

பொருணேக்கிப் பிரிந்திரீ போகுதியெனச் கேட்பின்
மருணேக்க மகந்தாங்கே மயல்கூர்கிற் பாண்மன்னே
விருணேக்க மிடையின்றி யீரத்தி னியன்றநின்
னருணேக்க மழியினு மவலங்கொண் டழிபவள்

எனவாங்கு,

விணவெஃகி நீசெலின் விடுமிவ ளுயிரெனப்
புணியிழாய் நின்வில யான்கூறப் பையென
நிலவுவே னெடுந்தகை நீயிடைச்
செலவெழுந் தன்னுற் செறிகின் வளையே

2. அறிதாய வறனெய்தி யருளியோர்க் களித்தலும்
பெரிதாய பகைவென்ற பேணுசைத் தெறுதலும்
புரிகமர் காதலிற் புணர்ச்சியுந் தருமெனப்
பிரிவெண்ணிப் பொருள்வயிற் சென்றநங் காதலர்
வருவர்கொல் வயங்கிழாய் வலிப்பல்யான் கேளினி;

அடிதாக்கு மளவிஞ்நி யனலன்ன வெம்மையாற்
கடியவே கனல்குழாய் காடென்ரு ரக்காட்டி
டிடியடிக் கலந்தலி கலக்கிய சின்னிலரப்
பிடிபூட்டிப் பின்னுண்ணுங் களிறெனவு முரைத்தனரே;

இன்பத்தி னிகக்தோரீ இயிலீந்த வலையையாற்
றன்புறுந் தகையவே காடென்ரு ரக்காடி
னன்புகொண் மடப்பெடை யசைஇய வருத்தத்தை
மென்சிறகு ராலாற்றும் புறவெனவு முரைத்தனரே;

கன்மிசை வேயலாடக் கணைகதிர் தெறுவலாற்
றன்னருவுந் தகையவே காடென்ரு ரக்காட்டி
னின்னிழ னின்மையான் வருந்திய மடப்பிணைக்குத் [ரே;
தன்னிழலிக் கொடுத்தளிக்குங் கலியெனவு முரைத்தன

எனவாங்கு,

1. *The Maid to her Master* :—

"The branches droop like the youth of the poor
And no shelter afford, like the lowly miser's hoard,
The tree withers to the root, as when the evil-doer
Shorn of all fame, nears his bitter end.
With the fierce heat of the burning sun, stricken sore
Like the country under the shelter of the unjust king,
Fleeced without scruple by his ministers, despite the people's cries,
In such arid desert, stand the tall trees bare.

"Of your crossing such desert, on gain intent, if she hears,
Will not her heart break and the light flee from her eye?
She, you know, will bemoan her loss, on the downy bed,
If even unconscious, you roll away from her arms.

"Of your cruel separation on gain intent, if she hears,
Will her eyes find sleep, without overflowing with tears?
She, you know, will indulge in cry, your beautiful wife,
If even in play, you were absent, a moment more.

"Of your journey in quest of gold, if she hears
Will not she lose her dazzling beauty and plunge in sorrow?
She, you know, will make herself greatly miserable,
If even, for a moment, love should not lighten your brow."

Maid to her Lady :—

"You part from her and she parts her life, I said,
Anon, your noble lover with the bright spear, his journey dropped
Therefore, my dear, put on your bangles tight."

(*Kalitogai* No. 10).

2. *The lady to her M*

Giving in rare charity to those who come beseeching
His foes, by a victor's strength, subduing,
And living in a union of love, formed in former life
Thinking these his duty, my lover who left in search of wealth,
Will he return soon, you think, my dear: I think so, now hear

Hot like fire, untrodden
So severe is the desert, my dear," said he In this desert,
The water, made muddy by the thoughtless young elephant,
Making his mate drink first, the male elephant would drink after," said he.

Devoid of pleasure, the leafage being withered and gone,
The desert is simply woe-begone, my dear," said he:
" In such a desert,
The pain, undergone by its loving young mate,
The dove alleviates by flapping its wings," said he,

On the hills, the bamboos droop and die, the sun scorches so,
And so difficult of approach the desert, my dear," said he
In such a desert
The young deer, suffering for want of shelter,
Her mate protects under his own shadow," said he

இனைகல முடைய கானஞ் சென்றோர்
புனைகலம் வாட்டுந ரல்லர் மனைவயிற்
பல்லியும் பாங்கொத் திசைத்தன
கல்லெழி லுண்கணு மாடிமாலிடனே

The desert, possessing such loving remembrances,
My partner will not bear to see suffer long,
Hark! The lizard did speak from the right quarter
And lo! My beautiful eyelids on the left flutter.
(*Kalitogai* No. 11.)

KAMBAN.

(*Continued from page* 44).

In the case of the author who composed and completed his Ramayan in a fortnight, bad syntax in some places is allowable and excusable. But his indulgence poetical license is unprecedented. Some of his words bear the stamp of bold grammatical coinage. That he cared very little for strict grammatical accuracy the very first line gives evidence. "உகைப்பனையதூர முவாச்சும்" has no மோனை (alliteration). In the stanza "காடியபொருள் &c.," the first two and the fourth sentences end with ஆதலினே, while the third ends with a பிறவினை. In the stanza "ஓசைபெற்றயர் &c.," "Kamban makes a blunder with கக்குபு using it as an infinitive instead of as the past participle. கக்குபு means கக்கி and not கக்க Kamban would have it to mean." (Mr. Sundaram Pillai in the *Christian College Magazine*). In the 17th stanza "பாரின்பாண் &c.," of வேள்வி Balakandam என்பான் according to some scholars is அசை. But others only force a meaning upon என்பான். He uses பிரதம் for பிரேதம் (133 பள்ளியடை-ஆயோத்) and மாணுயர் for மாணுடன் (50 திருத்தணிப்படலம்-சுந்தர) on account of rhyme (தொகை). கன்றுயிற்றுன்றே is "கன்றுதந்தன்றே" in stanza 66 நகரீங்குதல் (அயோத்). தாட்தந்தை+என்ன is contracted into தாடதந்தென்ன in 29. கைசேசிகுழ்வினே (ஆயோத்), லோபன் is எதிர் மறைத்தன மம வினைமுற்று of sanskrit லோபம (ஒன்றும லோபனை 7 கைகேசிகுழ்வினே) and this very bold conjugation. என்றலில is of the 7th case in தோன்றல் நீ &c. 24 அதிதியப்படலம of ஆரணியகாண்டம் ஒடும் is இசைகிறை in சேற்றடங்கட்டிரு வோடும் நீங்கியபாற்றடங் கடம் 37 பள்ளியடை. மூவரிஞல வாமுனி வன்தெய்தினுல (5 மந்திரப்படலம் of அயோத் is badly elliptical. It cannot be adapted to grammar unless it be expanded into something like this மூவருடனே சேர்த்தென்னை கால்பய் என்று வெல்லுதும் முனியதெய்தினுன் No modern poet will make bold to coin an adjective ஒம from ஓம் in ஓமராமரை (31 விராதன்வதை) note also பிறத்து for பிறப்பித்து (37 மந்திரப்படலம்). Rev. Beschi in sutram No. 7, section சலவரிமை of பொருளதிகாரம் (ஐந்திலக்கணத்தொன்றுரை விளக்கம்) draws attention to the confusion of (பருவமயக்கம்) கார் and கூதிர் in the Kishkindakanda but justifies the same as it is a compound of two consecutive and closely related seasons. Want of space and time forbids us from doing full justice to the grammar of Kamban. We are, however, of opinion that a short manual explaining the peculiarities of Kamban's grammar will be useful in the hands of Pandits and students.

We are also of opinion that this may form the appendix of a glossary explaining the peculiar meanings which the words and phrases convey here and there in Kamban's Ramayanam. In hundreds of lines our ordinary dictionary will be no true help in the hands of a pandit or student preparing his lesson. In the 2nd line of stanza 8 of மந்திரபடலம் நூலறதோக்கித் தெய்வ நூனத்தறங்நண்ணித்த மேலோர் தெயவம் means ஊழ் (fate). In ஒருத்தலைப் பாத்தோருத்தலைப் பங்குவி ஞர்தி (66 மந்திரப்படலம் அயோத்) the 1st ஒருத்தலை means ஒருபக்கத்தில் and the 2nd means நிச்சயமாக. "மாலும் in தாரின் ஏலமும் மாலமும் தொடர்ந்நசாரல்" (2) சித்திரகூடம் is தமாலம்=குங்குமமாம். அசை means கட்டி in அடையவாரி அரவால் அசை அனைகவித தம் (10 விராதன்). அனே means அனல் and புனே means புனல் in 4 அகத்தியப்படலம். குற்றடாகு means அரிபிளவு in 29 காடுப்படலம். There is no necessity here for multiplying such examples. Those who have had any experience with Kamban will feel this want. Kamban makes so many words and phrases serve his purpose in so many places that even the context cannot give us the clue in many instances. When some of the pandits who are supposed to have read deeply the Ramayana are dead, many of the passages will become obscure. The Ramayana serves as a valuable text in the higher classes and it is indispensable that at least the educational authorities should take upon their shoulders the accomplishment of this most useful though laborious task.

A few mannerisms we have noted in a persual of Kamban may be briefly stated to be the repetition of the form எழொடேழ் and ஐந்தொடைத்து, his frequent reference to the tender affection of the cow to its calf, and his frequent allusion to the meaningless love of

harlots in places referring to meanness. One more of this class is the comparison of the swiftness of the arrow to the immediate effect of the curse of sages and rishis.

The bright side of the picture:—Let us now turn for a brief view of the bright side of the picture. The most noteworthy feature is the use of the most *sublime and very apt similes* in the Ramayana. To examine even a greater part of them will be impossible here. We will only refer to some. The river Ganges takes its source at one place in the Himalayas, ramifies into many branches and enters the sea by one mouth, even as the first cause of the world is one, who is spoken of as different deities by the different religions, though, in the last resort, they all tend towards the selfsame first cause. (19 திருப்படலம்). Dasaratha reigned his country as carefully as a poor peasant watches his field (12 அரசியல்). Rama's arrow pierced through the throat of தாடகை, and away it went like a valuable lesson given to the vulgar (72-தாடகைவதை). The king's ministers when they heard of Dasaratha's resolve on a life of penance and of the installation of Rama were in the state of a cow between its two calves. (32-மந்திரப்படலம்). The face of Rama, when he was ordered by Kaikeyi to go to the wilderness, appeared better than the lotus which blossomed just at the time. (108-கைகேசி சூழ்வினை). When the army of Bharata was going to overtake Rama in the woods, the silence of their trumpets resembled the silence of the wise in the midst of the foolish vulgar. (33-திருப்படலம்). The water of the tank பம்பை was as clear and deep as the thought embodied in the numbers of great poets. In the 8th stanza of வரைக்காட்சி-the golden wheels of chariots which rolled on the roads over the base of சந்திரசைலம் gave a golden hue to the rocks underneath, even as the great sages, when they mingle with the low, change their folly. In the 20th *ibid*, the horses, when they got up, after rolling on the ground, shook the dust off their bodies, just as the good, when they come to know the evil nature of those whom they befriend, forsake their company.

There are innumerable passages where a word or a phrase produces an effect not so much by what it expresses as by what it suggests, not so much by the ideas which it directly conveys as by other ideas which are connected with them. For instance in the 49th stanza of விராதன்வதை of Aranyakanda

கடித்தகாரம் கதவகிமிர் கட்டெடித்து மெய்க்கவ்வி
உடித்தநிசை அணைத்தினும் சென்றெனல்கொள்ளா உறு
அயரால்
அடித்த பொருந்தனி முதற்றரும் பரமேபரமே என்
றெடித்தொரு வாளமழைக்கர்போதன்றென வென்றாய்

the word என் signifies simply *what* But it suggests that other deities were all silent because they are not all pervading whereas the god addressed here being omnipresent replied as soon as he was called. It also suggests that the deity as *protector* of the universe cares more than others for the miseries of all living creatures. It also suggests the readiness with which he complies with the requests of the suffering. In the 126th stanza of இளைகண்டீங்குதல் of Ayodhyakanda

சான்றவர்ஆகுதன் குரவர் ஆகுதாய்
போன்றவர் ஆகுமெய்ப் புதல்வர் ஆகுதான்
தேன்றருமலருளான் சிறுவ செய்வென் எந்
றேன்றபின் அவ்வுரைமறக்கும் ஈட்டதோ

Rama addresses Vasishta as the son of Brahma. But the implication is that "you are only a boy and you have yet to appreciate the sacredness of a promise." In the 87th stanza of the same padalam.

கன்னகுதிரன்புயக் கணவன்பின் செல
வுன்னகர்ஒத்தது கடந்தகானமும
மன்னவன்தஞ்சினன் என்ற மாற்றத்தால்
அன்னமும்துயர்கடல் அடிவைத்தனள் அரோ

As long as Dasaratha was alive, even forest life was city life to Seetha. Now that she heard of his death she stepped into the sea of misery. The phrase அடிவைத்தள் suggests that she knew no misery up to that moment and that she had yet miseries in store to pass through. This strikes a clear note to her future miseries. In the 28th stanza of கைகேசிசூழ்வினை of the same karda "கள்ளே தெண்டிம * * * மண்ணே கொள் கீ மற்றைய தொன்றுந் மறவென் றான்," the word மண் as per context means *earth*. The word here carries along with it an idea implying *scorn* What you want is only mud. You can very well have it being but mud (but in the other, my life is entered)." In the last stanza of குலமுறை கிளத்துபடலம் of Balakandam we have

"கோதமன்றன் பனிக்கு முன்னையருக் கெடுத்தநி
வன
போதுகின்ற தெனப்பொலிந்த பொலன்கழற்கால்
பொடிகண்டாய்."

Here பொடி of course means *dust*. But the inference is:—If the mere dust of Rama's feet can execute such wonder, what then of his feet and other limbs. By

this Viswamithra produces in the mind of Janaka a very strong impression in favor of Rama, and gives him to understand that there cannot come another personage capable of handling the bow which is to decide the fate of Seeta. In the 40th stanza of வேள்விப்படலம் of the same kanda "எண்ணுற்ற...முனிவன் வேள்வியை.....மன்னன் மைந்தர்கள் கண்ணினைக்காக்கின்ற இமையிற் காத்தனர்" the simile of course simply shows how carefully the brothers guarded the sacrifice. But the simile suggests how the brothers made a division of labour among them of the duty of guarding the sacrifice. The younger brother was guarding it from a place standing still like the lower eyelid, while the elder Rama was moving to and fro like the upper eyelid. What we have given are only some of the philosopher's stones doing duty in the hands of Kamban. Substitute another word or phrase, the magic is gone. There will only be a pebble.

Kamban sometimes plays upon words and they are very charming. "விந்தையெனும் விண்தோய், நாகமது நாகமுறநாகமெனநின்றான்" (39-அகத்தியப்படலம்). "நவன் செயத்தகைய இந்நனின நாட்டத்தான், தவன்செயத்தவன் செய்ததவன் என் என்கின்றான்" (18-சூர்ப்பநகை). "தையலார், உடையுயிர்யாவையும் உடையுமால் என்றான்" (23 *ibid*). "உள்ளமே தப்பெனில் தப்புடையாதைச் சொல்லுகென்" (21 *ibid*). "வெள்ளியையாதல் விளம்பினே" &c. (29-வேள்வி)—play upon வெள்ளி (சுக்கிரன்) the minister of Mahabali. "நாகமடங்கலு மால்விடையும் பொன், நாகமு நாகமு நாணடந்தான்" (32-கார்முகம்)—"விலங்காடுனை ஞதலிறல் விலங்கினேன்" (22-சடாயு).

He has a command of very happy metaphors :—

"நீலிருங் களங்க நீக்கி நிரைமணி மாட நெற்றிச், சாளரந் தோறுந் தோன்றுஞ் சந்திரவதனங் கண்டார்" (மிதிலைக்காட்சி-14) கரிப்பினை யுணர்த்துஞ் செவ்விக் கமலங்கள்பலவுங் கண்டார் (*ibid* 15.) சாளரத்தினும் பூத்தன தாமரை மலர்ன் (மந்திரப்படலம்-54). "மந்திரக் கிழவர்தம் முகத்தால், எழுதிநீட்டிய விங்கித மிதைமற் றேற்றி (*ibid*-45) "வெந்திறல் அரக்கர் விடவேர் முதல்றுப்பான், வந்தனன் மருத்துவன் எனத்தனிவலிப்பான் ("44-அகத்தியப்படலம்). "தன்னுதாள வளம் சுமந்தாழையில் பன்னுவான் குலைப்பதடியனேன்" (134-பள்ளியடைப்படலம்).

T. CHELVAKESAVARAYA MUDALIAR, M. A.

(*To be continued*).

EXTRACT.

The following reviews, we extract from the July number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*:—

1. *Sivagnana Botham of Meikanda-Deva*. Translated with notes and introduction, by J. M. NALLASWAMY PILLAY, B. A., B. L., District Munsiff. It is impossible to do more than announce the publication of this translation of the most important Tamil philosopihcal work known in the South. It contains a good deal of Tamil, and the supposed Sanskrit original of the fundamental principles of the system. The notes are exhaustive, but we rather think will be most valued by that reader who can compare the Tamil Text and Commentary with the learned author's own exposition. We acknowledge to having given some laborious, but pleasant, years to pondering this treatise and books connected with it. There are in in it very great truths, mingled with equally great errors both philosophical and religious. If our Tamil friends can be content to view it as a contribution towards the study of philosophy, and can believe that all truth is really one, and is developed from age to age, and that every system must learn to throw off from time to time its worn-out garments, it will be well for them. The editor is angry * with some recent writers who believe that the intercourse with the western world, which the Tamil people had from even before the first century of the Christian era, had influenced and materially modified their writings and systems. A tree is dead when it ceases to imbibe and absorb the influences of the soil and the atmosphere in which it flourishes. There is a subtle interpenetration of philosophical truths which makes every succeeding philosophy the child of all that has preceded it. Tamil philosophy has much to cast off, as much to recast; but its interest and importance can only be denied by the ignorant.

2. *Meykanda Sattiram*—The Text (with commentary) of 15 treatises on the fundamental Doctrines of the Saiva-Siddhanta System, edited by Nagalinga Muthaliar of Kanji (Conjeevaram); pp. 864. We have not space for even the names of all the treatises included in this bulky volume. In fact it contains, in somewhat difficult verse, the whole of the text books of the latest philosophy of the South Indian Saiva school; and to find anything analogous to it we shall have to go to the writings of the Schoolmen in the Middle Ages. The founder of the school, if we may so call it, was Meykanda-Devar, whose history, or rather legend, we should like to give. He is said to have derived his philosophy from the Sanskrit *Agamas*, and to have reduced it to twelve great aphorisms, which are in fact the texts which all the writers in this volume expound. But, as far as we know, no Sanskrit originals have been published (or found) to anything but the aphorisms themselves.—which however are supposed in the legend to have been composed in Tamil! Concerning these *Agamas* there is a profound mystery, in more ways than one. One of these works is the Siva-Pragasam

* The editor informs us that he feels surprised at this charge. The only sentence in the preface that can give room to this charge is the following. "But the deeply implanted prejudice lingers, and it leads him to say that truth found in the Kural must have been derived from a Christian source." There is nothing savouring of anger in this remark, but it only refers to the hobby of most Christians that wherever anything good is found, whether before or after Christ should be derived from a Christian source, and it is to correct this feeling, the Rev. G. M. Cobban wrote in the *Contemporary Review*. And the editor was quite agreed with the latter Rev. Gentleman to acknowledge truth wherever it might be found. The question however in one of pure historical importance but when we have no proper historical data, none need be in any way dogmatic about the question whether the East or West has received influences from the other; but in all probability both have benefited by the mutual contact.

by the great Umapathi, who is also the author of four or five of the very best of the series. He lived in the neighbourhood of Chidambaram, and belongs (as a date in his work shows) to the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The most notable matter, we think, in the whole system is the emphasis laid upon the absolute necessity for the reincarnation of Siva in the person of the consummate GURU, or Divine Teacher. The necessity for a divinely-imparted gift of enlightening and sanctifying Grace is insisted upon, in a very curious series of types, myths and legends. To an Englishman wishing to know what South India thinks and feels on the highest subjects, this work (and the ability to read it) is indispensable.

3. *The History of Manikka Vacagar, the Foe of the Buddhists.* This is the title of a pamphlet of some sixty pages, containing a paper read by Dr. G. U. Pope, of Balliol College, Oxford, before that institute. The paper itself is contained in about eighteen pages, and the remainder of the pamphlet is occupied with a discussion thereupon by those who were present and heard it read; this is followed by a lengthy appendix, containing very much that is valuable alike from a critial, historical, and religious point of view,—a remark which applies also to the numerous footnotes which accompany the Lecture throughout. For a great many years the contributions of Dr. Pope to the *Indian Antiquary* and other learned periodicals have familiarized all lovers of Oriental research with his profound learning and literary enthusiasm. Everything therefore, which proceeds from his pen must be deserving of careful attention. In the present lecture he gives an elaborate account of the sage Manikya: commencing with the sage's history prior to his "conversion" and with the events which led up to it, Dr. Pope proceeds to the narrative of the manner of that event, and then passes on to an account of the sage's doctrine and of his manner of life as a teacher. The work is well written, and is admirably calculated to assist missionaries and all who are desirous of thoroughly understanding the nature of Buddhism and the conflict of an earnest-minded Oriental in the investigation of its claims upon human acceptance. Of course, it is in its very nature a more or less religious work; but it is on the subject of religion that all Orientals are most interesting: all their literary productions are inspired with the religious spirit and gather round this as their prime centre; for the Oriental, and especially the Indian, is nothing if not religious. Apart, however, from this, the pamphlet is full of matter which will well repay the attention of the antiquary, the linguist, and the historian.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

A Tamil changam.—A Tamil changam is to be formed at Kumbakonam, under the auspices of His Holiness the Pandara Sannadhigal of Thiruvavaduthurai, who in promissing his support, desires the co-operation of all the well-to-do mirasidars and native gentry of the district. And no doubt he is right. It has of late been the practice to expect that some of these things should be done by some people and some people alone. When such hope prevails it is a sure sign that nothing will be done. The duty is on all, and self-help ought to be their motto. When each one tries to do his duty, it would be time enough to find fault with others, even though these latter may be expected in a greater measure to take the initative in such matters. We fervently hope that the projected *changam* will be an accomplished fact ere long.

***

Loyalty of the Tamil People.—We referred to the loyalty of the Indian people, in our review of the D. K. agency publication of the Life of Her Majesty. The Rev. Dr. G. U. Pope, in his review in the *Indian Magazine and Review* for July pays a graceful compliment to the loyalty of the Tamil people. He says "The Tamil people have always been loyal. The Tamil sepoys have yielded to none in bravery; and it may safely be said that the hearts of the 16 millions who speak the Tamil language are full of the most reverential and affectionate regard for their great mother. This makes the publication of this graphic and well-written book most fitting."

***

In the forthcoming October Number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, Dr. Pope reviews some more of the Poets of the Tamil lands. The serial No. 6, notices the *Naladi-nanuru, Tirikiadugam, Elathi, Nanneri, Cirn-Panja-Mulam, Paramori, Nithi-neri-villukkam* and in his summary, this veteran Tamil Scholar points out the originality of ancient Tamil verse, and the excellence of the subjects dealt with by the Tamil gnomic poets, and their influence on the character of the people, and observes that "it is therefore to be desired that in Schools and Colleges, the study of classical Tamil should be maintained. These quatrains are a well of good, old, strong, wholesome Tamil. They are calculated to strengthen and invigorate the character of the people. It is never good for a race to forget its old genuine literature."

***

In the correspondence we published from the Rev. Father G. Bartoli in our last, we beg to differ from the learned Father, about his estimate of Gita, that it follows the Vedanta theory. This is the common fallacy, created by the fact of the great use made of the book by Vedantists. But it is not so, and it was only some time back, that a learned professor and joint editor of a Vedanta magazine confessed that the Gita does not certainly postulate the identity of the Human and Supreme Spirit, and the Maya theory itself finds no place anywhere, the word itself occurs in two or three places only, but even then, it means not illusion but power or creative power only; and the *Brahmavadin* admits that "it is rather difficult to evolve out of it the later Vedantic sense." (p. 297, Vol. I). The description of God, "as the Supporter, Spectator and Seer &c." which our learned correspondent approves is also found in the Gita, (chapter13,22,) and of course is a quotation from the Svetaswatara Upanishad, and it is a remarkable fact that the Gita contains more quotations from the Svetaswatara than from any other Upanishad. The expression 'Sat and Asat,' and neither Sat nor Asat has been growly misunderstood by almost every writer, though the real meaning has been very clearly pointed by Mr. Davies, in his 'Hindu Philosophy' (Trubner's) note B. p. 135. The phrase does not mean existence, *per se* and non-existence, but manifested, or developed, Pratiaksha, and unmanifested or undeveloped, Apratiatcha or Avyakta. If in every place, the phrase occurs, this meaning is read into it, the whole passage is as clear and

unambiguous as anything. We hope to extract the whole note, which is a very learned one in our next.

***

The quotation from Boedder is very beautiful and true, and God's nature is compared to that of the Sun, illuminating itself, by that very light, with which it lightens up the whole world. The single word, *Scam paraprakasam* conveys the whole meaning. (*c.f* p. 60 Sivgananabotham).

***

Srirangakshetra Mahatvam.—The learned Editor of the *Crescent* has added this sketch of the most important temple of the south, to his large collection of descriptive sketches of various shrines. The sketch is an exhaustive one, giving as it does, the old puranic traditions, connected with the origin of the temple and its various shrines, the history of the various endowments attached to the temple, and its condition in medæval and modern times, with a brief account of the various festivals held during the year. The temple is chiefly famous for its association with most of the *Alwars* of the Vaishnavite faith, and the sketch deals with them also in brief. Of course, the antiquity attributed to the temple and its connection with Rama and Lakshmana cannot be treated seriously, and the brief account of the various builders of the temple and its different portions as gathered from the inscriptions is defective for want of proper dates, if they were available.

***

THE *Indian Social Reformer* says:—

"The current number of the *Siddhanta Deepika* has some observations on our leader on "Vernacular Studies in Madras." We have been the first to admit as will be seen from the back numbers of the *Reformer* that the Brahmans had not their own way in all things in Southern India. Refer to our notes on *Kapila*, the Tamil poet, for an illustration. What we do hold, however, is that as far as the hold of the Brahmans became stronger on the people, as it has apparently unaccountably been doing since the advent of the British rule, the development of vernacular literature in South India was checked. *We were referring to recent times and present conditions and not to the ancient or middle ages.*"

The italics are ours. The *Reformer* proceeds to out gratuitously enough who the Tamil Agastya *was not*, and refers very kindly to our credulity in believing him to be the author of several hymns in the first mandala of the Rig-Veda; and in indulging in this irrelevancy, he has forgot to answer the main question, we put, "Why did the Tamilians themselves neglected their own mother-tongue?"

***

THE question which our contemporary asked in his leader was "why is it that with far less encouragement from the University in Bombay, the vernaculars there grow and thrive, while with far greater encouragement, from our University, they tend to decay?", and the poser he put was "are the advocates of greater official encouragement, being given to vernacular studies prepared to face it." And we had better quote the whole of the following few sentences, as our contemporary has apparently forgotten the same:—

"We are afraid they are not. Even the mention of it may be unpalatable to some. But it had better be told, if at least for the purpose of preventing wild hopes being entertained of the outcome of the several proposals that have been put forward. The fact is, in this Presidency, or over the greater part of it, the literary class, the Brahmins, have never owned, though they had adopted, the vernaculars as their mother-tongue. How many of the Tamil classics are the work of Brahmins? There may be an exceptional scholar here and there like Mr. Swaminatha Iyer of Kumbakonam, who has consistently stood up for the superiority of the Tamil language *But the majority of the literary class, which unfortunately has always managed to be the sole literate class also, recognised no devoir to the Tamil language.*"

The italics are ours, and we would ask our contemporary to read these sentences together, and see, note and digest, if they mean the same thing. "*Always*," can it refer merely to 'recent times and modern conditions'; and the Brahmans, 'the sole literate class,' include the people, who "had a highly organized society and a well-developed language." No doubt, our contemporary did write the last clause but it is only human nature which conveniently sacrifices facts, when they cannot serve one's theory. Our contemporary was so far carried away by his theory (we admitted his theory was partially correct but did not meet all the facts and so had no reason to crow over the advocates of greater official encouragement), that he forgot facts known to himself. We don't wish to be hard on our contemporary, but as a *Reformer*, while charging others with credulity, he has to be more careful of *his own facts* and *theories*.

***

As regards, the difference, of encouragement accorded to vernacular studies by our two Universities, we should think they count little. We believe our contemporary is a professed utilitarian, and the common people who have bellies to take care of are greater utilitarians than he. Our contemporary must have heard the people talk of [illegible] (bread-studies), and with this feeling of gross materiality on the subject, our contemporary cannot expect them to avail themselves of the facilities afforded by our *alma mater*, when such distinction cannot pay. (We know what pay, a distinguished Master of Arts in the vernacular subjects is getting). What are the facilities pray? The subject is one of so many to be learnt, and a mastery of the English language is essential for all other subjects, and the study of the vernacular is as such narrowed, limited and crushed by want of scope and encouragement and inducement.

***

We have no desire to pursue the subject any further, but in passing we may remark, the position of Sanskrit stands not much better than the vernaculars, in spite of the great revivalistic stimulus. And the Hon'ble Dr. Duncan had as much the Sanskrit in mind, as the vernaculars, when he made his first proposals, and bewailed of the decay of the Pandit class, which fact we also referred to, just above the notice of our contemporary's views. The question on which our former question was based, is why should the Pandit class (Sanskrit and Tamil) die out?

***

For want of space we postpone the consideration of the question of who our Agastya is to our next.

***

MADRAS:—Printed by P. C. KALLIANA SUNDARA NADAR, at the C. N. PRESS, 39, Godown Street, Black Town, and Published by J. M. NAGARATHNAM.

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897

VOL. II. | **MADRAS, SEPTEMBER 1898.** | **No. 4.**

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page* 54.)

Adhikarana 4.

The next adhikarana proceeds to show that the Parames'vara, who has been proved to be the all-destroyer in the adhikarana just closed, is ever associated with Jivas, the manifestations of His own glory, as declared in the following passage

"Two birds, inseparable friends, cling to the same tree. One of them eats the sweet fruit, the other looks on without eating."*

Those who entered into the cave are verily the two Atmans, because so it is seen. (I. ii. 11).

The passage to be discussed in this adhikarana runs as follows:

"There are the two, drinking their rewards in the world of their own works, entered into the cave (of the heart), dwelling on the highest summit (the ether in the heart). Those who know Brahman call them shade and light; likewise those householders who perform the Trinâchiketa sacrifice."*

Here two beings are spoken of, as distinct from each other as shade and light, those two who have entered into the cave of the heart in the body of a brâhman or other person,—which is spoken of as 'the world of their own works' and as 'the highest summit.'—and who are the eaters of the fruits of works. A doubt arises as to whether these two are Buddhi and Jiva, or Jiva and Parames'vara.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—The two are none other than Buddhi and Jiva.—Why?—Because the words "drinking the rewards" show that the two are enjoyers. Parames'vara is not an enjoyer, because we find it said that "the other looks on without eating." It is a well-known fact that Buddhi and Jiva are enjoyers. Moreover, there exists no such thorough distinction between Jiva and I's'vara who are both sentient, as between shade and light. Buddhi being insentient,

*S'vetâsvatara-Upanishad 4—6.

*Katha-Upanishad 3—1.

there is a distinction between Buddhi and Jîva. Thus Buddhi and Jîva are the two beings spoken of here.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: the two beings who lie in the cave are none other than Jîva and Parames'vara, because we find it said that they have entered into the cave in the following passage:

"Him who is difficult to be seen, who has entered into the dark, who is hidden in the cave, who dwells in the abyss, who is the ancient."*

As to the contention that I's'vara is not an enjoyer, it is wrong to say so; for, the words "whose delight is in prâna, whose bliss is in manas" show that even Brahman who delights in A'tman is in the enjoyment of His own inherent bliss which is accessible to manas alone. The Purâna also says

"He is a youth who delights in the joy arising from the tasting of the nectar of His own S'akti; who as a rule tastes only the sweet honey of the supreme infinite bliss."

Every one knows that Jîva is the eater of the fruits of his own Karma. Though we are thus told that the two are alike enjoyers, a distinction has to be made in accordance with the nature of the two enjoyers. When, for instance, we say 'the king and his servant eat food' we mean that each eats that kind of food which is suited to his rank.

As to the contention that there is no distinction between them, we cannot assent to it; for, though the passage "the eternal of the eternal ones, and the sentient of the sentient ones" †declares the equality of Jîva and I's'vara in so far as they are eternal and sentient, there still exists a distinction between them caused by the existence of beginningless *mala* (original sin) in Jîva and its absence in the other. The S'ruti 'there are two, one knowing and the other unknowing, both unborn, one strong and the other weak"‡ declares that there is a distinction caused by knowledge and ignorance, by independence and dependence and such other attributes.

(*Objection*):—While both of them are alike associated with a body, how is it that one of them is afflicted with ignorance and other evils while the other is untouched by any evil?

(*Answer*):—There is no room for any such objection. Their occupation of the same body has nothing to do with the blissful condition of the one or the miserable condition of the other. On the other hand it is the independence of the I's'vara that makes Him blissful, and it is the dependence of Jîva that makes him miserable. Accordingly the S'ruti says:

"On the same tree man sits grieving, immersed, bewildered, by his own impotence. But when he sees the other, the Lord, contented, and knows His glory, then his grief passes away."

The traditional interpretation of this passages is given as follows: The Jîva bound by the shackles of beginningless Karma, having entered into many a body made of Mâyâ—each suited to the enjoying of a particular fruit—is subjected to a lot of incurable misery; and unable to ward it off on account of his impotence, he does not know what to do and grieves. He is thus immersed in the ocean of grief caused by his great delusion. When, however, by the Lord's Grace he intuitively sees Him who as the Impeller dwells within himself, who is gracious to all, who is ever associated with Umâ, then he attains to the unsurpassed greatness of the Lord, free from all grief. Wherefore though S'iva, who is independent and who has been free from samsâra from time without a beginning, is in contact with the body, he is not subject to its evils as the Jîva is. Wherefore it is Jîva and Parames'vara that are said to lie in the cave of the heart.

The Sûtrakâra again explains:

And because of the specific attribute. (1. ii. 12),

Moreover, in this section of the upanishad, Jîva and Parames'vara are specifically described. Jîva is described as follows: "The knower is not born, nor does he die,"† and so on. The Parames'vara is described as "smaller than small, greater than great."‡ How can this specific description apply to Jîva and Buddhi? Hence the conclusion that it is Jîva and the Parames'vara that have entered into the cave of the heart and dwell therein as the impelled and the Impeller, as the body and the Embodied.

Adhikarana 5.

Here will be mentioned another place for worshipping Parames'vara who has been shewn to be the object of worship dwelling in the cave of the heart.

(Parames'vara is the Being) who is within (the eye) because (to Him the attributes are) applicable. (I. ii. 13).

The subject-matter of discussion in this section occurs in a passage of the Chhândogya-Upanishad, which reads as follows:

* Katha - Upaniashad. 2 12.
† Katha - Upnishad 5-13.
‡ Svetâsvatara-Upanishad 1-9.

* Mundaka - Upanishad. 3-1.
† Katha - Upanishad. 2-18.
‡ Ibid. 2-20.

"The person that is seen in the eye, that is the Atman. This is the immortal, the fearless, this is Brahman."*

Now, who is the person within the eye spoken of as 'the immortal' etc? Is he the I's'vara or some other being?

(*Pûrvapaksha*) :—Such a doubt arising, we hold that he is a being other than the Parames'vara; for, in the Mahânârâyanopanishad 10, 11 etc., the Parames'vara is spoken of as dwelling only in the heart-lotus. On the other hand, Jîva enters into the organ of sight when perceiving colour etc., in virtue of his connection with the manas. He is the person in the eye. Or, it may be the reflected person.

(*Siddhânta*) :—As against the foregoing *prima facie* view we explain as follows: It is the Parames'vara Himself who is spoken of as the person in the eye; for, to Him alone are applicable such attributes as immortality and fearlessness in their absolute sense.

As to the contention that the I's'vara is nowhere spoken of as dwelling in the eye, the Sûtrakâra says:

And because He is declared to be seated and so on. (I. ii. 14.)

I's'vara is declared to be seated in the eye and to rule it within, in such passages as the following

"He who dwells in the eye, and within the eye, whom the eye does not know, whose body the eye is, and who rules the eye within, he is thy Atman, the ruler within, the immortal."†

Wherefore it is verily the Supreme I's'vara.

The Sûtrakara now proceeds to show an incongruity in case it is held that the reflected image of the person is spoken of in the passage referred to

And verily because of the declaration that he is endued with bliss. (I. ii. 15.)

The person referred to is the I's'vara for the very reason that he is declared to be endued with bliss in a former passage which runs as follows:

"Bliss is Brahman, âkâsa is Brahman."‡

Indeed no bliss can exist in the reflected image of a person.

As to the contention that the person in the eye is the Jîva, the Sûtrakâra says:

And for that very reason he is Brahman. (I. ii. 16.)

Because to Upakosala who was afraid of samsâra, and sought to know Brahman the s'ruti beginning with the passage "Bliss is Brahman, âkâsa is Brahman," teaches that "what verily is bliss, that verily is the âkâsa and what verily is the âkâsa, that verily is bliss,"* therefore the âkâsa spoken of as "Kha" is none other than Brahman. Is there any such appropriateness in the case of Jîva? Indeed in Jîva there cannot exist the absolute bliss. Wherefore, the very Brahman who has been spoken of in the opening passage as the infinite bliss being afterwards declared to be the person seated in the eye, Parames'vara is the being spoken of as the person in the eye.

In the Pûrvapaksha there is, moreover, an incongruity, as the Sûtrakâra says:

And because of the mention of the path of those who have learned the Divine Wisdom. (I. ii. 17.)

Because the s'ruti which begins with the words "He goes to light, from light to day" and ends with the words "there is a person not human; he leads them to Brahman; this is the path of the Devas, the path that leads to Brahman; those who proceed on that path do not return to the life of man, yea, they do not return;"* teaches, in connection with him who has known of the 'person in the eye,' the path of *light* etc.,—the path which has to be learnt by those who have known of the nature of Brahman,—therefore, the person spoken of is neither Jîva nor the reflected image in the eye; on the other hand, he is none other than the I's'vara.

Adhikarana 6.

Owing to looseness and impossibility, not the other. (I. ii. 18.)

The passage which has to be discussed here occurs, in the Mahopanishad and reads as follows

"The thumb-sized Purusha, seated in the thumb, the Lord, the Master of the whole world, the eater of the whole, is pleased.†

Here a doubt arises as to whether the being spoken of as 'thumb-sized' and so on is the Parames'vara or some one else.

(*Pûrvapaksha*) :—Inasmuch as this passage occurs in the section of *Prânâgnihotra*, and because the Purusha is spoken of as small—by the epithet 'thumb-sized'—we have to understand that it is Prâna or the Vital air which is the eater of the five oblations. And

* Op. Cit. 4-15.

† Brih. Up. 5-7.

‡ Chhandogya Upanishad 4-10.

* Chhandogya Upanishad 4-10, 15.

† Op. Cit. 38.

it cannot be urged that Prâna cannot be the eater ; for, even the air is spoken of as an eater in such passages as the following :

"The waters and the earth are the food, and the fire and the air are the eaters."

From all points of view the passage refers to the vital air.

(*Siddhânta*) :—It is none other than Parames'vara who is spoken of here ; for, if the attribute of lordship over the whole universe and that of being the eater of the whole be (somehow) applied to the other (Prâna), then these attributes are too loosely applied.* These attributes cannot be strictly applied to it (prâna). Wherefore none but I's'vara can be such a being. He is declared to be an object of worship even in the form of prâna, as the s'ruti speaks of Him as the seat of prâna in the following words :

"Thou art the knot of all prânas (senses),
Thou art Rudra, the destroyer (of pain) ; do
Thou enter into me."†

As to His being spoken of as "thumb-sized," there can be no inconsistency, inasmuch as He is so described only for the purpose of meditation. Though the vital air is found described in several places as the eater, it cannot be 'the eater of the *whole*.' Accordingly we should understand that the I's'vara is here described to be of the form of prâna and has to be worshipped by Prânâgnihotra.

Adhikarana. 7.

For the purpose of contemplative worship, it has been shown that S'iva, the Supreme Brahman, is seated in the orb of the sun, in man's heart-lotus, and so on, though He is all-knowing, all-powerful, all-benign, and all-pervading. This section proceeds to shew that He is seated everywhere.

(He is) the Inner Ruler abiding in the Devas, in the worlds and so on, because of the mention of His attributes. (I. ii. 19).

The text which forms the subject of discussion in this section occurs in the Antaryâmi-Brâhmana and runs as follows :

"He who dwells in the earth, within the earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body the earth is, and who rules the earth within, he is thy A'tman, the ruler within, the immortal."‡

A doubt arises as to whether he who is thus spoken of as the Inner Ruler in all beings,—in all things mentioned in the series extending from earth up to A'tman,—is the Parames'vara, or Jîva, or the Virât-Purusha, or the Pradhâna.

(*Pûrvapaksha*:)—It becomes only Jîva to enter into the sense-organs of all beings for the enjoying of the variegated fruits which he has earned. It becomes the Virat-Purusha to enter into all beings, as he is the upâdâna (material cause) of all sentient existence. Or, it is right to maintain that it is the Pradhâna which pervades all, as it becomes transformed in the form of the *mahat* and so on. It cannot be that the Parames'vara who, as superior to the universe, is declared in the s'ruti to have crossed beyond all phenomenal existence (vikâra) has entered into the universe of phenomenal forms. Wherefore the *Antaryâmin*, the Inner Ruler, must be one of the three mentioned above,—Jîva, Virât-purusha, or Pradhâna,—but not the Parames'vara.

(*Siddhânta*) :—As against the foregoing we hold as follows : He who is described to be the Antaryâmin, the Inner Ruler in the earth and so on, is none but Parames'vara, because of the mention of the attribute of being within all and the like. In the Atharvas'iras also the Parames'vara is found described to have entered into all beings as their A'tman. In the words "He is thy A'tman, the ruler within, the immortal," S'iva alone is described as immortal and liberated from time without beginning, it being said in the Jâbâla-Upanishad that "these are verily the designations of the Immortal." Just as the Parames'vara is described in the s'ruti as superior to the universe, He is also described as all-formed in the words "all verily is Rudra," and so on. In every subsequent passage of the section (following the one quoted in the opening part of the adhikarana from the Brihadâranyaka-upanishad) the word 'immortal' is used evidently to show that He is not in the least tinged with the phenomenal change though He is present in all changing phenomena. In that section of the Atharvas'iras which begins with the passage "He verily who is Rudra is the Blessed Lord ; He is Bhûh, Bhuvah, Suvah, as well as he who is known as Brahmâ ; to Him, verily, we bow, we bow," the Parames'vara is described as Brahmâ, Vishnu, Rudra, Umâ, Laksmî, Sarasvatî, Ganes'a, Skanda, Indra, and other guardian spirits of the world, the seven worlds comprising the earth etc., the five material elements comprising earth etc., the sun, the moon, the planets;

* That is, they become applicable to many other entities.

† Mâhânârayana Upanishad 37.

‡ Brihadaranyaka-Upanishad 5—7.

the Gods, Rishis and so on,—in each case repeating in its turn) all that has been said when describing Him as Brahmâ in the opening passage of the section here quoted.). And even here, with a view to prevent the notion that owing to His entrance into all sentient and insentient existence He may become tainted with evil, the word "Bhagavat" (blessed Lord) has been used in each case, thus showing that He is always endued with the excellent divine attributes of lordship and so on. Wherefore it is but right to hold that S'iva, the Supreme Lord, is superior to all and is the A'tman of all.

As to the contention that Pradhâna etc. may be spoken of as the Antaryâmin, the sûtrakâra refutes it as follows:

And not what the smriti speaks of, there being no mention of its attributes; nor is it the embodied. (I. ii. 20).

And we cannot hold that what the s'ruti speaks of as Antaryâmin, the Inner Ruler, is the Pradhâna mentioned in the smriti (of the Sânkhyas), there being no mention of its attributes, such as changeability, inertness and so on. Nor can the embodied Virât-Purusha be the being here referred to, inasmuch as he cannot be the ruler of all.

And it is not Jîva either:

Both alike, verily, declare Him as different. (I, ii. 21).

Both the schools, the Kânvas as well as the Mâdhyandinas, declare the Antaryâmin as different from the Jîva, in the words "He who abides in the vijñâna," and "He who abides in the A'tman," and so on. Wherefore it may be concluded that Parames'vara is alone the Inner Ruler of all, not the Pradhâna, nor Virât-Purusha, nor Jîva.

ADHIKARANA 8.

This adhikârana is introduced with a view to shew that the Parames'vara, who has been declared to be embodied in the visible forms of the earth etc., is not Himself visible like them.

(Parames'vara is the being) possessed of the attributes of invisibility and so on, because of the mention of (His) attributes. (I. ii. 22.)

The passage which forms the subject of discussion in this adhikarana runs as follows

"But the higher knowledge is that by which the indestructible (Akshara) is apprehended; that which cannot be seen, nor seized, which has no family and no caste, no eyes nor ears, no hands nor feet, the eternal, the omnipresent, infinitesimal, that which is imperishable,—it is that which the wise regard as the source of all beings."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the indestructible (Akshara) refers to Pradhâna, Jîva, or Parames'vara.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—Here Akshara refers to Pradhâna, inasmuch as it can be the source of all beings, transforming itself into *mahat* and so on. Or, Akshara may refer to jîva. He, can indeed, be rightly spoken of as Akshara, as said in the following passage of the s'ruti:

"That which is perishable (Kshara), the Pradhâna, the immortal (amrita), the indestructible (âkshara)."†

He can be the source of all beings through his Karma. Wherefore Akshara may refer to one of the two.

(*Siddhânta*):—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: The Akshara is none other than Parames'vara, His attributes being spoken of in the words "From Him who perceives all, and who knows all, whose penance (tapas) consists of knowledge"‡ and so on. Indeed, such attributes as omniscience can pertain to none other than Parames'vara. As to the contention that Pradhâna and Jîva can be the source of all beings, we say it is wrong to say so, inasmuch as they are (respectively) insentient and possessed of limited knowledge, and are therefore incapable of the act of (creating all beings).

Again, the Sûtrakâra proceeds to show that 'Akshara' cannot properly refer to Jîva and Pradhâna:

And because of the mention of qualifications and a distinction, (it is) not the two others. (I. ii. 23).

Here the Upanishad opens with the enunciation of the proposition that, one being known, all is known, in the words "Which one, O blessed Lord, being known, all this becomes known?"§ Besides this, there are other qualifications. Owing to a mention of such qualifications 'Akshara' cannot here mean Pradhâna. Neither does 'Akshara' refer to Jîva, inasmuch as the Akshara is described to be different from Jîva in the words "higher than the high, higher, than the imperishable.

And because of the description of (His) form (I. ii. 24.)

The Akshara is described to be of the form of the three worlds in the following passage

* Mundaka-Upanishad 1-1-5, 6.
† Svetasvatara-Upanishad 1-10.
‡ Mundaka-Upanishad 1-1-9.
§ Ibid. 1-1-3.
¶ Ibid. 2-1-2.

"Fire is his head, his eyes the sun and the moon, the quarters his ears, his speech the Veda disclosed, the wind his breath, his heart the universe; from his feet came the earth, he is indeed the inner Atman of all beings."*

And for this reason, Parames'vara, the A'tman of all, is alone referred to by the word '*Akshara*.'

Adhikarana 9.

It was shewn in a former section that Parames'vara is to be worshipped as the seat of prâna. This section proceeds to shew that He is to be worshipped as the fire in the stomach.

The fire (Vais'va'nara is Parames'vara), because of the specification of the general designation. (I. ii. 25.)

The following scriptural text forms the subject of discussion in this adhikarana:

"But he who worships the space-limited Vaisvânara A'tman as identical with himself, he eats food in all worlds, in all beings, in all A'tmans.†

Here a doubt arises as to whether the Vais'vânara here presented as an object of worship refers to Parames'vara, or to some other being.

(*Pûrvapaksha*:)—The word 'Vais'vânara' denotes the fire in the stomach; for we find the word used to denote the fire in the stomach in the following passage:

"Agni Vais'vânara is the fire within man, by which the food that is eaten is cooked, *i. e.*, digested. Its noise is that which one hears, if one covers one's ears. When he is on the point of departing this life, he does not hear that noise."‡

Or it may refer to 'fire' the third of the five 'great elements,' the word 'Vais'vânara' being applied to fire in such passages as the following:

"This fire, verily, is the Vais'vânara."§

Or, the word may denote the god known by that name, inasmuch as he, as the god to be worshipped, is declared to be the giver of the reward in such passages as the following

"When a son is born, oblations should be offered to the Vais'vânara in twelve cups."¶

It can never refer to Parames'vara, since the s'ruti teaches us that Vais'vânara is a finite being, in the words "space-limited.'

(*Siddhânta*:)—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: Parames'vara Himself is referred to by the word 'Vais'vânara.'—How?—Though the word Vais'vânara' is a common designation, yet in this section of the upanishad it is defined by such specific designations as 'Brahman'—which are peculiarly applicable to Parames'vara,—in the following passages:

"Who is our A'tman? What is Brahman?"*

"You know at present that Vais'vânara A'tman; tell us that."

This specific designation cannot be applied to the fire in the stomach etc. Wherefore Vais'vânara is none but Parames'vara.

The Sûtrakâra adduces another piece of evidence to show that Parames'vara is meant here:

Inasmuch as what is repeated may form a mark by which to infer. (I. ii. 26.)

In such passages as "Fire is his head, his eyes the sun and the moon,"† Parames'vara is declared to be embodied in the form made up of the regions extending from heaven to earth. Such a form is spoken of in the section of the upanishad we are here discussing in the following words

"Of that Vais'vânara A'tman, the head is Sutejas (having good light), the eye Vis'varûpa (multiform), the breath Prithagvartman (having various courses), the trunk Bahula (full), the bladder Rayi (wealth), the feet, the earth."‡

The form here spoken of forms the mark by which we may infer that Parames'vara is meant here.

If (you hold it is) not (so) because by word etc. It is said to be established within, we cannot (grant it) because of its being so taught for the sake of contemplation, and on account of its incongruity; and, moreover, they declare him to be Purusha. (I. ii. 27.)

(*Objection*):—This Vais'vânara fire is alone other than the fire in the stomach, because of its being spoken of as the three fires and as the receptacle of the oblations offered to the prânas, in such passages as the following:

"The heart is the Gârhapatya fire, the mind the Anvâhârya fire, the mouth the A'havanîya fire.

---

* Ibid 2-1-1.
† Chhandogya-Upanishad 5-18.
‡ Brihadaranyaka-Upanishad 7-9.
§ Taittiriya-Samhita 3-3-8.
¶ Ibid 2-2-5.

* Chhandogya-Upanishad 5-11.
† Mundaka-Upanishad 2-1.
‡ Chhandogya-Upanishad 5-19.

Therefore the first food which a man may take is in the place of homa ; *

and also because of its being declared to be established within man in the following passage

"He who knows this Vais'vânara fire to be of the human form and established within man."†

The Vais'vânara fire is not Parames'vara.

(*Answer*) :—Not so ; because it is taught that He has to be worshipped in the form of the fire in the stomach, and that it is impossible to hold that the fire in the stomach is of the form of the three worlds and so on. Moreover, in the words "this Vais'vânara fire is he who is known as Purusha,"—the Vâjasaneyins declare this Vais'vânara to be the Purusha. Moreover, none but Parames'vara can be strictly spoken of as Purusha, as the s'ruti says

"By that Purusha all this is filled."‡

Wherefore it is right to hold that Parames'vara is meant here.

Hence only, neither the God nor the element. (I. ii. 28.)

Because this Vais'vânara has the three worlds for his body and is known by the name of Purusha, therefore neither the fire-god nor the third element (of fire) is meant here.

It having been proved that Parames'vara is denoted by the word 'agni' (fire) as having to be worshipped in the form of the fire in the stomach, the Sûtrakâra now proceeds to show how other teachers (achâryas) have variously explained the application of the word 'agni.'

Jaimini (sees) no incongruity even in literally (applying the word.) (I. ii. 29.)

The application of the word 'agni' to Parames'vara is justifiable not merely on the ground that He has to be worshipped in the form of fire, but also on the ground that the word can be literally applied to Parames'vara himself 'leading (the devotees) to the front. Thus Jaimini sees no incongruity in applying the word to Parames'vara.

* Chhandogya-Upanishad 5-18, 19.
† S'atapathabrahmana 10-6-1-11.
‡ Mahanarayana Upanishad 1.

A's'marathya (holds it to be) for manifestation's sake! (I. ii. 30.)

Sage A's'marathya holds that the Unlimited becomes limited in space occupied by the regions from the heaven down to the Earth, with a view to manifest Himself to his devotees.

Badari (holds it to be) for recognition's sake, (I. ii. 31.)

Bâdari holds that the representation of the regions from the heaven to the earth as the head, feet and other parts of the body is meant for recognition, that is, for the attainment of Brahman.

Jaimini (holds it to be) for exaltation's sake; so indeed, (the sruti) reveals. (I. ii. 32.)

Jaimini thinks that it is with a view to exalt in thought the oblations to prâna etc.—taught in connection with the worship—to the rank of an Agnihotra that the chest etc. of the worshipper are represented as the altar and so on in the following passage

"The chest is the altar ; the hairs, the grass on the altar ; the heart, the Gârhapatya fire ; the mind, the Anvâhârya fire ; the month, the Ahavaiya fire."*

And accordingly the s'ruti says : "He who offers this Agnihotra with a full knowledge of its true purpose." †

And they declare Him to be therein. (I. ii. 33.)

The Taittirîyakas declare that the Parames'vara dwells in the devotee's body when oblations are offered to prâna etc., as the recipient of those oblations, as the following passages show :

"O oblation ! enter into me as S'iva, that there may be no sensation of burning."‡

"The Lord is pleased, the eater of all."‡

Wherefore in the opinion of all teachers, as also in point of reason, it is right to hold that Parames'vara alone is to be worshipped in the form of the fire in the stomach, by the prâna-agnihotra.

End of the Second Pâda of the First Adhyâya.

A. MAHADEVA S'A'STRI, B. A.

(*To be continued.*)

* Chhandogya-Upanishad. 5-18.
† Brihâ—Up. 5-24.
‡ Mahânâ. Up. 35.36.

TIRUMULAR'S TIRUMANTRAM.

(*Continued from page* 32).

In Praise of the Vedas.

வேதச் சிறப்பு.

வேதத்தை விட்ட வறமில்லை வேதத்தி
னோதத் தகுமற மெல்லா முளதர்க்க
வாதத்தை விட்டு மதிஞர் வளமுற்ற
வேதத்தை யோதியே வீடுபெற் றார்களே. (க)

1. There is no Dharma outside the Vedas. All praiseworthy Dharmas are set forth in them. Leaving aside works on logic, the wise attained to Moksha, by the recitation of the Vedas.

வேத முரைத்தானும் வேதிய னல்லன்
வேத முரைத்தானும் வேதா விளங்கிட
வேத முரைத்தானும் வேதியர் வேளவிக்காய்
வேத முரைத்தானு மெய்ப்பொருள் காட்டவே

2. He who recites the Vedas is not necessarily a brahmin, (unless he possesses the merits of one. The real author of the Vedas, He who taught the Vedas to Brahma himself, He who gave them out for the sacrificial rites of the brahmins, is the True Being, as demonstrated by the Vedas themselves.

இருக்குரு வாமெழில் வேதத்தி னுள்ளே
யுருக்குணர் வாயுணர் வேதத்து ளோங்கி
வெருக்குரு வாகிய வேதியர் சொல்லுங்
கருக் குரு வாய்நின்ற கண்ணனு மாமே. (உ)

3. In the beautiful laudatory verses of the Vedas, the Supreme Siva who is understood by the man of true love, is the True Being that is set forth and not the Black-hued Krishna who is belauded by catlike pretenders (*Vidala Brahmins*).

திருவெறி யாவது சித்தசித் தன்றிப்
பெருவெறி யாய பிரானை நினைந்து
குருவெறி யாஞ்சிவ மாவெறி கூடு
மொருவெறி யொன்றுக வேதாந்த மோதுமே.

4. The True Path, whereby the intelligent soul discriminating itself from Asat, and relying on its Lord who is the True Way, adheres to the teaching of its Guru regarding 'Sivoham' doctrine, is the one marga set forth by *Vedanta*.

ஆறங்க மாய்வரு மாமறை யோதியைக்
கூறங்க மாகக் குணம்பயில் வாரில்லை
வேறங்க மாக விளைவுசெய் தப்புறம்
பேறங்க மாகப் பெருக்குகின் றாரே. (ங)

5. None praise Him, the author of the Vedas with six *Angas*, by the names of His parts and attributes, (as set forth therein, such as *Nilakandam, Umasahayam, Virupaksham, Hiranyakesam* &c.), but they multiply the praises of the God with severable parts and hope to become one with those parts.

பாட்டு மொலியும் பறக்குங் கணிகையர்
ஆட்ட மறுத வலனியின் மாட்டாத
வேட்டு விருப்பார் விரதமில் லாதவர்
வீட்டு மிடஞ்சென் றிகலலுற் றாரே. (ச)

6. The hypocritical Brahmins who have not lost their desire, go and recite the Vedas in unholy and public places resounding with the song and dance of immoral women.

In praise of the Agamas.

அஞ்சன மேனி யரிவையோர் பாகத்த
னஞ்சொ டிருபத்து மூன்றுள வாகம
மஞ்சலி கூப்பி யறுபத் தறுவரு
மஞ்சா முகத்தி லரும் பொருள் கேட்டதே. (க)

1. The emerald-hued Uma's Lord gave out the the 28 Saiva Agamas, from His fifth Face, on the supplication with raised hands of the 60 Lords of Pranava.

அண்ண லருளா லருளுஞ் சிவாகம
மெண்ணி லிருபத்தெண் கோடி தூ முயிரம்
விண்ணவ ரீசன் விழுப்ப முரைத்தனர்
நண்ணினின் றப்பொரு ணேத்துவ ஞானே.

1. The five faces of Lord Sadasiva are called *Isanam, Tatpurusham, Aghoram, Vamadevam*, and *Satyójatham*. The four Vedas came out from the lower four Heads, and the Agamas came out from the other raised Head called *Isanam*. The twenty-eight Agamas are Kamikam, Yogajam, Chinthiam, Karanam, Achitam, Deeptam, Sukshuma, Sagaschiram, Anjuman, Suprabetham, Vijayam, Vichchuvasam, Swayambuvam, Akelliniyam, Viram, Rowram, Makadam, Vimalam, Chandarajnanam Mahavimbam, Qurorkitham, Lalitham, Chittam, Santhanam, Sarvoktham, Parameshvaram, Kiranam, Vathulam. Most of these are merely names and the originals are lost for ever. Even of the few that exist the Karma Kanda alone has been preserved. Sivagnanabotham is said to form part of Rowra Agama. There are Upagamas like Mirgendra, Paushkara, Siva Dharmottara, &c. which correspond to the Upanishads and they fully state the Saiva Philosophy. Unfortunately none of these works are yet in English. Care should be taken to distinguish these Agamas from the books of the Northern Left-hand School, which are clearly very late productions fully tinged with the Mayavada Doctrines. As the Saiva Agamas are dead against the idealism of Sankara, it is intelligible why he made so little use of them and tried to ignore them and throw dirt over it too.

2. The number of verses found in the Saiva Agamas graciously given out by our Lord, is 28 crores and one lac. The Devas praised the greatness of Isa, (from the study of the Agamas) I also praise the same Being, proclaimed in the Agamas.

பண்டித ராவார் பதினெடுப் பாடையுங்
கண்டவர் கூறுங் கருத்தறி வாரென்க
பண்டிதர் தங்கள் பதினெட்டுப் பாடையு
மண்ட முதலா வரன்சொன்ன வாறே. (ரு)

3. Real Pandits are those who understood the meaning of the author of the 18 languages. And it is for their benefit and for the whole world, Lord Hara made these 18 languages.

அண்ண லருளா லருளுந் திவ்யாகமம்
விண்ணி லமரர் தமக்கும் விளங்கரி
தெண்ணி லெழுபது கோடி நூ றுயிர
மெண்ணிலு நீர்மே லெழுத்தது வாகுமே. (ச)

4. The beautiful Agamas given out graciously by our Lord is difficult to be understood by the Devas. Their number is countless. Unless understood properly, they are like figures in water (of no use).

பரனுய்ப் பராபரங் காடடி யுலகிற்
றரனுய் சிவதன்மந் தானேசொல் காலத்
தரனு யமரர்க ளர்ச்சிக்கு நந்தி
யுரனுகி யர்கம மோங்குநின் றானே. (ரி)

5. He was the Supreme Guru (under the Banyan tree), when He showed His Supreme Nature, He became Hara (Sadasiva) when going out to the world the Agamas containing Siva Dharma. He, my Nandi is worshipped by the Devas and stood firm on the crown of the Agama teaching.

சிவமாம் பரத்தினிற் சத்திசதாசிவ
மூவமா மகேச ருருத்திர தேவர்
தவமால் பிரமீசர் தமமிற்றும் பெற்ற
நவாகம மெங்க ணந்திபெற் றானே. (க)

6. My Guru Nandi, got the nine Agamas which *Sakti* got from Sivam, Natham from Sakti, Vinthu from Natham, Sadasiva from Vinthu, Maheshwara from Sadasiva, Rudra from Maheshwara, Vishnu from Rudra, and Brahma from Vishnu in succession.

பெற்றநல் லாகமங் காரணங் காமிக
முற்றநல் வீர முயர்வா தளஞ்சிந்திய
மற்றவ் வியாமள மாகுங்கா லோத்திரந்
துற்றநற் சுப்பிரஞ் சொல்லு மகுடமே. (ஏ)

7. Such Agamas are *Karanam, Kamikam, Viram, Vathulam, Chinthiam, Vyamalam, Kalottaram, Suppirabetham* and *Makutam.*

அண்ண லருளா லருளுஞ் சிவாகம
மெண்ணிலி கோடி தொகுத்திடு மாயி
னெண்ண லறைந்த வறிவறி யாவிடி
னெண்ணிலி கோடியு நீர்மே லெழுத்தே. (அ)

8. The Agamas so graciously given out by our Lord contain countless verses. If the true meaning of them is not understood, the reading of them will be perfectly useless.

மாரியுங் கோடையும வாரபனி தூங்கநின்
றேரியு நின்றங் கிளைக்கின்ற காலத்து
வாரிய முந்தமி ழும்முடனே சொல்லிக்
காரிகை யார்த்துங் கருணைசெய் தானே. (கூ)

9. When during the summer and in winter, the dew does not cease, and the tanks are dry, in such a sore time, our Lord imparted the knowledge of Tamil and Sanscrit to His beloved spouse out of Grace.

அவிழுகின்ற வாறு மதுவிடு மாறுமு
சிமிட்டலுப படியிர் போனெறு வாதும்
தமிழ்செசொல் வடசொல லெனுமிவ விரண்டு
முணர்த்து மவனே நிரயமு மீமே (கஅ)

10. These two languages teach the way of Salvation, (of the wise) and of the enjoyment after release, and of death and birth (of the ignorant) and let us know therefore the Lord proclaimed by these two languages.

3. The following verse sets forth what the 17 languages are excepting Tamil.

[illegible]

So according to Tirumular Tamil or Sanscrit is not the only language by which God manifests his truth to mankind.

The season of utter desolation is graphically described. We are in the midst of such even now. Yet God's Grace is not lost altogether. The description here, however, applies to the time before creation and instances the antiquity of both these languages over all others. (After we wrote this, we had copious showers).

THAYUMANAVAR'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page 12*).

உன்னிலையு மென்னிலையு மொருநிலை யெய்திடாத
தன்னறிவு மவத்தையாகி
உருவுதான் காட்டாத வாணவமு மொளிகண்
டொளித்தின்ற விருளென்னவே
தன்னிலைமை காட்டா தொருங்கிரு வினையினுற்
றுவருக தக்கவேலே
தட்டழிய முற்றுமில் லாமாயை யதனுற்
றமத்தில பேதமான
முன்னிலை யொழிந்திட வகண்டிதா காரமாய்
மூதறிவு மேலுறிப்ப
முள்பிறழ்டு மேற்மே னடுப்பக்க மென்னுமன்
டு மாண்டிறைவே
எண்ணிலைமை யாய்நிற்க வியல்புகூரருள்வடிவ
மெந்நாளும் வாழிவாழி
இகபர பிண்டினிலு முயிரினுக் குயிராகி
யெங்குநிறை கின்றபொருளே. (கக)

99. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the soul of souls, both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions! Much glory and praise be to Thy Beneficial Manifestation* on my account.

Most delightful were its immediate results. The deleterious *anava*, which had tempted me unperceived into the unholiness of babbling that *Thy Subjective Nature* and my *objective nature* were one and the same and not *different*,† was by Thy blessed light, subdued to a state of nullity,‡ like darkness before light; the changing *samsara*§ with its ebb and flow of rebirths dwindled away at once; the phenomenal appearance of the '*magic maya*' ceased; and, above all, I was given the gnana of bliss that led me into the Infinite State of Supreme Ananda where there would be for me (soul) neither before nor behind, nor above nor below nor within nor without nor sides.

* The reference is to the Saint's initiation by Siva through Ma:

† *c. f.* with notes verses 50, 83, 89, 91, 92, 95 and 98.

‡ Anava (ignorance) mala—the origin of samsâra—never ceases to exist even in the soul's moksha state. It only loses its power for ever like the heated seed or the suppressed senses of a yogin or Jivan Mukta. *c. f.* Saint's couplet. பரமசமய பதிசீவ கலைய னடைவில சமதத முதிவரசக ரவிரசரசே". (O for the day to be one with the Lord yet not the Lord, nor the pasa to discard! *c. f.* 87th verse.

§ Samsara = cycle of existence full of transcient pleasure and pain.

GOD-HEAD AS SAT-CHITHA-NANDA* SIVA.

சச்சிதானந்த சிவம.

பாராதி கனைப்பரப்புமுண் டோவென்று
படர்வெளிய தாஞ்செழுஞாப்
பரிதிமதி காணுச் சுயஞ்சோதிபரயண்ட
பதிரண்ட வும்பரெவைக்கும்
நேராக வதிவா யகண்டமா யேகமாய்
நித்தமாய் நிர்த்தொந்தமாய்
நிர்க்குண விலாசமாய் வாக்குமன மணுகாத
நிர்மலா னந்தமயமாய்ப்
போதுகிற்றிரீ சும்மா விருந்துதான்
பேரின்ப மெய்திடாமல்
பேய்மனதை யண்டிவே தாயிலாப் பிள்ளைபோல்
பித்தாக வோமனதைதான்
சாராத படியறிவி னிருவினைப்பாங்மைஞ்
சாகுவதி னிஷ்டையருளாய்
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டத் துவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே. (ஈ)

100. O *Satchithânanda Siva*, the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all! Thou art the omnipresent and all pervading Gnâna-Akas wherein the bhûta-âkas† with all its myriads of differentiations *earth* &c., occupies a very insignificant position; Thou art the self-luminous Heavenly Brightness outshining and transcending the fire of seven tongues,‡ the Sun and the Moon. And Thou art the Super-eminent unique Wisdom of Infinite nature and bliss evidencing Thyself in the universality of *life*. And yet Thou art the Eternal Unconditioned *one* non-dual in character and void of properties and beyond all thought and speech.

Notwithstanding Thy Supernal existence as aforesaid, I have knit myself to the infernal mind and degraded myself to the position of a helpless orphan without taking to sacred quietism § of bliss.

* *C. F.* 1st verse (last portion of translation.) This word is the compound of *Sat* (real-existence or being) + *Chit* (Intelligence or knowledge or gnana) + *Ananda* (bliss or delight or joy or supreme pleasure of eternal unchangeable nature.)

† It means in brief that Siva-Lord is eternally everywhere like the akas or elemental ether and is not the latter; and He is Gnana or Chaitanyam by nature and Pure Love and imparts highest delight or Ananda to His Matured devotees. *c. f.* Sri Kanta Bashya on the Vedanta Sutras I. i. 23 & 24. *c. f.* Tait. Upanishad 2-1. "From Atmar ('Paramakasa') is akasa born."

‡ *C. F.* 36th verse (translation) and notes thereunder to "7 flames. *C. F.* Mund. Upanishad Section II part I-8. "Seven life-power come from Him, seven flames, seven foods (to feed the flames)."

§ Here the reference may be to the school of Quietists "who flourished at the close of the 17th century and who taught that the soul, *in the pursuit of the Supreme Good* must retire from the reports and gratifications of sense, and, in silence, be absorbed in *contemplation of the Deity*."

Do Thou grant me now the unchangeable state of solemnity in which I shall remain for ever self-controlled in Thy contemplation without subjecting myself to the implacable mind.

குடச்சொடி குணக்கதி நிக்கிண புழக்கடி
கொள்ளலியோ கூத்துடம்
கூடிஞ் சருள்மிகச் சகலமொன்பது
குலாவுகடை மிணையாகும்
வடக்கிரு வெண்ணாம் பாவெண்பு தசையிலல்
மதவேள் விழாகடத்தி
வளர்கின்ற கைதேசா வெண்ணீர்செ ரீக்கணீர்
மலசீர்பு னீரிறைக்கும்
வீடக்குத் தருத்தியைக் கருமருத் துக்கூட்டை.
வெட்டவெட் டத்தளிர்க்கும்
வேடகமா றுறுகின்ற சதகோட்டை முடிவிலே
மெய்போ லிருந்து மொய்வாம்
சடக்கைச் சடக்கெனச் சதமென்று னின்மயற்
தாருகி சிற்பதென்றே
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டத் தவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே. (ஈக)

101. *O Satchithânanda Siva*, the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all! O for the day on which I shall realize my blessed Gnâna-Svarûpa * eternally raised above all conditions of time, after gaining knowledge of *this* my *infirm self* of seeming reality. This self which is the *temporary* erection composed of the five elements just like the quarters east, west &c. contained in a dry-measure.

This self which is the front-hall possessing nine clear * windows. This self which is the play-car handled in festival by *Manmatha* † and conducted by means of its white sinews, bones and flesh.

This self which is the fleshy bellows ejecting impure liquids red and white from the eyes, proud-flesh, and secretions. This self which is the nest-egg of the drug of re-incarnation. This *cremation ground* with the trees of desire, ‡ thereon which send forth their shoots as often as they are chopped.

பாகத்தி னுற்கவிதை பாடப் படிக்கவோ
பத்திநெறி யில்லவேத
பாராய ணப்பனுவன் மூவர்செய் பனுவலது
பகரவோ விசையுமில்லை
யோகத்தி லேசிறிது முடலவென் முற்றேத
மொவ்வாதி லுன்வெறத்தால்
உயிர்வெறுத் நிடலொக்கு மல்லாது கிரியைக
ளுபாயத்தி னுற்செயவலோ
மோகத்தி லேதிறிது மொழியவில்லை மெய்ஞ்ஞான
மோனத்து னிற்கவென்றுல்
முற்றுத பரிபாக சத்தித னேகநின்
மூதறிவி லேயெழுந்த
தாகத்தி லேவாய்க்கு மமிர்தப்ர வாகமே
தன்னர் தனிப்பெருமையே
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டத் தவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே (ஈ உ)

102. *O Satchithânanda Siva*, the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all! Any attempt on my part to sing in metrical verses Thy Supreme Power

* *Gnana Svarupa of the soul.*—Just as a man carrying a heavy load has to subject and adjust himself to various hardships and pains incidental to his carrying of it, so the human soul, whose nature is chit or intelligence and which is bearing this self (*i. e.* this personality or physical body), *for the purpose of its spiritualisation*, has to undergo various difficulties incidentally arising from the body's material tendencies —to wit—Kama, desire &c., (the effects of flesh and blood and bones and sinews the product of the 5 elements). Here it may be asked, If Lord-Siva hath given us this body as a vehicle for us to travel in through the path of spiritualization, why should the Supreme choose such a bad vehicle for us? This query finds a ready infallible answer from a Siddhanti, who does not say like the Idealists &c., that this body (*i. e.* the matter or the five elements) is a non-entity; or that it is a projection from the Parabrahman's own substance or existence or self; or that it was brought to existence from nothing or non-existence. What the Siddhanti says is, in the words of the Saint, "அருளுடைய பரமென்றே அன்றுமே பாழுமென்றும், வன்பே வானாதி பெருகியிசைட்டு (Whenever there was the Supreme Being of Arul Sakti, I (the soul) have been since then co-existent with Him; and inseparable with me and for me hath been the bondage of action (Karma Mala) caused by my *anava* mala the antecedent cause of this *Maya* mala (*i. e.* this matter, my body). Thus matter (maya mala) being co-existent with souls as well as God and the souls with it being ever co-existent with and dependent on God, the query as to its (matter's) origin becomes illegical and unwarranted. It is our daily experience, we see that dirt will remove the dirt of copper when rubbed together *by an agent*; but if allowed to gather, it enshrouds the natural brightness of the copper. So, we (souls) require an author (rubber) the Supreme Siva, who, out of pure Benevolence, effects by His Arul Sakti our bodies out of *Maya* (matter) by the process of differentiation. For *Maya* or matter cannot differentiate itself nor do the Souls by their nature possess the power or capacity to bring about the differentiation of *Maya* towards their evolution. Hence the God is appropriately called Siva *i. e.*, God of Love or Benevolence. *c. f.*, verses 97 and 98 with notes and also 72nd verse.

* The 9 windows are:—2 eyes, 2 ears, 2 nostrils, the mouth, and the 2 lowest orifices. To these some Sages add the navel and the opening at the top of the skull.

† Manmatha is the Hindu name of the God of Love.

‡ This description of our body shews the Saint's view which lends to support to the truth of the analogy of the 'carrier' stated above.

This *Maya*, matter, true and false:
True, when to Lord it serves a tool,
To save the souls; and call it false,
When doth its *magic* th' souls befool.

and Benevolence might fall short of bhakti * or love of devotion to Thee. Or any attempt towards the recitation of the Tamil Veda Tiruvachakam † or the mystic poems of the three Sivite Saints ‡ might fall short of the harmonious flow of tone peculiar to them. Any effort towards the *Yoga* practice might hardly suit my bodily constitution. Any abstinence on my part from food-taking might deprive me of this life. To devise any means for doing the pious acts of *puja* &c., I am not at all rid of lust. And should I endeavour to habituate myself to the taciturn state of *mona, the verge and mark of the Supreme Sivagnana,* § my mind is ruffled in hundreds of ways by the wonderful powers of *Asutta maya.*‖

Thou must only guide me, O The Absolute Lord of Greatness! O The Bounty of nectar flowing in full to the aspirants of Siva-Sayujya, ¶ the thirst for which arises in them from *Thy knowledge Supreme* the final Siva-gnâna!*

இமையளவு போதையொரு கற்பமா லம்பண்ணு
மிவ்வுலக மேவிவுலகமோ
என்றெண்ணும் வருவிக்கு மாதர்சிற் றின்பமோ
வென்னின்ம கேருசாசிச்
சமையெடுபி னென்றதான் சம்மாடு மாயையைச்
சமையாளு மாக்கொளும்
தர்ப்புத்தி பண்ணியுள நற்புத்தி யாலையுஞ்
சூறையிட் டிந்த்ராஜாலம்
அமையவொரு கூத்துஞ் சமைந்தாடு மனமாயை
யம்மம்ம வெல்லவெளிதோ
அருள்பெற்ற பேர்க்கெலா மொளிபெற்று நிற்குமீ
தருளோவு லாதுமருளோ
சமயநெறி காணுத சாஸ்திர குஹ்யமுத்
தமியனேற் குளவுபுகலாய்
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தவிமே. (ஈசு)

103. *O Satchithánandha Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all! Ah! How can I conquer this deceitful mind of *maya*? It causes a momentary winking to appear as long as a great cosmic period of *Kalpa.*† It gets me to imagine this earth to be some other phenomenal region. It makes a *Maha Meru* ‡ of the sexual love and not only causes me to bear *that* burden serving itself as a pad for my head, but also constrains me to a vicious condition of life stripping off all my good qualities. In short, it leaps and frisks about and plays a wonderful juggle.

Yet, however, O Lord, in those blessed muktas of Thine, it becomes as bright § as Thy Grace.

Do Thou make me understand, O Seer of all, transcending all religious thoughts, whether *such* a mind in its nature is the Divine Light of Thy Grace or the unholy *darkness* of ignorance.‖

R. SHUNMUGA MUDALIAR.

(To be continued).

* Any act of piety without bhakti or real love to God is like the flower without fragrance and will not be appreciated by Him. *c. f.* Tiruvachakam "பத்தியெனுங் பூவொன் றால." (Behold! He (Siva-Lord) can be caught only by a net of *bhakti.*)

† The Sivite Saint Shrimat Manickavachakar was a brahmin prime-minister of the King Pandya of Madura and was initiated by the Supreme Siva-Lord in Tiruperundurai appearing as Guru with the Sacred Book 'Sivagnana Botham' in His hands and thenceforward sang Thiruvachakam and worked good many miracles such as making a dumb princess of an opponent sing in tamil the glory of Siva-Lord &c. (*Vide* also Dr. G. U. Pope's translation of 'Thiruvachakam for full details).

‡ The 3 Sivite Saints are Shrimat Apparswami (a Saiva Vellala), Shrimat Gnanasambandar (who lived as a brahmin) and Shrimat Sundarar (brahmin). These three and the *said* Manickavachakar are called together 'சந்தான' or சைவசமயாசாரியர் (The four or the establishers of the Saiva Samayam, the Saiva Philosophy *i. e.* the (Saiva) Siddhanta. They revealed this system as the Supreme Truth. So these four holy Saints are represented by the four idols in every I'swara's Temple in India. For fuller details about these four and the rest of the Sivite Saints, all 63 in number, the sacred book 'Periapurana' may be referred to.

§ *c. f.* the great Divine Poetess 'Avvai' "மோனமென்பது ஞான மார்க்கம்" (what can be called 'mona' is the verge and mark (மார்க்கம்) of the true Gnana).

‖ *Asutta maya*—avidya maya *i. e.* maya causing ignorance in souls by its deceitful tendencies which are multifarious (*c. f.* verse 101 and notes). This *maya* or *jada-maya* sakti is matter. It is mistaken for the Supreme Para Sakti (female Principle) of the Supreme Siva. It is this Female Principle that is represented as Maha Vishnu (not the Trinity Vishnu) or Parvati or Kali. This is the reason why the bigoted Vishnuvites adore and worship 'Parvati' (Goddess) only in Siva-Temples, thus making a *fanatic* distinction between Siva and His Sakti.

¶ *Siva-Sayujya* is the Highest state of Moksha. It literally means "intimate union with Siva in His Absolute Nature as Love." *c. f.* notes under 41st verse.

* Compare the 36th verse (translation), and its notes.

† Kalpa is the great cosmic period—a day of Bramha equal to 1000 yugas.

‡ Maha meru is the greatest of mountains used here to represent the hyperbolical character of the mind.

§ It i one of the sound postulates of this school that, of the 3 malas, the anava (the cause of the other two and the offshoot of the mind) of the muktas becomes one with the splendour attained by them (muktas) and sub-servient to their wishes.

‖ Ignorance is the *avava mala.*

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika

MADRAS, SEPTEMBER 1898.

THE ANALOGIES IN GITA.

Analogy is very largely used in the elucidation and explanation of various principles in Oriental philosophy, and with more or less effect. In most cases they serve a very important function, and many truths there are, which by reason of their dealing with the ultimate existences can alone be demonstrated by such analogies and not by any other kind of proof. In the use of such analogies there are great dangers also and the analogy may look so plausible that one is apt to be carried away by it, without noting the inherent flaw in it and which a little closer investigation will clearly bring out. Care should, however, be taken to distinguish between analogies which are merely similes or metaphors, based on a mere semblance, and intended merely to bring home to our minds, the subject matter in a more impressive and clearer light, and analogies strictly so-called, intended as proof. In the latter case, mere semblance alone will not do, and there must be sameness in the various parts of the illustration and the thing illustrated. Neglect of this rule often leads to great confusion and error in thought. If for the particular inference desired, the antecedents conform to the antecedents in the analogy, the inference will be quite justified if it conforms to the consequence in the analogy; and it would be simply illogical to strain the illustration to other purposes and to extremes. Analogy at best is but an indifferent kind of proof and where we do not take the proper precautions in using it, its value in philosophic argument will be almost nothing. Another source of error in the use of analogies by Indian writers is the brevity of expressions which is characteristic of such analogies as we meet them in some of the most ancient books. Where the analogy is taken literally without supplying the necessary parts and ellipses, they cannot but lead one astray

There is one school of philosophers in India, who are inordinately fond of these similes and who at almost every step seek the aid of a simile to help them out of their position; and these similes have now only become too much hackneyed and they pass from mouth to mouth, and even educated persons repeat them parrot-like, who would easily find out the fallacy, if the matter is only put before them for a moment. We expected at least those learned in the lore of the West to explain their subject instead of building all their argument on the strength of these doubtful similes and in this respect, even European scholars are not without reproach. For what shall we say of a scholar like Dr. Paul Deussen, if he gives expression to the following false analogy? Says he, "And then for him, when death comes, no more *Samsara*. He enters into Brahman, like streams into the ocean he leaves behind him *nama* and *rupam*, he leaves behind him *individuality*; but he does not leave behind him his Atman, his Self. It is not the falling of the drop into the infinite ocean, it is the whole ocean, becoming free from the fetters of ice, returning from its frozen state to that what it is really and has never ceased to be, to its own all pervading, eternal, almighty nature." In these few lines he crowds together as many fallacies as there are words in it, and we have neither the time nor patience to indicate all of them. We will however point out the most glaring of them. The Soul returning from its migrations to its resting place, its final goal was the stream returning to the bosom of the mighty ocean. When the stream joins the ocean, it loses its name and form? Does it really do so, and if it did what of that, how is it in any way changed? What we generally call a stream is a small body of water flowing between two banks. The water by itself without its local connection cannot be called the stream. The moment the water leaves its local connection, it ceases to be called stream. So it is not really the stream that flows into the ocean but that the water of the stream flowed into and mixed with the water of the ocean. What makes really the difference between the ocean and the stream is the difference in the largeness and smallness of the respective bodies and the largeness and smallness of the receptacle. The water in either receptacle is acted

on by the sun and wind, is tempest-tossed and discoloured and made muddy. The juggle by which the learned Doctor converts the stream water, nay a drop, into a mighty *ocean* is not manifest in the illustration. The drop or the stream water is the drop or the stream water in the bosom of the ocean though, for the time being, we are unable to distinguish its *identity*. When the *identity* is lost, its *individuality* is not seen, is lost in a sense also. The water remains as water and has not lost its *nama* and *rupa*, though this water gets other names by other accidents. It is the accident that determines the more specific name and we will have to enquire how the thing acquired this accident or became parted from it. Then we come to the figure of the frozen ocean and the free ocean. Here is a jump from one figure to another. The bound soul was formerly the stream, and the freed soul the ocean. In either case, we observed above, the two bodies of water were subject to the same changeability and disabilities except that one was larger than the other. Now, the bound soul is the frozen ocean and the freed soul is the ocean after it had thawed. And the learned Doctor speaks of the fetters of ice. What does it matter to the ocean whether it was in a frozen condition or otherwise? How does it cease to be almighty, all-pervading and eternal when it is frozen than when it was not? One would think that if the ocean's wishes were to be consulted it would much better like to be frozen than not, as it would not be subjected to the mercy of the Wind, and the Sun and the Moon. Water is water whether it remains a liquid or a gas or a solid substance. And it would be mere rhetoric to ascribe fetters to it. And this fetter is real or fancied, either an evil or a good. If real and an evil, how did this fetter happen to be put on. If not, why try to get rid of the fetter. The fetter was put on by the ocean's own will or by another will more powerful still. If the ocean put it on by its own will, it may do so again, and there is no inducement for any body to try to get rid of this fetter, and "*the strongest support of pure morality, the greatest consolation in the sufferings of life and death,*" would surely be undermined. If by another's will, who is the greater than this A'tman; no doubt the Paramatman, which ends in veritable dualism. In the case of the ocean itself, it did not become frozen by its own will or power. As water, its nature is unstable and changeable, and the change is brought about by other causes. If we apply heat to it, its liquid condition disappears and it becomes a gas. Withdraw the heat, and the more you do it, the water becomes more solid, and in the arctic regions, where the sun, thousands of times more powerful than the ocean water, is altogether absent for several months the water gets affected by cold and darkness, and gets fettered in ice. The learned Doctor failed to take stock of the antecedent agent, in the frozening or otherwise of the ocean, namely the sun, and hence his error. The Siddhantis take the water whether it it be that of the ocean or that of the smallest rill as analogous to the Soul and the universal *Akas* present both in the water of the stream and that of the ocean as the Parames'hvara and Paramatman, the universal Supporter, and all-Pervader; and the Glorious Sun is also God, whose panchakritya is also felt on the ocean and stream water, in its making and increasing and dissolving, and under whose powerful S'akti the minor powers of Karma (wind and moon) also find play, and the whole cycle of evolution is set agoing.

And it is this learned Doctor who spoke of the *misinterpreting variations* of Sankara's *advaita*, known under the names of Visishtadvaita, Dvaita, &c, and it is the frequent boast of people of his ilk, that Sankara's Advaita is the most universal and ancient system, whereas all other forms of Indian philosophy are only partial and sectarian and modern; and in the present paper, we propose to deal with this claim, to a certain extent by taking up the Gita, their most beloved Upanishad, and by merely taking the various analogies used by Lord Krishna, we will show, whether we find among them or not any of the favourite and hackneyed similes of this school, and whether the similes actually have any bearing on the special tenets of this school.

The first simile in the book occurs in chapter 2, 13.

"Just as in this body, childhood, and youth and old age appertain to the embodied man, so also does it acquire another body."

This is a popular enough simile, and its meaning is plain but it cannot be construed as is done by Sankara, that the soul undergoes no change or is not affected by the change of avastas or change of bodies; for it cannot be contended that the intelligence of Sankara is in the same embryonic stage as that of a new born babe, and the denial of this would also militate against all our ideas of evolutionary progress and the necessity for undergoing many births. In the previ-

one verse, Sri Krishna postulated the existence of many souls, by asserting, 'neither did I not exist, nor thou, nor these rulers of men, and no one of us will ever hereafter cease to exist;' and he reiterates the same fact, in chapter iv, 5, where he alludes to his own former births which fact is also mentioned by Sri Krishna himself again in the Anucasana Parva and stated by Vyasa in the Yuddha Parva. By 'I' and 'thou', and 'these', he clearly does not refer to their bodies as Sankara interprets. The next figure occurs in verse 22 of the same chapter, "just as a man casts off worn-out clothes and puts on others which are new, so the soul casts off worn-out bodies and enters which are new." Similar instances are that of the serpent throwing off its skin, the mind passing from the conscious into the dream condition, and the Yogi into another body which are given by Saint Meikandan. The next one occurs in verse 58, where the Sage withdrawing his senses from the objects of sense is compared to the tortoise withdrawing its limbs, at the approach of anybody. The same simile occurs in Tiruvarutpayan.

In chapter 3, only one illustration occurs and this in verse 38, which we have often quoted. "As fire is covered with smoke, as a mirror with dirt, as an embryo is enclosed in a womb, so this is covered with it." Sankara explains, "as a bright fire is covered with a dark smoke *co-existent* with it... so this is covered with desire."! The italics is ours. What 'this' and 'it' are, are seen to be, man and his wisdom-nature, Prakriti-guna Rajas and Desire constraining one to the commission of sins. 'Constrained,' Sankara explains as a servant by the King. Man is enslaved by his passion; his wisdom is such that it is deluded by unwisdom, ignorance (verse 40). Sankara leaves these passages quietly enough but when explaining the similar passage (xiv, 5) "Sattva, Rajas, Tamas,—these three Gunas, O mighty armed, born of Prakriti, *bind fast* in the body, the embodied, the indestructible," Sankara says, "now one may ask: It has been said that the embodied is not tainted (xiii, 31). How then, on the contrary, is it said here that the (Gunas) bind him? We have met this objection by adding '*as it were*'; thus 'they bind him as it were.'" It would have been well for his reputation, if he had not raised the objection himself and tried to meet it in the way he has done. Why did not the Omniscient Lord Krishna himself add this 'as it were,' and leave these passages alone apparently contradicting each other. In his explanation, he has omitted the force of '*fast*,' and he has forgotten '*Dragged and constrained*' and of the *co-existent darkness and delusion of the former passage and explanation*. There is one other passage relating to the soul and its bound condition namely verse 21 in chapter xiii itself. "Purusha, as seated in Prakriti, *experiences the qualities born of Prakriti*; "*attachment* to qualities is the cause of his birth in good and evil wombs." Lo, the Supreme Self, attaching itself to qualities born of Prakriti, constrained to commit sin deluded by co-existent darkness, having to undergo births and deaths and getting fettered and seeking salvation, and all this '*as it were*.'! What a precious excuse would it not prove, this '*as it were*,' to the murderer, the forger, the liar, the thief &c.? Besides, Sankara identifies the *embodied* of verse 5, xiv, with the 'dweller in the body' in xiii, 31. Even so far as forms of expression go, they are not altogether the same thing. It may be noted that the expression 'embodied' is always used in describing the soul, Jîva, and never to denote God. Though God is seated in the hearts of all, he is the Soul of Souls, and Light of Lights, He can never be called the '*embodied*.' The expression '*embodied*' conveys itself the idea of attachment and bondage. Anybody reading verses 36 to 40 of chapter 3, and xiii, 21; xiv, 5, 20; and, verses iv, 14; ix, 9; xiii, 31 together, can fail to observe the utter contrast of the two entities; and we appeal to common sense if Sankara's '*as it were*' will do away with this distinction and contrast. The distinction and contrast is brought out in different chapters, in the same chapter and in contiguous verses (xv, 16, 17, 18) nay in the same verse (v. 15). The word '*another*' '*Anyatha*' is itself a technical word, as 'the inside of' '*Antas*' &c., and occurs in the Gita in other places and in a number of Vedic texts to denote God Supreme as distinguished from the souls and the world, the entities admitted by Kapila Sankhyas Adhikaranas 4 to 9 of the Vedanta Sutra, and the texts quoted therein which appear in this very issue fully bear out our thesis. The apparent confusion caused by both the human spirit and the Supreme Spirit being spoken of as dwelling in the human body is altogether removed by the Mantras which speak of 'the two birds entering into the cave,' 'Rudra, destroyer of pain enters into me,' 'He who abides in the *Vijñâna*,' 'He who abides in the *Atman*,' 'higher than the high, higher than the imperishable,' (*c. f.* xv, 18, Gita). Leaving this subject for the present

we proceed. Chapter iv contains also only one simile, (37); "As kindled fire reduces fuel to ashes, O Arjuna; so does the wisdom fire reduce all Karma to ashes." The next illustration occurs in chapter v. 16, and is a very familiar one, that of Sun and darkness. "But in those in whom unwisdom is destroyed by the Wisdom of the Self, like the Sun the wisdom illuminates That Supreme." We have to read the previous passage together. "The Lord takes neither the evil nor the good deed of any; wisdom is enveloped by unwisdom; thereby mortals are deluded."

Here 'wisdom' clearly means atma, atmagnan, Soul, Soul's intelligence. This intelligence is covered by Agnana, unwisdom. As contrasted with ignorance-covered soul, there stands the Parameshwara, untouched by evil, though dwelling in the body. How is the Soul's wisdom to get rid of the veil of unwisdom. If it was able to get rid of this wisdom by its own wisdom, it could have got rid of it the moment it wills so, and we will never hear of a soul in bondage. So the illustration explains how this is done. Unwisdom is destroyed not by the soul's wisdom (spoken of merely as wisdom) but by Atmagnan, Brahmagnan Sivagnana, leading to the perception and enjoyment of Sivananda, as the darkness covering the individual eye, flees before the Rising Glory of the Effulgent Sun, and the Sun while it dispels the darkness, at the same time enables the eye to exercise its own power of seeing (soul's wisdom) and makes it see the Sun itself. The reader is requested to read the simile as explained, with Sankara's own explanation and form his own conclusions.

"As a lamp in a sheltered spot does not flicker" is the simile of the Yogi in Divine Union. 'இளையுப்ப திபோல் இன்ன ஔனியார்.' "Like the waveless sea-water, the gnani attains clearness and calm" is another simile. The water and the lamp are by nature changeable, any little gust of wind (karmamala) can make the one flicker and the other form into ripples. But the Sun, or Akasha (God) can n either flicker nor change. And this is exactly the simile in ix. 6. The simile in vii. 7 demands however our prior attention. There is naught higher than I, O Dhananjaya, in me, all this is woven as a row of gems on a string. Here the string is the Ishwara, and gems, other creatures and objects. Neither can the string become the gems, nor the gems the string; it only brings out the distinction of the lower and the higher Padarthas spoken of in verse 5, and how Ishwara supports and upholds the whole universe, as a string does support the various gems.

The next simile already alluded to is in chapter ix, 6. "As the mighty wind moving everywhere rests in the Akasha, know thou that so do all beings rest in me." And Lord Krishna states the truth explained by this as the Kingly science, the Kingly secret, immediately comprehensible; and well may he say so, as this explains the true nature of advaita. The verses 4 and 5, have to be stated in full. "By me all this world is pervaded, my form unmanifested. All beings dwell in Me; and I do not dwell in them." "Nor do beings dwell in me, behold my Divine Yoga! Bearing the beings and not dwelling in them is my Self the cause of beings." With this we might read also the similes in xiii. 32, and 33 "As the all-pervading Akasha is by reason of its subtlety never soiled, so God seated in the body is not soiled." "As the one Sun illumines all these worlds, so does the Kshetri (not Kshetrajña) illumine all Kshetra," and the simile in xv. 8. "When the Lord (the jîva the lord of the aggregate of the body and the rest—Sankara) acquires a body and when he leaves it, he takes these and goes as the wind takes scents from their seats." Here Parames'hwara is compared to Akasha and the soul, jîvâ is compared to the wind; and the relation between God and Soul is the same relation as between Akasha and wind or things contained in Akasha. And what is this relation? Logicians and Siddhantis call this relation as Vyapaka Vyapti Sambandam, container and contained. We explained in our article on 'Mind and Body' that this was not a very apt relation as it has reference to quantity, yet it is the best synonym and illustration of the *Advaita* relation not Betha, (Madhwa) nor Abetha or nor Bethabetha (Ramanuja) not Parinama (Vallabha), not Vivarta (Sankara), but Vyapaka Vyapti relation. Taking the five elements, and the order of their evolution and involution it is seen, how all the four evolve from and resolve into Akasha. But earth is not water, nor water earth, water is not fire, nor fire water, fire is not air, nor air fire, none of these is Akasha nor Akasha any of these. And yet all solids can be reduced to liquids, and liquids into gaseous condition and all disappear into Akasha. The one lower is contained in the one higher, and all in Akasha but Akasha cannot be said to be *contained* in any of these, though present in each. Each one is more subtle and more vast than the lower element,

and Akasha is the most subtle and vastest and most pervasive and invisible ('my form unmanifested'). Akasha is not capable of any change, though the wind and water and fire and earth contained in it can be contaminated by that to which it becomes attached. Wind carries off scents, and is subjected to all the forces of sun and moon. Water of the ocean becomes saltish, becomes frozen, and becomes tempest-tossed. The lamp flickers and becomes smoky or bright, spreads a fragrant smell or otherwise by the nature of the oil or wood it is burning. The very illustration of sea (space,) water and winds is used by Saint Meikandan in vii, 3-3 to illustrate ignorance not attaching itself to God but to the Soul.—"Ignorance will not arise from God who is the True Intelligence, as it is Asat (like darkness before sun). The soul which is ever united to God is co-eternal with Him. The connection of ignorance with the soul is like the connection of salt with the water of the sea." The word '*Akasha*' by the way is a technical word, like 'another,' 'antas,' 'jyotis' &c. and is a synonym for God (*vide* Vedanta Sutras I, 1-22 and texts quoted thereunder and in the article 'House of God,' Chit Ambara' in p. 153 last volume)

The simile of streams and the sea occurs in xi, 28, to illustrate not the entering into moksha, but undergoing dissolution and death. The similes in xv, 1 & 2, the Ashwattha rooted above and spreading below, and in xviii, 61, that "the Lord dwells in the hearts of all beings (jivas) O Arjuna, whirling by Maya all beings (as if) mounted on a machine ;"are the very last to be noted. These are nearly all the similes discovered in the Gita, and do we not miss here nearly all the favourite similes of the Mayavada school, and if so, how was it the omniscient Lord Krishna failed to use any one of them.

EVIDENCES OF NATURAL RELIGION

The Divine Perfections.

(*Continued from page* 66.)

God Eternal.

Since God is the First Cause and the only source of all possible being, He must exist of absolute necessity and therefore can have no beginning or end. Eternity properly belongs to God alone, and it is identified with his essence. As He is now, so He has always been in the past, and will be always in the future. Coexisting with all assignable moments of time the eternal God is above any of our measures of the contingent duration of created things. In Him therefore there is neither present nor past nor future. Thou O Lord art the Everlasting God who hast created the ends of the earth. Ps. 40. 28. Before the mountains were made, or the earth and the world was formed from eternity and to eternity thou art God. Ps. 89. 2. Thy years are unto generation and generation. Ps. 101. 25. In the beginning O Lord thou foundest the earth and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish but Thou remainest and all of them shall grow old like a garment and as a vesture thou shalt change them, and they shall be changed: But thou art always the self same and thy years shall not fail. Ps. 101. 26.

God immutable.

Indeed God is always the self-same, namely, unchanging, and this follows from his being an infinite and simple Being. As it has been proved above, God is infinitely perfect. But evidently, He could not be so, if he were liable to any change: for, by this He must either become more or less perfect and good. If we take the first alternative and suppose Him to be bettered by the change. He could not have been infinite in perfection before it. The other alternative is still more obviously untenable; if he becomes less perfect by the change, His infinity would evidently cease to be. The same conclusion may be drawn from the simplicity of God. by every change, a thing must either lose or acquire some quality or affection of its being. On the former supposition it must consist of at least two really distinct realities before it changes otherwise it would lose nothing. On the latter, it is composed of at least two distinct realities after the change. In neither case can it be necessarily a simple Being. But as we have shown, God is necessarily simple to the exclusion of all real and even of all virtual composition. Consequently he must be absolutely unchangeable. Cfr. B. Boedder. S. Y Natural Theology. p. 239.

God One.

We shall finally crown all the attributes of Almighty God, by asserting of Him, that He is One in essence, namely that the Divine nature exists undivided, that is, *is not something* belonging severally and distinctly to several beings. I may appeal first to the unity of the universe as testifying to the unity of its author. Science goes to show that the universe has been built on one plan. The universe itself is one system, namely each part is either dependent upon other parts, or is connected with some other parts by some physical law, as by motion, gravitation, affinity, elasticity and so forth. The universe is absolutely one, there is not one atom of matter independent of the thousand laws that govern the existence and the activity of this beautiful universe. When you look at the starry heavens, think not that those enormous globes situated so far off have no influence on our small earth. It may be as yet unknown, it may be as yet not recognized by science, but that they do exercise influence is shown by the general law of analogy Make for instance the water of the sea less salty by half than it is at present and the whole world will be very near destruction. The waters will be very soon corrupted, the tide will fall short, the evaporation will be doubled, no gentle rain but a deluge will sweep away lands and fields, fishes will die in the sea, men will starve or else die of pestilence on land. There exists nothing, but that contributes either directly or indirectly to the existence, conservation or ornamentation of the universe. There is not a blade of grass in the meadow, a pebble in the river, a microzoa in the water, an atom of dead or living matter in the air, but has its why creation, its laws, its many-fold links by which it is connected with each creature, and with the whole universe. But this unity of plan, this uniformity of design bespeaks unity of designer also, and proves beyond any reasonable doubt that the intelligent architect of this world, the infinitely-intelligent Maker of this Universe must be one in Essence, One in mind, one in will, that is one intelligent personal God. To this conclusion assents Mr. John Stuart Mill, a man not too easy of belief. He says (Boedder Natural Theology, page 89.)

"The specific effect of science is to show by accumulating evidence that every event in nature is connected by laws with some fact or facts which preceded it or in other words depends for its existence on some antecedent, but yet not so strictly on one as not to be liable to frustration or modification from others for these distinct chains of causation are so entangled with one another, the action of each cause is so interfered with by other causes, though each acts according to its own fixed law, that every effect is truly the result rather of the aggregate of all causes in existence, than of any one only, and nothing takes place in the world of our experience without spreading a perceptible influence of some sort through a greater or less portion of nature, and making perhaps every portion of it slightly different from what it would have been, if that event had not taken place. Now when once the double conviction has found entry into the mind that every event depends upon antecedents and at the same time, that to bring it about many antecedents must concur, perhaps all the antecedents in nature, in so much that a slight difference in any of them might have prevented the phenomenon or materially altered its character—the conviction follows that no one event, certainly no one kind of events can be absolutely preordained or governed *by any Being but One*, who holds in his hand the reins of all Nature and not of some department only. At least if a plurality be supposed, it is necessary to assume so complete a concert of action and unity of will among them that the difference is for most purposes immaterial between such a theory and that of the absolute unity of the Godhead. The reason then why monotheism may be accepted as the representative of theism in the abstract, is not so much because it is the theism of all the more improved portions of the human race, as because it is the only theory which can claim *for itself any footing* on scientific ground." Science therefore is to show that Almighty God is the only ruler, the only architect, the only creator and Lord of Universe, and as such is one God only. Nor is the conclusion of reason different either-God is, as we have shown, the self existing Being and as such simple and immutable. If there are several self-existing Beings the reason of the distinction between them must either be self-existence as such, or something outside of it. The first alternative is absurd, contradictory and inconsistent with its terms: because should self-existence be the reason of the distinction between them. only one would be self-existent: all the rest, for the sake of distinction falling short of it. Nor is the second alternative less absurd: because as the self-existent Being is of necessity simple, there is nothing in Him but self-existence, and in consequence there is no ground for the distinction in question.

Two Infinite Beings impossible.

Moreover, God being infinite, the coexistence of two infinite Beings becomes at once absurd and impossible. For, if they are said to be two, there must be some difference between them, else they are not two but one. But no difference is possible between them except in so far as one lacks something which the other has. Now, if the former lacks something which the latter has, what will become of his infinity? How can he still be said to be infinite, whilst one corner at least of his being is limited or curtailed of one perfection, which the other has, and which is the ground of the distinction between the two? Therefore that there is one God alone is a truth that cannot be call-

edin question and in face of the arguments above given, no one can possibly attempt to defend the worship which the heathens offer to their false Gods.

"There is not an object," says the learned scholar Monier Williams (Religious thoughts and life in India page 350) "in heaven or earth which a Hindu is not prepared to worship—sun, moon, and stars; rocks, stocks and stones; trees, shrubs and grass; sea, pools and rivers, his own implements of trade; the animals he finds most useful, the noxious reptiles he fears, men remarkable for any extraordinary qualities—, for great valour, sanctity, virtue or even vice; good and evil demons, ghosts and goblins, the spirits of departed ancestors; and infinite number of semihuman, and semidivine existences: inhabitants of the seven upper and the seven lower worlds—each and all come in for a share of divine honour or a tribute of more or less adoration."

I know that some educated Hindus deny that their countrymen are idolators. They say that idols are only like photographs, serving to remind us of those we love. This may be true when said of educated people, but it is quite false in regard to the mass of the common people. The pantheistic theory which more or less underlies all Hindu religious sects in this country induces the worshippers to view their idols in the light of God, or as real personifications of the divine attributes. So much is shown by a Hindu the gifted Ram Mohun Roy "Neither do they regard images of these gods merely in the light of instruments for elevating the mind to the conception of those supposed beings; they are simply in themselves made objects of worship. For whatever Hindu purchases an idol in the market, or constructs one with his own hands, or has one made under his own superintendence, it is his invariable practice to perform certain ceremonies, called Pran-Prathishtha, or the endowment of animation by which he believes that its nature is changed from that of the mere materials of which it is formed, and that it acquires not only life but supernatural powers. Shortly afterwards if the idol be of a masculine gender, he marries it to a feminine one: with no less pomp and magnificence than he celebrates the nuptials of his own children. The mysterious process is now complete; and the god and goddess are esteemed the arbiters of his destiny, and continually receive his most ardent adoration."

Catholics not Idolators.

There are some who try to excuse the worship that the Hindu people offer to idols by saying that if it is idolatory to pray to images, the Christian Catholics too are idolators. Now this plea is quite insufficient; for Catholics, *pray before images, not to images.* Catholics make use of images as of photographs serving to remind them of those they love; but they do not regard their statues or pictures in the light of gods or as real personifications of the divine attributes. Catholics do not believe that, by the blessing of the priest, their statues and pictures change their material nature into the nature of God, or of those superior Beings which the statues or pictures represent. Catholics do not believe that their statues and pictures have a supernatural life and supernatural powers, that they are possessed, inhabited, animated by the deity. If such were their belief they would be no less idolators than the great mass of the Hindu people. The veneration which Catholics pay to images is *not absolute, is relative*: it does not stop at the image, it is not referred to the image, but to the person which the picture represents, just as when we bow to the statue of Her Majesty the Queen Empress, we bow not to the statue but to the Queen of whom the statue is a senseless and material likeness. Moreover, in order that the homage paid to images may be defensible, the images must represent persons worthy of veneration. Now, are the gods and goddesses of the Hindu Pantheon worthy of a veneration? Are their lives and morals, as depicted in the Puranas, such as to deserve reverence and adoration? Let each Hindu answer to himself, and I am sure that his conclusion will not be far different from mine.

G. Bartoli, S. J., D. D.

(To be continued.)

KAMBAN.

(Continued from page 70).

Now and then Kamban expresses his ideas in the most impressive and striking manner. Dasaratha, instead of saying to Kaikeyi that "You will soon become a widow when your son is installed," is made to say "உன், கழுத்தின்னணின்மகற்குக் காப்பினணை மென்றான்" Then, again, thinking of Rama, he soliloquizes thus:—"நின்மேனிசோரிய, மணிமுடிசாய்வந்த புனல் மகனேவினேயேற், குணிலுஞ்சாயுதவியுமாகானடவாயென்றான்" implying that he will certainly die. "சோகினுல் சுமந்திரன்னுவலலுற்றதை, வாக்குலகறிவே உணர்ந்தமாதவன்" (4—ஆற்றப்படலம் of Ayodhya kandam)—what Sumanthiran indicated by his look Vasishta understood without words.

மாறு மக்கணம் வாயினைத் தோட்டதும்
தேலனிற் கால் தனித்ததுந் கண்டிலர்
காலனைப் பணித்தக் கையான் விட்ட
தூல மற்றது துண்டங்கள் கண்டனர்.
(70-ஆடலைகை)

and again (காமுறம் 35)

தந்தினமை யாம் விருந்தவர் தானின்
மந்தது காணுறி வைத்தது நோக்கார்
கம்பினின் யாரு மறிந்திலர் கையால்
எடுத்தது கண்டனரிற்றது தோட்டார்.

Note what வலி says :—

"வாய்மையுமறனுங் காத்தமன்னுயிர்திறந்தவள்ளல்
தாயவன்சுமந்தனே கீ பாதன்முன்தோன்றினயே."
(76-வலிவதை.)

வலியைப்பகிர் சாயலோன்னற
லேலியைப்பித்தாய் விறல்வீரனே (89-ibid).

When Hanuman returns from Lunka he bows and says to Rama anxiously awaiting his message "கண்டனன் கற்பினுக்கணியை கண்களால்" (58-இருவடிதொழுத படலம் Sundarakandam). Note how appropriate the order is. Rama would be in suspense thinking whether Hanuman found Seeta. In order to remove this suspense, he opens his sentence with கண்டனன். As soon as Rama hears this, he would further be in suspense about her chastity. Hanuman, therefore, adds next (கண்டனன்) கற்பினுக்கணியை (the ornament of chastity). In such places, disturb the order of words, the whole effect will vanish.

While Rama and Seeta were approaching the பஞ்சவடி on the banks of the Godavery, they are both made to exhibit very pretty humour:—Rama, finding chakravala birds there, looked at Seeta's breast: Seeta, intent on his shoulders, looked at the adjoining beautiful hillocks. Rama who looked at the swans turned his eyes towards Seeta's steps and made a smile. Seeta who looked at the elephants which went away after quenching their thirst turned her eyes towards Rama's steps and smiled also. Rama saw the creepers on the banks of the river and gazed at Seeta's waist. Seeta saw lotus blossoms amidst a forest of blue lotus and gazed at the whole form of Rama. This humour and playful fancy is most appropriate and has a dramatic effect as their separation is approaching.

Kamban makes a very superfluous use of தற்குறிப் பேற்றம் (Reflection natural occurrences), and it peculiarly befits his description of the dawn after Kaikeyi's conspiracy (which we explain here as a striking example of this usage). The matron of darkness, finding the deed of Kaikeyi who did not sympathise with the misery of her husband though she had been acting all along as though she were his life, went away as if she were ashamed of even standing before her. The fowls indicating the hour of dawn seemed to beat their winged hands over their breasts unable to bear the lamentation of Dasaratha all the night long. The starry heaven which formed as it were a canopy of pearls for the installation ceremony of Rama vanished having known that the ceremony was put off. We will cite another instance. Just after the ministers had consented about the propriety of raising Rama to the throne, Dasaratha sends for him, and on his approach embraces him. The poet adds :—What beauty is there in saying that the father embraced his son? In order that he might judge of the capability of the son to bear the sovereignty of the world, he measured the breast and shoulders of his son with his own breast and shoulders.

Kamban versus Valmiki.—Such are some of the beauties we have gathered with some difficulty. To choose a beauty where beauties abound is a laborious task. After all it may be said that the Tamil Ramayan is not an indigenous production but only after the Sanskrit original. A very cursory examination of the Sanskrit original and the Tamil imitation will convince any one that Kamban has not made a verbatim translation of Valmiki. The bare plot of Valmiki is all that Kamban borrows. Bishop Caldwel says that "the difference between the Tamil and Sanskrit Ramayan may be compared to the difference between Pope's Iliad and the Iliad of Homer." Kamban even makes bold to slightly change the plot in his own way. We compared the Tamil Ramayan with the first two kandams of Valmiki in Dutt's translation, and noted that all the first portions (which are believed to be interpolations by western scholars) are very dexterously omitted by Kamban. Dasaratha consults his ministers in regular assemblies about what may be done for securing a son. They advice this and that sacrifice. Sumanthiran says in private to the king of what he heard from Sanatkumara, and Dasaratha then learns that Kalaikkottu Maharishi is indispensable for conducting the sacrifice. But Kamban in the very opening of the story makes Vasishta to muse upon the divine mystery and to hint to the king the procedure to be adopted. The Kalaikkottu Rishi of Valmiki is dealt with as an ordinary personage. But that Rishi in the hands of Kamban commands the awe and respect of the reader. The message to Dasaratha of Rama's marriage is all narrated by Valmiki in a short compass. But Kamban makes undue expansion here. He allots one whole chapter to the march of the imperial army and four chapters to their riotous revellings on their way. In the second kanda Valmiki goes on narrating like a garrulous old man. It is in this kandam that Kamban is most dramatic. Valmiki's account of

packing Rama to the desert is most tedious. But Kamban makes Kaikeyi call Rama and give him his father's injunctions. Rama straightway takes leave of his own mother and his younger aunt who ordains Lakshmana to accompany and serve Rama. Seeta troubles Rama that she will also accompany him to the woods. Sumanthira is ordered to take them in a chariot and leave them in the near forest. Valmiki makes Dasaratha and his wife see Rama driving in the chariot till his head disappears, and this is omitted by Kamban with the intention of producing an impression on the reader that the horror of the news when brought by Sumanthiran was unbearable by Dasaratha and he expired immediately. We find from such comparisons that Kamban—where he varies from the plot of Valmiki varies with a purpose. He either gives a dramatic coloring to his variations or puts a stronger epic impression upon them. Like Valmiki, he has not mentioned anything of the Saiva baptism of Rama by Agasthya, though other authors of Athyathmaka Ramayan and puranas are strong upon the point. Kamban's Iranyapadalam in the Yuthakanda is certainly his interpolation. His object in putting it in the mouth of Vibhishana must be raising Rama in the estimation of Ravana. His execution of this episode is so masterly that even should the other portions of his Ramayan be destroyed that single chapter would be enough to give evidence of the master hand as a poet and an epic poet too. His sentiments and language and spirit are so strong there. In his paper on Tamil Literature in the *Calcutta Review* page 159, July No. 1855, Vol. XXV, the Rev Bower of Madras says:—"We have read both Valmiki and Kamban, and at times we were at a loss to know to which of the poets the palm of victory was to be assigned. Valmiki is diffuse and simple. Kamban abridges but elaborates. There is a profusion of ornament at times, here and there, abounding in beautiful touches of expression."

Kamban judged by the canons of Aristotle.—Even when judged by the canons of Aristotle, in their fourfold classification of the fable, the characters, sentiments and the language, in reviewing an Epic, Kamban does not fall short of any of the requirements. The fable with its episodes and the characters are the partially historical and partially mythical creations of Valmiki. The sentiments and the language of the Tamil Ramayana are Kamban's own. Except in some places where Seeta abuses the Rakshasas, and the Rakshasas abuse the monkeys and their manly masters; there is no vulgarity to be traced anywhere. We have already noted the fine sentiments of Kamban and also the beautiful language in which he couches them. His style always carries a majesty with it. An experienced scholar after one reading can distinguish between the verses of the *Ramayan* and the *Chinthamany* even, if they should be shuffled together in confusion. Another beauty of Kamban's style is that the sound and the sense are always in harmony. You can regularly dance at a joyous passage and weep at a pathetic passage.

The strength and capability of the genius of Kamban.—We believe in the anecdote that Kamban, when asked how far he had composed his Ramayan, while in fact he had not even invoked the muse, answered that he was going on with சதுரங்கப்படலம், whereas his brother poet was actually going on with கடவுள்படலம். He was conscious of the wonderful power of his genius and was sure that he could overtake ஓடகூத்தர் in a few days, and he did so in one fortnight. Every page of Ramayan shows the author who only took care of his thoughts and whose words had to take care of themselves There is not one line which is laboured. He had not to press his forehead for a simile. His knowledge of the world and acquaintance with literature were very wide. Being of the middle age his practical experience was ripe and he did "his best thing easiest" as Emerson would say. We will parody Emerson and say "Kamban's principle may be conveyed, in saying that he, of all men, best understands the *Tamil* language, and can say what he will." That he did compose the சதுரங்கப்படலம் at a moment's notice in the royal court we cannot doubt. The incident contained in this chapter was so fresh in his mind that it served as a simile in the 9th stanza of தைலம் படலம்.

மலையிடித்த மரங்கள் பறித்த மா
மிலமுதற் பொருள் யாவையு மேந்தலான்
அலைகடற் றலைவன் றனை வேண்டிய
சிலையுடைக் கலி சீற்றமுஞ் சீற்றமே.

His other works:—The genius of Kamban had its full play only in the Ramayan. His சடகோபரந்தாதி is the only other work which shows a master hand. His சரஸ்வதியந்தாதி was perhaps his juvenile composition. It does not bear the stamp of a ripe and strong intellect. In fact it has not the excellence of சடகோபரந்தாதி of recent date. He

actually believed no doubt that a daily adoration to the Muse strengthened the talents and powers of a poet.

பக்க நிறுவி பலசொரிவ தறிவ
சகலமுந்தே தரவைபெற மயல்—தகவியடிய
ரெல்லாம் பரவுங் கழலைத் தினந்தினமு
மள்ளுதுசேவ் வடிதொ டுவ மகி.

T: CHELVAKESAVAROYA MUDALIAR, M A.

(To be Continued).

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Wrote Dr. Johnson to his friend Boswell, "Whatever philosophy may determine of material nature, it is certainly true of intellectual nature that it *abhors* a vacuum: *Our minds cannot be empty*; and evil will break in upon them, if they are not preoccupied by good. My dear sir, mind your studies, mind your business, *make your lady* happy and be a good Christian."

We came across the passage a few days ago; and after what we wrote about the nature of the *Satsant*, we were not a little surprised. Our old pandits used to express the same truths more popularly when commenting on the necessity why our Good Mother *Avvei* enjoined "சர்வ ஜன சிவபூஜை செய்க, &c." "To visit the Good is good &c" immediately after laying down, "துர்ஜனசேவை பூஜை செய்க, &c." "To visit the wicked is bad, &c." We admire also the sage and most practical advice contained in the last line of Dr. Johnson quoted above.

***

We are glad to welcome the first number of the Re-Awakened India or Prabuddha Bharata, under the new management, and in a new form, the reason for which is explained in the editorial. The present contains a short notice of the passing away of Pawhari Baba of Ghazipur, on 10th June last who is said to have been a very pious Saint and Yogi.

***

It is a well-known fact how unscrupulous Vaishnava editors generally are when editing well-known ancient classical works both in Tamil and in Sanskrit. A Reviewer of Bengali Literature, brought out the fact in a late number of the *Calcutta Review*, how in all modern editions and renderings of ancient Puranic and Itikasa writings, all reference to Siva and Sakti were being studiously omitted. In the September number of the *Theosophist* a correspondent noticing a new edition of Mahabharata in Devanagari Type by V. Ramanujacharlar, Proprietor, L. H. Press, Coleroon, S. I. R., states as follows. "In 1881, some gentlemen of Tanjore District, Madras Presidency, associated themselves together to bring out a Grantha edition of Bharata; they finished the first five parvas or cantos. The editor of the present edition was one of them, but as he would not consent to the others *striking out some stanzas in support of the Saivite and the Sakta system of faith, and putting in other stanzas of their own composition in praise of Vishnu*, he severed the connection and established a press of his own at Coleroon, to bring out the complete text in Devanagari letters."

***

Such things are going on almost every day, and when we sent a copy an old Sanskrit manuscript obtained from the Tanjore Library, our Pundit was horrified to find how the text was mutilated here and there and badly interpolated with expressions and sentences which could not by any possibility have come from the original author's lips. What an uproar would have been raised in Europe if even the most harmless liberties of the kind were taken by editors. Unfortunately in India there is no proper press criticism of such misdeeds and no effective public opinion, and when anybody says the least offensive things against such misdeeds he is easily put down for a sectarian bigot! In the case of Mahabharata, the texts began to be interpolated long ago, and Dr. Lassen has noted down in various places the texts probably interpolated: And Srilasri S. Somasundara Nayagar called attention to the fact how, in the edition of Villiputtûrar's Bharata (Tamil) many stanzas were omitted wholesale and how other minor alterations were made in the texts.

***

We have received an unauthenticated communication, signed 'A critic,' taking exception, to our notice of the 'Life of Her Majesty' of the *Vivekachintamani* series and containing an enumeration of errors in language and diction contained in the book. There was however nothing very extravagant in our praise of the book, and the criticism is also very unfair and prejudiced and, may, incorrect too. For instance where he objects to redundancy in expressions like 'பண்டுபழை,' and where he says 'அரசர்' (heralds) is misspelt for 'ஈ அரசர்,' and goes on to compare the mistake to that of the printer who made J. S. Mill the greatest *drinker* of the age. Why we know a recent performance of a great functionary and scholar who translated a Vedanta treatise entitled "ப ஈ ஈ ஈ ஈ ஈ ஈ ஈ" into "are ours happy." (not a printer's mistake surely). The critic however objects to the use of unfamiliar Sanskrit words and with unusual spelling and to the free use of foreign words though in colloquial use, and some other mistakes, with perhaps greater justice. But it must be remembered at the same time, that the writer is a Brahmin and a graduate and who could not have acquired much freedom in

the use of pure classical Tamil. But our own experience of what is called pure classical style, approved of, for instance, by the Editor of the *Gnanabodhini* is also disappointing. There is no harm in introducing colloquial foreign words if they are effective and otherwise indispensable. As the new school of Indian Tamil graduates are not altogether writing for the vulgar, they should also take care that they do not altogether drift into slang; though a certain amount of freedom and lightness is altogether essential in such compositions.

***

Says the *Indian Social Reformer* :—

"As for Agastya, who is said to have perfected Tamil, being a Brahman, we would advise our contemporary not to accept these things too literally. Who is this Agastya who is said to have done so much for the Tamil language? Certainly not the Agastya the reputed author of several hymns in the 1st Mandala of the Rig Veda, in one of which he figures in the odious light of the old husband of young Lopamudra. It so happens that Lopamudra is a name for the river Cauvery, and if we adopt the credulity of the *Siddhanta Deepika*, there can be nothing more easy than to give the Southern Rishi a southern wife. It is, however, more in consonance with established facts to believe that Lopamudra was adopted long after the vedic times as the name of the Cauvery, suggested it may be by the name of the southernmost star known to Hindu astronomy, Agastya, which the Greeks called Canopus. Nothing is more natural than that a pastoral and agricultural people like the ancient Aryans should distinguish a people as the children of the star under which and the river on whose banks they dwelt. We are inclined to believe that the Agastya of the Tamil language is a mere myth, meaning no more than that the language flourished in the country which lay in the direction, and, therefore, according to old-world views, under the protection, of the star, Agastya. It was the settled policy of the Brahmans to give everything they came in contact with a Brahmanical pedigree, provided it was not absolutely licentious or revoltingly inhuman."

Well, according to our learned contemporary the 'Tamil Agastya' was no person, much less a Brahmin, was a mere myth, and was the name of the Southern Asterism. We would ask him for his authority for saying so; and in what old book of the Brahmans or the Tamils is this fact recorded. We thought our contemporary found fault frequently with Revivalists and Reactionaries for giving explanations for facts and practices other than those denoted by them.

***

We are sorry to say our contemporary has not grasped the true way of reading ancient Itikasa and tradition in India. Valuable suggestions on this point were thrown out by Sir Alfred Lyall and Dr. Leitner at the discussion which ensued on the reading of Mr. Sewell's paper "India before the English." And then there is another way of regarding these traditions and legends and which is suggested by such a great historian as the late J. A. Froude. He says, in his book *Oceana*, page 69.—

"Where were the lines which divided truth from falsehood in the mind of Alcinous? The words of Ulysses had *form*. Organic form is possible only when there is life and so the problem returns which so often haunts us. What is truth? The apple falls by gravitation. Whether Newton ever watched an apple fall and drew his inference in consequence, has nothing to do with the universal reality which remains unaltered if the rest is a legend. The story of the apple is the shell The truth is the kernel or thing signified. Sacred history in like manner, busy only to convey spiritual truth, is careless as Alcinous of inquiring into fact. It takes fact or legend or whatever comes to hand and weaves it into form. The beauty of the form, and the spirit which animates the form, are the guarantees of truth and carry their witness in themselves. Thus we are rid for ever of critical controversies. The spirit is set free from the letter and we can breathe and believe in peace. Two good news to be true! Perhaps so. In a long voyage where we can do nothing but read and reflect such thoughts come like shadows upon water when it is untouched by the breeze (ஜ). The air ruffles it again and they are gone.

So what we conclude about Agastya is, though we never said he was the Agastya of the Vedas, 'the odious husband of young Lopamudra' (though as a matter of fact young wives run away from their young and beautiful husbands and sometimes shoot them dead too), yet nearly all the Puranas and Itikasas written by Aryan Brahmans attest Agastya's sojourn in the south, and the very first Tamil work written by a Brahman, author of Tolkappiyam refers to him in the following verse.

"ஆயிற்றமிழ்தான் அகத்தியர்க்குணர்த்திய
மாதொருபாகனே வழுத்தினாம்
போதமெய்ஞ்ஞான மடைபெறற்பொருட்டே."

and the same tradition is preserved in several other important works. Agastya is believed to be the author of the first work in grammar "பரதத்தியம்" a work believed to be lost now, and Agastya is always spoken of as the Tamil Muni; as such Agastya was probably a well-known historical figure, connected with the very first settlement of North Indian Aryans into the Tamil land, and who soon after their settlement, identified themselves completely with the Tamil people for centuries. (and so we have the fact that till the time of Nilakanta and Sankara we have very few Sanskrit works of any importance composed in Southern India; and even if Agastya was not a Brahman and was a mere myth, the traditions connected with him are enough for our purpose to show the feeling of social unity which prevailed in those times between the Aryans and Tamils. Gnana Sambantha of the Kaundinya Gotra (a Vedic Gotra by the way) always calls himself very frequently 'Tamil Gnana Sambanthan' but perhaps our contemporary will say he was no Brahmin and was a myth also.

***

In memoriam :—We regret to record the passing away of Pundit Venkataramana Dass of Sâmakulam, Coimbatore, on 11th August last. He belongs to a Vaishnava family of the Sholiya sect and his family members were heriditary archakas of the Vishnu temple of the same village. He learnt Sanskrit in his youth under one Appulinga Sastri and but his proficiency in the Tamil language was more or less self-acquired, though he received some finishing from Pundit Kandasami Mudaliar of Coimbatore. In early life he was helped by some local magnates, and subsequently he got engaged in a Bajanakutam on a small salary. During this period and latterly he spent his time mostly in preaching and in literary work. The pages of *Brahma Vidhya, Nagai Nilalochani, Viveka Divakaran* and a number of other vernacular journals were frequently enriched from his contributions, and he was a powerful writer and speaker. He has published an innumerable number of pamphlets and books and his *Thirupandi Kodumudi Puranam* is spoken of highly. We met him while returning from the Maharaja Setupati of Ramnad loaded with a present of Rs. 500, and he expressed to us his great gratification and gratefulness to the Maharajah. He lived a life of extreme purity, and piety and simplicity and extreme contentment. He got from the Maharaja of Ramnad the title of *Valiakaliyuga Haradatta* on account of his great proficiency in the Saiva Siddhanta Shastras and adherence to the faith. All the vernacular journals feel his irreparable to themselves and to the public. He has left behind him a father, 2 sons and 3 daughters, in rather a precarious condition.

***

The *Madras Mail* in reviewing the series of articles contributed by Mr. C. V Swaminatha Aiyar on *Vernacular Studies*, concludes as follows :—

"Now for a practical suggestion, to finish up with. The people of this Presidency, we mean the vernacular-speaking people, want books to read. At present this literature is limited in quantity and rashy in quality. Why should not a big society, consisting of the wealthiest and most enlightened men of this Presidency, be formed for the "propagation of vernacular literature?" There is no lack of money in the country, and the men who possess it have not shown themselves backward in helping on philanthrophic schemes, and there is little doubt that this support would be forthcoming. The business of the society, when duly furnished with funds, would be to employ educated men to translate suitable English books into the vernaculars, and, if possible, to compose original works. We are convinced there would be no lack of men to do this; men who are capable, and who would be only too glad of the opportunity of making a few hundred rupees in this way. Besides, they would get *Kudas* too. The society would publish the books at its own risk, but if the people are as anxious for something to read as we are just now being led to suppose, there would not be much risk about it. An incalculable amount of good might be done in this way. The masses would be supplied with sound and healthy reading, the vernaculars would be improved, and the necessary stimulus and encouragement given for their study. And, what is more, it would in all probability, pay, and there seems to be no reason why, in time such a society should not have its book depôts in every town in the Presidency. And above all, it would be done by the people's unaided efforts, without the help of Governments, or Universities, or any other official corporations. The thing only wants organising. The money, we are convinced, is ready at hand; the working material, if scanty at first, would increase to supply the demand. There seems to us to be an opening here for individual effort and public spirit. The men who could organise such a society as this, would be doing much for their countrymen and for posterity."

***

We are glad to congratulate Mrs. Annie Besant on her achievement in establishing a *Central Hindu College* at Benares. The College was opened on 7th July last, with Ganesha Puja and Homam &c. There are two European and two Indian Professors, and one Head Sanskrit Pandit in the staff. The fees are fixed very low—one Rupee a month in the School and two Rupees a month in the College.

MADRAS:—Printed by P. C. KALLIANA SUNDARA NADAR, at the C. N. PRESS, 39, Godown Street, Black Town, and Published by J. M. NAGARATNAM.

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science &c.

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897

VOL. II. | MADRAS, OCTOBER 1898. | No 5

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page* 79.)

THIRD PA'DA.

This pâda will be concerned with an enquiry into the meaning of such of the Vedântic passages as contain explicit marks of Brahman, as also incidentally with determining as to who is qualified (for the study of this science):

The abode of heaven, earth etc., is the Parames'vara, owing to the word 'self' (I. iii. 1).

The passage referred to here occurs in the Mundaka-Upanishad and reads thus:

"In him the heaven, the earth and the sky are woven, the mind also with all the senses. Know him alone, the A'tman, and leave off other words. He is the bridge of the immortal."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the being spoken of as the abode of the heaven and the earth is the Parames'vara or some other being.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—It seems that some being other than Parames'vara *viz.* Vâyu, is the abode of the heaven, the earth etc., for he is declared to be the abode of all in the following passage:

"By air, as by a thread, O Gautama, this world and the other world, and all creatures are strung together."*

As against the foregoing, we hold as follows:

The Parames'vara is the abode of the heaven, the earth etc., because of the word 'A'tman' in the passage "Know him alone, the A'tman."

What is the objection to Vâyu, the Sûtrâtmân, being denoted by the word 'A'tman'

The Sûtrakâra answers thus

And because of the declaration (that he is) reached by the liberated (I. iii. 2.)

It is none other than Parames'vara, because that Being is to be reached by the liberated souls,—those who are liberated from name and form generated by the meritorious and sinful acts—as declared in the following passages:

* Mundaka-Upanishad 2—2—5.

* Brihadâranyaka-Upanishad 5—7—2.

"When the seer sees the brilliant maker and lord (of the world) as the person who is the source of Brahman, then he is wise, and shaking off good and evil, he reaches the highest *Samyam* free from passions."*

"As the flowing rivers disappear in the sea, losing their name and their form, thus, a wise man, freed from name and form, goes to the divine Person who is greater than the great"†

How can this be possible in Vâyu? Vâyu becomes the Sûtrâtman only as ensouled by Parames'vara, inasmuch as Vâyu is one of the eight forms of the Parames'vara. Hence the conclusion that it is not Vâyu.

Not the subject of inference, for want of its designation; nor the living being (I. iii. 3.)

It cannot be maintained that what is spoken of as the abode of heaven, earth etc., refers to Pradhâna as known by inference, inasmuch as it is the upâdâna or material cause of all; for, there is no word denoting Pradhâna. Neither can it be the Jîva, for, then, it would involve an incongruity.

Because of the mention of a distinction (I. iii. 4.)

Here a distinction is made between I's'vara and Jîva in the following passage:

"On the same tree man (purusha) sits grieving, immersed, bewildered by his own impotence. But when he sees the other Lord contented and knows his glory, then his grief passes away."‡

Wherefore He who is the Supreme Lord (Parames'vara) in Himself can alone be the abode of heaven, earth etc.

By the context (I. iii. 5.)

This section, indeed, treats of the Supreme, and begins thus:

"Now the supreme knowledge by which that Indestructible is known."§

Wherefore also, the Parames'vara is here referred to.

And on account of presence and eating (I. iii. 6.)

And also because, after having said that Jîva eats the fruits of his actions, the s'ruti speaks of Him who shines forth without eating, in the following passage:

"Two birds, inseparable friends, cling to the same tree. One of them eats the sweet fruit, the other looks on without eating."¶

Hence the conclusion that it is the Parames'vara Himself, distinct from the Jîva, who is spoken of as the abode of heaven, earth etc.

Adhikarana 2.

The Sûtrakâra proceeds to shew that unsurpassed Bliss is the result of reaching Parames'vara who, as has just been described, has to be reached by the liberated souls:

The Infinity (is Parames'vara) because of its mention after serenity (I. iii. 7.)

In the Châudogya-Upanishad, after declaring that "Infinity only is bliss," the s'ruti describes the nature of the Infinity as follows:

"Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, that is the Infinite."†

Here arises a doubt as to whether it is the Parames'vara or some other being who is denoted by the word 'Infinite.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—The Infinite is some being other than Parames'vara, namely Prâna. When, as regards 'name' and other things mentioned in the previous passages, Nârada asked "Is there something better than a name?"‡ Sanatkumâra mentions "speech" and other things, in such words as "speech is better than a name;"§ but, after Prâna, s'ruti introduces the Infinite without resorting to a question and an answer. Because Parames'vara is thus not the subject of discourse here, therefore Prâna is the Infinite.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows. Parames'vara alone is denoted by the word 'Infinite,' as coming after 'serenity.' 'Serenity' means Jîva as spoken of in the s'ruti "Now that serene being which etc."‖ And he is referred to by the word 'Prâna.' After him, the Infinite is declared as something different from him in the words. "But in reality he declares what is beyond who declares the Highest Being to be the true,"¶ and so on. Here, after declaring that He who understands Prâna

* Mundaka-Upanishad 3 1-3.
† Ibid 3 2-8.
‡ Mundaka Upanishad 3-1-2.
§ Mundaka Upanishad 1-1-5.

* Ibid 3 1-1.
† Op. cit. 7-24-1.
‡ Ibid. 7-1-3.
§ Ibid. 7-2-1.
‖ Ibid 8-3-4.
¶ Ibid 7-17-1.

declares that which is beyond in the words, "He who sees this, perceives this, and understands this, declares what is beyond;* the s'ruti indicates, by the word 'but,' that he who declares the Highest Being to be the True is superior to him who is mentioned above, —to him who declares that Prâna is the Being who is beyond all. Therefore it is to be concluded that the being who is called the True and is the subject subsequently spoken of as the Highest Being, is superior to Prâna previously spoken of as the Highest Being. It is that Being who is described in a succeeding passage as possessed of the attribute of infinitude. He is even spoken of as A'tman in a passage next succeeding it, in the words "Next follows the explanation of the Infinite as the A'tman."† Wherefore the Infinite is the A'tman, none other than the Parames'vara, who is Superior to Jîva spoken of by the word 'Prâna.'

And owing to the appropriateness of the attributes (I. iii. 8).

The attributes that He rests in His own greatness, that He is the Atman of all, that He is the cause of all, and so on, are taught in the following passages:

"O Lord, wherein does He rest? In His own greatness."‡

"A'tman is all this."§

"From the Atman comes Prâna; from the A'tman, hope."‖

These are appropriate only when applied to Parames'vara, not to Jîva denoted by the word 'Prâna.' Wherefore, it may be concluded that Parames'vara alone is the Infinite, not the other.

(*Objection*):—In the preceding adhikarana it was shewn that the liberated souls attain equality with Brahman, as said by the s'ruti "He reaches the highest equality free from passions."¶ Accordingly it is to be concluded that the liberated souls who have attained union with Brahman remain separate from Him. In the passage "where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, understands nothing else, that is the Infinite,"** it is declared that, when Brahman denoted by the word 'Infinite' is seen, there can be no perception of the universe as opposed to Brahman. How to reconcile this?

(*Answer*):—The meaning of the assertion that "one sees nothing else" when the Infinite is immediately perceived, may be explained as follows: He whose nature is unsurpassed bliss, in whom—when immediately seen—merged, a man does not seek to perceive colour and other sense-objects with a longing for any more pleasures, He is the Infinite, He is Brahman. Indeed, the various kinds of sensuous pleasure are only the infinitesimally small fractions of Brahman's bliss. Accordingly the S'ruti says, "All other creatures live on a small portion of this bliss."* Wherefore here, as regards Brahman, there can be no denial of duality. We need not specially investigate as to how the perception of the universe which is alien to the highest end of man can be avoided so long as the universe exists. For, in the case of liberated souls, it is not the material (Prâkrita) universe which is perceived by them. On the other hand, it is Brahman Himself, whose essential nature is unsurpassed bliss, that forms the object of perception in the form of universe. Accordingly the S'ruti says:

"That, then, he becomes; Brahman whose body is Light (âkâs'a), whose nature is true, whose delight is in Prâna (Supreme S'akti), whose bliss is in Manas."†

There, the liberated soul is introduced in the words "He attains to the state of self-effulgence, he attains to the mastery over manas," and so on. In "he is the master of speech" and so on, he is said to be endued with speech and other sense-organs which are under his own control, which are non-material (aprâkrita) and perfectly pure. To him, then, on attaining to that condition, this visible array of the material (prâkrita) universe becomes the very Brahman whose body is âkâs'a, *i. e.*, whose body is the Light of spiritual consciousness. This is the hidden meaning of the passage. Wherefore equality of the liberated souls with Brahman consists in their perceiving the universe as one with Brahman in essence. Hence the propriety of the whole doctrine.

Adhikarana. 3

The Akshara (is Parames'vara) because of the supporting of (the universe) including a'ka's'a. (I. iii. 9).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Brihadâranyaka, and runs thus:

* Ibid 7-25-4.
† Ibid 7-25-2.
‡ Chh. Up. 7—24—1.
§ Ibid. 7—25—2.
‖ Ibid. 7—26—1.
¶ Mundaka-Upanishad. 3—1—3.
** Chh. Up. 7—22—1.

* Bri. Up. 6—3—32.
† Tait. Up. 1—6.

"O Gargî, the Brâhmans call this the Indestructible (Akshara). It is neither coarse nor fine, neither short nor long, neither red nor fluid; it is without shadow;"* and so on.

Here a threefold doubt arises as to the meaning of the word 'Akshara': does it refer to Pranava, Jîva or Paramesvara?

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—One of the two, Pranava or Jîva, is denoted by the word 'akshara.'—How?—It is but right that it should refer to Pranava inasmuch as the word 'akshara' is synonymous with 'letter.' It is also right that 'akshara' should refer to Purusha or Jîva, as said in the scriptural passage 'Purusha is termed akshara."† Wherefore they alone are referred to by the word 'akshara'

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: Here, it is Brahman who is denoted by the word 'akshara.' Why? Because the Akshara is said to support everything including âkâs'a. When Gârgî asked "In what then is the âkâs'a woven like warf and woof?"‡—that âkâs'a which is described as the basis of all phenomena in the passage, "That of which they say that it is above the heavens, beneath the earth, embracing heaven and earth, past, present, and future, that is woven, like warf and woof, in the âkâs'a,"§—Yâjñavalkya said. "O Gargî, the Brâhmanas call this the Akshara. .....In that Akshara then, O Gargî, the âkâs'a, is woven, like warf and woof."‖ We are taught that the Akshara so described supports the universe including âkâs'a. Where else is this possible except in the Paramâtman? Wherefore Paramesvara alone is the being denoted by the word 'Akshara.

And that, by the command. (I. iii. 10).

And we are taught that this support is owing to the high command, as the S'ruti says, "By the command of that Akshara, O Gârgî, Sun and Moon stand apart"¶ Jiva cannot exercise such a command over the world, as the S'ruti says that there cannot be a second in the command of the world, in the passage, "One alone is Rudra they are not for a second"**. Wherefore Paramesvara alone is denoted by the word 'Akshara.'

And because of the exclusion of distinction (I. iii. 11.)

"Distinction" means being a separate entity. The concluding portion of the passage,—namely, "This Akshara, O Gârgî, is unseen, but seeing: unheard, but hearing; unperceived, but perceiving; unknown, but knowing."—excludes the idea of the Akshara being distinct from Paramesvara, inasmuch as neither Jîva nor Pranava can be spoken of as seeing and being at the same time unseen. Hence the conclusion that Paramesvara alone is the Akshara.

Adhikarana.—4

This Adhikarana is intended to show that the Paramesvara, though beyond the reach of sensuous perception, yet becomes immediately perceptible to His devotees, as a result of His Supreme Mercy:

He is the object of perception, because of the mention (of His attributes). (I. iii. 12.)

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Prasna Upanishad and reads as follows:

"Again he who meditates with this syllable '*Aum*' of three mâtrâs, on the Highest Purusha, he comes to light and to the sun. And as a snake is freed from its skin, so is he freed from evil. He is led up by the Sâman verses to the Brahma-world, and than Him who is superior to the Jîva-mass he sees the Higher Purusha lying in the body."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the entity spoken of as the object of perception is the Paramesvara or some other being.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—He is not the Paramesvara. He is none other than the Hiranyagarbha, as the s'ruti speaks of the attainment of his regions, in the words, 'by the Sâman verses, he is led up to the Brahma-world.' And the world 'Highest' too is applicable to him who is the highest of the Jîvas. Or, it may be Nârâyana; for he is the being denoted by the word 'Puru-ha'. He can also be spoken of as higher than the Hiranyagarbha who is the aggregate of the Jîvas He alone is known to be designated by Pranava His abode alone is declared in the s'ruti to be intuited by the wise, in the words, "That supreme abode of Vishnu do the wise ever see;"† and in the concluding verse this fact is thus referred to:

---

* Bri. Up. 5—8—8.
† Bhagavad Gita. XV. 16.
‡ Bri. Up. 5—8—7.
§ Ibid 5—8—7.
‖ Bri. Up. 5—8—11.
¶ Ibid. 5—8—9.
** Atharvas'iras.

* Op. Cit 5-5.
† Taittirîya-Samhitâ 4—2—9.

"Through the Rik-verses he arrives at this world, through the Yajus-verses at the sky, through the Sâman-verses at that which the wise teach."*

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: Here the object of the act of perception is the Parames'vara, because of the mention of His distinguishing attributes such as tranquillity in the following passage:

"The wise arrives at that which is tranquil, free from decay, from death, from fear,—the Highest"†

Indeed, in the Hiranyagarbha who is a creature of the Parames'vara, no such attributes as tranquillity can exist. The term 'Brahma-world' means the region of S'iva—the Para-brahman—which is worthy of attainment. He, indeed, who is 'higher than him who is superior' to the Hiranyagarbha, the aggregate of Jîvas spoken of as 'Jîva-mass'—is declared as the object of meditation. Hence the untenability of the view that the Hiranyagarbha is meant here (to be the object of perception).

As to the assertion that Nârâyana is meant here, it needs investigation. How can he be spoken of as eternally free, as the cause of fearlessness, as the supreme, beyond all universe, as taught in the words "free from death, from fear, and highest"? He is, indeed, of the form of the universe. And how then to explain the statement that the devotee directly sees Him who is higher than Nârâyana—than him who is superior even to Hiranyagarbha the 'jîva-mass,'—Him who lies in the body as the Antaryâmin and is therefore called Purusha, Him who is Para-brahman? Indeed, the s'ruti declares as follows:

"Superior to Nârâyana is Brahman."‡

"True, real, the Supreme Brahman, the spirit (Purusha), dark and yellowish, celebate, diverse-eyed"§

Wherefore it is but right to maintain that the s'ruti —"he sees the Purusha lying in the body, Greater than the Great,"—declares as the object of perception Him who is called Purusha as dwelling in the Dahara-lotus in the body; who is denoted by the Pranava, as declared in the sr'uti," Designated by that (Pranava) which is merged in its root (the syllable *a*) is He who is the Highest, the Mahes'vara (Great Lord);" who, as said in the s'ruti "Brahman who is greater than Nârâyana," is greater than Nârâyana who is the form of universe; who is true and real, as devoid of all divergence in speech and thought; who, as possessed of three eyes, is said to be diverse-eyed; who, as coloured by the Supreme Energy (Para-s'akti) called Umâ—a word formed of the constituent sounds of the Pranava in their reversed order,—is described as dark and yellowish; who is the supreme all-transcending Brahman. Now as to the assertion based on the s'ruti "That Supreme abode of Vishnu": there is no incongruity whatever, inasmuch as that very supreme form of Vishnu which, when looked apart from the universe, is made of unsurpassed bliss, is itself the Supreme Brahman called S'iva. That is to say, there is no essential distinction between Vishnu and S'iva, the material and efficient causes of the universe, except what is due to a difference of state.

*Prasna-Upanishad 5-7.
† Ibid 5-7.
‡ Mahana-Upanishad.
§ Ibid.

Adhikarana 5.

Thus, it has been shown here that the Sâkshâtkâra or direct perception of Parabrahman, the diverse-eyed,—who is above the universe including Vishnu, Brahmâ and so on, who, lying in the body as an act of Grace to the devotee, is called Purusha, who is associated with Umâ, the Supreme Energy (Parama-S'akti),—enables His devotees who are always intent on His name, Pranava, to attain Him, by way of bringing about the cessation of all samsâra. This adhikarana proceeds to speak of His residence in the body and of His worship:

Dahara (is Parames'vara), because of the next-mentioned (attributes) (I. iii. 13).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Chhândogya-Upanishad and reads as follows:

"There is this city of Brahman, and in it the palace, the small (dahara) lotus and in it that Dahara (small) âkâs'a. Now what exists in that Dahara-âkâs'a, that is to be sought for, that is to be understood."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether it is the material ether (Bhûtâkâs'a), or Jîva, or Parames'vara that is denoted by the word 'dahara.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—The application of the word 'âkâs'a being restricted to the material ether, 'Dahara-âkas'a' denotes bhûtâkâs'a or material ether. Or, the word 'dahara' refers to Jîva, because the word means 'small in size' and is therefore applicable to

* Op. Cit. 8-1-1.

Jîva who is *anu*, of atomic size. "Dahara" cannot denote the all-pervading Parames'vara.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: 'Dahara-âkâs'a is none other than the Parames'vara. Why? Because of the attributes next mentioned, such as the attributes of being free from sin and so on, thus declared in a subsequent passage of the section:

"This A'tman is free from sin, free from old age, free from death and grief, free from hunger and thirst, of unfailing desires, of unfailing will." *

How can these exist in the Jîva who is a samsârin, a being of the world? Wherefore Dahara-âkâs'a is none other than the I's'vara, possessed of the attribute of being free from sin, and so on.

And because of going and of the word. So indeed it is found; and there is an indicating mark (I, iii, 14).

'Dahara-âkâs'a' denotes Parames'vara, also because it is declared that the creatures daily go into this Dahara-âkâs'a, and because it is spoken of as 'Brahma-loka' in the following passage in the same context:

"As people who do not know the country walk again and again over a gold treasure that has been hidden somewhere in the earth and do not discover it, thus do all these creatures day after day go into the Brahma-loka, and yet do not discover it, because they are carried away by untruth." †

So, indeed, elsewhere the s'ruti speaks of the creatures thus going to the Parames'vara, as found in the following passage:

"In the same manner, my son, all these creatures, when they have become merged in the True, know not that they are merged in the True." ‡

We also find the word Brahma-loka applied to the same in the following passage

"This is Brahma-loka, O King." §

Moreover, even leaving out of consideration the fact that the s'ruti speaks *elsewhere* of the creatures daily going to Brahman and refers to the Dahara-âkâs'a by the word 'Brahma-loka,' we find ample evidence, showing that Dahara-âkâs'a is Parames'vara, in the section under discussion which speaks of all creatures going daily to Brahman and contains the word Brahma-loka' referring to Dahara-âkâs'a.

* Ibid. 8 -1-5.
† Ibid. 8-3-2.
‡ Ibid. 6 9-2.
§ Bri. Up. 6--3-32.

Because of His greatness—the supporting (of the universe)—being found in this (Dahara-a'ka'a'a). (I. iii. 15)

The act of supporting the universe, which constitutes the Parames'vara's greatness, is predicated of this Dahara-âkâs'a, in the following passage:

"Now that A'tman is the limit the support, so that these worlds may not become jumbled up." *

And this supporting of the universe forms the greatness of Parames'vara, as the following s'ruti declares.

"He is the lord of all, the master of all beings, the protector of all beings. He is the limit, the support, so that these worlds may not become jumbled up." †

Wherefore also, Dahara-âkâs'a is Parames'vara.

And it being well-known (that He is to be worshipped there). (I. iii. 16).

The Mahopanishad says:

"There is that small lotus situated in the body's midst, free from sin, the abode of the great; and therein is the Dahara (small) âkâs'a, free from grief; and that which is there within has to be worshipped." ‡

The Kaivalya-Upanishad says:

"Having regarded the heart-lotus as free from all stain,.....and having contemplated the Lord Parames'vara, with His helpmate Umâ, as the Trilochana (three-eyed), as Nîlakantha (dark-necked) as serene..... "

From such passages as these it is clear that Parames'vara associated with Umâ is to be contemplated as dwelling within the small lotus. For this reason also, Dahara-âkâsa is Paramesv'ara.

(*Objection*):—From such passages in another Upanishad as "In that âkâs'a within the heart, there reposes the ruler of all, the lord of all, the king of all," § it is clear that the Parames'vara is to be contemplated as dwelling in the Dahara-âkâsa within the small lotus. Here He is to be contemplated as the Dahara-âkâs'a itself. There is thus a self-contradiction in the Upanishads.

(*Answer*):—Even here it is the Parames'vara dwelling within the Dahara-âkâs'a that has to be con-

* Chhâ. Up. 8—4 1.
† Bri. Up. 6--4—22.
‡ Mahânâ. Up. 10.
§ Bri. Up. 6—4—22.

templated. But, inasmuch as sinlessness and other attributes of Parames'vara are found predicated of Dahara-âkâs'a, Parames'vara may also be spoken of as Dahara-âkâs'a when conceived as *Chid-ambara*, as enrobed in the Spiritual Light.

(If you say that)—owing to reference to the other—that (other) is meant here, (we reply) no, owing to impossibility (I. iii. 17.)

(*Objection*) :—The other, namely jîva, is referred to in the following passage :

"Now that serene being who, after having risen from out this earthly body, and having reached the highest Light, appears in his true form, that is the A'tman : thus he spoke."*

Therefore the âkâs'a under discussion can be no other than the Jîva.

(*Answer*) :—No ; because the attributes mentioned above, such as freedom from sin, cannot pertain to him. Wherefore âkâs'a properly refers here to none other than Parames'vara to whom those attributes belong.

(If you say that it is ji'va) because of the subsequent (passage), (we hold that it speaks of ji'va) whose true nature has manifested itself (I. iii. 18.)

(*Objection*) :—In the sequel, in Prajapati's words, the s'ruti declares that Jîva is devoid of all sin and so on, thus :

"The A'tman who is free from sin, free from old age, from death and grief, from hunger and thirst, whose desires never fail, whose will is ever true, He it is whom we must search out ; He it is whom we must try to know. He who has searched out that A'tman and understands Him obtains all worlds and all desires."

The s'ruti also speaks of the characteristic mark of Jiva—namely his association with the three avasthâs or states—in the following passages :

"That person who is seen in the eye, he is A'tman ; thus he said."†

"He who moves about happy in dreams, he is the A'tman."*

"When a man being asleep, reposing, and at perfect rest, sees no dreams, that is the A'tman."†

Therefore it is right to say that Jîva is here referred to.

(*Answer*) :—There is no force in this contention. Here the s'ruti describes Jîva whose attributes, such as sinlessness, had been veiled by the body generated by his own beginningless sin and karma, but who, when afterwards become united to the Supreme Light, has his own true nature manifested, as well as the attribute of freedom from sin and the like ; it is not the Jîva who is of samsâra.

But the Dahara-âkâs'a denotes the Being whose several blessed inherent attributes are never hidden. Thus, the Dahara-âkâs'a here spoken of is neither bound nor liberated.

The reference serves a different purpose. (I, iii, 19).

The manifestation of Jîva's true nature on reaching the Supreme Being denoted by the word Dahara-âkâs'a is spoken of in the following passage :

"Having risen from out this earthly body, and having reached the highest light, he appears in his true form."‡

Here the reference to Jîva serves to show that such is his greatness. Hence no contradiction.

(If you hold that Jiva is here referred to) because of the s'ruti speaking of smallness, this has been answered. (I, iii, 20).

As to the objection that, as dwelling in a small place, the Dahara-âkâs'a must be a limited being, and that it is therefore not the Supreme Being here referred to,—it has already been answered in the sûtra I, ii, 7.

V. MAHA'DEVA S'A'STRI, B. A.

(*To be continued.*)

* Chhâ. Upanishad 8-3-4.
† Chhâ. Upanishad 1-15.

* Ibid 8-10-1.
† Ibid 8-11-1.
‡ Ibid. 8—3—4.

SIVAGNANA SIDDHIAR
OF
ARUL NANDI SIVA CHARIAR.

(*Continued from page 55*).

BHARKARIAN'S STATEMENT.

PARINAMA VADAM.

1. Though agreeing with the Mayavadi in regarding the Veda as Swayambu yet he differs from him in regard to the end of the Veda, and postulates both *betham* and *abetham* of *Brahm*. This philosophy we will expound herein.

2. It is Chit that evolves by Parinama into this world and Jivas, so Sat (Brahm) is all. The Vedas declare the means whereby the bliss of Moksha can be secured. If these means are followed, the Jiva will lose his separateness and become One with Brahm. So the *Parinamavadi* states.

HIS REFUTATION.

1. Brahm cannot become this world, as the same entity cannot become matter and yet be separate from matter. If you instance the salt present in union with sea-water, even then, the nature of salt is quite distinct from the water and the subject cannot divide itself into subject and object. Why do you confuse yourself whose intelligence is so ponderable!

2. If you assert that this world forms only a fractional part of God, then this part becomes destroyed in time, and is reproduced from maya. If you say that it resolves into Brahman itself, then this portion of Brahman becomes mere insentient matter only, by reason of this origination and dissolution. And as you yourself evolve with this world, your intelligence aspiring to *soham* cannot itself be real and cannot but be insentient matter.

3. You instanced the seed as the Brahm and the tree as the world. Then your describing God as Eternal and unchangeable cannot be true and your Brahm will change into insentient matter and die out again as such. Besides, when the seed developes into the tree it has the support of the earth (for nourishment etc.) but whence does your Brahman derive support.

O you, who have become Brahman, you will be ridiculed by the world as mad.

2. The seed and the tree, gold and ornaments, sea, and salt produced from sea are the familiar analogies of this school.

4. If you say that as from gold is produced all kinds of ornaments, so all this world is God, then it must follow that there must be a person who created this world and persons for whom this world was created, as we infer from your analogy, persons who made the gold ornaments and persons who wear them.

5. The Jiva cannot reach the Heaven of Moksha, if its intelligence and volition die out. Yet you say, he can reach Brahman by losing his intelligence and volition. If this individual intelligence &c. die out, then there is nothing to unite with God. If without such annihilation, you can reach bliss, then why don't you enjoy it in this body, but instead, try to rid yourself of it and subject yourself to all sorts of mortification.

THE NIRISHWARA SANKHYA SYSTEM.

Prakriti divides itself into Mula, Puriashtaka and Vikriti; and Sthula, Sukshuma and Param. The Purusha evolving in conjunction with the evolution of the worlds and bodies fancies he is one with them and when he understands from attaining wisdom that he is different from Prakriti he attains Moksha. So the Nirishvara Sankhya states.

5. Mula or Root is here identified by our commentators with *Chitta* or Intellect, in which case what Mr. Davies says cannot be correct. He says, "The mental physiology of Kapila is imperfect. The 'intellect' (buddhi) merely represents sensational ideas in a complete form to the gaze of the soul and the soul never acts. It does not appear therefore how abstract ideas are formed or by what means a course of reasoning can be carried on. The Vedantists add a fourth faculty called *Chitta*, the thinking or reasoning faculty." We are not sure also if he is correct in translating *buddhi* as intellect and *chitta* as reason. See pp. 48 and 49 Sivagnanabotham for our definition of these terms. Puriashtaka comprise *Manas*, *Buddhi* and *Ahankara* and the five tanmatra, sound, sight, touch, smell and taste. Vikriti are the gross elements and senses,—namely, five elements, five organs of sense, the eye, the ear, the nose, the tongue and the skin; the five organs of action (*Karmendriya*) the voice, hand, the feet, the anus and the organs of generation. The *Sankhya Karika* gives a slightly different classification. Prakriti (mula) is not produced. Prakriti in this sense is the Tamil word Pakuthi (பகுதி). That which is produced is Vikriti, same as Tamil (Vikuthi) (விகுதி). Mahat or Buddhi, and Ahankara and the 5 *tanmatras* are both Pakuthi, (பகுதி) as they are producing and Vikuthi (விகுதி) as they are produced from Mula Prakriti. The rest 16 are Vikuthi விகுதி only (including the 5 elements and 5 senses and 5 organs of action and manas). The five tanmatras are produced from Ahankara. So the number of tatwas (Prakriti) is variously given as 24 or 19, when we include the 5 tanmatras or omit them in the enumeration. Including Purusha, the total number is 25. The Siddhanta classification, as will be seen from the table printed in No. 11, Vol. I of this *Magazine*, accepts these 25 tatwas and postulates 11 more, *c.f.* Vayusamhita, Purva 25, Ch. 15.

"Sankhya yoga praiddhani tatvanyapi kanichit
Siva sástra praiddhani tatônyaniyapi critnasah."

Prakriti is called *Mula* as it is the root of all the 24 tatwas, and as it is the first cause and is causeless it is called *Param*. The Puriashtaka form the *Sukshuma Sarira*. Th gross body, *Stula Sarira* is formed of Manas, Buddhi, and Ahankara, 5 tanmatras, 5 senses, and 5 organs of action. Mula Prakriti or Pradhana is called Avyakta or unmanifested and the rest of the tatwas are called Vyakta or manifest. The manifested or scon je Sat, and the manifested is Asat (unseen). The soul or *Purusha* or *Buman* is unmanifested or Avyata. Asat is explained as அருவ. சத்தாய் இருப்பு or அரூபசத்தாய் இருப்பு or குணத்தோற்றம் by Saint Meikandan and Saint Arul Nandi and that this is the original and true meaning and not unreal or non-existent or illusory will be apparent from the learned note on 'Sat and Asat' from Mr. J. A. Davies M. A., which we take the liberty to extract to-day. We stated elsewhere how this misreading and misunderstanding and incorrect translation have been the parent of so much confusion and tortuous reasoning. The phrase 'Sat and Asat' and 'neither Sat nor Asat' occurs very frequently and always in conjunction as a phrase in the Gita, Mahabarata and Upanishads and Vedas; and when it is said of God or Soul that it is 'neither Sat nor Asat' the meaning is intelligible enough if the phrase (Sat and Asat) means only Prakriti (both unmanifest and manifest), but it is quite unmeaning if God is spoken of as neither existing nor non-existing, neither real nor unreal. The mistake consists in reading into these primitive words mistaken notions developed in quite medieval times. The original meaning is still preserved in popular language when a man states what he saw with his own eyes and saw with his own ears, that is Sat and Satyam (truth) and the rest is not Satyam. A hearsay evidence might be as much of a truth by itself as direct testimony, and yet the latter is alone truth, though a witness giving hearsay evidence is not liar. The word Sat originally meaning seen and latterly meaning truth, and from truth to permanency, and the only thing permanent, thus it came to be applied to Soul, and God and as distinguished from them, Prakriti was called Asat, and when the word Sat has been more often confined to God, the word *Satasat* has been brought into use to mean Soul or Purusha. The same changes can be traced in other words also, as in the word Atma, which beginning to mean mere life, living things, animals, living body, manas, soul and going up to God, has been latterly confined to mean Soul and God, and necessity to distinguish between these two 'Atmas,' the words Paramatma and Atma have come into use. In the Tamil language these last meanings have become fixed, Atma meaning only Soul or Purusha and not God; and Paramatma meaning God; though owing to the recent Sanskrit revival, thoughtless writers of Tamil are to confuse these words *vide*—*Chudamani Nigantu*.

அ.சி.

* அருணை

NOTE ON MEANING OF SAT AND ASAT.*

There is a general misunderstanding of these terms as used in the philosophy of the Hindus, especially in the system of Kapila. Sat is supposed to mean existence and Asat is therefore represented as its logical opposite, or, rather contradictory, the negation of being, or non-existence. Thus Dr. Muir writes: "These ideas of entity and non-entity seem to have been familiar to the Vedic poets and we find it thus declared (R. V. X. 72, 2, 3.), that in the beginning non-entity was the source of entity. 'In the earliest age of the gods entity sprang from non-entity, in the first age of the gods entity sprang from non-entity (asat).' In the Atharva Veda X. 7. 10.) it is said that 'both non-entity and entity exist within, the god Skambha;' and in V. 25 of the same hymn, 'powerful indeed are those gods who sprang from non-entity. Men say that that non-entity is once the highest member of Skambha.' The Taittiriya Upanishad also (P-99), quotes a verse to the effect: 'This was at first non-entity. From that sprang entity (Sat).'" And in a note he adds: "This phrase is also applied to Agni in R. V. X. 5. 7, where it is said that that god, being 'a thing both Asat, non-existent (*i.e.*, unmanifested), and Sat, existent (*i.e.*, in a latent state or in essence), in the highest heaven, in the creation of Daksha, and in the womb of Aditi, became in a former age the first boon of our ceremonial, and is both a bull and a cow'" (Progress of the Vedic Religion, Journal A. S., 1865, P. 347). So also Professor Max Muller writes: "Some of the ancient sages, after having arrived at the idea of Avyakrita, undeveloped, went even beyond, and instead of the Sat or *To on*, they postulated an Asat, *To* as the beginning of all things. Thus we read in the Chhandogya Upanishad "And some say in the beginning there was Asat (not being) alone, without a second; and from this Asat might the Sat be born'" (Sans. Literature, P. 324). There is occasionally some confusion in the minds of Hindu writers, especially the later ones, about the meaning of Sat and Asat; but, with Kapila and his exponents, Sat denotes the existence of things in the manifold forms of the external world, the *Dasein* of Hegel, the *Natura naturata* of Spinoza, and Asat is the opposite of this or the formless Prakriti, the mind-matter from which all formal existence has sprung. Sat corresponds in each separate form to the "being-this" of Hegel, and Kapila argues, as the German philosopher, that "by virtue of its predicate of merely being this, every something, is a finite," and therefore it is an effect, because otherwise we could only conceive it as absolute being, and therefore unlimited. Soul was something different from both. So in the Satapatha Brahmana (X. 5, 3, 1.) it is said, "in the beginning this universe was, as it were, and was not, as it were. Then it was only that mind. Wherefore it has been declared by the rishi, 'There was then neither non-entity (asat) nor entity (sat); for mind was, as it were, neither entity nor non-entity.'" The meaning is that mind is neither the primal matter (Prakriti), (which Kapila assumed to be the source of all formal existence), nor the sum of existing things. The Vedantists taught that this primal matter was the Sakti, or productive energy of Brahma. So says Sankara Acharya "We (Vedantists) consider that this primordial state of the world is dependent upon the Supreme Deity, (Paramesvara) and not self-dependent. And this state to which we refer may of necessity be assumed. it is essential for without it the creative action of Supreme Deity could not be accomplished, since if he were destitute of his Sakti, any activity on his part would be inconceivable." (Comm.) on the Brahma Sutras, Muir's Sans. Texts IV 164). The full development of the Vedantist's doctrine made the external world to be only maya, illusion. There is nearly neither Sat nor Asat, but the Supreme Spirit is absolutely the All. Nature is only the projection of the One, or, as Hegel thought, for he was essentially Vedantist. "The idea its externality, in having fallen from itself into a without in time and space;" but this is only manifestation of the Ab-

* Extracted from "*The Hindu Philosophy*" by J. A. DAVIES, M. A., A. S., Trubner's Oriental series.

solute. "The Absolute, the being-thinking (the ultimate synthesis of existence and thought, of object and subject), passes through the three periods, and manifests itself as idea in, and for itself. (thinking).; secondly, in its being otherwise, or in objectiveness and externality, (nature) thirdly, as the idea which from its externality, has returned itself, (mind)." (Chalybaus, Hist of Spec. Phil. Eng. ed. P. 362). As Mr. Morrell has expounded his views and correctly, I may add, "With him God is not a person, but personality itself, *i. e.* the universal personality which realizes itself in every human consciousness, as so many separate thoughts of one eternal mind... God is with him, the whole process of thought, combining in itself the objective movement as seen in Nature with the subjective as seen in logic, and fully realizing itself only in the universal, spirit of humanity." (Mod Phil. II. 189). Pure Vedantism? though Hegel, if he were alive, would protest, against such a statement. But Kapila, was not a Vedantist. With him, the aggregate, of existing things, and each separate existence, (Sat)., and the formless Prakriti from which they issued (Asat), were objectively real and eternally distinct from Soul, though both Soul and Prakriti are eternal, and uncaused. Dr. Muir, however, refers to the commentators, on the Rig-Veda, who explain Asat as meaning, "an undeveloped state" and adds that if we accept this statement, there will be no contradiction Asat does not mean simply an undeveloped state but the state of pure or formless existence, of the primal substance from which all forms have sprung. It is clear, however, that if Asat means, an undeveloped state then Sat must mean, not the essence of anything, but a developed state. the development of the existing world as Kapila uses it. The writer of the Vedic hymn (R. V. X. 57) meant to say that Agni was Asat, but, became Sat in the birth. (Janman), of Daksha and in the womb of Aditi. It is clear also that Kapila, in this part of his system, incorporated, an older theory, in which Asat denoted, at least the undeveloped state from which existing things have been developed. Sat was the whole of existent things. In Rig-Veda. I. 96, 7, Agni is called Sat as gopa, the guardian of that which has a present being. There is also the germ of another part of his system in a hymn of this Veda. (X. 129). "There was then neither Asat nor Sat." There was only the one Supreme Spirit dwelling in self-existence. "Desire, then, in the beginning, (agree) arose in It, which was the earliest germ of mind, and wise men there beheld in their heart, not being ignorant, that this is the bond between Asat and Sat." In the system of Kapila, it is an unconscious impulse on the art of Prakriti, or instinctive desire to set the soul free from matter which causes the emanation of Prakriti into the manifold forms of developed life (Sat). This latter was, in Kapila's view, an effect, because developed, and implying therefore a developing cause.

His Refutation.

1. If the Purusha's intelligence is pure, Prakriti cannot envelope it. As such, even after Moksha, he will become covered again. As we cannot get rid of the evil effects of Prakriti by perceiving them to be evil with the aid of the Supreme Intelligence (Parasakti or Divine Arul), he can never attain Moksha. To the Pure Being (God) there is no veiling by Mula-prakriti.

2. When the Purusha is united to Prakriti, the Purusha's intelligence becomes cleared up a little and with this it guides the dark Prakriti and eats the fruits thereof, as does the lame man seated on the back of the blind man guides the latter, so the Purusha is not the Lord (God). He who unites both and actuates their intelligence and activity is no other than the *Ninmala* (Hara).

3. The Purusha is not *self-luminous*. Prakriti is insentient. Know that there is a First Cause who evolves these two. If mukti is attained by knowledge (that you are not prakriti) no, you cannot get it by such knowledge. For removing the bondage, the help of the person who brought about the union is required. This bondage will be removed by the Grace of God. By following the fourfold path of Sariya, &c. secure the Grace of the *Ninmala* God, and remove your physical bondage.

J. M. Nallaswami Pillai, B. A., B. L.,

(To be continued).

THAYUMANAVAR'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page* 84).

இனியே தெமக்குனருள் வருமோ வெனக்கருதி
யேங்குதே னெஞ்சமையோ
இன்றைக் கிருந்தாகை நாளைக் கிருப்பரென்
றெண்ணவோ நிடமில்லையே
அனியாய மாயிந்த வுடலோ டெனதுவரு
மந்தகற் காளாகவோ
ஆடித் திரிந்தான் கற்றதற் கேட்டது
மலலவாய்ப் போதனன்றே
கனியேனும் வறியசெங் காயேனு முதிர்சருகு
கந்தமூ லங்களேனும்
கனல்வாதை வந்தெய்தி னள்ளிப் புசித்தான்
கண்மூடி மௌனியாகித்
தனியே யிருப்பதற் கென்னிசை வெண்ணமித
சாமீர் யறியாததோ
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே. (கoச)

104. *O Satchithânanda Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all! I merely wear away under complete despondency that I may not at all get Thy blessed Grace, inasmuch as, O Lord, I cannot be confident of visiting again to-morrow, any person whom I might meet to-day. The book of Fate lies quite concealed.

Alas! The God of death should come at any moment in a proud attitude and take away *this* physical body. Is it *all* my merit that I should end this life in mere *suffering* although I have had good deal of struggle to acquire the spiritual knowledge by reading and by hearing?

O Supreme Lord, art Thou not cognisant of my internal desire to quench the fire of hunger by * stuffing up my belly either with fruits or with unripe fruits or with dead leaves or vegetables and sit silent in Thy contemplation in solitude, with my eyes closed for ever?†

மத்தமத கரிமுகற் குலமென்ன நின்றிலகு
வாயிலுடன் மறியகடோய்
மாடக டச்சிரை மொய்த்தசந் திரகாந்த
மணிமேடை யுச்சிமீது
முத்தமிழ் முழுச்சுமேடன் முத்தாகை யார்களொடு
முத்தமுத் தாய்க்குலாவி
மோகத் திருந்தமென் யோகத்தி னிலிருன்ற
மூச்சைப் பிடித்தடைத்துக்
கைத்தல நகப்படை விரித்தபுலி சிங்கமொடு
கரடி தழை தழைகொண்ட
கானகமெ யுச்சியிற் குகையூ டிருந்தமென்
காதலா மலகமென்னச்
சித்தமற மோனநிலை பெற்றவர்க ளுய்வர்காண்
சனகாதி தனிவிதன்றே
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே (கoஞ)

105. *O Satchithânanda Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all!

What if a man is placed in the pleasures of the household, say, such as rejoicing in company with the women of pearl-like teeth charming and excelling in beauty and best conversant in Tamil in its three-fold* classifications, in a lofty palace, at the top-most story, so high as to reach the moon-centre and so well built up of moon-stones as to, by itself, excite lust therewith, and where in front of the gate are arrayed the elephants which are as dark as the thick-gathered clouds? Or, on the other hand, what is the use † of merely living the secluded life of a recluse, say, sitting dumb in Yoga, controlling the breath, either in caves or in the summits of dark-wooded mountains where there are lairs of long-clawed tigers, lions or bears?

Is it not a fact as clear as day-light that those only can expect themselves to be saved who set upon *Thy Divine contemplation* in silence? Is *this* not the fundamental Truth aimed at by the *Munis* Sanaka &c.

* *c. f.* 36th and 48th verses regarding 10 vital airs.

† The Saint gives a caution to himself to invoke and get, if he can, the Supreme Lord's Arul before ever he should discard his body which is quite uncertain. *c. f.* "Procrastination is the thief of time." "Winnow the corn while the wind blows."

* The 3 classes of Tamil are (1) இயற்றமிழ் (Natural grammatical Tamil whether prose or poetry), (2) இசைத்தமிழ் (Tamil adapted to music), (3) நாடகத்தமிழ் (dramatic Tamil).

† The Saint points out in this verse that there is no evil of household life; nor any real bliss or benefit in a *Sannyasin's* life of mere yoga practice. Under either conditions of human life one would do well only if he should fix himself upon God's Grace in contemplation. *c. f.* the Saint's stanza

"சாட்டையிற் சம்பாசனம்போலெல்லாம்,
ஆட்டுனையிறையெனதிது வெஞ்சமே,
தேட்டமென்றதனுட் செயலிறதிசேன்,
கிட்டதந் தனைமிசையு னென்னமேல்."

(Just like a top on its point made to spin
By means of a cord; so do yourself see
That th' Lord rules all; and were you, then, to win
Th' Lord's Grace alone, in world or retired be).

கைத்தலம் விளங்குமொரு நெல்லியங் கனியெனக்
கண்டவே தாகமத்தின
காட்சிபுரு வார்த்தமதின் மாட்சிபெற முற்றியது
கருதினது மானமாதி
உற்றபல வாகிரு விகற்பமே லில்லையா
லென்றே டரஞ்டென்னவோ
உரையுமீ நீயுமீ நானுமீ லென்பது
முபாயநீ யுண்கொளும்
சிததமுள ஞனில்லை யெனுமவ்சன நீயறிவை
தெரியார்க் டெரியவசமோ
செப்புகே வலநீதி யொப்புவமை யல்லவே
சின்முத்தி ராங்கமரபில்
சத்தமற வெனையாண்ட குருமௌனி கையினற்
றமியனேற் குதவுபொருளே
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே. (கoசு)

106. *O Satchithânanda Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all! Clear as a nelli* fruit on the palm are the four *purusharthas* † announced in the Vedagamas. Of these the fourth and the supremest is the *moksha*. To think of this Final End to be aimed at by the souls and to understand truly its nature. Different *schools* of philosophy define It differently by means of several logical methods such as *anumana*‡ &c. But in the soul's undifferentiated *anubhava*§ of the profound meditation on Thee, these logical reasonings cease to have any use. In that supreme state of Changeless Peace, there is no speech at all. *There* the souls in their absorbed state cannot say *either one or two.*

The saying there is neither 'Thou' nor 'I,' is simply a method adopted to teach the *Sivôhambhâvana*‖ practice of Sariya, Kiriya, Yoga and Gnana. For, in reality, *Thou art a Being as well as I am a being.* Then what is meant by saying 'There is no individual existence as ego or 'I'?¶ *Thou* knowest it well. How can those percieve it who are yet not free from their anava or ignorance? To make them know it, there is nothing else we can pitch upon to compare with the *Moksha* state or *anubhava.*

Do Thou help me, O The Supreme End and Aim of my solemn initiation by my Guru Mauni, the silent teacher, by the Symbol of True Gnana.

காயாத மரமீதி லேலேறு செல்லுமோ
கடவுணீ யாங்களடியேம்
கர்மபந் தத்தினுற் சன்மப்பந் தும்பெறக்
சற்பித்த தன்னதருளே
வாயார வுண்டபேர் வாழ்த்துவது நொந்தபேர்
வைவதுவு மெவ்வுளுகை
வாய்பாடு சிற்சின் வைதிக வொழுங்குசீ
வாழ்த்தினுற் பெறுபேறதான்
ஓயாது பெறவொண முறையிட்ட தாற்பின்ன
ருளறுவது கருமமன்றும்
உபயநெறி யீதென்னி னுசிதநெறி யெந்தநெறி
யுலகிலே பிழைபொறுக்கும்
தாயான கருணையு முனக்குன் டெனக்கிவிச்
சஞ்சலங் கெடவருள்செய்வாய்
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே.

107. O *Satchithânanda Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all!

No stones will be aimed at a tree which bears no fruits. So it is but Thy Grace that does set us (souls) to the cycle of evolution and that invokes our love of devotion and prayer to Thee; Thyself being our Benevolent Lord (*Pathi*)* and ourselves Thy dependent slaves (*Pasus*) suffering under the° *pasa bhanda* or bonds of life.

But it has been the rule of custom in this world of evolution that those, who have had their hunger appeased, praise Thee and those who have to suffer from want, upbraid Thee. Of these two methods, the first is the commendable one. And the vicious act of upbraiding Thee has to be avoided indeed, inasmuch as the Vedagamas proclaim† that it is only by Thy adoration and praise that the souls can achieve the Highest End of *Siva-Sayujya.*‡

Since Thou possessest *also* the motherly Forbearance and Grace, do Thou, my Lord, cause my mental agonies to disappear.

R. SHANMUGA MUDALIAR.

(To be continued).

* Nelli is a kind of Indian fruit of grape-like appearance.

† Vide 41st verse with notes.

‡ The 3 essential Logical methods are (1) Prathiatcha (observation and experiment) (2) Anumâna (Inference) and (3) Agama (Testimony or Authority). Vide p. 3 of *Siddhanta Deepika* Vol. I, where my esteemed brother Mr. Nallaswami Pillai gives fuller details.

§ Anubhava—experience.

‖ Vide notes to 53rd verse and *c. f* 91st verse with notes.

¶ It means that the soul can only live and act by its co-existence with the Lord and by the power of the *Lord*; just as consonants can sound only by the help of the vowel. '*a*'. *c. f.* verses 8, 25, 50 with notes.

* *c. f.* 25th verse and notes to '*Pasupathi.*'

† *c. f.* notes to 37th verse.

‡ *c. f.* notes to 41st verse for '*Siva-Sayujya.*'

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika

MADRAS, OCTOBER 1898.

ANCIENT TAMILIAN CIVILIZATION.

We extract elsewhere from the *Indian Social Reformer*, what appeared in its editorial columns and notes, on the 'Pioneers of South Indian Civilization.' The subject is one which, as may well be conceived, was nearest our heart and we were postponing its consideration from a variety of causes, and we have to thank our learned contemporary for giving us a chance, by his characteristic outspokenness, for stating our own views more fully and thus remove some misconceptions from his mind as regards our real position. There is an absurd sentiment abroad, known by some high sounding (meaningless) names which is thoroughly destructive of independence of thought and honest criticism, and before which, as we will show, even the boldest and truest minds have quailed. Its baneful influence is being felt in the cause of religion, and humanity and truth. To proceed with our subject, we wish to settle the terminology by which we can describe South India and the South Indian people. Nobody dares now use 'Turanian', though we used to hear it in our school-boy days. 'Dravidian' was brought into use by the late Bishop Caldwell, but even this is dropping out of use. 'South India,' 'South Indian people' and 'South Indian languages' are more often used now but even these are too unwieldy and cumbersome. We want a word as elegant and as short as 'Aryan,' and no better word than 'Tamilian' can be thought of. The Reverend Dr. Pope gives reasons for giving preference to this word, in his first paper on the 'Poets of the Tamil lands,' contributed to the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* and which we extracted in our columns. The people of Malabar see no objection to it. The difficulty is with the Canarese and Telugu people. The Canarese people would seem to occupy a back seat now for literary purposes. They do not seem to know themselves nor their relations to their neighbours. Even they can be made to see how purely Tamil is their language and customs. When we heard some Canarese songs, the quaint old harmony of the *Devara* hymns seemed to strike our ears. The Telugu people have been the worst to subject themselves to Sanscritic influences, and they will be the most difficult people to be dealt with. However we wish to give greater currency to Dr. Pope's choice. The oldest Tamil writers spoke of '*Vada-mori*,' and '*Ten-mori*,' and '*Aryam* and Tamil,' and to them it did not seem to have occurred that any other language could stand in comparison, much less in opposition to these two. Saint Appar speaks of God, "ஆரியத்தமிழை மையாளவன்" Saint Thirumular also speaks of Aryam and Tamil as the only primaeval languages (*vide* stanza 9, p. 81 of this volume). Saint Gnanasambantha considers Aryan and Tamil as the only two languages worth learning. "ஆரியத்தொடு செந்தமிழ்ப்பயன் அறிவார்".

We next wish to note our perfect agreement with the views expressed by our contemporary, though we in no way fall back from our views already expressed by us in these pages. Our friends well know that we have been expressing these views ever so long in private, and we however communicated them in brief in a letter to the *Weekly Review* (Madras) sometime in 1896 and we extract the whole article here, as its importance is more felt by what we hear of certain doings from Sivakasi.

"Dr. Pulny Andy's hobby.—In re your editorial note on Dr. Pulny Andy's hobby, permit me to make the following observations. As in some of these questions you can look at a thing from many points of view, you may consider the question from its historical bearings how these castes originated and whether and when these underwent changes, &c., and the questions which thus open up are of vast importance. Several of the castes have thus received interest; and among them Vanniyas call themselves Kshatriyas and the Shanars call themselves also Kshatriyas, and these two castes with the Kammalas, being rich and intelligent, are able to fight out their own way. The Kurumbers are a much despised and backward community; but European antiquarians have come to their help, and the Revd. Foulkes supposes that they with the Vanniyas are the remnants of the old pre-Chola dynasties of Chalukyas &c. Of course I do not belong to any of these castes and consequently cannot be accused of taking sides. Still I am bound to say their claims have some sort of foundation or

other. But there is one fundamental fallacy in the consideration of this question and which fallacy has been pointed out and yet ignored in other fields than in questions of Ethnology. The fallacy is to seek for sanction and precepts from the Vedas and other Sanscrit books for a people who are essentially Tamilians. It is my view *that Tamilians were not derived directly from the settlers in the north during the Indian Vedic days, and that the Tamilians did not emigrate from the north of India to the south* **by choices or by force**; *that they are not to be identified with the people whom the Vedic settlers encountered and called Dasyus; that if they did settle in the south from outside, they did so* **by the sea and not by land** *and through mountain ranges, and that they came from Assyria and Asiatic Minor, the oldest seat of ancient civilization. I further think, that once they entered India by the western sea-gate they spread themselves rapidly over the whole of South India up to the Dandakaranya and the Vindhya which at that time must have been impassable, and that they developed their letters and arts and sciences and law and Government which, at the time, they came in contact with the northern settlers, must have been in a sense perfect.* About the same time or probably later, the Vedic people settled in the north and developed their arts and civilization; and perhaps, for thousands of years, the people in the north had no idea of the people of the south, and if they had any, they probably stood in the relation of Lord Salisbury's blackman and the orthodox Brahmin's white barbarian. The point which I wish to draw out is, that the Vanniyas or Shanars may have occupied positions of as much respectability as they now claim among the orginal Tamil people; but probably suffered a disgrace when the Brahmans came down to the south and effected their own supremacy by flattering the ruling princes by telling them they are descended from the illustrious race of the Sun and the Moon. On the other hand, it is difficult to account for the fact, of the great ruling dynasties of the south having left no trace whatever. The case of the Candian exiles in the presidency has given me a clue. After their exile here, they have contracted relationships with some of the indigenous Balija class and call themselves Naidus and, in course of time, all traces of their origin will be completely washed out of their minds or if they do, nobody will easily believe their claims. I doubt not therefore that when one dynasty upset a previous one, the latter were forced to flee the country and seek homes elsewhere, and there, hide their name and origin and become hewers of wood and drawers of water and undertake such low occupations, as were despised by the other sections of the community who found favour or were tolerated by the new dynasty. Such questions therefore derive importance in one way, namely, if these despised castes should recognize their old high position and should therefore bestir themselves and strive to better their position by education, &c., I should say they should have all honour and glory. In such a case, a quiet laugh from an outsider will not be meet at all. *Of course, as I have already stated, there is an element of absurdity in their adopting and identifying themselves with such foreign names as Brahman or Kshatriya, in the same way as a high class Hindu should assume European dress and call himself an European.* (I purposely abstain *from another comparison which their enemies* would suggest.) Apart from these considerations, of course, the question is of no moment to any party and the historical and antiquarian interest altogether being wanting in the Indian he is disposed no doubt to treat this question offhand. *The question, however, which I have raised here, in regard to the distinct origin and development of the Tamils and Aryans, is of very great importance though it has attracted very few writers in the field, though the able dissertation of Mr. Nelson is an important contribution to the subject so far as the domains of South Indian Law is considered.*"—The *Weekly Review*.

We refer more particularly to the portions italicized, and we may be allowed to say that we were the first to broach the notion that the Tamilians had no sort of connection with the north or the northern settlers, and they never derived their letters or arts or civilization from the Aryans, or at any rate, we never before remember to have seen or met with the theory suggesting a sea-route across the Arabian Sea from Assyria. The theory most prevalent some decades back was the aboriginal theory. Then came the theory that they were aborigines conquered by the invading Aryans, who called them Dasyus and drove them south. Then came the theory, the latest, that they were also Aryans or pre-Aryans, like the Celts and Cymri in Ireland who were gradually forced down south. In regard to the Tamil language itself, our old Tamil Professor—no—Superintendent of Tamil studies,—himself a Tamilian from the extreme South, used to hold forth that it was derived altogether from the Sanscrit, though his successor in the chair spoke of the affinities lying deeper between Sanscrit and Tamil, and spoke of the two peoples living together in the father land, at a very remote time, and used to derive every Tamil word from Sanscrit by all sorts of tortuous processes. We were however inclined to think at one time that the relation of Tamil to Sanscrit would be like that of Anglo-Saxon to Latin and Greek; and though this may be true still to a certain extent as regards the outermost polish, yet this could not be true as regards the origin of the two peoples and their languages. Nearly all these theories

suggested a connection with the North somehow or other and we had first to disabuse our mind of all such notions and the main lines of argument we followed were the following. The Tamil people do not bear any marks of a conquered race. If they are, rather we should say, were, proud of any one thing it was of their independence, and as it is his speech which brings out a man's real nature, we see in the Tamil language a vigor, and independence displayed which is unparalled in the history of the world amidst similar surroundings. The early Tamil writers were so scrupulous as not to admit foreign words and their influence must have been so great at one time that even Aryan writers dared not take libertics with the language. Its influence was so great that it brought the whole body of Aryan settlers in the South under its complete sway, so that we have, as we had already remarked, very few works of any importance written in Sanscrit by South Indian Aryans before the 8th and 9th centuries after Christ. It was not the case of the Aryans taking the Tamilians under their wings at first; though there can be no doubt that under the later Dynasties of Pandya, Chera and Chola which upset the previous and more genuine Tamil Dynasties, they gained more in power and influence. If a conquered race, they cannot boast of a proverb, "தூவாவெல்லாம் உழுவார் புறக்கடையில்," 'all the learned men (brahmins) wait at the gate of the cultivator', which by the way expresses the dignity of labour in no measured terms. The Tamilians never, at any time, called themselves 'Dasa,' as do the people of the North and it is in the so-called more civilized districts, and among the more civilized non-Brahmins, that the term Sudra is used, and one Tamil writer tried to bring into use the words Sat-sudra (சற் சூத்திரன்) and Asat-sudra (அசற் சூத்திரன்); otherwise each one called himself by his respective calling, trade, or profession. There was no castes then, unless the social distinctions into முதலியர்* இடையர் and கடையர் can be called so. Till within half of a century or so, all the real temporal power, all the land, all the wealth, and the professions were confined to the non-Brahmin classes, though there were no doubt exceptions to the rule. The terms அய்யர்,† அந்தணர், பார்ப்பார், ஓதுவார், which were common names at first to describe the learned, and which were subsequently applied to the Brahman settlers, show in what character they became known to the Tamilians for the first time and when they came. They had teachers, and writers and bards and sages among themselves and so could appreciate these new people. If they were not a conquered race, they would not have found their way to the south by mere choice leaving the most fertile Indus and Gangetic plains, crossing those formidable obstacles of the Vindhya and Dhandakaranya. The story of Agastya subduing the power of the Vindhya Mountain refers evidently to the fact of the Brahmin being the first to cross to the Tamil country, and his learning Tamil from the Supreme Siva cannot be mistaken in its import. When the story of Ramayana opens, we see Agastya already settled in the Tamil country and though we find that other stray settlers a little to the north, were molested by the tribes living there, yet Agastya is reported to be all powerful in the extreme South, having conciliated the people and become one with them; and the Ramayana records that it was through his influence, the exiled and despairing Rama got the Pasupathastra from Siva *i.e* the co-operation and support of the Tamil tribes to recover his lost wife from the hands of the chief of Singalese (a fierce people even now) whose country was not so far removed from the main land as now. And there can be no excuse for the writer of the Ramayana for his *ungrateful* and *ungenerous travesty* of the Tamilians, and the gross exaggerations and hyperboles he deals with; and the only excuse could be that he was altogether ignorant of the Tamil people. Oriental Scholars say that the work itself is later than the actual composition of Mahabharata, and if so, the book should have been written from a worse cause than mere ignorance. The very next work in order of date, as it is usually reckoned, is the Mahabharata, and we find that at that time, the Tamil land had a settled form of Government and a polity, and the conquering hero could only hope to achieve his object by intermarriage. The position of woman was one of complete subordination under the Aryan Polity, and we do not hear of a single princess who held sole regal sway. On the other hand the position of women in the Tamil land is that of an equal, if not more, as in Malabar, and the Heads of the Pandi and the Kerala were Queens.

If therefore they did not come from the north, they must have formed the aborigines or if they came from outside, where did they come from? If we can

* In the oldest Tamil works Brahmins are called Mudaliyars. In Ceylon, it is still conferred by Government as a title.

† In the old pial schools, the pupils addressed their teacher always as அய்யர், whatever the caste of the latter may have been.

forget for a while our prejudice against the word aborigines, and if we can believe in the tradition of there having been a vast continent south of Cape Comorin, whence all humanity and civilization flowed east and west and north, then there can be nothing strange in our regarding the Tamilians as the remnants of a pre-deluvian race. Even the existing works in Tamil faintly speak of 3 separate deluges which completely swamped the extreme southern shores and carried off with it all its literary treasures of ages. And it stands to reason why, in South India, unlike in ancient Chaldea and Babylon, none of the old records of the pre-historic civilization are absolutely not forthcoming. The Palmleaf, the readiest material and the most fragile, one which the Tamilians had, must also account for it. However, this theory stands on no historical or scientific footing. And when we remembered that the earliest route known to the Europeans was by the sea and that even in days of King Solomon, there was a brisk trade between his country and Western India, and from what Dr. Caldwell had pointed out there were a number of Tamil words in the Hebrew and when it was known that there were a large number of words common to the Tamil and Assyrian or Sumerian, and what important part the monsoon winds play in the Arabian Gulf, it does not seem improbable to conclude that the first settlers in Western India must have been sailors or merchants coasting along the Arabian Sea who were driven thitherward by adverse winds and stranded. In this connection, we publish below extracts from the correspondence we had with the late lamented Professor P Sundaram Pillai. The argument turned on the fact whether the original of a certain work was Sanscrit or Tamil, and he held that it was the latter against the received tradition and he wrote to say (letter dated 31st March 1896).

* * * * * *

"On the contrary, the 2nd point of difference implies a substantial divergence of views with respect to the *Historic* position of our Saiva Religion and Philosophy. With all deference to the Vedas, which have subsequently become the Dravidian as well as the Aryan Bible, I believe the Saiva system of thought and worship *peculiarly* our own. With our usual complaisance we have surrendered our right to it, no less than to the temples which, you know, were originally constructed by us and administered entirely by our குருக்கள் and which it is now a pollution for them to enter and worship with அர்ச்சனை &c. கலாபகன் புற்றறிக்கப் பாம்பு குடியிருக்கும் is a significant proverb applicable in many ways to the history of the poor Dravidian race. Please think over the matter calmly and in the spirit of *historical criticism*. I can't hope to convince you of the truth of my statement in the course of a letter however long."

* * * * * *

We wrote in reply that though we differed in regard to the particular book in question, we were in the main agreed as to the independence of the Tamil race. This brought a reply on 19th December 1896.

* * * * * *

I am glad, indeed, you are feeling your way to accept the truth I conveyed to you by the proverb of the snake and white ants. I regret I have not yet been able to formulate my theory for popular conviction: but am doing what I can to prepare the minds of gentlemen like you from Ceylon to Bangalore for the full recognition of the truth when publicly announced. The Vellalas who form the flower of the Dravidian race have now so far forgotten their nationality as to habitually think and speak of themselves as Sudras (and even more stupidly as Vaisyas) exactly as the ignorant among them call themselves in courts of law as of அஞ்ஞனமத்தம் at the bidding of the so-called கூத்தக்கர் Christians. In fact to tell them that they are no more Sudras than Frenchmen and that the Aryan polity of castes was the cunningly forged fetters by which their earliest enemies—the Aryans of the North—bound their souls which is worse than binding hands and feet might sound too revolutionary a theory, though historically but a bare fact. I have converted privately several to this opinion among the leaders of the community here and there: and I must go on with the work, sometime more, in the same noiceless fashion before I can trust myself to print. Most of what is ignorantly called Aryan Philosophy, Aryan civilization is literally Dravidian or Tamilian at bottom. The idea of *jeevan*, of Karma of Maya and of Divine Grace or அருள் can be directly proved to be ours, and most of the great thinkers and philosophers and even poets who pass for Aryan are our men as Europeans are now beginning to find out. But I cannot go further just now in the course of this letter. Let the idea work in you and you will find enough of proof yourself. What a lamentable history is ours! It crushes my heart to think of it"!

* * * * * *

We also communicated to him the letter we wrote to the *Weekly Review* and he expressed his perfect agreement with us, though another Tamil Scholar asked us for our proofs. In the editorial contributed by him to the *Madras Standard* on 30th January 1897, under the heading of the 'Basic element of Hindu Civilization',

he took more courage and came out with his views in stronger language than in his letter, which we also extract, so that it may not go altogether into oblivion.

"THE history of Indian Civilization is the old story of the Giant and the Dwarf. The victories in it are the victories of the vaunting Aryan, while the wounds are the wounds of the bleeding pre-Aryan. Our Dwarf to boot is the most self-denying of ethnical units imaginable, claiming nothing, rejoicing in small mercies, and glorying in accepting any nickname his proud, disdainful, partner may be pleased to bestow on him. How much of the justly celebrated Hindu Philosophy, Hindu Literature and Hindu Learning may be due to the despised non-Aryan races of India, and how little to the Brahmins who appear long ago to have grasped the key to it, is perhaps the hardest problem that the scientific historian of India will ever have to encounter. To the people at large even the all-important ethnical distinction of Aryan and non-Aryan is as good as inconceivable. Even the best educated among the latter are lost in the senseless scramble to rise to the supposed superior grades of Aryan castes, as little applicable to them as to the members of the 'celestial empire.' Those of them who have learned to call themselves the *Sudras* '*the wretched*' exactly as the ignorant Hindu complacently speaks of himself as of 'Ajnana Matham' at the bidding of the Christian missionary, consider it the acme of social elevation to be known as *Vysias*, meaning simply the masses or the people at large, while the classes below them such as the *Shanars* or the *Elavas* aspire to the name of Kshatriyas, probably on the principle of asking for a thousand in the hope of getting a hundred. How ludicrous, and yet how melancholy, are the efforts made by a Vellala, a Coorg, a Kayasta to shuffle off the natural dignity of his own independent non-Aryan position and to pass muster as a Vaisya, *a man of the masses*! It will take long, long, indeed, therefore, for native scholars to shake off the shackles of current notions, and to face the problem with the requisite calmness and independence of thought. Till then, we have to depend only on European research, subject to all the disadvantages that foreign scholarship is naturally heir to. Already with the best among the *savants* of Europe and America such as Goldstucker, Muir, Max Muller, Cowel, Deussen Charles Johnston, and others, the truth has found unreserved acceptance that the ground-work of Hindu Philosophy is *not* Brahminical, that neither the doctrine of an all-embracing supraconscious Brahman nor of an Atma bent upon absorption into it, nor again of Maya, of Karma, or metampsychosis is consistent or compatible with the system of ceremonials and "the milking of Gods" for material advantages which alone the early Aryan invader of India was capable of conceiving as religion. Most of the Upanishads—those hoary compilations which still continue to be the wonder of the world—contain internal evidences of a most unmistakable character of their origin in an altogether different tribe, red in colour as opposed to the white foreigner, but subsequently admitted into the Aryan polity under the name of the Kshatriyas. Pregnant with history is the declaration of King Pravahana in the *Brihad Aranyaka* when addressing Uddalaka, the Brahmin, he says: "*This wisdom never hitherto dwelt in any Brahman.*" A Rajanya, like Pravahana was Visvamitra, the author of the *Gayatri*—the holiest of the Brahmin holies—and to the same non-Aryan tribe belonged Buddha—the Light of the East—and of a tribe, though somewhat different, being the black one, but yet equally pre-Aryan and Scythian, was born Krishna whose divine song is so unparalleled in beauty and in truth.

"But the attempt to find the basic element of Hindu civilization by a study of Sanscrit and the history of Sanscrit in Upper India is to begin the problem at its worst and most complicated point. India south of the Vindhyas, the Peninsular India, still continues to be India proper. Here the bulk of the people continue distinctly to retain their pre-Aryan features, their pre-Aryan languages, their pre-Aryan social institutions. Even here, the process of Aryanization has gone indeed too far to leave it easy for the historian to distinguish the native warp from the foreign woof. But if there is anywhere any chance of such successful disentanglement, it is in the South; and the further South we go, the larger does the chance grow. The scientific historian of India then ought to begin his study with the basin of the Krishna, of the Cauvery, of the Vaiga rather than with the Gangetic plain as it has been now long, too long, the fashion.

"It is impossible, therefore, to exaggerate the value of any undertaking which endeavours in any direction to expand our general knowledge of the South—our knowledge of the ancient Dravidian civilization, Dravidian Literature, Philosophy or Religion, the vestiges of which in however altered a garb, do still present themselves at every turn. Of these, the Saiva Siddhanta Philosophy is by no means the least important. It has been justly styled by that able and amiable Tamil scholar—Dr. Pope—'the choicest product of the Dravidian intellect.

It is melancholy to note that the Professor had actually started from his home just before his death, on a lecturing tour, and alas! The country has lost altogether the matured wisdom of a cultured Tamilian. We, however, think he made a mistake in coupling and confusing the North Indian non-Brahmins and Tamilians. As we are afraid our article is spun out a good deal, we stop to-day, hoping to pursue the theme at a more convenient moment.

LORD SAMBANDHA AND AN UNKNOWN *TAMILIAN* PROSODY

It is not easy to trace the existence of any prosody common to the languages of the *Tamilian* group. No body ever suspects that the prosody of Tamil can have anything to do with its sister languages. The prosodies of the *Tamilian* languages seem to differ so immensely and so radically from each other that one hardly suspects the possibiliiy of detecting anything common to them. No doubt the prosodies of Telugu and Canarese are apparently identical with a few points of deviation. Malayalam, we hear, has nothing more than Sanskrit prosody, a fact shewing the recent origin of its poetry. But the establishment of a common *Tamilian* prosody with the comparative history of the several prosodies of the *Tamilian* languages has been not only an impossible task but altogether an unsuspected fact solely on account of the greatest obscurity in which Tamil prosody has ever been involved and the extreme and surprising scautines of its treatment by Tamil writers. There has ever been a great disproportion between the immense and ever-growing poetical fields of Tamil literature and the inflexible nature of its limited prosody which was apparently completed in ancient days and could not consistently with its ancient dignity be interfered with in the opinion of Tamil prosodians.

Tamilian Prosody unsuspected.

Tamil prosody may be instructively compared to the ancient Common Law of England ,'having completed its development in the sense that a girl completes her education and having suddenly grown prim and dry and become to a great extent '*Jus strictum*;' that is to say, a system positive and inflexible and one which is unable to accommodate itself to the exigencies of a larger world than the school in which it had been formed." But the defects of the English Common Law have been in time remedied by its handmaid equity and it is a mystery why Tamil prosody which has become unfit for further development and which no writer who had any reverence for antiquity could venture to tamper with, has not been supplemented as Common Law was by equity. The result was that Tamil versification has grown into a mass of the wildest confusion unarranged, unclassified, unscanned, undescribed, unnamed and undistinguished. The verses sometimes, in consequence, overlap and mix with each other in a hopelessly inextricable confusion. If it were not for the high intellectual energy of its poets, Tamil prosody would long ago have lost all vitality and collapsed into a lifeless mass. It is wonderful how even in the midst of this utter confusion, the minutest *Tamilian* principles have been preserved unimpaired by poets in the course of a large many centuries.

Tamil prosody resembles English Common Law.

Tamil versification a wilderness.

It is therefore the defective and cramped nature of Tamil prosody that is responsible for our not detecting and grasping the common metrical principles of the *Tamilian* languages. Perhaps no other language at the time of its greatest prosperity possessed such an immensely wide field of versification and yet no other language so totally neglected its prosody and accorded such a perfunctory treatment bequeathing to us a nominal prosody so unworthy of its vast poetical literature. If Tamil had possessed a complete prosody quite commensurate to its vast literature like its sister languages, a glance through these prosodies would long ago have enabled any reader to detect their common ground.

Tamilian Prosody unknown because Tamil Prosody unexplored.

Tamilian prosody may be divided into three periods, *viz.*, (1) the Pre-*Tamilic* period, (2) The *Tamilic* period, (3) The Sanskrit period. Tamil flourished through all the three periods. Telugu and Canarese belong only to the 2nd and 3rd periods and Malayalam only to the 3rd.

Divisions of *Tamilian* Prosody.

During the Pre-*Tamilic* period, the four main metres of Tamil flourished *viz.*, அகவல், வெண்பா, வஞ்சி and கலி Of these four, அகவல் which is a little better than prose was the earliest and next to it was வெண்பா These two were the primary main metres of the language and are coeval with Tamil prosody itself. From அகவல் it would appear வஞ்சி is derived and வெண்பா has given birth to கலிப்பா. These two therefore are the derivative metres.

Pre-*Tamilic* Prosody.

There is nothing in Telugu and Canarese prosodies that bears any resemblance to these metres or the principles that govern them. The Tamil metrical formulæ must have come into existence at this period and are quite unsuited to the other languages There is no such thing as வெண்பா elsewhere though it plays such an important part in Tamil metres. The

Non-existence of other prosodies during this period.

Tamil formula ... is quite foreign to the prosodies of the other languages and has never been recognised as a foot. The absence of any such similarities as also of ancient poems in those other languages points to the fact that those languages had no poetry worth the name during this period when these metres came into existence and flourished. The Tamil prosody of this period is full, complete and exhaustive. Tholkappiam belongs to this period. Perhaps no prosodians have so much exhausted their energies over their verses as the Tamil prosodians of this period did in the investigation of these ancient Tamil metres. A glance at some of the commentaries shews what a large number of metrical works on prosody flourished during this period and our bitterest complaint is that not even a small share of this attention has ever been bestowed on the much more important poetry of the next *Tamilic* period.

Tamilic Prosody.

The next period is the *Tamilic* poetry when the *Tamilic* metres arose and flourished. Though Tamil, Telugu and Canarese poetries flourished during this period, it was Tamil that seems to have flourished most and to have been richest in *Tamilian* metres.

Sambandha's Poetry.

We have simply to open the inimitable pages of our Lord Sambandha to understand the profuse richness of Tamil poetry during this Tamilic period. We are able to point out nearly one hundred metrical varieties in his Poetry. Was there ever, we ask, any poet, ancient or modern, in any language on the face of the earth not excluding Sanskrit, who has so spontaneously and with such an insatiable thirst for the praise of his Divine Father in Heaven, sung on that same subject so many interesting varieties of lovely verses as nearly one hundred—varieties not based on small distinctions such as are recognised in Sanskrit but differing as widely as any two metres of a language—leaving of course out of consideration the verses which are alleged to have perished? We fear the unparalleled poetical excellences of Sambandha have not been thoroughly understood, appreciated, and admired. We, in our supreme and blissful ignorance of the history of this period, glance at his metres with indifference and sometimes with surprise and nay, with contempt. In fact Lord Sambanda has overflooded the Tamil land with an enormous number of metres of unknown varieties and of unsurpassed perfection, accuracy and beauty and how have we profited by the heavy rains? What have we but a few pools in the poems of a few poets to remind us of the heavy rains having allowed all the precious waters to run down into the salt sea? Perhaps our Lord was too high for the simple poets and the simpler people of the Tamil land. We have neglected Tamil Prosody, we have neglected Sambandh's Poetry and what wonder is it that the existence of *Tamilian* Prosody has been unknown to us. We dont read Sambhanda's Poetry because it does not contain any vain philosophic disquisitions or learned commentaries on Vedanta or an ingenious attempt at an Advaitic or Siddhantic interpretation of the Gita or even a faithful record of the much advanced metaphysical experiences of the author. These are more or less vain and pedantic productions of simple men struggling successfully or oftener unsuccessfully for knowledge. But Sambandha's poetry shines far above these cloudy controversial regions like the lofty towering peak in Goldsmith's poetry. Even his biographer, his most ardent and enthusiastic lover and admirer, has not drawn the attention of the world to the unparalleled poetical source of his greatness. Evidently he thought slightly if it as being of a trivial nature. But to us living at this remote period, this is the only light by which all of us could see him and the only point through which he is accessible to all of us. We, philosophers, find nothing in him to quote, not even so much as we find in Appar nor is there allusion to any subtle point of Theology such as we are sure to find even in the dullest Tamil poet. If it were not for our Lord, we would have no traces of the poetry of this period and any attempt at the establishment of anything like Tamilic poetry would prove wholly futile. The poetry of the first period is completely explained in Tholkappium and the works that followed.

Unexplained.

In fact, all the works on Tamil prosody following in his footsteps relate principally to the poetry of the 1st period and if any writer ventured beyond, it was only to say, by a sweeping remark that *Vrittahs* are a secondary class of metres having four equal lines and nothing more; and the unfortunate poetry of this *Tamilic* period therefore has to this day remained obscure and unexplained, so that it has become a problem whether it is capable of complete and satisfactory explanation at all.

Pandit's view.

We imagine the Tamil Pandits might argue that we do not require any classification or nomenclature for Vrittahs as they may be understood by a reader of average

abilities in the course of his studies. Such an imaginary student must really be a prodigy. Are any metres left to be explored by the student himself in Sanskrit or any other language? We do not wish to rely upon the blunders committed by the modern Pandits as they have acquired their proficiency in the most discouraging circumstances. We are here reminded of a fault in a book containing nothing more than a string of illustrative metres where a metre like the opening stanzas of Thayumanavar occurs as illustrative of எழுசீர். We fondly hoped to discover it was a mistake. The preceding metre is அறுசீர் and the succeeding one எண்சீர் and there can therefore be no doubt that the metre in question has been regarded as எழுசீர். We need hardly point out that the metre is அறுசீர். But we can hardly believe that the illustrious author to whom it is attributed could be guilty of it. We are rather inclined to believe that it was not his production as is very common in Hindu literature. The best editions of classical works contain faults in the arrangement of metres. The faults are too many to be passed over as oversights. While the same metre is continued, the editors mark it somewhere as ஏழடி and a different metre is passed over in silence as continuation of same metre without any such note. Such blunders on the part of editors we can point out in scores. But we are unwilling to undertake such an unpleasant task as it will unnecessarily offend the well-earned fame of industrious editors. The same class of metres is fully treated in the other *Tamilian* languages. Of course the Pandit's argument is hardly sound enough to require notice and refutation. But a complete answer to the argument is found in the fact that the neglect of these metres has led to a most disastrous consequence *viz*, the poetry of our Lord Sambandha is unintelligible to the modern critical reader. Tamil versification has been undergoing various changes while it left to drift along and take care of itself and it is a matter for congratulation that it has not met with any serious accident by being wrecked and dashed to pieces. Our sympathies are more for the ancient metres which are very scientific as some of the modern ones seem to be nothing more than accidental forms assumed by ancient ones when they have been left to drift for themselves through centuries.

Ancient and modern *Tamilic* period in Tamil.

This *Tamilic* period is divisible into ancient and modern, so far as Tamil poetry is concerned. There can be no doubt that our verses differ in a great many points from those of the days of Sambandha. A large many metres have altogether disappeared and it would be pedantic on the part of a modern writer to attempt to revive them again; and even those that have had the energy to survive the destroying hand of time are so unlike their ancient prototypes that one can even question their identity; and even where their identity is clear, there are very many serious points of deviation and difference which require satisfactory explanation. A good many principles were in use formerly which would now be considered as gross blunders attributable to ignorance.

No such division in Telugu and Canarese.

No such division as ancient, and modern is apparent in the prosodies of Telugu and Canarese. At least the prosodians, we believe, have laid down no such distinction. Their metres are all of one period, governed by one set of principles presenting no difficulties or irregularities and have never drifted along without the guiding hand of a pilot to meet with various accidents and assume fanciful and unscientific forms though by accident appearing to be measured and harmonious. They were the same throughout, governed by the same principles, without any accidental or other forms and none of them died out. They are altogether as perfect, regular, intelligible and reducible to principles modern Tamil metres are.

Telugu and Canarese a key to lord Sambandha.

But their great importance to us consists in the fact that they throw some light on the question of the solution of ancient metres, especially those of Sambandha. They contain few metres which seem to occur in Sambandha and other old poets. It will be impossible to understand these metres of Sambandha on any principles known to Tamil Pandits or recognised in their prosodies or deducible from modern poetry. *But, they become perfectly intelligible, scientific and admirable metres when look at them in the light of principles assumed in Telugu and Canarese prosodies.* But we regret the prosodies of Telugu and Canarese do not contain more *Tamilic* metres than they now possess. Telugu Pandits tell us that there is no work extant earlier than their Nannaya Bhatta's Bharata. It is therefore not easy to decide whether in those languages there did not flourish more *Tamilic* metres which we meet with in Sambandha and for which we look for similarities in vain in those languages, than what are explained in their prosodies. If Telugu and Canarese Pandits would co-operate with us

and discover earlier works containing old metres, we believe and fondly hope they will contain metres similar to those found in Sambandha and some of the Alwars and we may then hope completely to understand and admire these poets.

Old Telugu and Canarese poems to be discovered.

The earlier works in Telugu were very probably neglected and consigned to oblivion or allowed to perish from too fond a predilection for Sanskrit and its metres. Even at the present day, the Telugu Pandit as well as poet cares more for Sanskrit metres than the *Tamilian* verses. The admixture of *Tamilian* verses in Telugu poetry has been gradually diminishing from the time of Nannaya Bhatta and we have even heard a very learned Telugu Pandit remark with reference to some of the non-Sanskrit verses that they are fit only for women and lower classes. Fortunately the Tamil poets have not lost their heads by this Sanskrit mania and we are glad to note that the influx of Sanskrit metres into Tamil has not been able to stifle out of existence or drive into obscurity the non-Sanskrit verses. Telugu and Canarese writers open their prosodies with Sanskrit metres and their own verses occupy only a secondary importance at the end.

Tamilian metres neglected in Telugu and Canarese.

We now proceed to point out and explain the Telugu and Canarese metres occurring in our Lord Sambandha.

Telugu and Canarese metres in Sambandha.

T. VIRABADRA MUDALIAR, B.A., B.L.

(To be continued).

EXTRACT.

The following extracts we take from the *Indian Social Reformer* under date October 2, 1898.

THE PIONEERS OF SOUTH INDIAN CIVILIZATION.

In his interesting paper on "National Progress" which we published in two recent issues, Mr. M. Tillanayagam Pillay who is entitled to speak with authority, confirms the observations we had to make with reference to Mr. V. Runga Rao's remarks at the Mangalore Hindu Social Reform Association, that the Brahmans were only a microscopic minority and that the social evils peculiar to them were of no importance to the community in general. "It is the Brahmins" said Mr. Tillanayagam Pillay "that brought light and civilization to Southern India. Their example is followed by the other castes who look to them for their regeneration. Let us entreat our educated Brahmin friends, then, to be more humane to their child-widows and prove themselves to be the enlightened conductors of their Hindu brethren, and to lead them on in the path of progress and reformation necessary under the present state of culture, just in the same way as their forefathers did centuries ago, according to their lights." So far as the above relates to the facts of the present day, it is in accord with our own view of the situation. But we cannot accept without question the statement that it was the Brahmans that brought light and civilization to Southern India, nor admit that the non-Brahman Hindus, at the present time when the avenues of culture and progress are open alike to all, when no class is placed under in any special disabilities, and when the administration exercises an indirect but powerful influence in bringing up the classes long looked down upon as beyond the people, are justified in hanging to the coat-tails or rather to the holy thread of the Brahman. For one thing such a procedure is not conducive to their self-respect, and for another, the holy thread of the modern Brahman, made in Manchester and renewed at long intervals, is scarcely equal to the strain. This is, however, an aspect of the present position of the Hindus, that could be best enforced from the non-Brahmin side. It is the view popularly held that "it is the Brahmans that brought light and civilization to Southern India," that we desire to examine in this article. If the statement means anything it means that Southern India before the advent of the Brahmans was plunged in Cimmerian darkness. There was no light, no civilization. The people had perhaps not as yet emerged from the hunting stage. Social and political virtues were unknown or held in abeyance until the Brahmans came and

> Waved his sceptre o'er his kind
> By Nature's first great title, Mind.

It is not our intention, it is certainly not to our interest, to minimise or depreciate whatever services the ancestors of the Brahmans might have rendered to Southern India. That they rendered good service is beyond doubt. In one of the numbers in a previous volume we have specified and eulogised the benefits conferred on the country by Brahmanical influence. It is, however, one thing to make an admission of this kind, and quite a different thing to assert that "it is the Brahmans that brought light and civilization to Southern India." The history of Southern India is as yet very much of a sealed book, but enough is known of it throw serious suspicion upon the claim of the Brahman to be regarded as the pioneer of light and civilization in that part of the country. The fact that Southern India so rapidly assimilated the more important features of the Brahmanical civilization, is itself proof that it had undergone previous to its contact with that civilization a process of preparation quite incompatible with the lightless condition that some people would assign to it. Even the *Siddhanta Deepika* which is wedded to a theory which assigns no mean position to the Brahman in the evolution of South Indian life, speaks in its last number "the very first settlement of North Indian Aryans in the Tamil land, who *soon after their settlement, identified themselves completely* with the Tamil people," and of "feeling of social unity which prevailed in those times between the Aryans and Tamils," and adduces in support that "till the time of Nilakanta and Sankara we have very few Sanskrit works of importance composed in Southern India," and also that 'Gnana Sambantha of the Kaundinya Gotra (a Vedic Gotra by the way) always calls himself very frequently 'Tamil Gnana Sambanthan.'" Was such rapid fusion and such social unity between "the very first settlement of Brahmans" and the Tamils possible if the one had the monopoly of light and the other was a monster of darkness? This it may be objected is a *priori* argument. But is it not borne out by evidence of the presence

in Southern India in pre-Brahmanic times of certain features which require a high degree of civilisation to develop and foster? The art of building, gold coins, a well developed language, a flourishing trade, truthfulness, reverence for law and order, ideas of God-head with which the Aryans had to compromise, the results of which compromise are visible to this day, and the Communial village system are some of them.

We deal in our leading article, necessarily somewhat perfunctorily, with a statement made in his lecture on "National Progress" by Mr. M. Tillanayagam Pillay, regarding the part played by the Brahmans as pioneers of civilization in Southern India, which seems to admit of qualification. The following passage which we take from a learned article in the April number of the *Journal* of the *Royal Asiatic Society* of Great Britain and Ireland, on the "Early Commerce of Babylon with India" by Mr. J. Kennedy, throws some further light on the subject. (Mr. Kennedy's article, we may say, is directed to proving that the international commerce of India did not go so far back into antiquity as some scholars hold). "And now for the sea-trade with India," he writes. "There is ample proof that it flourished from the seventh century B. C; but did it exist earlier? The Dravidian race, which can be traced throughout the greater part of India and Mekran, must have come from the West; it was doubtless akin to the primitive Cushite populations of Arabia and Babylonia; and it dwelt along the seaboard from the entrance of the Persian Gulf to the Indus Delta. *** The Dravidians of Southern India were accustomed to the sea, and afterwards furnished a large proportion of the ships and sailors, not to say the pirates, on the Indian Ocean. So that, although the coasting, perilous, and uninviting, there is no obvious physical or ethnological reason why an early intercourse by sea should not have existed between India and the West'.

"More striking still is the following passage which we take from the same article, criticising the derivation of the Hebrew *yoph* (ape) from the Sanskrit Kapi. "The Hebrews must have known apes and their designations in Egypt; whereas if they had imported them from the West Coast of India, they could not fail to have imported their Tamil name. Rice, peacocks, sandal-wood, every unknown article which we find imported by sea into Babylon before the fifth century B. C *brought with it a Dravidian, not a Sanskrit, designation*; and had apes ever come by this route, they would have found no exception.'

A few quotations from another distinguished writer who has made a study of the subject: "The agricultural races who first ruled India have always been a hospitable and tolerant race, who received strangers and allowed them to take up unoccupied lands in the country without difficulty. They also admired these new comers and were impressed with their genius for organization and Government, and saw the advantages arising from their political system. The great and fundamental difference between this and the republican Government of the Munda village and state was the Turanian belief that a strong central Government ruled by a king was the best means of securing order and unity, and enforcing the observance of the Dravidian maxim that every man and woman must do his or her duty to the State." It was under this form of Government that the lands of India were gradually apportioned among villages united into provinces, and governed by the matriarchal Dravidians from the south, united with the Mons from the north-east; and though the cultivation was scanty, and large areas of land unsuited to the growing of rice and the other national crops were left unoccupied, yet the country must, under the rule of the matriarchal races, have attained a stage of civilisation which not only attracted the cupidity of Northern immigrants, but also led to extensive emigration among the tribes living on the Western Coasts." The same writer describes the national character of the primitive Dravidians as "silent, self-contained, and indomitably obstinate." The Brahmans has always bulked largely in the vision of Indian life, but the foundations of national life, like the foundation of a building, are always hidden from view. If they were otherwise, if the foundation of a building be laid on the surface, the result would be inevitable collapse. Do our educated men sufficiently realise this at the present day?

"A FRIEND was complaining the other day that a gentleman who is to the front in all matters connected with and advantages derived from a certain important movement, has never subscribed a single pie to the funds of that movement. This is typical of the part played by the Brahmans in Indian history. He has taken a platform seat on every occasion, had arrogated to himself or insinuated himself into the most prominent positions in national life, has enjoyed the fruits of the industry and perseverance of his countrymen but he has been strictly adhering to his initial maxim that Brahmans should only take but not give. When years hence owing to the labours of scholars and archæologists, the real history of Southern India comes to be written, when the historian is enabled to penetrate behind appearances which are deceptive, the world will know how much the country is indebted to the silent, self-contained, indomitabe industry of the Dravidian people. Even to-day they are the backbone of our population.

REVIEWS.

I. The **Aitareya Upanishad*** (1st of the series). This is the first of the attempt by the editor and publisher to interpret the eleven Upanishads in Marathi, the vernacular of the Western Presidency; and a most commendable one it is. The masses all over India were satisfied till now with the Divine writings of their Saints who sang and spoke to them in their own vernaculars, though embodying all the best thoughts of these ancient writings. But the spirit of research and critical study induced by Western scholars and translators has also caused a revival of Sanscrit, and there is evidently a great demand among the masses to know the real contents of these ancient scriptures. We have no doubt also that once they have learned their contents, they will have to unlearn a great deal too. For the language, embodying as they do, the thoughts of a very remote and primitive stage is too veiled and highly figurative, and when all the figures are removed, they contain no more than what the people already knew by their own vernaculars. However, we expect that one great good will come out of them. The people now divided into so many different sects and con-

* By Prof. Rajarama Rama Krishna Bhagavata. Published by Tukarama Javaji, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1898. Price 8 As.

flicting creeds will in the light of their past history begin truly to throw off their idiosyncracies, and even if they cannot go back or coalesce, there will be greater good feeling between them. The value of the book is greatly enhanced by the English translation and introduction and notes appended, and the get up of the book and its cheapness are all that can be desired. The Editor pays due homage to the greatness of Sri Sankaracharya, whom one of our Siddhanta Teachers, Saint Umapathi Sivacharya speaks of as '*Mahan Sri Sankaracharya*' but at the same time he is not oblivious to the great drawbacks in his expositions. And says he:—

"The mission of Sankaracharya was the diffusion of the doctrine of the identity of the individual with the universal soul. With this one great idea ever present before him, he is always anxious to establish the imaginary syntactical unity of the Vedanta texts. He had no occasion for a critial study of the various Upanishads which as a matter of fact, represent the views of many independent and often conflicting schools. When there are differences even in regard to the daily rites to be performed by the members of the various Vedic schools, when schism has worked its way even among the followers of Yajur-Veda, the syntactical unity even among the Vedic texts is an impossibility. How much more impossible must the syntactical unity of the Vedantic texts be to a critical eye? Sankaracharya evidently possessed all the powers of a critic of a very high order, but as they conflicted with his great idea, and as the times also were ill suited, he had no occasions to use them or opportunities to develop them. *This fondness for syntactical unity is the great drawback*, which makes his otherwise very valuable commentary not quite always a safe guide in finding out and fixing the meaning of Vedantic texts in not a few places. *Another drawback* is that when the syntactical unity is not in peril Sankaracharya omits altogether to notice words and expressions which at times are found to be very material in determining the meaning of the texts. Barring these two drawbacks Sankaracharya is otherwise a safe and therefore a very valuable guide."

We commend most heartily the enterprise and the public spirit of the editor and publisher, and we have no doubt that the Marathi speaking people in our own Presidency will patronize the publication.

II. **The Psychology of Buddhism.*** By C. C. Bose. This is a reprint of the contribution to the *Mahobodhi Journal* and for any one who desires a succint and clear exposition of Buddhist Metaphysics and Ethics, we can commend this short treatise. The 2nd chapter treats of Skandas, and Mr. Bose is in perfect agreement with us in holding that Buddhism aknowledges no Ego which we call the *Atman* and the Christians, the Soul. We have elsewhere expressed our dissent from the attempt of Mr. Chatterj to identtify our *Atman* and Soul with the Vignana Skandha of Buddha, and Mr. Bose observes:—

"The Pitakas distinctly declare that none of these Skandas or divisions of the qualities of sentient beings is the Soul, when everything including man is subject to change, then every material part of him must change. The Buddhist scriptures teach that there cannot be anything permanent, out of impermanent something." The other chapters deal with 'Karma and Rebirth,' 'Conduct,' 'Concentration;' The four paths, Contemplation, 'Wisdom and Nirvana.'

"The culmination of Buddha's teachings is the realization of that state of blissful thought unconnected with sorrow; and the life of the student has to be so regulated as to make his progress sure. It is a life of self-conquest, a struggle for peace. The control of self is indeed a difficult achievement; but the struggling aspirant who fights on unceasingly against his lower, selfish sensual nature ultimately triumphs and realizes the fruits of his life in the enjoyment of the bliss of calm thought in solitude—Samadhi."

Whatever may be said as to the merit of Bhuddist metaphysics nothing can be grander than the Ethical Ideal of Buddha; and we heartily commend the book to our readers.

* Published by the Mahobodhi Society, Calcutta, 1898. Price 4 as.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

We are glad to acknowledge with thanks a new magazine entitled 'The *New Century*' under the able editorship of Mrs. Katherine Tingley devoted to the cause of Universal Brotherhood. It is an illustrated weekly and the get up is everything that is desirable and the contents are most interesting. We tender our thanks to our other exchanges both Indian and European.

***

We congratulate Mr. R. S. Vedachalam Pillay, Tamil Pundit of the Christian College, in having brought out in a collected form four very ancient and excellent works in Tamil, hitherto unpublished and which are ascribed to a Siddha called *Chittambala Nadigal*. The collection is called by the editor *Siddanta Gnanabotham*, and contains 10 forms, and it is cheap at the price offered namely 8 annas. We will notice the book at length in our next.

WHEN we visited *Kalugumalai* last, the scene of that grim tragedy some years back, we noted that whereas the Mahomedans and Lubbays were allowed to take the water from the temple tank and frequent also some parts of the temple, the Shanars were absolutely prohibited from touching the water and going into the outer courts. This only confirmed our belief that the reason for the ostracism of some of the Tamilian-sections were more political than religious. It is remarkable how freely and intimately the

Mahomedans in South India move with the Tamilians, and how strongly marked is the feeling between the Hindus and Mahomedans in North India. In the South, the last dominant power was that of the Mahomedans, whereas in the North, there was a terrible conflict for supremacy between the Hindu and Mahomedan powers, when fortunately, the English interfered and took the morsel for themselves. In South India, a stroke of the pen achieved what in North India, was accomplished at an enormous sacrifice in men and money. While touring in the Tinnevelley District, we freely spoke our mind about the Shanar question (we found even non-Shanar Christians taking sides against Shanars) to several friends and requested them, in the name of our religion and our country to bring about an amicable understanding between our own people. But alas! The less we speak about our leaders, the better for them.

***

Punditha Manonmani Ammal requests us to bring to the notice of the Tamil public, the word ஒருவன், which she claims to have first brought into use. We see no objection ourselves to the use of the word, much less do we see any harm in continuing the old world. The உயர்வுப்பன்மை ஒருவர் and அவர் can be used in the Faminine gender as well.

***

For want of space, we have to postpone the Revd. Dr. Pope's article on the "Poets of the Tamil lands" to our next.

***

The April number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* contains The Rev. Dr. Pope's further contribution on "the Poets of the Tamil lands"—and it is devoted to the truly Divine Tiruvallur, whom he regards as an ecletic in religion and philosophy and which religion and philosophy he says is based love and faith and he concludes:

"But the Tamil race preserves many of its old virtues, and has the promise of a noble future. Their English friends, in teaching them all that the West has to impart, will find little to unteach in the moral lesson of the Kurral rightly understood."

***

The same number contains another admirable paper contributed by Mr. J. Kennedy B. (Ret), "on the teaching of true Indian History" After observing that the chief end of education is not intellectual but moral and that the chief virtues which men acquire by education are reverence and self-respect, and that the ancient system of Hindu training put reverence above all things, whereas lay all its vitality and free so that self-respect is best learned by the history of one's own family and people, he points out how egregiously they have blundered in teaching the true Indian History and how the present educational policy has been the most signal of failures. We extract the following important paras, as they fully bear out sentiments we have already expressed in these pages. The editor in a short note also points out how the "Anglo-Oriental Punjab University" failed, from the 'secularizing' tendencies of the Educational Department. Mr. Kennedy says:

"We have not as yet europeanised Indian administration. In our educational policy, however, we adopted an entirely different course. Instead of a progressive conservatism founded upon native ideas, we made a brand-new departure: we forget that the first duty of a successful teacher must be to study his pupil. We introduced a new system of education entirely abentra, which was necessarily European but without the saving elements of European education. To make it fit for everyone we made it so purely intellectual that it is good for no one. The root being bad, the tree and fruit must be bad also.

"The Hindus are a sentimental and romantic race: the English practical and matter of fact. It ought to have been the aim of our educational policy to bridge over the gulf. It can be done.

"To preserve what was good' of the old, to graft on it what was adaptable and excellent in the new, to bring Englishmen and natives into friendly social relations, and to make the Professors line with and act upon the students, these are, for instance, the main elements of the system at the Anglo Mahomedan College at Aligarh. It was an Englishman who first obliged its students to attend the daily prayers of their respective communities. Englishmen live with its students, dine with them, play with them. I can vouch for the results so far as the upper classes of the Aligarh District are concerned. Aligarh was, to say the least, not noted for its loyalty in the mutiny and now I do not know a more enlightened body of native gentlemen than the leading gentlemen of the Aligarh District."

"It is, indeed, for the leaders of native thought to show us what they need, rather than for us to thrust educational nostrums upon them. Our higher educational policy at present is a failure, whether judged by its effects on character, or by its political results; it bids fair to be the cancer of the British Empire: it requires to be reformed, and, above all, to be moralized. Indian History certainly, affords much material for moral training if it is taught scientifically and in a spirit of sympathy and generous appreciation for indigenous civilizations."

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897

VOL. II. | MADRAS, NOVEMBER 1898 | No 6

TRANSLATIONS

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page* 103.)

And because of his resemblance. (I. iii. 21).

The Jîva's resemblance to the Supreme Light referred to by the word 'Dahara-âkâs'a' is spoken of in the sequel:

"That limit day and night do not pass, nor old age, death and grief; neither good nor evil deeds. All evil-doers turn back from it; for the world of Brahman is free from all evil. Therefore he who has crossed that limit, if blind, ceases to be blind; if wounded, ceases to be wounded; if afflicted, ceases to be afflicted. Therefore, when that limit has been crossed, night becomes day indeed; for the world of Brahman is lighted once for all."*

Here, indeed, the sinlessness and constant luminosity of the Dahara-âkâs'a which has to be reached are given out as the reason why, like the old age etc. which are the result of sin, the evil of blindness etc. ceases to be on reaching the Dahara-âkâs'a, and why then there is a constant light. That the former is the cause of the latter is clearly seen in another passage which reads as follows

"Free from all taint, he attains to highest equality."*

Thus we have that he who has reached the Dahara-âkâs'a attains the result mentioned above, namely, the resemblance thereto by way of attaining equality. This will hold good only when the Jîva is distinct from the Dahara-âkâs'a. And therefore it may be concluded that Jîva is not the being spoken of here.

Again, the sûtrakâra cites yet another authority on the subject:

And, moreover, (it is so) said in the Smriti. (I. iii. 22).

It is said in the Smriti that Brahman dwells within the small lotus and is the object of worship

* Chhâ-Up. 8-4-1, 2.

* Mundaka. Up. 3—1.

"Or, from the teaching of a Gûru let him know Paramâtman whose body is the Supreme Bliss, who is Purusha, dark and yellow. By practice, O Gârgî, the righteous perceive Brahman in the city of Brahman, in mid-âkâs'a of the small lotus, and do thou also proceed in the same way."

Accordingly it may be concluded that the Parabrahman whose nature is the Supreme Light, who has to be reached by the liberated, who is associated with Umâ as His Supreme Energy, should be contemplated as dwelling within the âkâs'a in the small lotus, as possessed of sinlessness and other attributes inherent in his own nature.

Adhikarana.—6.

Now the Sûtrakâra proceeds to treat of another form in which Parames'vara may be worshipped:

By the text itself He is declared. (I. iii. 23.)

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Katha-Vallî:

"The Purusha, of the size of a thumb, stands in the middle of the body, the Lord of what was and what is yet to be; thenceforward he fears none."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the Purusha, said to be 'of the size of a thumb,' is Jîva or Parames'vara.

(*Pûrvapaksha*:)—It is but right to say that Jîva is here spoken of; for, Jîva is declared to be of the size of a thumb, in the following passage

"He assumes all forms; he is led by the three *guṇas*, following the three paths. He is the lord of life and migrates through his own works. He is of the size of a thumb, brilliant like the sun, endowed with thoughts and egoism."†

And the words "stands in the middle of the body," show that the Purusha here spoken of dwells in the middle of the body. The all-pervading Parames'vara cannot be the Purusha here spoken of.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: It is well to say that it is Parames'vara who is spoken of as thumb-sized Purusha; for the passage under discussion describes the characteristic marks of Parames'vara, in the words "He is the lord of what has been and what is yet to be;" and so on. The S'ruti declares (elsewhere) that He alone is the lord of all, in the words "endued with all power, the lord of all, S'ambhu dwells in the A'kâs'a's midst."

How, then, to explain the finitude frequently predicated of the Parames'vara? As regards this, the Sûtrakâra says

But (it is so said) because of (His being) in the heart, while teaching what man has to do. (I. iii. 24.)

It is with reference to the heart of the devotee that Parames'vara, though infinite, is said to be thumb-sized; and the injunctions of the science of Upâsanâ (contemplation) are to human beings. The Parames'vara who is supremely merciful assumes the form of the same size as the heart of the human devotee, thus rendering contemplation possible. Hence the conclusion that the Parames'vara who is full of light, dwells within the heart of the devotees in the form of *linga* or the subtle form.

Adhikarana.—7.

In the adhikarana just closed, it has been shown that the worship of Parames'vara is intended for man alone. How is it that the Atharvas'iras speaks of Devas worshipping the Parames'vara, in the words, "Then the Devas saw not Rudra, and those Devas (began to) contemplate Rudra"?

In reply to this question, the next adhikarana proceeds as follows:

Even above them, as Ba'dara'yana holds; because it is possible. (I. iii. 25).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion occurs in the Atharvas'iras and reads as follows: "Those Devas contemplate Rudra."

Here a doubt arises as to whether it is possible or not for Devas to engage in the worship of Parames'vara.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—It is not possible. He alone is qualified for Vedic ritual who is possessed of an aspiration, who is able, wise, and not excluded by the S'âstra. They have not the requisite ability, for want of a body. Indeed it is the embodied ones that can engage in the act of adoring, contemplating, and the like. It cannot be maintained that they do possess bodies, on the authority of such passages as "Indra raised his thunderbolt (*vajra*) against Vritra"; for those passages which are subservient to the inculcation of an injunction cannot point to any thing other than that injunction. Even supposing that they

* Op. Cit. 4-12.

† S'vetas'vatara-Upanishad 5-8-9.

do possess bodies, they have nothing to aspire after, inasmuch as their abode and that of Parames'vara are one and the same. From the passage "Devas went to the region of svarga, and these Devas asked Rudra 'who art Thou?'", we understand that the region of svarga is itself the abode of Rudra, the Parabrahman; and that is also the region of Devas. We also learn that even the Mukta or liberated soul has ultimately to attain to the region of svarga, from such passages as the following

"He attains to the region of svar."*

Nor do they possess requisite knowledge, since, in the absence of Vedic study preceded by the sacramental process of upanayana, no Vedantic enquiry is possible and they cannot therefore acquire a knowledge of Brahman. Hence, too, their exclusion (from worship) by the S'àstra. Wherefore the Devas are not qualified for the worship of Brahman.

(*Siddhânta*):—Even the Devas are competent for the worship of Brahman.—Why?—Because there is room for aspiration in their case. And it cannot be said that the abode of the Devas and the abode of the Parames'vara are same; for, the word 'Svarga,' though signifying bliss in general, denotes a particular kind of bliss according to the context. The word 'Is'vara,' for instance, signifying 'master' in general, applies to a king who is the ruler of a country, in virtue of the context, as in the following passage

"And one should also visit the king (Is'vara), for the sake of acquisition and security."

But the same word occurring in a section treating of Brahman signifies unsurpassed power and applies to Brahman. So also, in virtue of the context and of the explanation afforded by other sources of knowledge concerning the subject, the word 'Svarga' signifying 'bliss' in general denotes the abode of Devas which affords a (comparatively) small amount of bliss, tainted as it is with the defect of being liable to decay and of being less exalted than some other kind of bliss. On the other hand, it denotes S'iva the Parabrahman's abode as being unsurpassed bliss itself, and as the place from which there is no return. Thus it is quite possible that the Devas who dwell in a place where happiness is tainted with the evil of being less exalted than some other kind of happiness, aspire to attain to Brahman's abode which marked with unsurpassed bliss. On the authority of passages speaking of subjects subsidiary to an injunction, it may also be seen that the Devas are embodied entities, and, as such, are efficient agents of action. Though such passages as "the sun is the sacrificial post," and "Fire is the antidote to the frost," which figuratively speak of things subsidiary to the main injunction, are not intended to inculcate what they literally convey, still, such subsidiary statements as "Indra raised the thunderbolt against Vritra," which are neither contradicted by other authorities nor vouchsafed by any other sources of knowledge, may justly inculcate what they speak of as a truth to be accepted. It is also possible that,—either because, in virtue of their exalted power, the Vedic doctrine reveals itself to them, or because they have not forgotten what they had learnt before,—they possess requisite knowledge. The S'âstra having enjoined divine worship on all in general, it cannot but be intended for the Devas, so that there is not the slightest ground for the exclusion of Devas. Wherefore Devas are competent for Brahmavidyâ.

The Sûtrakâra supposes an incongruity resulting from the Devas being embodied and refutes it as follows:

If you urge an incongruity in ritual (Karma), (we answer), no, the assumption of more than one (body) being revealed. (I. iii. 26.)

(*Objection*:)—While the Devas are embodied entities, it should at the same time be supposed that, being invoked in the several sacrificial rituals performed in various places, they are simultaneously present in all those places. This does not hold good. Thus arises an incongruity in the matter of ritual.

(*Answer*):—No such incongruity can be urged here. It is declared that, though embodied, Saubhari and others have assumed more than one body. Hence no incongruity whatever.

Let there be no incongruity in the matter of ritual; but an incongruity does arise in the matter of Vedic Revelation. As against this objection the Sûtrakâra proceeds as follows:

If (you urge an incongruity as to) Revelation, (we answer) no, because of the origin thence, (as may be seen) from the direct (revelation) as well as (the indirect revelation or) inference. (I. iii. 27.)

(*Objection*):—Though there may arise no incongruity in the matter of ritual, an incongruity does arise in the matter of Vedic Revelation.—How?—Being made up of parts, the Devas are naturally impermanent. From this it necessarily follows that Indra and other

* Taittiriya. Up. 1-6.

Devas had also a birth. Then it is necessarily either that, previous to their birth and subsequent to their death, such Vedic words as 'Indra' have no meaning, or that the words are impermanent. If impermanent, they must have proceeded from an individual person; and then the injunctions and prohibitions lose their authority, and the rituals therein enjoined have no ground to rest upon. Thus many are the evil logical consequences of the doctrine. Accordingly, to avoid incongruity as to the Vedic Revelation, the doctrine that the Devas are embodied should not be assented to.

(*Answer*) :—Not so; for, *thence i. e*, from the very Vedic words such as 'Indra,' Indra and other beings were created. If 'Indra' and other words denote particular individuals, then, indeed, it would follow either that on the extinction of the beings denoted by those words they will have no objects to denote, or that they are impermanent. We maintain that, like the word 'cow,' such words as Indra' merely denote a general form. Accordingly, a potter thinks of a general form suggested to his mind by the word 'pot,' and then produces a pot; so too, on the disappearance of a former Indra, Brahmâ thinks of the particular form of that Indra suggested by the Vedic word 'Indra' and produces another Indra of the same form, and so on. Wherefore, though Indra and other individuals may disappear, the several general forms do not cease, and the words are accordingly eternal. Hence no incongruity whatever. If you ask for authority on this point we appeal to *S'ruti* (direct revelation) and *Smriti* (indirect revelation). Thus says the S'ruti:

"By Veda, Prajâpati projected the forms, existent (or sensuous) and non-existent (or super-sensuous)."*

"He uttered "Bhûh," and he created the earth."†

The Smriti says:—

"The names and acts of all, severally, and the various forms, He created at first from the Vedic words themselves."‡

And hence, indeed, (its) eternality. (I. iii. 29).

Hence alone, though Vis'vâmitra and others are the authors of mantras—as may be seen from such passages as

"He should invoke the authors of mantras."*

"This is Vis'vâmitra's Sûkta (hymn)."†

still, such words having reference only to general forms of things, the eternality of the Veda which is made of *mantra* and *brâhmanâ* becomes explicable. For, Brahmâ recollects by Vedic Word what things are to be created and then creates them. He being endued with the power of seeing the mantras without learning them from a teacher. Accordingly, on the expiry of the *Naimittika-Pralaya—i. e.*, the deluge of the three worlds taking place at the end of a day of Brahmâ—Brahmâ recollects, by the Vedic word, the several forms, such as that of Vis'vâmitra, belonging to preceding cycle, and creates others possessed of the same form and endued with the same powers, and these give out all the mantras without having studied them at all. Thus they are the authors of the mantras, while at the same time the Veda is eternal

(*Objection*) :—It may be so in the case of the Naimittika-Pralaya. But how to explain the eternality of the Veda in the case of the Prâkrita-pralaya or Kosmic Dissolution when Brahmâ and the word called the Veda disappear altogether?

In answer, the Sûtrakâra says:

They being of same names and forms, no incongruity in the return (of the Kosmos) either, as shown by Revelation and smriti. (I. iii. 29).

Because the things to be created are of same names and forms, there is no incongruity in the Kosmos coming again into being after the Prâkrita-pralaya. To explain:—The Prames'vara, the original Creator, who is Omniscient and Omnipotent, and who is beyond the whole universe, recollects the form of the preceding Kosmos and creates again a Kosmos of the same form, and He also recollects the Vedas as they were arranged before and gives them to Brahmâ, His son.—How is this known?—By S'ruti and Smriti. S'ruti says:

"The sun and the moon, the Creator made as before, as also heaven and the Earth, the Mid-Air and Svarga."‡

"Who creates Brahmâ first, and who gives Him the Vedas."§

Smriti also says.

* Taittirîya-Brâhmana. 2—6—8.
† Ibid. 2—3—4.
‡ Manu. I. 21.

* Apastambha-Pravarasutras 1—7.
† Taittirîya-Samhitâ 5—2—3.
‡ Mahânârâyana—Up.
§ Svetâ—Up. 6—18.

"He first created water alone, in that He cast seed. That became a golden egg, like in splendour to the thousand-rayed (sun); in that was born spontaneously Brahmâ, the grand parent of all the worlds."*

"He first created Brahmâ and gave Him the Vedas."

Wherefore, even though the whole Kosmo has to come afresh into being after the Prâkrita or Kosmic Pralaya, the Vedas are eternal.

The Sûtrakâra proceeds to state another view:

Owing to impossibility in Madhu etc., Jaimini holds that they are not qualified (I. iii. 30).

In Madhu-Vidyâ† and other such Upâsanâs, the Vasus and other Devas are themselves the objects of contemplation and form the goal of the worship. Now it is impossible that the Vasus should form the objects of their own worship, owing to the impossibility of one and the same entity being the agent and object of the same act. Moreover, as they are themselves Vasus, the state of the Vasus has been attained already and cannot form an object yet to be attained. Jaimini, therefore, thinks that the Vasus and other Devas are not qualified for them (*i. e.*, for the Madhu-vidyâ and other Upâsanâs).

And because they are (qualified) for the Light. (I. iii. 31).

Though Parabrahman, the Light, has as a matter of course to be worshipped by the Devas in common with men, the S'ruti (specially) declares that they should worship Him, in the following words:

"Him, the Light of lights, Devas (should) worship as life, as immortal."

From this, it seems quite reasonable that they are not qualified for the worship enjoined in the Madhu-brâhmana.

The Sûtrakara now declares his own view:

But Bâdarâyana (holds that they) do possess (the qualification), because there is (a possibility) I. iii. 32).

Bâdarâyana thinks that the Vasus and other Devas are qualified even for Madhu-Vidyâ and the like; for, though they are Vasus etc., they may worship Brahman in the form of the Vasus, and they may also seek to attain to the state of the Vasus etc. in the next cycle (Kalpa). Here Brahman has to be worshipped both as the cause and as the effect. In the passage beginning with the words "The sun is indeed the honey of the Devas"‡ Brahman to be worshipped is presented as the effect, endued with the names, forms, and functions of the A'dityas, the Vasus, and so on, and in the passage beginning with the words "When from thence he has risen upwards he neither rises nor sets"* Brahman to be worshipped is presented as the Cause, dwelling as the Antarâtman or the Inner Ruler of the subtle sun devoid of all names, forms, and functions. The result of the worship of Brahman in both the aspects consists in the attainment of the position of Vasus etc., in the next cycle (kalpa), and the attainment of Brahman on the expiry of the terms of both the effects. The passage "He who thus knows this nectar becomes one of the Vasus, and with Agni at their head, he sees the nectar and rejoices"† speaks of the result which consists in the attainment of the position of the Vasus etc; and the passage "to him who thus knows the secret of Brahman, the sun does not rise and does not set; for him there is day once and for all,"‡ speaks of the result consisting in the attainment of Brahman. Thus the Devas are qualified for the Madhu-Vidyâ and the like. Wherefore the Devas are in every way qualified for Brahma-Vidyâ.

Adhikarana—8.

Now, from the sutra I. iii. 24 it would appear that men in general are all qualified. As against this supposition, the sûtrakâra says:

Because his grief is shown by the hearing of the taunt and by his running up (to the teacher). I. iii. 33).

The passage which forms subject of discussion here occurs in the Chhândogya-Upanishad and reads as follows

"You have brought these, O S'ûdra; but only by that mouth did you make me speak."§

Here the teacher addresses the pupil as S'ûdra. So, a doubt arises as to whether S'ûdras also are qualified for Brahma-Vidyâ or not.

(*Pûrvapaksha:*) They do possess the qualification, because of the possibility of their aspiring for it. It cannot be restricted to the three castes, inasmuch as it has been shewn that, though coming under none of the three castes, the Devas are yet qualified for it. To this one may object as follows Though Devas are

* Manu, I. 8, 9.
† *Vide* Brihada-ranyaka-Upanishad. 4—5.
‡ Chha. Up. 3—1—1.

* Ibid. 3—11—1.
† Ibid. 3—6—3.
‡ Ibid 3—11—3.
§ Op. Cit.. 4—2—5.

not formally initiated by *upanayana* and do not learn the Vedas from a teacher, yet it is possible for them to attain knowledge inasmuch as the Vedic doctrine reveals itself to their minds; how is this possible in the case of these (the S'ûdras)? This objection is untenable; for, even in the case of these, knowledge can be attained by listening to the Purânas etc, and it is even possible that they are qualified for initiation into the grand truths (Mahâvâkyas), on the principle of *nishâda-sthapati* (*vide* Jaiminîya-Mîmâmsâ 6-1-51, 52). Wherefore it is but proper to say that they are qualified for Brahmavidyâ.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: Sûdras have no right to Brahmavidyâ; for, in the absence of Vedic study, it is not possiple for them to attain that knowledge of the Deity to be worshipped and of His attributes, to which such a study forms an essential means. The Itihâsas and Purânas form a means only as expatiating on the teaching of the Veda, but not independently of it. And the permission accorded to the S'ûdras listening to the Itihâsas and Purânas is merely intended to bring about the extinction of their sins. Vidura, the Dharma-Vyâdha and the like were devotees of Brahman because of the knowledge they had acquired in the previous births not having vanished. If you ask how, when teaching Brahmavidyâ, the master addressed the disciple as S'ûdra, we reply as follows: He was addressed here as S'ûdra, not because h belonged to that class, but because he was found to be overpowered with grief for not having attained Brahma-jnâña. That he was overpowered with grief is indicated by the fact of his having heard the swan's taunting reference to him for not being possessed of Brahmavidyâ, and by the fact of his running up immediately to the master. He having been addressed as S'udra not because he belonged to that class, the S'udra has no right to worship Brahman.

For the following reason also, the disciple is addressed as S'ûdra, not as belonging to that class:

And it being known that he is a Kshatriya. (I. iii. 34.)

It being known that Jânas'ruti, the disciple, is a Kshatriya, he is addressed as S'ûdra not because he belongs to that caste. At the commencement of the episode, Jânas'ruti is described as the master of the wealthy, and as the giver of an abundant quantity of prepared food, thus:

"There lived once upon a time Jânas'ruti-Pautrâyana (the great grandson of Jânas'ruti), who was a pious giver, bestowing much wealth upon the people, and always keeping open house. He built places of refuge everywhere, wishing that people should everywhere eat of his food."*

In the middle, he is spoken of as directing a charioteer, in the following words:

"As soon as he had risen in the morning he said to his charioteer."†

At the end he is spoken of as offering many towns in the following words:

"There is this wife and this village in which thou dwellest."‡

"These are the Raikva-parna villages in the country of the Mahâvrishas where Raikva dwelt under him,"§

From these characteristic marks, Jânas'ruti appears to be a Kshatriya.

And because of the indicatory mark in the sequel in connection with Chaitraratha. (I. III. 35.)

In the sequel of this Samvaga-Vidyâ, we find references to the Brâhman and Kshatriya castes alone, in such passages as the following:

"Once while S'aunaka-Kâpeya and Abhipratârin Kakshaseni were being waited on at their meal, a religious student begged of them."‖

Abhipratârin, a decendant of Chitraratha, appears to be a Kshatriya, because of his connection with a priest belonging to the family of the Kâpeyas. The S'ruti does speak of Chaitâratha's connection with a Kapeya priest, in the following words.

"The Kâpeyas caused Chaitraratha to perform the sacrifice: him alone they made a master of food."

Thus, though, on account of a difference in the name, he is not identical with Chitraratha, it is certain that he belongs to the same family for generally, members of one and the same family become priests of the others who are members of one and the same family. As a member of Chitraratha's family, he must be a Kshatriya, as evident from a complementary passage occurring elsewhere: "From him, one Chaitraratha is born, a Kshatriya nobleman." Accordingly, it is concluded that Abhipratârin who is mentioned as connected with a Brâhman of the family of the Kâpeyas is a Kshatriya.

* Chhând. Up. 4—1—1.
† Ibid. 4—1—5.
‡ Ibid. 4—2—4.
§ Ibid. 4—2—6.
‖ Ibid. 4—3—5.

Simiarly, it may also be inferred that Jânas'ruti who is connected with the Brâhman Raikva is a Kshatriya. Wherefore, he is addressed as S'udra while in fact he is a Kshatriya.

As to the allegation that, on the principle of *Nishâda-Sthapati*, the sudra is merely entitled to initiation into the Grand Truths (Mahâvâkyas), the Sûtrakâra says :

Because of a reference to the sacrament and of the mention of its absence. (I. iii. 36).

At the commencement of Brahma-Vidyâ, in such passages as "I shall initiate thee ;" Him did he initiate ;"* reference has been made to the sacrament of upanayana. And in some passages such as "There is no sin in a Sûdra, and he is not fit for a sacrament ;"† and "the Sûdra, the fourth caste, has one birth alone ;"‡—the smriti speaks of its absence in the case of a Sûdra, for both these reasons, he is not entitled to Brahma-vidyâ, Because of the injunction "Let him cause a *Nishâda-sthapati* to perform a sacrifice," there is no objection in that particular case. There is no scriptual injunction anywhere permitting the initiation of a Súdra into the Grand Truths (Mahávâkyas), in spite of the absence of Upanayana.

And because he proceeded (to initiate) on ascertaining its absence. (I. iii. 37.)

A Sudra is not entitled to it, inasmuch as master proceeded (to initiate), to ordain and to teach the Vidyâ only after ascertaining that Jâbâla was not a S'ûdra because he told the truth, as the S'ruti says

"No one but a true Brâhmana would thus speak out. Go and fetch fuel, friend, I shall initiate you. You have not swerved from truth."§

(*Objection*) :—Does the prohibition of the uttering of the Veda in the absence of Upanayana apply to some cases only or to all cases? It does not apply to all cases, for notwithstanding the absence of Upanayana in the case of a child, there is an injunction to the effect that the child should recite the Veda while making an offering to the manes, as declared in the following passage :

"Let him not be made to utter the Veda, except when making an offering to the manes."*

It is therefore proper to hold that the prohibition applies only to a few cases. Wherefore the uninitiated S'ûdra is prohibited from uttering the Veda while performing the pâkayajñas (small sacrificial rituals), but not when learning the Brahma-Vidyâ.

As against the foregoing objection., the Sûtrakâra says :

Because of the prohibition of the hearing, studying, and (knowing the) meaning (of the Vedas.) (I. iii. 38.)

The hearing of the Vedic texts by a S'ûdra is prohibited in such passages as the following :

"Therefore, Vedas should not be recited near a S'ûdra.

To one who should not hear the Veda, whence comes the study etc. thereof ?

And on account of the Smriti. (I. iii. 39).

The Smriti lays down punishments in the case of a S'udra hearing the Veda and so on, in the following words :

"Now, when hearing the Vedas, his ears should be filled with (molten) lead and wax ; when uttering the Vedas, the tongue should be cut asunder ; when keeping the Vedas in mind, his body should be torn."†

In the face of this prohibition of the recitation of the Vedas in the S'ruti and the Smriti, how is an enquiry into the teaching of the Vedas possible in the case of a S'udra ? It is therefore to be concluded that, except after the sacrament of Upanayana, such as is performed on a Brâhman eight years old (and so on), no study of the Vedas is anywhere possible to any one under any circumstances. Therefore, the S'ûdras are not entitled to Brahmavidyâ.

A. MAH'ADEVA S'A'STRI, B. A.

(*To be continued.*)

* Chhând. Up. 4—4.
† Manu 10—126.
‡ Gautama 10—50.
§ Chhând. Up. 4—4—5.

* Gautama 2—6.
† Gautama 12-4-6.

THAYUMANAVAR'S POEMS.

(Concluded from page 108.)

இன்னம் பிறப்பதற் கேதென்னி லில்லுடை
பிறவா திருப்பதிலை
தெழுமன்னி பமிர்தொழுகு மதிமண்ட லத்திறை
வெண்ணெய்மை குடைவிளியால்
மின்னும் பிறைக்கொடி யேயென வளர்த்திடப்
பேயேனு மஞ்சவேண்டும்
பிறவாத நெறியெனக் குன்றென்னி லிம்மையே
பேசுகப் பூதியம்
மின்னும் படிக்கலன் டிரா வண்ணபால்
வினையேனு மெடுப்புவித்த
வீட்டெறி கட்டிதென் பிதவன் றினையன்றி
வினாரா முண்டென்னிலோ
தன்னைத் தனிச்சிறிய ஞற்றினேன் போற்றினர்
சன்மார்க்க முத்தருமுதலே
சிவபரி பூரண வண்டத் துவமான
சச்சித வாத்தனிவமே. (கூடி)

108. O *Satchithânanda Siva*, the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all!

If I have yet to undergo the pains of rebirth on account of my *Karma mala*, do Thou please leave me in the care of *Kundalin** that she might surely endow me with power to preserve any *thanu*† by the scientific Yoga of causing the innermost fire to rise up to the lunar orbis‡ above and make the blessed nectar issue therefrom.

And if my course of rebirth should cease with *this*, Thou wilt do best to grant me the Moksha of Siva-Sayujya by entrusting me to the Infinite Mother of all; So that, freed from my Karmic noose, I can, in this very life, become absorbed in the Everlasting Brightness like the burning camphor.§

On the other hand, if I should be destined to struggle beyond *this* life, I will be left in an extremely helpless condition which I cannot endure at all.

Praise be to Thee, O The Absolute Giver of the Final Bliss of Siva-Sayujya of the *Sanmârga*.‖

* Kundalin. lit. snake. It is applied to Kali one of nine Saktis (vide Tiruvembavai in Tiruvachakam.)

† Thanu=physical body.

‡ Vide verses 61 & 63 and notes.

§ The analogy is used to shew that just as the camphor, a thing different from the elemental fire, does yet, when set to fire, burn and become assimilated with the latter (fire), so the soul, an entity dependent on and different from the Supreme Siva, does when set to devotional *love* to the Supreme Siva, *become* absorbed by realisation in advaita union with the Supreme Siva which is called the Siva-Sayujya.

‖ The Śiva school opens Four Steps or stages of exercising Love to God (Siva) (1) like a servant, (2) like a son, (3) like a friend, and (4) like a Gnani or wise man; viz.

(1) *Dâsa Marga* (like a servant) or *Dhâtha mârga*, also called 'Kiriya' is the rendering of tangible bodily service to the Supreme Siva in Temples &c.

வேதாவை யில்லையும் விரித்தநே தென்னிலுன்
னிலைப்பதுநி யென்பனத்த
னினேபே லறியாது நிறைவுடனதால்
னினைத்தலுன் மனைதாடில்
போதமே நிற்குமப் போதத்தை நாடிலோ
போதமு நினலனிக்கம்
பொய்யன்று தெய்வமறை யாவுமே நினென்ற
போக்குவ லறிகுற்றம்
ஆதார மாதேவ முழுதுநீ யாதலா
லனிலமீ தென்னையாட்டி
ஆடல்கண் டவுநீ யாக்கின் றனவுநீ
யநுபவி மெனைவாவை
தாதாவு நீபெற்ற தாய்த்தந்தை தாமுநீ
தமருநீ யவுநீகான்
சிவபரி பூரண வண்டத் துவமான
சச்சித வாத்தனிவமே. (கூடி)

109. O *Satchithânanda Siva*, the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all!

Should the Brahma be asked why he should stamp my destiny like this, he would say at once that it was the result of my past karma or action.* My *Karma* being achit,† I cannot question it; but, since it is the offshoot from my *manas*,‡ then, remains the true knowledge in me which I percieve to have been manifested by Thy Grace. This is not a fiction at all; for, the Divine Vedagamas rightly declare 'Thou art all; Thou art the Sustainer and everything sustained by Thee.' In consequence I can rightly conclude that Thou art the cause as well as the Spectator of my dance of life; why, Thou art Thyself the Universal Dancer. Thou art the Heavenly Grace. Thou art the Giver of the Blessed *Maunagnana*.§ In short, Thou art the mother father, kindred and all!

R. SHUNMUGA MUDALIAR.

(*To be Continued.*)

(2) *Putra Marga* (like a son), also called 'Kiriya' is worshipping or making pûja to Siva conceived in linga or idols &c.

(3) *Saka Marga* (like a friend), called also 'Yoga' is contemplating Siva by *scientific* concentration of thoughts and.

(4) *Sanmarga* (like a gnani or wise man) also called 'Gnana-Mârga is '*becoming absorbed by realisation in advaita union with the Supreme Siva, the Anâdi Mukta Sûkshma Chit.*

'*This is the Final Goal for all*
To reach, step by step, as they call;
To shun a part is to shun th'whole:
Cut your one leg and you must *roll*.'

for fuller details see 'Sivagnan Siddhiar and *c. f.* 41st verse with notes.

* Vide notes to karma under 2nd verse.

† Achit=not chit (intelligence) or other than chit, that is, a non-intelligent thing, It may be called also asat (other than sat.)

‡ This school establishes 'manas' as asat or matter.

§ Gnana of silence (manas or mona.)

¶ *c. f.* 89th verse and its notes.

OBSOLETE SYLLABLES நெடில் AND இரண்டு IN MODERN VENBAS.

Final foot of Venba instructive.

The final foot of a Venba has an old and instructive story to tell us if we care to listen to it; but before we examine it, let us refresh our memory with the formation of the metre.

Principles of Venba.

Venba is a metre that is peculiar to Tamil and its principles are wholly foreign to the prosodies of other languages. The metre is well known to the Tamil reader. Every book on Tamil prosody treats of it *ad nauseum*. To understand its construction, we must know the syllables and feet of Tamil prosody.

Syllables of Tamil prosody.

Let a=any sounding letter=*Genus*

b=union of two such letters beginning with short=*இரண்டு*

N. B.—A dumb consonant may also be added to a and b.

Then a and b are the only two syllables of Tamil prosody. They have nothing to do with Sanskrit.

A combination of these syllables into twos and threes gives rise to disyllabic and trisyllabic feet respectively.

Four disyllabic feet.

The two syllables a & b may be permuted into twos in 4 ways viz. a a, b a, b b, a b. These four disyllabic feet are called *இயற்சீர்*.

Four trisyllabic feet.

By adding a to the above permutations, we get 4 trisyllabic feet ending in a. These four called *வஞ்சிச்சீர்* together with the four disyllabic feet above named are all the feet admissible in a Venba where it is further necessary that they must combine in such a way that the final syllable of a disyllabic foot may not be followed by the same syllable and that a trisyllabic foot may be followed only by the syllable a.

Venba Lines.

Any four of the above feet combining in the manner above pointed out form a Venba line and nothing more need be said regarding the 1st & 3rd lines. But at the end of the 3rd foot in the 2nd line there is a pause or something like it and the 4th foot has generally the *எதுகை* of the 1st two lines.

Final foot anomalous.

But what appears anomalous to us is the three-footed fourth line whose last foot is none of the eight feet we have enumerated as admissible in the metre.

What is the nature of this final foot? The prosodian describes the final foot in the the following terms; "*இனி வெண்சீர், தேமாந்தண் பூ மெனவிரிந்து நிரைநிரை நிற்ப, நிழற்கீழ் நிறுத்தி, பெருந்தகை வாழ்மின் நீதறைவே.*"

(The venba ends in a three footed line of which the last foot is either a monosyllable or an expression of the formula *நிரைபு* or *காசு*.) That the last line should have one syllable in excess of two feet or half a venba line, we can understand, but why should words like *காசு* and *நிரைபு* occur in excess of two feet at the end?

Explanation found in Tholkappiam.

The explanation is found in Tholkappiam. The rule there with regard to the final line of venba is as follows;

'*வெண்பயற்றற முச்சிற்றடியும்*'

(The final line of a venba is three footed.)

The final foot of this final line is there described as follows;

'*அசைச்சிற்றாகு மவ்வியலான*'

(The final foot of that last line is a monosyllabic foot.)

Tholkappiar's four syllables.

We don't find here, as in the *சூத்திரம்* above quoted, the additional rule that at the end, besides a monosyllable, words like *காசு* and *நிரைபு* are also admissible. The reason is that Tholkoppiar had two more syllables than our a and b. Besides ă and b *Gசி* and *இரண*, which he called *இயலசை* he had also a followed by *உகரம்* which he called *Gசிபு* (au) and b followed by *உகரம்* which he called *இரைபு* (bu). The latter two syllables *Gசிபு* and *இரைபு* he called *உரியசை*. His syllables therefore were four in number viz a, b, au, bu; *Gசி*, *இரை*, *Gசிபு*, *இரைபு*. The original rule, as laid down in Tholkappium was simply that the last line had one syllable in excess of two feet and nothing more and as there were 4 syllables in ancient days, the line ends by virtue of that rule alone in any one of the 4 syllables viz in expressions like *காசு*, *மலர்*, *காசு* and *நிரைபு* corresponding to *Gசி*, *இரை*, *Gசிபு* and *இரைபு*.

His இயலசை and உரியசை.

Gசிபு, *இரைபு* at the end of Venbas.

Syllables *Gசிபு* and *எதுகை* now obsolete.

But the two compound syllables *Gசிபு* and *இரைபு* must have led to a great many awkward complications in the formation of feet and were naturally discontinued in course of time. But

although these syllables were discontinued, their long established use at the end of venba could not be interfered with and in modern poetry the venba is the only place where we have remnants of the two curious compound syllables நேர்பு and நிரைபு to remind us of the days of Tholkappiur, and as they are no longer syllables, the modern prosodian in the சரிகை had to slightly modify the rule in Tholkappiur to suit the modern nomenclature and say that the last foot is either a syllable or formula காசு or பிறப்பு, the latter two words being no longer included in the former expression syllable as in the days of Tholkappiur. While நேர் and நிரை may take a dumb consonant after them, the other syllables நேர்பு and நிரைபு do not admit it at the end. Hence words like செய்யுள் and கடவுள் are not உரிசை and cannot occur at the end of Venbas.

No dumb consonant after நேர் and பிறப்பு.

The annotator, however, on the சரிகை above quoted is not quite accurate when he paraphrases it into 'காசு, பிறப்பு என்னும் வாய்பாட்டுக்குற்றியலுகர மீறாகிய நேரீற்றியற் சொல்லும் நிரையீற்றியற் சொல்லும் இற்ற முச்சீரடி' &c., It will be seen from what we have said above that the words காசு and பிறப்பு at the end of a venba are நேர்பு and நிரைபு syllables in their origin and unlike இயற்சீர் do not take a consonant at the end and cannot therefore be regarded as இயற்சீர் or dissyllabic feet. If Tamil prosody has changed, it is no reason to apply the present nomenclature retrospectively to a state of things anterior to the change.

காசு, பிறப்பு not இயற்சீர் but நேர்பு, நிரைபு syllables.

T. VIRABADRA MUDALIAR, B. A., B. L.

THE KALITTOKAI METRES.

Kalittokai is the name of a very ancient Tamil classic belonging to the department of Tamil literature called அகப்பொருள் which treats of இன்பம் the 3rd புருஷார்த்தம் by describing what was supposed to be the best and most scientic mode in which a young man and a young maid could meet, marry and live together so as to derive the utmost pleasure of sexual enjoyment. The subject which is of enormous antiquity seems to be the exclusive product of Dravidian imagination and is independent of Aryan literature. It has reference to many crude practices and customs of Dravidian life in the most primitive ages of Dravidian Society. In the treatment of this quaint and antique subject of ancient literature, various devices such as sad disappointment in the meeting of the lovers, their elopement to prevent the probable marriage of the heroine to another suitor, their reunion, separation, the heroe's visits to his mistress and the consequent jealousy of the heroine are resorted to and dramaticaly described as being indispensable features in the lives of a married couple to enhance to the utmost possible extent their conjugal pleasures. The incidents in the plot of this little drama are almost monotonously the same with every writer on the subject, who has therefore very little latitude allowed him in his treatment.

Subject of Kalittokai.

Some writers therefore describe detached incidents in the usual dramatic style without any regard to the sequence and the development of the plot which every reader was supposed to know. The author of Kalittokai is of this description. The book consists of verses treating of various detached incidents quite unconnected with each other either in time or scene. Another book of this description is Kalladam. Why in these books certain incidents are chosen and certain characters are made to speak on certain particular occasions in preference to other speeches on other occasions, is not clear except that they may have particularly pleased the author's fancy.

It describes detached incidents.

The name Kolittokai means a collection of Kalippa metres and but for the prevalent practice of composing detached verses might point to the fact that the author compiled together the best Kalippas on the subject known in his time.

Its name.

The book is divided into 5 chapters named respectively பாலைக்கலி, குறிஞ்சிக்கலி, மருதக்கலி, முல்லைக்கலி and நெய்தற்கலி. These are technical terms used not very felicitously in every work on அகப்பொருள் and present not a little difficulty to the modern reader. Of course the apparent principle of the division is clear viz., those Kalippas which relate to separation of the lovers are classed under பாலை, those relating to their cohabitation under குறிஞ்சி, those relating to jealous quarrels under மருதம், those relating to their reunion under முல்லைக்கலி and the remaining verses relating to the

Division of the Book.

It abounds in instances of இசை மயக்கம்.

lamentations of separated lovers under ஒய்தற்கண். But this principle does not apparently justify the local position of a large number of verses apparently seeming to be misplaced and the annotator supposed to be சச்சிதானந்தையர் does nothing more than slavishly reproduce the very words of Tholkappium commentaries in justification of the confusion of இசை. The only writer that has grappled with the real difficulty and does justice to the subject is சச்சிதானந்தையர் the annotator of Tholkappium Porulathicaram. If he is not intelligible to us on account of his quotations from books not accessible to us such as அகரமுதல, ஐக்கமுதல, சற்றிசை, குறுந்தொகை, the problem becomes entirely hopeless of solution, no other commentator or writer however modern having really grasped the difficulty and attempted a solution, there being no confusion of இசை in any modern work.

Its metres.

True to its name, the book consists wholly of Kalippa metres in all its ancient varieties which seem to be admirably adapted to the subject of அப்பொருள் and were most extensively used in former days for the subject, being an improvement upon and a relief against துறையம்பா originally used as in ஐக்குமுதல and அகரமுதல.

Nature of Kallippa.

Kalippa is one of the four main Tamil metres and is the exclusive product of the ancient Tamil poets. It is a very uncouth complex metre and is said to have been derived from Venba. The two primary pure Tamil metres are துறையம் and வெண்பா and their respective derivatives are வஞ்சி and கலிப்பா. These four metres are exhaustively described with all their varieties from Tholkappium downward and the Tamil prosodian in his jealous endeavour to preserve unsullied their ancient dignity and respectable birth has not accorded more than a cold reception and a passing recognition to the ever increasing swarm of

Invasion of Vrittahs.

foreign Vrittahs whose powerful invasion has proved irresistible to the noble but less powerful aristocracy of the land. Even after the land has been completely invaded, subdued and occupied by the foreigners, the metric historian in his true conservative instinct cannot make up his mind to recognise and avow the fact, but continues to allot the first and foremost ranks to the ancient noble but defunct aristocracy and displays still his aversion to the Vrittahs the foreign invaders, by summarily dismissing them with the simple remark that they are a secondary class of metres, without ever pausing to look at them severally, lest he might lower and offend the ancient dignity of the hereditary aristocracy by bringing the new comers into undue prominence.

Though the metres therefore occurring in Kalittokai are well described in every work on Tamil prosody, yet for the benefit of those readers who have not had much leisure to devote to prosody, we propose to explain the exhaustively various classes of Kalippas in the book. In no other place shall we get so many classes of the metre in such a small compass, some of which are very unique and rarely met with and others involve principles no longer in use. The annotator kindly though unusually points out untiringly at the end of each verse the nature of its metre though, if he is the same annotator as that of சிந்தாமணி, he, except a few remarks on the opening stanza, has not had the same kindness to enlighten us on the varieties of the சிந்தாமணி metre which present insuperable difficulties to the modern reader.

Kalippas in Kalittokai.

Kalivenba.

This ancient metre has been long divided into a number of classes. We shall not discourage or frighten the general reader at the outset by giving the long sounding technical names. We shall first take that class which is remarkable for its simplicity and easy character viz., the metre called கலிவெண்பா.

This verse as the name indicates closely resembles the time-honored Venba.

T. VIRABADRA MUDALIAR, B.A., B.L.

(*To be continued.*)

KAMBAN.

(*Continued from page* 94).

There is a small pamphlet இலக்குமிபதிதி of 30 pages whose authorship is attributed to Kamban. There is not a line in it which breathes either the hand or the mind of Kamban. Here is the fifth stanza of it.

தாயதே வெல்லாரும் யாக்குந் தயரிதிய
ளாயதே தீர்ந்தாரும் புடைத்தே மாமென்பர்

தாயகமே மினஞ்சும் மினச்சாயல பேருலகோ
சாயகமே யன்னகண்ணியம் போருஞ் சார்பவளே

Perhaps this was also a juvenile production. Here is the 5th stanza of சரஸ்வதியந்தாதி.

சேயகமான மலரக மாவது ஞானவின்பச்
சேயகமான மலரக மாவதுந் தீவினையா
லேயகமணி விடமக மாவது மெவ்வுயிர்க்குந்
தாயகமாவதுந் தாதார் சுவேத சரோருகமே.

Compare with these any one stanza taken at random from சடகோபரந்தாதி. We open the book and our eyes fall on the 45th stanza.

சேராதனவுளவோ பெருஞ்செல்வர்க்கு வேதஞ்செப்பும்
பேராயிரத்தின் பெரும்புய மாயிரம் பெய்தளவுத்
தாராமுடியாயிரங் குருகூர்ச் சடகோபன் சொன்ன
ஆராவமுதக் கவியாயிர மவ் வரியினுக்கே.

There is no denying the fact that the diction and thought here excel those of the stanzas quoted above. And yet Saraswathi Anthathi is said to have been composed by our poet when he was entangled by the concoctings of the court poets of சேரன் in relationship with a barber. We have already noted that some scholars assume that the inspiration of the Brahmarakshasa gave birth to this minor work. But there is no internal evidence to substantiate either of the anecdotes. ஏரெழுபது according to தொண்டை மண்டலசதகம் (86th stanza)

சுழுவதுங் கொண்டு புலம்பாமனஞ் சுண்டதுமறைத்தே
ரெழுவதுங் கொண்டு புகழ்ச்சம்ப நாடனெழுப்பவிசை[யின
முழுவதுஞ் சொன்னடொரு சொற்பேசநெய்யின் முழுங்கை
மழுவதுங்கொண்டு புகழ்கொண்டதாற் ரெண்டைமண்டல
[மே.

had its origin when a Vellala, in whose house Kamban had one day to dine. The Vellala தளவாய் முதலியார் a noble of the court, hiding his son who was bitten by a cobra, gave meals to the poet, but the poet wanted his son to dine with him. The truth could not then be hidden and Kamban sang some verses and the boy got up as if from sound sleep. Being pleased with the Vellala's conduct Kamban composed ஏரெழுபது. Some scholors believe that this work was written with the view of celebrating the caste fame of Sadaiyappa after the completion and publication of the Ramayana. At any rate the work seems to have been composed when the author attained great fame. But செம்பொற் சிலை யெழுபது seems to be so close an imitation of ஏரெழுபது that we are sceptic about its authorship. Other works said to have been written by Kamban are காஞ்சிப்புராணம்—காஞ்சிப்பிள்ளைத் தமிழ்—சோழக்குறவஞ்சி and திருக்கைவழக்கம், of these திருக்கைவழக்கம் even in the printed copies shows many irrelavancies. These are bold interpolations. We can't believe what the true text of Kamban was. About the other works we are unable to state anything as they are not forthcoming. According to Wilson's Descriptive catalogue of the Mackenzie Mss. Kamban also said to have compiled a dictionary கம்பராதரி. A prose version of the Ramayan is also ascribed to him. That the Ramayan was submitted to the approval of the learned in Srirangam and that he was by that assembly unanimously installed as the Emperor of poets seem to be facts as there is a mandap said to be built at the expense of Kamban and there is also a stone statue of Kamban carved with all the paraphernalia of an emperor.

Kamban, the man—Walter Bagehot in the second para of his study on Shakespeare says that "A person who knows nothing of an author he has read, will not know much of an author whom he has seen." Let us see what we can glean about Kamban—the man from his Ramayan. From the last stanza of நகரப்படலம் "ஏசம்முதற்கல்வி...பேரும்மன்றே," it is plain that he valued Education and learning. But that he was not satisfied with the pial school education in vogue from time immemorial is apparent from the fact that the compares the noise of a pial school to the croaking of frogs in the rainy season.

கல்வியிற்றிகழ்கணக் காயர்சம்பலிற்
பல்லிதச்சிறுசெனப் பகர்வபல்லரி.

He seems to have been a staunch advocate of Female education as appears from the following:—

பெருந்தடங் கண் பிறைநுதலார்க்கெலாம்
பொருந்த செல்வமும் கல்வியும் பூத்தலால்
வருந்தி வந்தவர்க் தேதலும் வகையும்
விருந்தமன்றி வினைவன யாவையே.

That he had the sweet uses of adversity are seen from the statement.

"தண்புள தெனினன்றே சுகமுளது கீழ்" (69—கங்
கைப்படலம்)

That he had all the torments of adversity is proved by "யாவையாத மிலர்க்கிதையாதவே, (50 பள்ளியடை) He disbelieved the proposition believed by many that women are more amorous, vide "மஞ்சர்க்கு மாதர்க்கு மனமென்பதொன்றே யன்றே" 19—கோலங்காண்படலம்)

But at the same time he advocated the doctrine that lust is the cause of man's evil.

நமதெனவெனப் புனித்தோன்றிய
வாமமேகலை மல்கையாலவரும்
காமமில்லையெனிற் கெடுகேடெனும்
காமமில்லை காதலுமில்லையே, (21—மந்தரைப்படலம்).
மல்கையர் பொருட்டாலெய்து மாந்தர்க்கு மரணென்றல்
சல்கையின் துணைநிலாலி செய்கையாற் சாதுமில்லும்
அல்கலர் நிறத்தினுலே யல்லலும் பழியுமெய்தல்
எல்கனித் காண்டியன்றே * * * (33—அரசியல் இட்சிந்தாகாண்டம்).

That he was familiar with mountain and forest scenery is exhibited in the beauties and sights pointed out to Seeta by Rama while going through the forests and on the சித்திரகூடப்பருவதம். They are not what can be depicted by pure imagination. By his many references to Sadaiyappa and his brothers, Kamban reveals a grateful nature and he has a separate stanza on gratitude :—

நிதைவகல்காதற்ருயைத் தந்தையைக்குருவைத்தெய்வ
பதவியத்தனரையாவைப் பாலரைப் பாவைமாரை
வதைபுரி குகர்க்குமுண்டா மாற்றலா மாற்றல்மாயா[டோ
உதவிகொன்ருர்க்கென்றேனு மொழிக்கலா முபாவமுண்
(62—இட்சிந்தைப்படலம்).

He discarded indulgence in spirituous liquors :—

வஞ்சமுங் களவும் பொய்யுமயக்கமு மாபில்கோட்பும்
நஞ்சமென்ருரை நீக்குந்தன்மையுங் களிப்புந்தீர்க்கும்
கஞ்சமெல் லணங்குந்திருங் கள்ளினுலருந்தினுரை
நஞ்சமுங் கொல்வதல்லால் நரகினு கல்காதன்றே

He always takes peculiar pleasure whenever he has to refer to Tamil and the Tamil country though he believed Agusthya to be the creator and father of Tamil, as was generally believed even until very recent times.

But in determining whether he was a Saivite or Vaishnavite, we fear we are in a very delicate position. There is not one tradition which refers to his religion. His son was named அம்பிகாபதி. The printed editions which we have seen of ஏரெழுபது (we have not seen Mss) have all the adoration of Vinayaka. He always refers in eulogistic terms to Siva in the Ramayan. In an edition of திருக்கைவழக்கம் printed by the late ஆறுமுக நாவலர் among the many refereuces to Saiva devotees there is this பண்ணமைத்த வேதமொரு சான்றியும் பிக்கதமிழ் சாலடியால் ஓதியுரைத்தே கருணை போற்றுகை, and this perhaps refers to நம்மாழ்வார் and this is scrupulously omitted in the edition of ஸ்ரீவேலாயுத முதலியார். But there is no other reference to Vaishnavism. In 5 of the 6 Kandas of his Ramayan, Kamban adores the Deity in general terms and in two of them Rama himself is represented. In the first Kanda, there are three stanzas in adoration of the Deity, but the first two of these are in general terms. About the third there is a difficulty. Some of the printed editions have "ஆதியந்தமரியெனயாவையும்." But some Mss read ஆதியந்தமரியன யாவையும். Let us now proceed to examine the contents of the Ramayan. In திருவவதாரப்படலம் he calls கருடன் by the epithet "என்னேர்வாளுடைய வையன்" (15) The 49th stanza of கடிமணம் reads as fallows:

என்ற நான்முகன் முதல்யாரும் யாவையும்
நின்றபேரிருளினை நீக்கி நீணெறி
சென்றமீளாக்குறி சேரச் சேர்த்திடு
தன் திருநாமத்தைத் தாலுஞ்சாத்தினே.

In the 21st stanza of சம்புமாலிவதை we have of Hanuman

"ஐயனுமமைந்தனின்ரு னுழியாளளவினுமம்
கெய்சுடர்விளக்கிற்ரோன்ற நெற்றியே நெற்றியாக,"

In the enumeration of various sins by Barata in the presence of Kausalya is included "தழைத்த நண்டின விஞன் தலைவன் அல்லனென், றழைத்தவன் &c." (99—பள்ளியடை). Virathan is made to say "மழுவாளிக் கன்றளித்த, அய்யத்தால் நிறையம்தவிர்த்தாரு முளரையர." Indra in சரபங்கர் பிறப்பு நீங்குதல் is made to utter.

எல்லையிலயற்கன் றின்னுழையென் றங்கான்
எரியோனேத்தினடி எழுவனெ றின்ற
தொல்லைமுதல் முனிவர் குறுற்ற போதே
தொலைகின்ற ஐயம் துடைத்தினையோ வந்தாய்

கவந்தன் addresses Rama as

"மூன்றுகவடாய் முளைத்தெழுந்த மூலமோ."

Such passages abound throughout the work. But we have selected only some of those which the author might have conveniently omitted without offence to Saivites and we do not hear variations of readings in the above passages. "சுக்கன் வண்டொடுமொய்ப்ப (10—காட்சிப்படலம்) is quoted by the commentator of பெரியதிருமொழி in மஞ்சளாஞ்சோலை வண்டினமாகீர் &c.," (10-1st திருமொழி). There is also reference made to Kamban about the usage of குற்றியலிகரம் in "எனமுயலெனக்கினாதே" (29 சடகோபரந்தாதி) in the commentary of இராமானுசநூற்றந்தாதி. Kamban is interred in சோட்டாசன் கோடை in accordance with the principles of Vaishnavism. Some scholars maintain that Kamban was a Saiva before writing the Ramayan. But one of the stanzas eulogizing him just when he completed the Ramayan has கம்பாட்

உரைசால்" and the previous line rhymes தமிழ்சால் உரைசால். Sadageparanthathi was written or sung extempore just when the Ramayan was subject to the approval of the assembly at Srirangam. But this work has no separate adoration of the deity and might have been composed on the requisition of the foremost of the assembly. From the evidence before us we are led to infer that Kamban died a Vaishnavite.

The last stage of his genius.—"It is reported of the poet that after he finished his Ramayan, he entirely lost his poetic inspiration and was known to listen with intense admiration to his own poems when recited without knowing that he was the author." He exhausted in his epic all the resources of the Tamil language. What a great genius is capable of producing in Tamil he did produce in the shape of the Ramayan. The muse had no more to do.

T. CHELVAKESAVAROYA MUDALIAR, M. A.

(To be continued).

EVIDENCES OF NATURAL RELIGION.

THE DIVINE PERFECTIONS.

(Continued from page 91.)

They too have a soul like theirs: They too are destined to the happiness of heaven, and they too cannot reach that happy fatherland, but by the true worship of one, intelligent personal, self-existent, infinite, eternal, immense, simple God. It is worth while to hear how Rammohum Roy described in one of his books the debasing influence of idol worship. (Populor Hinduism, page 41) "Idolatry as now practised by our countrymen, must be looked upon with great horror by common sense, as leadding directly to immorality and destructive of social comforts. For every Hindu who devotes himself to this absurd worship, constructs for that purpose a couple of male and female idols, sometimes indecent in form, as representatives of his favourite deities, he is taught and enjoined from his infancy to contemplate and repeat the history of these, as well as their fellow deities, though the actions ascribed to them be only a continued series of debauchery, sensuality, falsehood, ingratitude, breach of trust, and treachery to friends. There can be but one opinion respecting the moral character to be expected of a person, who has been brought up with sentiments of reverence to such beings who refreshes his memory relative to them almost every day and who has been persuaded to believe that a repetition of the holy name of one of these deities or a trifling present to his image or to his devotees, is sufficient not only to purify and free him from all crimes whatsoever, but to procure to him future beatitude."

As the God is so is the worshiper.

There is an old Hindu proverb which has always proved true: "Yatha Deva, tatha bhaktah," as is the God, so is the worshipper. So long as the people of this country worship the Gods of the Puranas, no religious, moral or social reform is possible. The customs usages and prejudices which hinder this vast empire from taking a high place in the common wealth of nations, are intimately blended with the superstitions of idolatry. Therefore it is the duty of every citizen to look forward to, and on his part to hasten that time when India will rank among the christian nations. Then India, along with the true religion, shall enjoy the complete benefits of civilization. Then her children worshipping the same Almighty God shall be united in the same bond of faith, hope and charity and the path of salvation shall be open to all, because the only gate that leads into life everlasting is to worship Almighty God according to that rite, or form of worship which is taught us by the christian revelation.

On creation.

Swami Vivekananda, in his speech before the Congress of Religions in Chicago, ventured to assert, that as to the origin of the world, the Vedanta Philosophy agrees with science in professing "Evolution, not Creation." This assertion, however is open to some objections which may be made introductory to the first lecture on Creation:—

Ex nihilo nihil fit.

We readily grant that in regard to the origin of the world it is a fixed dogma of every Hindu philosopher that Ex nihilo nihil fit. Nothing is produced out of nothing: and this dogma, if properly understood, is not at all wrong. When Christian scholars maintain that the world was produced out of nothing; they do not mean that nothing was to the Omnipotent Creator the meterial cause, the plastic matter out of which the world was made just as clay is the matter of the potter, wood or marble the matter of the sculptor, building materials the matter out of which the architect rears a house. 'Nothing' means 'non-entity' and non-entity cannot be the plastic matter of *anything*, because the plastic matter of *anything* is entity, not non-entity. What, therefore is meant by the proposition, "The world was made out, of nothing," is, that the Creator caused it to come into existence, with the implication that nothing of the same kind previously existed. Therefore, creation is not the change of nothing into the world but the starting of the

whole world into existence at the command of Almighty God, nothing whatever existing before. Therefore, nothing is not the subject of creation, but the mere point of departure, whence every thing that now is, sprang into existence by the power of Almighty God."

Evolution not opposed to Creation.

We deny that Evolution is opposed to creation. Evolution regards the secondary or derivative creation, not the primary, and consequently they are not mutually opposed o each other. Christian Revelation teaches us that the World was created out of nothing, but it leaves us perfectly free to believe that the whole substance of the material Universe was created in one instant, not in its individual beings and developed organisms, but as 'Pradhana,' namely, as the Unformed Nature or the material cause of the world, the root and plastic origin of everything material, unmodified, undistinguishable, without shape, character or form, but containing potentially everything merely material, and, moreover, the germs and seeds of vegetable life, which subsequently, and under the active agency of secondary causes, evolved from its germinal cell into actual existence. Now the evolution of the elements of matter into matter itself, and the development of the germs of life into particular forms of life, presupposes the existence of the elements as well as of the germs, which can be explained only by creation or by emanation from a self-subsistant Being, not by evolution. Therefore evolution begins when God's creative act is at an end. Creation regards and explains the existence of unformed matter; evolution, presupposing the existence of matter, explains the gradual development of matter into the actual existence of those things which were potentially precontained in "Pradhana" or matter itself. Evolution stands in the same relation to matter as the germ to the soil. Creation is to matter as the act of a creative will is to the thing which it calls out of nothing into existence. Thus it may be seen, that the doctrine of creation is not antagonistic to that of evolution, as the former regards the primary origin of the plastic matter of the world, while the latter regards the subsequent development of matter into the actual existence of particular things. And this is the conclusion of real science at the end of the 19th century. "It is usually assumed," says Professor Huxley, "that in the description of creation by Moses the "heaven and earth" means the material substance of the Universe. Hence the Mosaic writer is taken to imply that where nothing of a material nature previously existed, this substance appeared. That is perfectly conceivabl and therefore no one can deny that it may have happened.....It appears to me that the scientific investigator is wholly incompetent to say anything at all about the first origin of the material universe. The whole power of his organon vanishes when he has to step beyond the chain of natural causes and effects." (The Nineteenth Century, February 1880 P. P. 201—202.) And Dr. John Tyndall: "Evolution does not solve—it does not profess to solve—the ultimate mystery of this Universe. It leaves in fact that mystery untouched. For, granting the nebula and its potential life (as the plastic matter of the Universe) the question whence they came, would still remain to baffle and bewilder us. At bottom, evolution does nothing more than "transport" the conception of life's origin to an indefinitely distant past (Fragments of Science, P. 435.) The same view is indorsed by Professor St. George Mivart ("Lessons from Nature," page 372;) Mr. Lewes ("Problems of life and Mind," Vol. II, P. 292,) and generally by the greatest biologists of the day. Nor is this to be wondered at. Creation is outside the domain of physical science. Biology has nothing to say about the first origin of things: its scope, its aim is to assign a cause for any given effect connected with life, not to search into the origin of the cosmical or the plastic matter of the world: in consequence, as soon as it attempts to tear asunder the veil which enshrouds the history of creation: its organon, as Professor Huxley says, vanishes and it is left in the dark.

Emanation antagonistic to Creation.

But if Evolution is not antagonistic to Creation, Emanation is certainly so. The theory of emanation is one of the oldest in philsophy. It represents the effort of the human mind, eager to solve the mystery of the origin of the world and yet not able to transcend the power of the imagination. The mythologies and cosmogonies of all peoples, as well as ancient and modern non-Christian Philosophers, tracing out the origin of the Universe, resorted to the theory of emanation because they could not imagine the act of creation. And in so doing they deserve more pity than blame. Creation is unimaginable.

"As to the original or primary creation," Professor St. George Mivart says: "Science can say absolutely nothing against it. That it is conceivable is proved by the fact that it is widely not only conceived but believed. That it is unimaginable necessarily follows from its being an action which by the hypothesis, is utterly beyond experience." Lessons from Nature, page 372. Creation is one of those truths which in themselves belong to natural knowledge, but the clear explicit knowledge of which can hardly be attained without the aid of Revelation. And the reason is because we have no direct evidence of what creation is. We live in a world of phenomena, in a world of effects and emanations, and no man assisted, in the beginning, at the creation of the Universe. Now, all phenomena, all effects that fall under our senses, are mere changes of substances already created, something emanating from the same substance. The sun emits rays,

but from its own body, part and parcel of its substance, kin and kindred to its nature. A tree puts forth leaves, flowers, fruits, but, although differently shaped, they all partake of the nature of the tree, they are real emanations of the tree. A sculptor makes a statue, but out of a piece of marble; an architect rears, a house, but out of building materials; an author lays down the plan of a book but out of the stock of ideas and information which he treasured up in his mind; a man begets another man: but out of his own substance, and the child is truly another self, similar to him in body and soul. Indeed, we live in a world of emanations, and all corporeal changes are but emanations, either substantial or accidental, of substances already created, akin in consequence to the nature of the substance they spring from. Now, should this Universe have thus originated or emanated from God, the pantheistic theory in regard to the origin of the world would be the right one. In this supposition everything would be God, part and parcel of God a portion of the Deity, a fragment of the Divine substance. According to this theory creatures would be but particles emitted from the Divine essence, and God would be at the same time the material and efficient cause of the universe, the agent, its action and the result of action, the cause and the effect, the clay, the potter and pot, the spider and its web, the creator and the creature, the architect and the building, heaven, earth, trees, animals, men; in short, everything visible and invisible would be but a different shape, form or clothing of the same universal God.

But is it really so? Is the theory of emanatian defensible on philosophical grounds? Can we explain the origin of the world by saying that everything came from God by emanation? The origin of the world may be accounted for in four ways.

Different opinions as to the origin of the Universe.

I.—The Universe always existed as it is now; that is, it is eternal not only as to the plastic matter out of which it might have been made, but also as to the form or shape which it now bears. This opinion is ascribed to Aristotle. Cf. Jul. Simon, De Deo Aristotelis, Paris, 1839.

II.—The World was made out of an uniformed matter, eternal, self-existent, undifferentiated, undistinguishable, productive but not production; and this opinion is said to have been Plato's and it is in fact that of the Sankhyan Philosophy.

III.—The Universe originated from God by emanation, so that in no way is it distinct from God, but is evolved out of God's substance, so that God is at the same time the efficient and the material cause of the world, the clay, the potter and the pot, the spider and its web, the creator and the creature, the architect and the building, as the Vedanta Philosophy will have it.

IV. The Universe was created by God out of nothing.

Now, which of these four opinions is the right one? Let us examine each one of them.

The first opinion untenable.

The world exists. Nobody who is in his senses can deny this truth. We see the sun, the moon, the stars; we breathe the fragrant scent of the flowers; we enjoy the sweet flavour of fruits; and our ears delight in the harmonious sounds of music. Nobody can deny what the senses infallibly tell us, *viz.*, that we exist, and the world exists too, and that our corporeal and mental impressions are caused by the very objects that strike our senses, and which make up with their number and variety this visible universe.

Aristotle's opinion.

The world therefore exists. But whence did it come? Did it always exist as it is now? Is this universe eternal, not only as to the plastic matter out of which it might have been made, but also as to the form or shape which it now bears? Some say, this was the opinion of Aristotle, and if so, he was certainly wrong, and his opinion is altogether untenable on scientific grounds.

Plato's opinion.

Plato, with most philosophers of antiquity, admitted the eternity of matter, but not the eternity of the world as it is now. In the Timæo, page 27, he raises the question whether the world is without origin, eternal ab initio, or whether it had a beginning, and answer it by saying that the world is not eternal but generated because it is visible, perceptible by the senses, and corporeal. That the world is visible, perceptible by the senses, and corporeal, any one can see by himself, but some perhaps may fail to see why a thing that is corporeal cannot be eternal. And yet the reason is at hand. Everything that is corporeal is, by its very nature, inconstant, alterable, mutable and what is such cannot be eternal in the sense that it was never created by God. That the world is made up of things inconstant, alterable and mutable, needs no demonstration. The world develops, itself in a constant movement, in a cantinual progress. Nothing in this world is immovable. We assist every day at the birth, growth and decay of the things in the midst of which we live. Science tells us that not even the heavens are beyond the borders of mutability. New stars appear in the blue deep of the sky: old ones in course of time turn pale, emit but faint lustre, and finally vanish altogether from among their fair companions. Change, dissolution or death closes the cycle of everything. But there is no effect without a cause: therefore from the fact that all things are mutable we rightly argue that they are not

self-existent, but had a cause and beginning of that existence, whether substantial or accidental, which they acquire by the change. When we see a newly born babe and search for the agency which caused it to be born, its father and mother are pointed out to us as the joint-authors of its existence. When we ask how that field, before so barren, now looks so beautiful and green with the growing crop, we are answered, because of the seed that was sown in it. When we inquire why that liquor, before so sweet, has now become so sour, we are told that this change, this effect is due to fermentation. Therefore we rightly argue that every change, every effect, has a cause of its existence, namely it is contingent. But if each thing, each effect, each creature in particulars has a cause of its existence, it is no less true of the universe in general. Each man has had a father, all men have had fathers. The first man also must have had a father; we do not necessarily say a man like himself, but a cause of his existence. For if each link of a chain depends, through its superior links, on the first link that starts the chain, how is the whole series of links or the whole chain intelligible without the first link? Therefore, if each one of the things, the collection of which we call the universe has had a cause and a beginning, the collection also, that is the universe has had a first cause and a beginning, that is, it is not enternal.

Contingency of the Universe.

Indeed everything that can be and not be, that is, which so exists as not to exclude the possibility of not existing, is contingent, namely, it does not exist of absolute necessity, but has a cause of its existence, and depends for its existence on a cause outside itself, because, what ever does not exist of absolute necessity and in virtue of its own essence, is, in itself, indifferent to being or not being, and is, in consequence, indebted for its actual existence to a cause or agent outside itself. Thus a house, for instance, is of itself indifferent either to being or not being,, namely, it so exists as not to exclude the possibility of not existing, and as it was raised on its foundations it might also not have been raised, and consequently, its existence is limited, finite, caused, or contingent.

Now, as has been shewn above, all things of which we have experience are contingent, namely, they so exist as not to exclude the possibility of not existing, they being effects of other causes which can fail, and being connected by laws with other beings which, as they are mutable, show by their very nature that they have not in themselves the cause of their existence, and are indebted for it to some agent external to them. Therefore if the whole world is contingent, viz., has not in itself the cause of its existence, there remains no other alternative but to say that it was created by God.

The Universe not self existent.

Moreover, if this world is eternal and not created by God, but has in itself the necessity of its existence, it must exist of itself, or be self-subsistent. But self-subsistence as such is the essential character of God, and God cannot be but one. Therefore we are forced either to admit the contingency and casuality of the world itself, or to grant that the world itself is God. But the alternative is absurd as God is pure spirit and the world is material; God is unchangeable, the world is forever changing; God is infinite, the world is finite and limited on every side; God is essentially simple the world is a collection of composed beings. Therefore the contingency or causality of the world is an established fact, proved alike by reason and science.

Science in favour of the temporality of the world.

We say by science, because as Professor Charles A. Young says: "One lesson seems to stand out clearly that the present system of stars and worlds is not an eternal one. We have before us irrefragable evidence of continuous, uncompensated progress, inexorable in one direction. The hot bodies are losing their heat, and distributing it to the cold ones, so that there is a steady unremitting tendency towards a uniform (and therefore useless) temperature throughout the universe; for heat does work, and is available as energy only when it can pass from hotter to cooler bodies, so that this warming up of cooler bodies at the expense of hotter ones, always involves a loss, not of energy (for that is indestructible), but of available energy. To use the technical language now usually employed, energy is unceasingly "dissipated" by the processes which maintain the present life of the universe and this dssipation of energy can have but one ultimate result, that of absolute stagnation, wher a uniform temperature has been every where attained. If we carry our imagination backwards we reach at last a "*beginning of things*" which has no intelligible antecedent; if forwards, an "*end of things in stagnation.*" That by some process or other this end of things will result in new heavens and a new earth we can hardly doubt, but science has as yet no word of explanation. (A text-book of general Astronomy page 525.) And Professor Newcomb says "All modern science seems to point to the finite duration of our system in its present form, and carry us back to the time when neither sun nor planet existed, save as a mass of glowing gas. It also points forward to the time when the sun and stars shall fade away, and nature shall be enshrouded in darkness and death, unless some power now unseen shall uphold or restore her." (Popular Astronomy, page 504.) Indeed the whole Universe may be likened to a clock when going. The force which keeps the hands and pendulum in motion is transmitted to the pendulum through

a train of wheels the motion of which is kept by a gradual falling of the weight with which they are connected. The whole moving machinery therefore depends on the slow falling of the weight which is running through a certain course from the top of the clock to the bottom. Hence we can infer with entire certainty that some power must have wound it up and started it; and that unless the same power intervenes again the weight must reach the bottom and the clock must then stop. Now, what the weight is to the clock, that is the available energy to the Universe. But we know with entire certainty that available energy is unceasingly dissipated, with the ultimate result that the weight of the Universe will stop running, which means the end of the present order of things; and likewise we know for certain that the available energy must have been, so to say, wound up and started at the beginning of things. which implies the existence of a creator as well as the temporal production of the world.

The world created by god in time and not from eternity.

It may be objected here that the world was created indeed by god, but from all eternity and not in time, and consequently that the world, although dependent on god for its existence, is nevertheless eternal both retrospectively and progressively.

We answer, that cannot be. This theory is against the conclusions of modern science which proves beyond any reasonable doubt the finite duration of the world in its present form, both retrospectively and peogressively. It is likewise against reason as the following argument shows:—

All that is mutable is temporal.

Everything that is or can be mutable, must have had a measure of its duration from its beginning till now. But the world is mutable, as it consists of an uninterrupted chain of causes and effects succeeding one another in time, space, corruption and generation, which successions are all capable of being numbered. Therefore the world has had a measure of its duration from its beginning till now, that is to say, it was created in time, and is not from eternity. Indeed, movement. and succession without beginning involves a contradiction, because all movements can be numbered and measured by time, whilst no increase or accumulation of any time. could ever exhaust the past eternity which is infinite and unlimited. Therefore the world cannot be eternal, but was created by god in time and not from eternity.

Infinite multitude in act, absurd.

Moreover, movement and succession belong to material quantity or number, which can be, indeed, infinite potentially, but not in act. But if the world were from all eternity we might have an infinite number of human souls, which appears to be absurd. Therefore the theory that the world was created from eternity must be discarded altogether. (Cfr Fr. Mattiussi S. Y. Lectures on Natural Philosophy, n. 64-5. 1896.)

The duration of the world not finite and infinite at the same time.

Furthermore, if the world were from all eternity, its duration, considered retrospectively, would be actually infinite: illimited; but taken progressively it would be actually finite and limited, that is to say, it would at the same time be finite and infinite. But this is a most flagrant contradiction, and the world therefore cannot have existed from all eternity. (cfr. Select writings of the M. R. Dr. L. Meurin s. y. p. 7.)

Finally common sense tells us that there is no succession without a beginning, no number without a unit, no period without a commencement, no movement without a first impulse, and consequently no world without a temporal origin.

We are pleased to close this first lecture with an extract from a Lecture on the Existence of god, delivered in Bombay in the year 1875, by the late Rt. Rev. Dr. Meurin, s. y. He starts with the following syllogism: Nothing moveable can have existed from eternity: this world is moveable; hence it cannot have existed from all eternity, but must have had a beginning." And here the Rt. Rev. Bishop brings the following illustration:—

"Let us for a moment suppose that the world, and consequently a movement, or a succession of movements, was possible from all eternity, that is, without having had any beginning. Now, imagine an eagle and a dove coming both in a straight line from the East and fly into this our hall, and stopping here before us. Suppose them to have come from all eternity in a straight line through space, from beyond the earth, the moon, the sun, the stars, without any rest till now and here. There is nothing impossible in this, if we suppose the world can be from ever. Now we ask the eagle: Where do you come from? Straight from the East. From where did you start? From nowhere; I never started, but have always been flying from all eternity till now. What distance have you travelled through? An infinitely long distance without a beginning up to this spot. How many miles did you do a minute? One mile a minute. How many miles altogether?

An infinite number without any beginning. How many years did you take to finish this task? An infinite number of years without a first one.

"Now we ask the dove Where do you come from? Straight from the East, along the same path with the eagle Where did you start from? I never started, but have always been flying till now, like the Eagle. How long has your journey been? Infinitely long, up to this spot just like the eagle's. How many miles did you fly in a minute?

Half a mile. Why, you have only accomplished half the eagle's journey, since you moved only half a mile, whilst he moved one ? Yes, my way is only half the eagle's way. Yet both ways are infinite ? Of course. And consequently equal ? Yes, equal. Then the whole is equal to its own half, and at the same time double its half ? Well, say the dove, such a contradiction you must swallow, if you admit the possibility of any movement from all eternity. Well said, little dove you are cleverer than all our philosophers, who admit the possiblity of the world having existed from all eternity, and going ever on through an infinite number of changes."

In conclusion : the world in its present form cannot be eternal, neither retrospectively nor progressively, but as it had a beginning, so most certainly it will have an end. Or, as Mr. Balfour has expressed it: " We sound the future and learn that after a period, long compared with the individual life, but short indeed compared with the divisions of time open to our investigation, the energies of our system will decay, the glory of the sun will be dimmed, and the earth tideless and inert, will no longer tolerate the race which has for moment disturbed its solitude." This then is the verdict of science, that there was a beginning, and that for it no force whereof she takes cognizance can account." *Modern science and Ancient Faith, by the Rev. J. Gerard S. Y.*

G. BARTOLI, S. J., D. D.

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, NOVEMBER 1898.

"PATRIOTISM IN THE MAKING OF HISTORY."

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Subramania Aiyar, delivered a most excellent speech on the occasion of his presiding at the Presidency College Historical Society, when Mr. Glyn Barlow delivered his able address on " Patriotism in the making of History." A speech containing so much manliness, and thorough good sense, and breathing such genuine love of his country and his people and sparkling with mother wit, we have seldom read. He began by observing that we would have no occasions for the exercise of patriotism as illustrated by the lecturer in as much as the Government gave us good Government and internal peace combined with perfect non-interference with the religious and social institutions of the Hindus. Yet he said there were instances in which he would like Government interference. Talking of the Government's absurd attitude towards the control of our religious and charitable endowments, he observed,

" The temples and *matams* had not been created for enjoyment of particular individuals, but were institutions intended for the public good ; when they found the resources of such institutions wasted and misappropriated, and asked the Government to give Boards and regulations for controlling them, Government on the plea of maintaining religious neutrality would not interfere in the matter. He mentioned this instance to simply show them that in the matter of religion they had not the slightest chance of their patriotism being evoked." But he left unsaid that it is our duty as good and patriotic citizens that we should agitate and agitate till we get Government to interfere and set our religious institutions in order. Of course we crave Government help, only because the Act now in force is a Government measure and it is so imperfect and ill-conceived that no good is possible, so long as this regulation remains in force. To instance only a recent case where this Act miserably failed to secure any good we refer to the Alagar Covil Devastanam suit. It was after very great difficulty counsel and pleader argued and obtained sanction to sue the committee for several acts of misfeasance, and public subscriptions were also raised to pay for the courtfee, &c. The suit was very hotly contested and the litigation was pending

for more than 3 or 4 years in the District Court itself and a decree for several thousand Rupees and the dismissal of some of the committee members was obtained. The dismissed members appealed to the High Court and while it was pending there, the plaintiffs were got to file a razinama, consenting to the reversal of the decree itself! So that the whole litigation ended in a miserable fiasco notwthistanding the time and trouble and money spent in the matter. And such a monstrosity was possible under this existing statute!!! And the Bill to deal with these institutions in still hanging fire and for more than 12 years. Going back to the speech, it contains several others gems, by way of defining and illustrating what true and false patriotism consisted in. Here is one, "After all, the proper work of patriotism consisted in the display of one's influence and powers for the benefit of some body other than himself. If a man was growing wealthy, powerful, strong and full of knowledge, what he asked was the good of that man's wealth, power, strength and knowledge if they were not to be utilised in the service of weaker people. In the case of an individual, possession of these powers could only be held to be possession, where proper use was made of them." He paid a compliment to the present generation, which we hope they will try fully to deserve, "There were more patriotic men in their generation than among the men of his generation. Every year that passed broke some barriers of caste, race and creeds. The British Empire was conferring upon them almost imperceptibly several boons and instilling a new feeling of unity out of which should come this desire to serve the country. They were therefore in the future likely to have many more opportunities of being patriots." And he exorted them to help to secure such educational institutions which will form and mould their character as true Indians and Indian gentlemen by supplying truly indigenous and national moral and religious culture. And he gave useful hints as to how to combine the old with new in the improvement of the Indian mind.

He admitted that there were numerous evils in their society and their customs, which were being got rid of gradually Nevertheless, pruning away the evils, they should try not to destroy the root and substance of the Indian char cter": and after instancing the case how in Madura, all the ornamental trees planted by him (not all, a few *Pinnata* have struggled to get on) beside the margosa trees have died out, whereas the margosa trees are flourishing and giving luxuriant and useful shade, he drew the moral that in selecting things which were not actually indigenous to the country, they would have to take great care; they should be careful not to plant exotics which would die out, so as to ensure that their progress might be healthy natural and useful. He also remarked that patriotism was impossible without character, and character cannot be formed except in truly national institutions. And he instanced the Central Hindu College of Benares and the grand scheme of Mr. Tata's as truly national conceptions and he recommended these institutions for support from the purse of every real patriot of our country and lover of our people.

THE POETS OF THE TAMIL LANDS.

By the Rev. G. U. Pope, M.A.; D.D.
(Balliol College and Indian Institute, Oxford.)

VI. THE NALADI NANNURRU, OR 400 QUATRAINS, AND THE LATER TAMIL GNOMIC POETRY.

§ 1. Introductory.

It is sometimes said that gnomic verse is not poetry. Yet if the faculty of taking the thoughts that most occupy minds, the ideas that all men acknowledge, the feelings that inspire all hearts, and of giving to them such perfect expression, that they shall be recalled by all the people everywhere, and become the favourite commonplaces of all who speak the language,—if this faculty be not the poetic faculty, it is something so closely allied to it that, for the gnomic bards of South India (some of whom not unfrequently take a flight into higher regions, on the wings of imagination, intense feeling and profound thought), we feel inclined to vindicate the title of genuine poets.

Before we proceed to the consideration of the other poets that have written didactic or gnomic verses in Tamil, it is necessary to remark that very early in the history of Tamil literature, probably about the time of Kabilar, the learned men of Madura, and it may be of other places, began the preparation and publication (if we may call it so) of a whole series of books which profess to be collections, compendiums, or anthologies, of poetry in different topics. To these the name of *togai* or abstracts was given. Thus the collection called the Four Hundred Quatrains (*Naladi Nannurru*) gave what were supposed to be the gems of that species of composition, moral epigrams. Four hundred larger lyrics were gathered together which had been sung or supposed to be sung by ancient bards on matters connected with active life (*Poral*). Many similar collections of great value have been published, and generally in collections of four hundred poems, or verses; though some in which the poems are longer are in tens or hundreds. The chief of these valuable works will be noticed hereafter

In the case of all these compilations there is good ground to believe that changes have been made in the text, and that some

Written for the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, October, 1893.

poems have been composed to fill up the number. But in general they represent the most valuable remnants of ancient Tamil literature, and it is only recently that they have been brought out of obscurity, collated and published by the very learned and enlightened Tamil scholars of the day.

It may also be mentioned that some of these contain very important passages of a didactic character, which have been made the foundation of a great deal of the more popular recent poetry.

No doubt many things in this remarkable literature say more to us than they did to those for whom they were first written. Many of these epigrammatic masterpieces have a profound significance, of which their authors themselves perhaps were hardly conscious. Their resemblance to the gnomic poetry of Greece is remarkable as to their subjects, their sentiments, and the state of society when they were uttered.

In regard to both Avvaiyar and Kabilar (of whom we have given some account), it might be possible to number them among the gnomic poets, but they were authors also of lyric and romantic compositions. Tiruvalluvar, of course, is the prince of gnomic poets; but his exquisite metre, the couplet called the Kurral, separates him from all the rest. Avvaiyar's quatrains we have spoken of, but it is only the *Muthurai* that can claim our attention here. Though not high imaginative poetry, the grace, ease, simplicity, perfect classical propriety, striking ingenuity, and homely sweetness of these thirty quatrains—a necklace of pearls worthy of the neck of Sarasvati—are quite unemaginable to a western mind. They are not great, but they are wonderfully charming!

In passing from the *Kurral* to the next in popular esteem, the *Naladiyar*, and other gnomic poetry, we are struck by the fact that except Tiruvalluvar there is really no great poet who has composed any number of couplets. We believe that the couplet itself was the result of an attempt (scarcely successful in other and weaker hands) to condense a quatrain into a perfect gem: "an arrow of song." The Venba quatrain, which is the normal metre of the gnomic bards, is, as a rule, complete in itself. A notable exception to this is the famous *Nala Venba* (History of Nala). This quatrain (see introduction to Pope's *Naladiyar*) consists of two lines which rhyme (at the beginning), followed by a single foot which rhymes with the preceding line, and connects them with another couplet having its own rhyme, and being in fact a *Kurral*. This is a kind of miniature sonnet, the first couplet often strikes the keynote, the single foot prepares the transition, and the latter couplet contains the whole point and application of the verse. There is an inexpressible charm about a perfect quatrain. Of these (very generally consummately beautiful) quatrains the *Naladi* contains 400. We must again remark that during the later days of the Madura school of poetry (or college) the learned men set themselves to gather together and arrange the scattered fragments of verse that had come down the stream of time (a few of them), from, it seems to us, about the date of the christian era. That Madura was a great and civilized city in the time of Augustus is certain, and it seems probable that these epitomes, as well as the oldest grammars, contain fragments of Tamil verse dating from that period. These poems for some reason or other are arranged into groups of 400 compositions. The *Naladi* contains 400 quatrains; the *Pura-Nanuurru* is made up of 400 songs varying in length from four to forty lines, and these are not unlike the canzoni of Italian poetry. The *Kuli-Togai* is a series of lyrics, each of which reads like a short act of a drama, and elucidates some theme, generally amatory. There are nine of these epitomes, of which only five are really known at present.

It is evident that the compilers took great liberties with their material, and it is very hard in all cases to believe in the authenticity and genuineness of many of the fragments. There are however, in very many cases, their own abundant and striking evidence.

§ 9. The Naladi,* or 400 Quatrains.

The work, then, which stands next in estimation to the *Kurral* among the Tamil people is the *Naladi-Nanuurru*, or 400 Quatrains. Of this we need say little as it has been made fully accessible to both English and Tamil students. The tradition regarding it is that 8,000 sages brought their verses to the king of Madura, who, to test their worth, caused the palmyra leaves on which they were written to be thrown into the river Vaigai. Those that floated against the current were to be preserved. Three collections of leaves stood the test; one was found to contain these 400, and the two others consisted of similar collections of verses, which are extant under the names of *Para-mori* = "Old words" (see § 9) and *Arruneiri-saram* = "Essence of the way of Virtue." (See § 10.) The two latter works are inferior, and are noticed later on.

I suppose that the meaning of the tradition is, that these are verses of various ancient Tamil poets, which the stream of time has not been able to sweep away into oblivion. Since they were not allowed to perish, they may be presumed to have been the most worthy compositions of those olden times.

They are, however, of very unequal value, often obscure, sometimes trivial. The prevailing tone is cynical, and we miss in them the healthy humanity of Tiruvulluvar. They have been forced by a later native editor into an arrangement harmonizing with that of the *Kurral*; the result of which is, that the title of a chapter often affords no clue to its contents. Some few are of much later date, I think, than the *Kurral*, and seem to indicate an acquaintance with it. The following are fair specimens:

The Funeral.

They march and then strike once. A little while they wait.
Then strike a second time the drum. Behold, how brave!
The third stroke sounds: they veil *it*, take the fire, go, forth:—
The dying bear the dead!

Summer Friends.

Lord of the goodly land, adown whose hilly heights.
Cool, clear, the torrents ceaseless flow. The beetle bright
With many a beauteous spot, seeks not the bloom less bough:—
The unprosperous have no friends!
(*Comp.* Hor. I., xxxv. 25. 28)

"Vanitas Vanitatum."

Severed are friendship's ties; minished are pleasant ones;
Love's bonds are loosen'd too; then look within and say,
What profit is there in this joyous life of thine?
A wail as from the sinking ship is heard!

The Good Housewife.

One every side the narrow dwelling lies exposed;
On every part the rain drips down; yet, if the dame
Has noble gifts, by townsfolk praised for modest worth,
Call such a housewife's blest abode a *home*!

* Naladiyar, or Four Hundred Quatrains in Tamil, with Introduction, Translation, and Notes Critical, Philological and Explanatory, to which is added a Concordance and Lexicon, with Authorities from the oldest Tamil Writers." By the Rev. G. U. Pope, D.D., sometime Fellow of the Madras University, Member of the Royal Asiatic Society and of the German Oriental Society. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1893.

PENITENCE.

As when lamp enters darkness flies, so sin stands not
Before man's penitence. As when in lamp the oil
Wastes, darkness rushes in; so evil takes its place
Where deeds of virtue cease.

VARIOUS PARADOXES.

The unintelligent may read but are unread!
Men of intelligence unread are men well read!
In utter penury who scorn to beg are rich!
And poor are *wealthy men* who give no gifts.

SALT AND SWEET WATERS.*

"Though close by the sea, sweet waters ofttimes spring forth there; on the hill-side the waters often gush out all brine! Thus men are not as their race. Lord of the dashing sea's cool shore! Men are as their minds." (245.)

Compare Tiruvalluvar's (595: "The height of men is measured by their minds."

§ 3. NAN-MANI-KADIGI: "THE SALVER OF FOUR GEMS."

The *Nan-mani Kadigai* is similar in subjects and manner to the Naladi, consisting of quatrains in the same metre.

A usefull edition was published at the "Kala-ratnagaro" Press, with a good Tamil commentary and notes; and a very poor English translation. It is by *Vilambiya Kaganar*, who, some say lived in the fifteenth century; and seems to have been modelled after the *Elathi*.

The printed work contains 106 quatrains; but a MS., once belonging to Mr. Stokes, gives only 101. Many are very modern; some are exceedingly elegant; but more are rather rugged and pedantic. Parallel verses to most of them occur in Bohtlingk's Indische Spruche. A work of this name is mentioned second in the list of Sanga-Seyyul, or poems that received the sanction of the Madura College, but it seems to have been, at the best, only the germ of this cento.

A few specimens of this homely "household" poetry will not be uninteresting.

"THE HEART KNOWS ITS OWN BITTERNESS."

The trouble from *toddy* the drunkard knows;
The trouble from water among birds the sea-gull knows;
The trouble from poverty the master of many wives knows;
The trouble of concealment knows the thief. (97.)

NATURE.

Though foulness light upon the pearl, its worth's the same;
Anoint it, yet will rust upon the iron spread;
In fetters bind the BASE, and give him light of fore,
He still will show his nature's stain. (100.)

"Not to sever from the excellent and wise is an education;
To live with those who cherish us not is a sore;
The word uttered by friends is as the tuneful lute;
The house without a courteous house-wife is as a waste." (101.)
So in Naladi 361.

WORDS.

'Sweet words make men your own. Harsh words
Unpleasing cause men's hearts to harshly blame.
A gentle word
Brings gracious thoughts to human hearts. By this
The heaven that passes not is gained." (106.)

(To be continued.)

* Another bard, whose epithet was "Owner of the Elephant that Chews the Sugar-Cane," and who is otherwise unknown, has composed an interesting bit on the same theme, but with a different application:

THE SEA AND THE STREAMLET.

'Tis shame to say to wealthy men, "Give ye";
Sorer disgrace when these say, "We give not"
To say, "Take this my gift," is excellent;
To say, "I take not," is more excellent.
Who thirst for water will *not stoop to drink*
On the sea's marge where sparkling wavelets spread
Of water crystal clear.—Though cows and sheep
Thick thronging make the banks one muddy mass,
And though the streamlet trickles scant and slow,
There's well-trod path to where sweet waters flow.'

WEALTH.

From the rock the radiant gem is born;
From the dear one's speech high joys are born
From gentle kindliness is virtuous action born
And everything from wealth is born. (7.)

The following is suggestive

THE SENSES AND REALITY

By the tongue men know sweet flavours; by the nose
They smell and know all flowers; by discerning eyes
They see what is ornamental; by *thoughtful search*
Of many combined the real is thought out. (78.)

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE Philanthropic Miss Manning, Hony. Secretary of the National Indian Association intends to make a short stay in India from next December to the end of February. The committee hope that the visit may help to stimulate the Branches of the Association, encourage education for girls, and in general tend to promote friendly relations.

***

MR. V. APPUSWAMY PILLAI, Dubash of Messrs. Best and Co., has done a great public service by publishing the short Pamphlet on the Plague in all the Vernaculars and distributing them gratis. This is highly commendable, and his example is worth imitating by all our patriotic and well-to-do citizens and nobles who really wish to benefit our ignorant fellow countrymen. The amount of ignorance that prevails among them is simply incredible.

***

THE last number of the 'Theosophist' contains the first instalment of translation of Vijnana Bikshu's commentary on the Vedanta Sutras, from the able pen of Mr. Srish Chander Basu, B. A. The publication of this translation will also prove how untenable some of Sankara's positions are.

***

PROFESSOR Wilson also observes in page 81 Vol. I of his works as follows. "The principal places at which worship is addressed to Vishnu include Srirangam and Venkatadri or Tripati. The traditions of the latter acknowledge that it was a Saiva shrine in the time of Ramanuja, who recovered it for the Vishnavas." The Friday *Abhisheka* and pujah and the *Vilvarchana* in the month of Kirthika are also remnents of the old practice.

We are glad to learn that the Reverend Dr. Pope is actually passing his first proof sheet of our beloved 'Thruvachakam' through the Press. Will our Tamil nobles and *Madathipathies* respond to his call at least now?

***

The ensuing Theosophic convention between the 28th and 30th December next promises to be a most interesting one. All the leading lights of the Theosophical society are expected to be present. The subject chosen by Mrs. Besent for her four morning lectures is "Evolution of life and form" in its fourfold division of.

(1) Ancient and modern science.
(2) The function of the Gods.
(3) The evolution of life,
(4) The evolution of form.

***

The truth is as Dr. Fairbairn himself seems to perceive it, Christianity makes so much less progress now than in the olden days, in India, and this is mostly due to the attitude and character of the Government chaplains and missionaries who now come out to India. Judged by the high religious ideal the Indians have of a man of God, the Christian "*Padre*' seems too worldly in their eyes. They indulge in all sorts of sports and games and shooting &c., and this occupies a much greater portion of their time than the time actually spent in active preaching. And the want of sympathy between these and even their own congregation is one of the standing complaints against the modern missionaries. Many a respectable and highly placed Indian Christian Gentlemen have complained to us in the most bitter terms of the marked race distinctions made by their spiritual guides between their European and Indian congregation. The Christian preacher may talk as loudly as possible about the Father-hood of God, and the equality of all his children before His eyes, but when it comes to putting the precepts into practice, even as regards their own *Christian brethren*, the pill is too bitter for them to swallow. The European Missionary thinks it a great condescension to invite an Indian Christian to his table in private, but he has not the courage to do so, when he has also invited others of his own race to his table. It would be worth as much as his place if the native catechist would dispense with his low *salaam*. "*Salaamiah*," and presume to shake hands with his *superior*. Even the American, while he hates all kind of snobbery in his own country becomes the veriest snob after be sets his foot in Indian soil and this when displayed in a teacher of God embitters them much more to their Indian congregation. Of course our observations must not be taken to be universal nor applying to all as we know of many noble exceptions. But the generality of people, as the world goes, judge of things more by particular instances than otherwise: and how are we to blame them.

Four of the eight Articles which appear in the current number of the *Madras Review* will be interesting to our readers. By "Ancient Indian Literature," an *Indian Lady* only understands. 'Ancient Sanscrit Literature,' which latter title would have been more appropriate and less misleading; and it contains an admirable review and follows the views of such great oriental scholars as Colebrooke. Wilson and Weber, Max Muller and as such contains nothing new in it. And this short para is the all that appears about the Tamil-land, and embodies the old view which we tried to explode in our last number. Says she.

"The subject of the second great epic is the invasion of Ceylon by Rama, king of Oudh. The existence of Rama has been questioned by many; but his name appears as a king of Oudh in the most authentic of Hindu genealogies, and the date of 2000 B. C. is generally given him. The allegory in the Ramayana can be historically applied to the spread of Aryan Civilization towards the South, especially Ceylon; and Professor. Weber applies it as follows. Sita refers to the field furrow and therefore may represent Aryan husbandry protected by Rama, against the attacks of the plundering aborigines, the Rakshasas, while the native aborigines, who were friendly to aryan civilization were called monkeys. Probably the civilized inhabitants in Southern India and Ceylon found by Rama were the descendants of Turanian or Cushite Invaders; but not much is known about them. The Aryan colonies founded in the South by Rama, may have led to the gradual amalgamation of the Northern and Southern Races."

***

The wonder is why our own people living amongst ourselves, should take the cue altogether from the often imperfect and onesided observations of scholars of a bygone age, instead of trying to study the institutions and things directly, and form their own conclusions.

***

Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai continues his long article of "The Tamils Eighteen Hundred Yeards ago," and the present contribution is wholly devoted to the story of Kovilan and Kannaki as contained in the ancient classic Silapadikaram, much older by far than the classic poems in Sanscrit, except perhaps the Mahabharat and Ramayana and the story is most charmingly and pathetically told.

***

The article on 'Tirupathi Temple' contains no mention of the well-accredited tradition, which finds place even in the District Manual of North Arcot besides the distinct account in the Skanda and other puranas and in many an old Tamil poem, that the Temple was originally a Temple of God Subramanya; and which tradition is well crystallized in such names, as *Venkata Subban*, *Venkata Subramanyan*, *Thirumalai Swamy*.

***

Mr. C. V Swaminathier, of the *Viveka Chintamani* fame contributes an article on his favourite topic, "the encouragement of Vernaculars." And from the mass of opinions and incidents he quotes it is evident that the true cause of the decadence of Vernacular education in this presidency is the stopping and cutting of all material encouragement for the study of the Vernaculars, follow-

ing as it did the abolition of purely Vernacular Schools and Vernacular tests for preferment to Government Office, an opinion which we have been holding to from the very beginning and against the very opinion of the *Madras Mail*. We have also supported the scheme of Oriental side, but not as a complete panacea, but only as the least expensive and practical beginning that can be made in the direction. We should indeed be glad if the present Learned Head of the Education Department would reverse his predecessor's policy and rehabilitate the purely indigenous Vernacular Schools and reintroduce the purely Vernacular Test. There are still surviving in many a Mofussil Cutchery and in many a Mofussil Court, many a clerk and many a pleader earning decent salaries, and incomes, who know not a single word of English. Is the qualifyihg by a pleader for his profession an impossibility in the Vernaculars, when by statute every act of the legislature has to be translated into every one of the Vernacular. And here was a gentleman who came to occupy the post of at District Judge and who originally wrote his Judgments in the Vernaculars. Shall such things be in the future or shall not be? Unless the Government moves in this direction, of course the thing must be impossible.

***

Dr. Fairbairn, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford who is shortly coming out to India as Haskell Lecturer, made the following interesting observations, at an entertainment provided by his friends:—Dr. Fairbairn in the course of his speech in reply, said that there was a time when he would have faced this visit to India perhaps, with no more courage than it was faced to-day, but with more pleasure. It could have been faced with a feeling that was not wedded to responsibility in the same measure, and also with the feeling that visitors would come, and that profit would have been gained past one's own expecting. It was a different thing going with duty to do from going with simply pleasure to enjoy. It was the old tale of one's first interest in comparative religion. The old eternal problem of "What is God?" "Whence come faith in Him?" "Why do I believe in Him?" haunted him in old days in waking and in sleeping. Many a long hour was spent in trying to find reasons for faith that was hard to stand, but while long search found frail reason, often there rose at one moment a wondrous vision of man in all the generations, and in all his religion, building his altar formulating his belief, seeking after God, that haply he might find Him. And that gave such a new sense of meaning to the old word "God" and to the old word "religion," that there grew a nobler inspiration, which had come back to him during this past month. Religion, in a sense, was but an incident in the life of their people. They loved to explore; they loved commerce and conquest. They loved literature; they had many loves, and religion was but one. The Hindu people dwelt in their own land, a mixed multitude, but their supreme consideration was religion. It filled them it possessed them in a way which our own could not be said to possess us, and to take the religion that was, as he said, an incident in their English life to them seemed about as venturous an enterprise as could well be handed over to mortal man. They should, too, fell how very necessary it was that they should understand the Hindu, and that the Hindu should understand them. It was not a very great thing for a man to be a student of comparative religion in England, and to interpret in England the Hindu mind. They would never suspect anyone of trying to make Hindu of them, and they would therefore make the necessary deductions from his presentation of the faith of that land. When they went to such a people as the Hindus, and had to speak to them, they were not simply students of comparative religion. They were to talk to the inmost feelings and convictions of their minds to a race whose convictions were not theirs. Then consider what they needed. They had two great representatives of the Christian religion. They had the representatives of the English power—the Civil servant and the soldier. It was very difficult for the religion of peace to be carried out by a people of dominion. (Hear, hear.) It was a very difficult thing for the people who were ruled to receive the religion of the rulers as a religion of peace, of simplicity, of humility. (Hear, hear.) They regarded that religion as bound up with the Empire—its armies and its magistrates—and Christianity would have a far better chance in India if it had come in its own right to speak in its own name, in absolute dissociation from the Imperial power. (Applause.) Look, then, at the limitations which surrounded the missionery who presented the other power. He could not get at the people, and the people could in hardly any sense get at him. They talked of Hiduism as if it were a unit; it was an infinite multitude. It was a great social system, and that social system bound it all together and displayed the only unity it had. The caste was a marvellous thing. It had stood through centuries. Alexander and his Grees saw it; Islam and his conquerers saw it, Portuguese and French saw it, and the Englishman found it to-day as strong as ever. Could they set a harder task than to break throught it? All change in India, as elsewhere, must come through the mind, and however slow the change might be, it was still a change to be worked from the mind outward, and not simply from circumstances inward. There was nothing England needed so much to know as the people she governed. (Hear, hear.) They would never know the Indian problem until they knew the Indian mind, and therefore interpret India to England was even a greater necessity than to interpret England to India. They needed to know something of the immost life and heart of the people before they were able to know how to rule them."

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897

VOL. II. | **MADRAS, DECEMBER 1898.** | **No 7**

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-S'UTRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page* 127.

Adhikarana 9.

Having thus incidentally shewn what sort of a person is qualified for Brahmavidyâ, the Sûtrakâra now proceeds with the main subject.

Because of trembling. (I. iii. 40.)

In the Katha-Vallîs, in the section treating of the thumb-sized Purusha, it is said as follows

"Whatever there is, the whole world, when gone forth (from the Brahman) trembles in the breath; (it is) a great terror, the thunderbolt uplifted; those who know it become immortal."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the cause of trembling is the Paramesvara or some other being.

(*Púrvpaksha*):—Here the s'ruti speaks of the trembling of the whole universe by fear caused by the entity denoted by the word "breath". It is not right to say that the Parames'vara, who is so sweet-natured as to afford refuge to the whole universe and who is supremely gracious, is the cause of the trembling of the whole universe. Therefore, as the word 'thunderbolt' occurs here, it is the thunderbolt that is the cause of the trembling. Or, it is the vital air which is the cause of the trembling, because the word 'breath' occurs here. Since the vital air causes the motion of the body, this whole world which is the body as it were moves on account of the vital air. Then we can explain the passage "Whatever there is, the whole world, when gone forth (from the Brahman), trembles in the breath." Then, we can also explain the statement that "it is a great terror, the thunderbolt uplifted," inasmuch as, like lightning, cloud and rain, the thunderbolt which is the source of great terror is produced by action of the air itself. It is also possible to attain immortality by a knowledge of the air, as the following s'ruti says

"Air is everything itself, and air is all things together; he who knows this conquers death."*

(*) Of cit. 6—2.

* Bri. up. 5—3—2.

(*Siddhanta*):—As against the foregoing, we say that Parames'vara himself is the cause of the trembling. It is possible that, as the Ruler, Parames'vara is the cause of the trembling of the whole universe; and by the fear of His command all of us abstain from prohibited actions and engage in the prescribed duties; and it is by the fear of His command that Vâyu and others perform their respective duties, as may be learned from such passages as the following:—

"By fear of Him, Vâyu (the wind) blows."*

Though gracious in appearance, Parames'vara becomes awful as the Ruler (of all). Hence the sruti:

"Hence the King's face has to be awful!†

Wherefore as the Master, I's'vara Himself is the cause of the trembling of the whole universe.

Adhikarana. 10.

This Adhikarana proceeds to shew that the Parames'vara, who has been mentioned as the object to be worshipped in the Dahara and so on, is the Being to be reached (by the liberated)

The Light (is Parabrahman) because we find (it so). (I. iii. 41).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Chhândogya-Upanishad

"That serene being, arising from this body, appears in its own form, as soon as it has approached the highest light. He is the highest person (Uttama—purusha)."

Here, a doubt arises as to whether the highest light said to be reached by the liberated is Parames'vara, or Nârâyana the Embodied.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—It being found that the highest light to be reached by the liberated is spoken of as the highest person, the *Uttama Purusha*, and the designation "*Uttama Purusha*" being a specific designation of Nârâyana, Nârâyana is the highest light to which the epithet Uttama-Purusha is here applied.

(*Siddhânta*):—As against the foregoing, we hold as follows: The highest light, here said to be reached by the liberated, is the Supreme Brahman called Paramas'iva, it being found that those alone do not return who have reached Him. How can it be right that those who reach any other being than the Parabrahman have no return? Though specifically applied to Nârâyana, the epithet *Purushottama* is used to denote Brahman, who is above all Purushas, —all Jîvas. In the ritual of Brahmamedha, the word Purushottama is used as a synonym for Parabrahman who has to be reached. Wherefore the highest light here refers to Parabrhman Himself.

Adhikarana 11.

A'kas'a (refers to Parames'vara), because of the mention of His being a distinct being, and so on. (I. iii. 42.)

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Chhândogya—Upanishads and reads as follows:

"He who is called A'kâs'a is the creator of name and form. That within which these are contained is Brahman, the Immortal. He is A'tman."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the "A'kâs'a" spoken of as the creator of name and form is Parames'vara, or the Ether, or Jîva.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—Here "A'kâs'a," refers to the Ether, since, by affording space for all beings to exist in, the Ether can be said to be the creator of name and form. Or, it may refer to Jîva, inasmuch as Jîva is declared to have some connection with the manifesting of name and form, in the following passage:

"In the form of this jîva, I will enter and make name and form manifest" †

As against the foregoing, we hold as follows:— Here, by the word, "Akâs'a," it is the Parames'vara who is declared as the creator of name and form, because of the mention of immortality and other attributes of His. Indeed neither of jîvâ nor of the ether can immortality and the like be predicated. Wherefore, "Akâs'a" refers to Parames'vara Himself.

(*Objection*):—Because of the unity declared in the passage "That thou art," Parames'vara is not a being distinct from the Pratyagâtman.

In answer, the Sûtrakâra says:

(Because of His being declared) as distinct in sleep and death (I. iii. 43)

Parames'vara is a being distinct from jîva, because as conscious during sleep and death, He is declared

* Tait: up. 2—8.
† Taitt. Brâ. 3—8—23

* Op-Cit 8—14—1.
† Chhâ 6-3-2.

to be distinct from jîva who, in those states, is devoid of all consciousness, both subjective and objective, in the following passages:

"Embraced by the intelligent A'tman, (the jîva) knows nothing that is without, nothing that is within" *

"Mounted by the intelligent A'tman, the jîva moves along groaning" †

It is He who is here spoken of as âkâs'a.

And because of the words such as "Master." (I iii 44.)

From the words such as "master" applied to the Intelligent embracing the jîva, it may be seen that He is distinct from the jîva. For, in the sequel, the scripture has the following:

"He is the ruler of all, the lord of all, the king of all. He does not become greater by good works, nor smaller by evil works. He is the lord of all, the King of all beings, the protector of all things." ‡

From such passages as the following:

"Bow to the Lord of Cattle, to the Lord of trees," § it is clear that the Parames'vara is the Lord of the world; and nowhere do we find it said that jîva is the Lord of the universe. Wherefore, the being here spoken of as âkâs'a is the Parames'vara, distinct from jîva.

End of the Third Pâda.

Fourth Pâda.

Adhikarana. I

In the preceding Pâda were discussed such passages as contained clear and vague indications of Brahman. This Pâda proceeds to discuss certain passages which contain vague indications of Brahman.

If (you hold that) with some the inferential (is meant), (we say) no, because of reference to that which is included in the figure; and so the sruti says. (I. iv.1).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here is read by a school of the Kathas as follows:

"Beyond the senses (indriyas) there are the objects (arthas); beyond the objects there is the mind (manas); beyond the mind there is the intellect (Buddhi); the Great (Mahat) Atman is beyond the intellect.

"Beyond the Great, there is the Avyakta; beyond the Avyakta there is Purusha, the supreme; beyond Purusha here is nothing; this is the limit, the supreme Goal." *

Here a doubt arises as to whether that which is spoken of as Avyakta beyond the Mahat is the Pradhâna of Kapila, or the body.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—It is the Pradhâna.—How?—For, Mahat, Avyakta, and Purusha are only known to us as treated of in the Sânkhya system of philosophy. As these are referred to here in the s'ruti, there is no occasion whatever to treat of the body. Therefore it is the Pradhâna of the Sânkhyas that is here spoken of.

Siddhânta maintains that the body is here spoken of; for in a preceding passage,—namely.

"Know A'tman to be sitting in the chariot, the body to be the chariot, the intellect (buddhi) the charioteer, and the mind (manas) the reins.

"The senses (indriyas) they call the horses, the objects of the senses their roads." †

A'tman, the body, etc., which are the means of upâsanâ (worship), are represented as the chariot, and the driver in the chariot, with a view to show that they are to be brought under control; and it is the body included in this figurative representation, still remaining unnoticed (after all else has been noticed),—that is referred to by the word Avyakta. Indeed in the verse quoted above,—beginning with "beyond the senses there are the objects," and ending with "this is the goal, the highest road,"—one thing is spoken of as superior to another with a view to show that each should be brought in subjection to the one that follows. This the sr'uti declares in the sequel as follows:

"A wise man should restrain speech in manas; he should restrain that (manas) in the A'tman which is knowledge; he should restrain the knowledge in A'tman, the Mahat; he should restrain that (mahat) in A'tman, the tranquil." ‡

Therefore Avyakta here refers to the body.

* Bri. Up. 6-3-21.
† Ibid. 6-3-35.
* Bri. Up. 6-4-22.
† Taittiriya—Samhitâ 4-5-2

* Katha-Upa. 3-10, 11.
* Ibid. 3, 3, 4.
* Ibid 3—13.

(*Objection*):—By Avyakta, everybody understands Pradhâna. How can it refer here to the body?

In answer, the sûtrakâra says:

The subtle, verily, (is the body) because of the capability for it. (I. iv. 2.)

"The subtle" means avyakta or unmanifested.—Being capable of manifesting itself as the body, the unmanifested or subtle form of the body, it may be rightly held, is spoken of as "avyakta."

The sûtrakâra adduces another reason.

As subject to Him, everything serves its purpose. (I. iv. 3).

A'tman, the body, and all, serve their purpose, i.e, conduce to the fulfilment of worship, when subjected to Parames'vara. Parames'vara, the Inner Ruler, impels all including A'tman. As such, as thus forming an accessory of worship, He is spoken of as the finality of the principles to be brought under control; and as the Being to be ultimately reached, He is spoken of as "the supreme Goal." Therefore A'vyakta here means the body itself.

Because of the absence of all mention that it has to be known. (I. iv. 4).

If the Pradhâna of the Sânkhyas be here referred to by the word ("avyakta," then It would have been mentioned as a thing worth knowing; and there is nothing of the sort. Hence no reference to Kapila's Avyakta.

Now the Sûtrakâra proceeds to refute the objection that there is a mention made of the Pradhâna as worth knowing:

If (you urge that the srutî) speaks of (it as such) (we say) no; for, by context, it is the Intelligent (I iv 5)

Objection:—The Pradhana, too, is spoken of as a thing worth knowing in a subsequent passage, which reads as follows:

"Having perceived that which is without sound, without touch, without form, without decay, without taste, eternal, without end, beyond the Mahat, and unchangeable, one is freed from the jaws of death."*

Answer:—No, for, it is the Prâjna or the Intelligent that forms the subject of discourse, as may be seen from the following:

"One should restrain speech in the mind"† etc.

Hence the "Avyakta" refers to the body.

The Sûtrakâra says that there is no occasion to speak of the Pradhâna:

And of three alone is this exposition and this question (I iv 6)

In this section, the question and the exposition are concerned with three things alone as worth knowing namely, the being to be worshipped, the worship, and the worshipper,——not with the Pradhâna. Their exposition is contained in the section beginning with the following passage:

"The wise who, by means of meditation on his A'tman, recognises the Ancient who is difficult to be seen, who has entered into the dark, who is hidden in the cave, who dwells in the abyss—as God, he indeed leaves joy and sorrow far behind."*

The question is contained in the following passages:

"There is that doubt, when a man is dead,—some saying, he is; others, he is not. This I should like to know, taught by thee; this is the third of my boons."†

"That which thou seest beyond Dharma, and beyond A'dharma, neither cause nor effect, neither past nor future, tell me that."‡

Wherefore, "avyakta" is the body, not the Pradhâna, as it is a thing with which the present section is not concerned.

Moreover, there is yet another thing pointing to this conclusion, as the Sûtrakâra says:

And like the Mahat (I. iv. 7).

Just as, on account of the word "A'tman" in the passage "beyond Buddhi is Mahat, the A'tman," "*mahat*" cannot refer to the *mahat* technically so-called, so too, it may be concluded here that the word "Avyakta" cannot mean the Pradhâna.

Adhikarana.—2.

(*Objection*):—Granted that there is no occasion here to speak of the Pradhâna, as the present section is not concerned with it. Elsewhere the Pradhâna itself is spoken of as the cause.

In answer, the sûtrakâra proceeds with this adhikarana:

* Katha-up. 3-5.
† Ibid. 3-15.

* Ibid. 2-12.
† Ibid. 1-20.

For want of a distinguishing mark, unlike "Chamasa." (I. iv. 8).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Śvetâśvatara-Upanishad:

"There is one unborn being (female), red, white and black, uniform, but producing manifold offspiring. There is one unborn being (male) who loves her and lies by her; there is another unborn being who leaves her, having enjoyed all pleasures."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the Prakriti which is spoken of as the cause of the whole universe and therefore as devoid of birth, is the one which the Sânkyas have assumed, or the Supreme Prakriti (of the Parames'vara).

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—It is but right to say that it is the Prakriti assumed by the Sânkyas; for, it is declared to be 'unborn,' devoid of birth, to be the cause of all creatures; and we also find a reference to the three gunas indicated by the three colours, "red, white and black." We cannot hold that anything else can be of this nature.

(*Siddhánta*):—It is not the Prakriti technically so-called that is here declared to be the cause. Indeed, by the mere mention of absence of birth, we cannot understand that that (Prakriti) alone is meant; for there is no differentiating mark in the section, unlike the case of "Chamasa" in the passage "A vessel (chamasa) with aperture downwards"† which is followed by another sentence,—namely, "this (*chamasa*) is the head";—which indicates what particular kind of vessel is meant. For a word understood in its (generic) etymological sense to convey an idea of a particular thing requires some other word supplying a difierentiating mark. Therefore it is not the Prakriti technically so called that is here meant.

The Sûtrakâra proceeds to show what that Prakriti is which is distinct from the one technically so called:

Accordingly, indeed, some read by commencing with Light. (I. iv. 9).

"The Light" means Parames'vara. This 'unborn' Prakriti is rooted in the Parames'vara as the cause. Accordingly, some, namely the Taittirîyas, read the verse treating of the nature of the Prakriti, so as to declare that which is rooted in the Parames'vara as its cause. Having started with a description of Parames'vara in the words "subtler than the subtle, greater than the great," the upanishad speaks of the origin of the universe from Parames'vara in the words "From him emanate the seven prânas," and so on; and it is while thus describing the universe as made up of him, that they read the verse (quoted above) beginning with "There is one unborn being." Because of this reference to him, it may be concluded that this unborn (Prakriti) is the one rooted in Parames'vara. Hence the untenability of the contention that the Prakriti technically so called is meant here.

(*Objection*):—As caused by the Parames'vara, this Parakriti is declared to be an effect. How can such a thing be also described as unborn?

In answer, the Sûtrakâra says:

And because of the construction being taught there is no incongruity, as in the case of 'honey.' (I. iv. 10).

"Construction" means creation or emanation.—There is no incongruity whatever in the divine Prakriti being described both as unborn and as the effect caused by Parames'vara because of the creation taught in the following passage:

"That from which the maker (Mâyin) sends forth all this—the sacred verses, the offerings, the sacrifices, the penances, the past, the future, and all that the Vedas declare—in that the other is bound up through that Mâyâ. Know then Prakriti is Mâyâ, and the great Lord the Mâyin."*

To explain: During the time of Pralaya, even the Mâyâ which is insentient (*achit*), though devoid of name and form, yet exists in a subtle form as the body of the Mahes'vara, and it may therefore be described as unborn; and it is the effect caused Parames'vara, because it is invested with name and form at the time of creation. For instance, at the time of creation, A'ditya is the 'honey,' as the repository of the essence which the Vasus and other gods live upon; he is, however, not an effect, inasmuch as he exists in such a very subtle from that he cannot be designated by any such word as 'honey,' as declared in the following passages in the *Madhuvidyâ*

"The sun is indeed the honey of the Devas."†

"When from thence he has risen upwards, he neither rises nor sets. He is alone, standing the centre."‡

* Śvetaśvatara-Up. 4—5.
† Brihadar-Up. 4-2.

* Śve. Up. 4-9, 10.
† Chha. Up. 3-1.
‡ Ibid. 3-11.

Accordingly there is no incongruity whatever in the Divine Prakriti being described both as unborn and as caused by Parames'vara. Wherefore the 'unborn' is not the Prakriti technically so called (by the Sânkhyas).

Adhikarana-3.

(*Objection*):—Elsewhere, again, the twenty-five principles (tattvas), established by the science (of Sankhya), are spoken of in the Sruti.

To prevent this supposition, the Sûtrakâra introduces a fresh Adhikarana:

No, despite the mention of the number; because of (their) being distinct and of excess.(I. iv. 11).

The following passage forms the subject of discussion here:

"Him in whom the five five-beings are established as well as the âkâsa, do I think to be A'tman; knowing the immortal Brahman, I am the immortal."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the things referred to as the "five five-beings" denote the *Tattvas* of the Sânkhya system, or those spoken of in the s'ruti.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—The number twenty-five being prominent in the Sânkhya system, and that number being mentioned here, the "five five—beings" undoubtedly refer to *tattvas* of the Sânkhya system, and to none else.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows Despite the mention of the number twenty-five—obtained by multiplying five by five,—the technically so called tattvas are not meant here. We are given to understand that the things mentioned here are rooted in the Parames'vara who is referred to by the words "Him in whom." As such, they are distinct from the tattvas (of the Sânkhya system); and there is a mention of too many tattvas, owing to the separate mention of âkâsa. 'Mention of too many tattvas' means that the tattvas (here mentioned) are more than twenty five in number. Wherefore it does not follow that the twenty-five tattvas are here referred to. Neither can it be held that there is here any reference to the number twenty-five. The compound "five-beings"—*pancha-jana*—is a *sanjnâ* or specific designation, meaning that there are some beings (each of whom is) known as a *pancha-jana*; and five such beings are are here referred to, just as there are seven *saptarshis*. Wherefore there is no room for the supposition that the *tattvas* of the Sânkhya system are here mentioned.

What, then, are they? The sûtrakâra says:

Prana and others, from the remaining portion of the section. (I. iv. 12).

The "pancha-janas" refer to the five *indriyas* (including prana) as may be seen from what follows:

"Those who know the life (prana) of life, the eye of the eye, the ear of the ear, the food of the food, the mind of the mind,"* etc.

From this also it follows that the *tattvas* of the Sânkhya system are not meant here.

Again an explanation is given as follows:

By 'light,' accrding to some, in the absence of 'food.' (I. iv. 13).

'Some' refers to the *Kânvas*. In spite of the absence of the words "the food of the food" (in the Kânva recension), we may still understand that the five *pancha-janas*" refer to the *indriyas*, because of the word 'light' occurring in the opening passage which reads as follows:

"Him the gods worship as the light of lights."†

Having thus said that the Brahman is the light of lights, the illuminator of the illuminators, the s'ruti then speaks of the five *"pancha-janas."* By this we are given to understand that those lights refer to the five *indriyas*.

And because of the mention, as the cause in akasa etc., of what is specifically declared (I. iv. 14)

All such Vedantic passages as "the non-existent, verily, this at first was;" ‡ and "This verily was then undifferentiated,"§ not declaring specifically of what nature the cause is which underlies such emanations as the âkâsa, we understand that the cause (referred to) is what is declared specifically in the passage "Atman alone, verily, this at first was;" ‖ but not the *Avyâkrita* or the *Undifferentiated* of the Sankhyas. So, too, we are to understand that the five *indriyas* specifically declared in other passages are here meant, but not the *tattvas* of the Sânkhyas.

The Sûtrakâra proceeds to show why the *tattvas* of the Sânkhya cannot be meant here

A. MAH'ADEVA S'A'STRI, B. A.

(*To be Continued.*)

* Bri. Up. 6-4-17

* Bri. Up. 6-4-18. (Mâdhyandina recension.)
† Ibid. 6-4-16.
‡ Taitti. up. 2-2-7.
§ Bri. up. 3-4-7.
‖ Aitarey Upanishad 1-1.

SIVAGNANA SIDDHIAR
OF
ARUL NANDI SIVA CHARIAR.

(*Continued from page 106*)

PANCHARATRI'S STATEMENT.

Note.—[It may be distinctly understood that we do not want to open any sectarian controversy on the subject matter of this chapter. We would fain have omitted it altogether but it would spoil the completeness of the work under translation. This chapter closes the *Parapaksha*, and God willing, we would enter on the colossal work, composing the *Supakshaa* of Siddhiar.]

1. *Mayan* (Vishnu) who is the Beginning, the Formless, the Indivisible, the omnipresent and the Wisdom-Light, took a form of his own free will, and from out of his just grace, slept in the midst of the vast ocean and gave out the Pancharatra Agamas; so begins the Pancharatri his statement.

2. Producing Brahma from his navel and creating the worlds through him, and creating Hara to destroy these worlds and becoming Himself the Protector for such worlds, He is thus the author of creation, destruction and protection.

3. The Pancharatri states further that his Lord out of His great mercy has incarnated in this world as the Fish, the Tortoise, the Boar, the Man-Lion, and the Vamana, Parasurama, Rama and Balarama and Krishna and will incarnate still as Kalki and He is the God of Gods also.

4. Our Lord had borne the seven seas in his gill, (as the Fish) and the great mountain on his back (as the Tortoise) and discovered the earth which became submerged, (as the Boar), and split the body of Hiranya (as the Lion), and measured the three worlds (as Vamana) and became the king of kings (as the three Ramas) and had thus protected the earth by destroying the wiles of the Asuras. He will even become the Horse in future.

When that elephant was caught between the teeth of the crocodile and was unable to get home and cried out 'O my father, my Lord, O the first cause,' who else but our Lord whom we worship for our salvation, ran with rapid strides to his help and killed the fierce crocodile and gave Moksha to the elephant.

6. Our Lord of Illusive Powers churned the ocean and distributed the ambrosia to the Devas, destroyed the evil doing Asuras and protected the worlds, and gave out the true meaning of all the Shastras to his Bhaktas out of His grace, and thus became Supreme.

7. Our Mayan, is himself, the Maya, himself the Jiva, himself the product of Maya, himself the Maya that binds the mortals, and this Maya *bandham* cannot vanish except by his aid. Full of this conviction, if a man worships Mayan, his Maya will vanish and he will be taken into the Vaiguntam, by Mayan.

His Refutation.

1. If he was the Beginning, this beginning will have an end. So the Vedas say he has *neither* beginning nor end. If he is Light and Wisdom, then he cannot unite with Maya (darkness). If his body is formed of indestructible Intelligence, then it cannot be formed of the Subda-Datu.

2. That he possessed the elements of the human body (such as flesh, blood, &c) is evidenced from the episode of Sankara going and begging for sacrificial food. When Vishnu opened out his head, was it not his blood that flowed out and from loss of which he fainted and fell down. Our Lord raised him from his fit and he who slept on the waters walked behind Him.

3. If Hari can assume form of his mere will, then why did he not make good his own head, on that day when he went to eat at the great sacrifice and lost his head by the fearful act of Virabhadra. At the entreaty of his devotees our Lord gave back Narayana his head.

4. You said that Mal (Vishnu) gave out the Vedas and explained their meaning. Who but our Lord, taught the great truths from under the Banyan tree, when the whole world lay confused through ignorance of the Vedas. He it was who is the real author of the Vedas.

You said that Hari begot Ayan (Brahma). He was not able to create the (fifth) head af Brahma nipped off by Rudra. And is it not therefore false to assert that this Brahma begot Rudra. Understand therefore without mistake that all are Siva's acts.

6. You assert that he is God and incarnated of his own will to protect the world, him who was born like ordinary mortals from the wombs of a few individuals! The Lotus-born Brahma unable to create, prayed to Hara, and the Lord of the Vedas burst forth from Brahma's forehead and taught him the act of creation

7. As Narayana begot Brahma and Brahma created Narayana, so each is the cause of the other. The first cause of both is the Lord who cleaved the body of the elephant-Asura, is asserted by the Veda. As such indeed, Vishnu and Brahma became merged on either side of Hara.

8. You said that the world is destroyed by the *FIAT* of Hari. But he cannot stay his own destruction which comes at the end of time; and the Relics of Vishnu's frequent deaths, are worn by Rudra. So too is destroyed the assertion that by the *fiat* of Hari every-thing is destroyed. The Destroying Siva, it is He, who also creates and developes the world.

9. You stated that Mayan protected the three worlds. He, to cleave the body of *Salandara* of whom he was afraid, prayed to our Lord for the Discus, and on obtaining it he killed the Asuras and protected the world and this episode is well-known everywhere. As such Sankara it is, that protects.

10. When Mal assuming the form of a fish carried the seven seas in its gill and threatened the whole world with destruction, presuming that he was the Lord of *Samharam*, the Lord of the trident speared the fish and severing the gill and eyes, put them on the trident as an ornament.

11. When Vishnu assuming the form of the tortoise bore the mountain Meru as a supporting piece of Rock he became puffed with pride and asserted that he was the support of the whole world. And the devas kept silent without supporting or repudiating his claim. And Hara, looking on, broke the tortoise open and put on the shell as an ornament.

12. As the Boar, he cleaved through the seven worlds and bore them on his tusk, and put himself forward as the only Adorable Light of the world. Then did the Lord who delights to dance in the Burial ground, tear out the boar's tusk, felling him down crying.

13 When Hiranya asked if Vishnu was in that pillar and struck it with his foot, Vishnu appeared as the man-lion and catching him cleaved his body and assumed the God. Then did Hara appear as the *Saraba* Bird and subdue the man-lion.

14. Begging for alms, and obtaining the three foot of earth, and taking the Heavens also, he took a mean advantage and imprisoned the giver Maha Bali. Such as he, cannot be the Lord. They are not the best of men who injure their benefactor.

15. You would make him as the Lord of Maya, him who not knowing the illusive deer as a deceitful creature, was caught in the toils of the Rakshasa and thus lost his wife. Becoming bewildered (from the loss of his wife), he went and killed the Rakshasa and to purge himself of the sin of killing, worshipped the divine Father (at Rameshwaram).

16. Parasu Rama, a devotee of Parameshwara, conquered all the race of kings, and for freedom from the consequent sins, he again performed austere penance and worshipped Parameswara. Bala Rama again stood in Yogic contemplation by meditating on Uma's Lord adored by the whole world.

17. When Maharishi Upamanyu bestowed his gracious look, on Vasudeva (Krishna) and touched his head with his hand and made him a vassal of Parameshwara, do you know that the said Vasudeva dedicated his body and soul and wealth to the service of his teacher and fell down and worshipped him.

18. You said that as a horse (Kalki) Vishnu will become incarnate in the future. If he does, we do not know what will befall him from our Isa. You have learnt what happened during the previous *avatara*. Nothing but the glory of the Lord whose crown is adorned with *kourai* (cassia) flowers did shine everywhere.

19. Simply because the elephant cried out 'O First Cause,' should God Vishnu be held therefore as such. When any one cries out "justice! justice! O king," does the King himself run up to him. This act of the Lord of Protection is like that of the City Magistrate who renders justice.

20. Besides, the elephant was a vassal of Vishnu, and if it called its master 'Adimulam,' the latter does not thereby become so. For instance, your own slave calls you 'my Lord,' and hence you are not to compare yourself to your Lord Vishnu.

J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B. A., B. L

(*To be continued.*)

17 The Anusasana Parva of Mahabarat gives the full account of Lord Krishna's initiation.

19. Both derive their power from a Superior Power, which to all appearance is invisible and inscrutable and latent: but the moment the inferior power begins to misuse or abuse its authority, then will the Power of the King and Master be brought into certain play

THAYUMANAVER'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page* 128.)

GOD-HEAD AS BLISS OF SHINING SPLENDOUR.

கொத்தலரும் மலர்ச்சோலை நள்ளிழல் வைகினுமை
குளிர்நீரும் புனற்கைடன்னிக்
கொள்ளுகினு மந்நீ ரிடைத்திளைத் தாடுறுங்
குளிர்சந்த வாடைமட வார்
வந்துலவு மின்றதென முன்றிலிடை யுலவுமே
வசமெறு போதம்வெள்ளே
வட்டமதி பட்டப் பகற்போல நிலவுதர
மதிழ்போதும் பேரின்பமுதம்
விந்தைபெற வறுசுவையில் வந்ததென வமுதுணினும்
வேரோயினு மாலைகந்தம்
வெள்ளிலே யடைக்காய் விரும்பிவேன டிவணணம்
விளையாடி விழுதியிலினும்
சந்ததமு நின்னருளே மறவா வரத்தை
தனியேனு ரைஷைபுரிவாய்
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே. (க ம)

110. O *Satchithananda Siva*, the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all! Grant Thou to me the blessing that I might not, even for a moment, let go from my memory Thy All-Graciousness: whether I remain under a cool-shaded grove of fragrant flowers; Or whether I drink fresh water of a most refreshing kind or take a good bath in it; whether I be gifted to walk at pleasure in a court-yard which diffuses the most delightful flavour of sandal-wood as if occupied by the accomplished damsels of exquisite taste and beauty who wear it; whether I enjoy with pleasure the bright moon-light; whether I take sumptuous food consisting of all six tastes and sweet as nectar of the *Sea*.* or when, prior to sleep at night, I am engaged in a joyous sport garlanded with sweet smelling flowers, wearing pleasant smelling *Sandanam* and chewing the compound of the *areca* and cloves, of the betel pepper with chunam and lime.

O Universal Protector, do Thou receive me into Thy care.

தேசோமயானந்தம்.

மருவலர்ச் சோலைசெறி கன்முழன் மலையாதி
மன்னுமுனி வர்க்கேவலாய்
மந்த்ரமா லிகைசொல்லு மியமாதி யோகமே
மார்க்கத்தி னிணைமுலகிலே
சருமருவு காயத்தை நி
கமலாச னஞ்சாதித்த

* *Samarasa*,—Lit. viewing all equally. This epithet fits this school better than other schools inasmuch as this school unlike the rest accomodates and assimilates other *schools* without any contradiction or strained construction of ideas or interpretation of srutis. Cf. verses 40 & 46.

* Munis are Rishis or ascetics.

† Vide Ashtanga Yoga (another name) under verse 61 and to Siva Raja Yoga under verse 62.

‡ Vide notes to verse 108 P. Kamalasana is the asana or seat or lotus seat (formed by allowing the feet to rest on the upper thighs). There are nine kinds of seats (vide 127th verse with notes

காலைப் பிடித்தனலை யமனைமுன் டலிபடிக்
கலைமதியி னூறிதாக்கி
உருகிவரு மமிர்தத்தை யுண்டுண் டெங்காம
லுளர்வான விழியைமூடி
ஒன்றே டிரண்டெனுச சமர்ச சொருபசுக
முற்றிடவென் மன்றின்வணணம
நிருவருண் முடிகவித் தேகமொடு காணபெரு
தேடரிய சத்தாகியென்
சித்தமிசை குடிகொண்ட கிவான தெய்வமே
தேசோ மயானந்தமே (கக)

111. O Bliss of teeming Splendour, O The Supreme Intelligence, being the Indiscernible Sat that hast filled my heart! O for that day of my present life, when Thou wouldst make me be absorbed in the Peaceful Beatitude of Samarasa* Advaita Gnana, *neither one nor two*; *which* I can experience indeed, if I be granted the opportunity of serving under the *munis*† in the cool mountains of best shaded groves of fragrant flower-growths, and of practising the Siva Raja Yoga‡ of *Yama*, *Niyama* &c., given in the Yoga sastra called *mantramalika* i e of purifying the body by taking the prescribed seat such as kamalasana and by pressing with the folded legs and arousing the lunar orb in the holy domain of *kundalini*§ and with the steadfast eyes, enjoying with great pleasure the delicious nectar produced thereby and the consequent bliss of sleepless eternity.

இப்பிறவி யென்னுமொரு சிறுட்கடலின் மூழ்கிக
னெள்ளுமொரு மகரமாய்பட
டிருவிகா யெனுந்திரையி லெற்புண்டு புற்புத
மெனக்கொண்டை வரிசைகாட்டிக்
திப்பித்தம் மடத்தையர் மயற்சண்ட மாருதச்
சுழல்ப டவித்தமிப்பச்
சோராத [illegible]
சரத்தென்ன [illegible]
மைபடிந்த கரும்பேர் கறியான வுங்குறும்
மைவிடு மதிமடக்கக்
கள்ளவிழ் கத்காலர் வருவென் றுரைய
கண்ணருவி காடதிமெனவென

§ Vide notes to verse 108 P. Kamalasana is the asana or seat or lotus seat (formed by allowing the feet to rest on the upper thighs). There are nine kinds of seats (vide 127th verse with notes

செபரிய முதலியாக கரைசேர வுகஞ்சீ
செய்வையோ சத்தாகியென்
சித்தமிசை குடிகொண்ட வறிவான தெய்வமே
தேசோ மயானந்தமே. (கஉ)

112. O Bliss of teeming Splendour, O The Supreme Intelligence, being the indiscernible *Sat* that hast filled my heart! Thou knowest that I am a helpless soul lamenting with tears like a boatman, losing sight of the ship of *Sivagnâna*, and struggling in a besotted state with fear of sea robbers the messengers of death; sunk in the deep ocean of this mundane life, seized by the shark of I-ness or Egotism, rolling with it in the waves of good and bad Karma and tremendously attacked by the storm of sexual love to the woman of blooming countenance with beautiful coral lips; and the rapid streams of increasing desires continually flow into the Ocean life in which I thus struggle.

O Benevolent Lord, do Thou render me the deed of mercy of enabling me to reach the blessed *sea-shore* of Siva-Sayuiya-Mukti*

தன்னைதாய் தமர்தார மகவென்னு மிவையெலாஞ்
சன்னையிற் கூட்டமிதிலோ
சந்தேக மில்லைமண மாடமா ளிகைமேடை
சதுரங்க சேனையுடனே
வந்தோர் வாழ்வுமோ ரிந்த்ரஜாலக்கோலம்
வஞ்சனை பொருமைலோபம்
வைத்தமன மாக்கிருமி சேர்ந்தமல பாண்டமோ
வாஞ்சனை யிலாதகனவே
எந்தநா ளுஞ்சரி யெனத்தேர்ந்து தேர்ந்துமே
யிவ்வுபச வில்லாவிடத்
தேகமாய் நின்றுநின் னருள்வெள்ள மீதிலே
யானைபப தறவுமூழ்கிச்
சின்னைதான் றெளியாது சுழலும்வகை யென்கொலோ
தேடரிய சத்தாகியென
சித்தமிசை குடிகொண்ட வறிவான தெய்வமே
தேசோ மயானந்தமே (கக)

113. O Bliss of teeming Splendour, O The Supreme Intelligence, being the indiscernible *Sat* that hast filled my heart!

Our life is but a sham. The crowd of persons would call *father, mother, kindred, wife* and *children* are in no manner better than those we shall meet in a market place. This is simple truth. And our happy living in richly ornamented houses and lofty palaces encircled with the four kinds of forces is a mere juggle; and our physical constitution is nothing but a wicked dream, being as it were an earthern vessel full of dirt and filth with the internal replete with *infidelity, envy* and *avarice*

* Vide notes under verses 11 108.

Nevertheless, O Lord, why should my mind be restless with sceptic and unsteady thoughts without *determining* itself ridden of I-ness into the sole boundlessness of Thy Grace, which is not limited by day and night and where alone does prevail the *Eternal* Beatitude, void of any unholy concerns of this life?

ஆடாம லேய்ந்திட்டபம்பரம் போல் விசை
யடங்கிமனம் வீழதேரே
யறியாமை யாகின்ற விருளகல விருளொளியு
மல்லா திருந்தவெளிபோல்
கோடா தெணேக்கண் டெனக்குணிறை சாந்தவெளி
கூடியின் பாதீ தழுவ்
கூடினே னுரசரியை கிரியையின் முயன்றுநெறி
கூடினே னுவல்லனியா
னீடாக வேயாறு வீட்டினி னிரம்பியே
யிலகிவளர் பிராணனென்னும்
இருநிதி யிணைக்கடி யோகபர னுகீம
லேழைக் குடும்பனுகித்
தேடா தழிக்கவொரு மதிவந்த தென்கொலோ
தேடரிய சத்தாகியென்
சித்தமிசை குடிகொண்ட வறிவான தெய்வமே
தேசோ மயானந்தமே (கசச)

114. O Bliss of teeming Splendour, O The Supreme Intelligence, being the indiscernible Sat that hast filled my heart! Neither could I have the extremest Bliss of my Chittâkas being absorbed in advaita union with Thee the *Ever Bright Paramâkas*,* my mind being not yet tranquillized to the state of a steady top and consequently, my ignorance having not yet dissipated. Nor have I exerted myself in the Highest San-marga Sâdhana *Sariya, kiriya* &c. Nor did I, without extravagant indulgence enrich myself spiritually by procuring the great wealth called the *Yoga*† of restraining the prana that quite pervades all the six ‡ centres ‡ of my body.

But alas! I have had the imprudence of becoming a poor wretched soul to waste what I had with no further earnings

O God I cannot know how I got this imperfectness

R. SHUNMUGA MUDALIAR.

(To be Continued).

* Cf. verses 95 and 100 and notes. P. Vide notes to verse 108 The saint is narrating the course of a devout soul in the figure of speech of *autotelsmus*. First, the Highest Goal of Sivadvaita-saivam; Next, the Gnana Sadhana best conducive to the same; Thirdly, the excellence of the Yoga Sadhana included in the Second.

* The saint points out here by figure that *Yoga* (in Tamil called *Ogam*. (Yogam) which is colloquially used for good fortune or good luck of a thriving individual in this world of *sâdhana*) is THE REAL WEALTH OF A MAN. Without Contemplation and Bhakti on account of God any wealth and fortune in this sâdhana world be simply thrown productive of evil consequences.

† Vide under 36th verse.

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, DECEMBER 1898.

Our heart sinks and we could not repress a tear as day after day we read of the ravages of the plague among our brothers and sisters in Bangalore. How they have suffered, and how much more in thought, the living more than the dead, and how many grim tragedies have been perpetrated, and how many harrowing pictures have been furnished! To the afflicted and those sore of heart, we extend our heart-felt sympathy, and our prayers are fervently offered to Him who once before raised His Hand to stay that of Death, to save his Loving child Markandeya.

Our afflicted Brethren.

***

We remember, when we were last in Bangalore, in a house where the hand of death had been felt on a very aged gentleman, telling our friends what we were to understand by this story of Markandeya. The teaching of this story is simply expressed by the scriptural text. "Remember now thy creator in the days of thy youth." The poet also has—

Remember now.

"Be wise today; tis madness to defer.
Next day the fatal precedent will plead;
Thus on, till wisdom is pushed out of life.
Procnastination is the thief of time—
Year after year it steals, till all all fled
And to the mercies of a moment leaves
The vast concerns of an eternal scene.
And why? because he thinks himself immortal
All men think all men mortal but themselves.

We do not take time by the forelock and attend to our dearest necessity first. We think our religious salvation can wait. There is a time for all things and for thinking of Good in particular. When we are young and robust and strong and healthy, we do not think there is any necessity for thinking of God. Now is the time for the pursuit of wordly ambition and wealth and pleasure and Jollity and when the vigour of manhood ceases, when earthly pleasures begin to pall, and when old age comes with pain and sorrow, then is the time we ordinarily turn our thoughts to God. But will such time ever come? Shall we ever reach this fancied time? What if we shall be cut off in the very midst of our youth and vigour, in the very midst of our ardent pursuit after power and pelf in the very midst of our enjoyment of love and pleasure? Where shall we be then? Shall we not have sacrificed in a few years of vain pursuit after transient pleasures, a whole life, and everlasting life and everlasting Bliss? Markandeya was doomed to death at 16 years of age. Well, so! Rather he acted on the firm conviction that *death was ever present, was always at hand.* "Time flies, death urges, knells call, Hell threatens, Heaven invites." *To over-come death, to gain ever-lasting life* (என்றும் பதினறு வயது) one must work for his salvation at once and even now. And this Life and Love eternal can only be secured by ridding yourself of your self (அகப்பற்று & புறப்பற்று) and by blending your love and life in this other one, by worship of Him with all your heart and with all your soul, *even now* when your energies are fresh and intellects unclouded, and hearts untouched by sorrow and pain, and not when the eyes become dim, and speech begins to fail and the mind begins to wander and death is knocking at your door.

இழவருமாய் நோய்மூப்புச் சிற்பட்சுகாமத்
தழவரும்போ யோயுமாகண்டோடு—மொழிதெரிய
வாயினு விப்போதே மன்றினடமாடும்
காயமு மென்றுணரப் போகாம்.

***

The text is that of Saint Tirumular, that match less song.

A text and its commentary.

உரையற்ற தொன்றை யுரைசெய்யு மூமர்காள்,
கரையற்ற தொன்றைக் கரைகாண லாகுமோ!
இரையற்ற நீர்போல் இந்தத் தெளிவாய்க்கு
புரையற் றிருந்தான் புரிசடையோனே

"O you dumb, who speak of the unspeakable,
Can you reach the limits of the limit-less one?
When like the waveless water, the soul attains calm
Then will the Lord of the matted hair
Shine in you brightest."

And its commentary we extract from the 'Voices of a still night' appearing in the Nov. number of the *'Universal Brother hood.'*

"Keep thy soul at peace, as a still and quiet lake, that the depth of the skies may find its reflection in thee; and a flower of the shore see again in thee its vernal beauty; and that cloud boat travelling on the blue with its taut sails and hiding at times the sun; and that sun (Siva Surya) emerging from the cloud, shining so radient above the earth sweet and refreshed by the rain (*karuna mari*)

"Lull thy soul into the endless harmony with the sicelen of the world, which seems to buzz as a golden bee. That

which is Divine is reflected on thy wave, that which is earthly, lie on the bottom deep. When thou art still, the Radiance of Eternity (Anadi Jyotis) is burning upon thee; but when a stone of passion falls into thy waters, the blackness of thy deeps will appear, the blackness of the soil and mud."

Selfishness and Self-lessness.

N. S. writes to the *Universal Brother hood*:—"There is one word that expresses all good and one word that opposes it. The great all-powerful uplifting and up-building word is Love! It is Harmony! There is a light and warmth, a shadow and coolness, a joy and rest even in the word itself. There is a tumult and a calm, a combination of the forces that is indescribable.

"Love is rooted in eternity and its threads that focus in the present are so powerful that when the clouds and the corruptions of life are wiped away, revealing the natural self, that self is God-like."

"The opposing power and word is selfishness; all evil, meanness, and crime, all lust and worldliness are treaceable to selfishness as its cause. Ambition, jealousy, and the innumerable ills of life are the out-growth of selfishness. But this evil is a sham. It is on the outside. Behind all and underneath and rooted in the past is Love. Covered up with rust and rot is the Divine Spark that we all worship! Underneath is the Beauty that fires love and devotion! In the heart of hearts is that Harmony of eternity, Love!

A kindly thought, a loving deed, life giving and revivifies even a dying spark; it helps to burn away the dross, and lift the life one step nearer the desired end. We are always surrounded by affinities. If we will hold love in the heart, Brother-hood in the mind, and help with our hands, we shall be surrounded by Angels and a glorious golden light."

***

A caution.

The writer in the Watch Tower of last month's 'Theosophical Review' conveys a kindly warning and caution to Theosophic readers not to create authority out of conjecture and not to regard emphatic utterences as 'esoteric knowledge' which warning in our opinion has not been given too soon. For we have not unfrequently heard our brothers accept as the veriest Gospel, anything and everything which may appear in such a magazine, however wild and unsubstantiated the theory may be. He says "My guesses on various allegorical and mystical points of Zoroastrianism may be right or wrong but this much alone is certain, that they cannot be authoritative, for they are still mere hypotheses even for the writer.....The world has suffered long enough from this publication of legend and sanctification of chance utterences. Are we modern students of Theosophy to continue this fully or are we to aid in turning the clear, steady light of common sense on the phantasies of the ages, and making these shadows flee away? Credulity in a false 'esotericism' is as bad as credulity in a false 'Science'—nay is worse, for it goes deeper within."

***

A very old error.

It is not for us to correct Scholars like Professors Monier Williams and Max Muller, but when such slips are for ever perpetuated and made the basis for other theories, then it is time, the correction is given. We refer to the mistake in the translation of the last sentence of the famous 'Nasadasad' Hymn in the Rig Veda. The last lines are usually translated thus.

He only
Who in the highest heaven sits, the omniscient Lord,
Assuredly knows all, or *haply knows he not*?

***

The last sentence is a suicidal one and we are glad to say this is not the correct translation or rendering. A more proper rendering is given in the translation of the same Hymn given at page 44, in that useful publication by the Society for the resuscitation of Indian Literature, *Vedas*.

"He who in the Highest Heaven is the Ruler of this Universe, does indeed know *but not another can possess that knowledge*."

We have already pointed out that Sat and Asat in this hymn is also not to be translated as ought and nought, but only as the seen and unseen Universe of matter.

THE THEOLOGICAL SITUATION IN INDIA.

We cannot do full justice in any review of it however full to that interesting and highly suggestive article which appeared from the pen of that talented Anglo-Indian statesman and Scholar who goes by the name of *Vamadeo Shastri*. It displays an amount of erudition and what is rare a deeper insight into the real feelings and thoughts of the people; and his observations are far truer than many we meet with in the writings of profound Oriental Scholars, and Indian Missionaries. The first observation which he makes is about the all-absorbing interest which is

evinced by an Indian in regard to the consideration of religious and metaphysical problems, and he states his conclusions in these happy words, "I am sure that a religion without any philosophy at all is no more stable than a house built on the edge of a great Indian river, which cuts away its banks or changes its course periodically." And the common mistake which an ordinary foreigner commits is in supposing that no good can be found in the ordinary forms of religious beliefs prevailing in India except an endless series of superstitious rites and ceremonies, and when he has scoffed at these and answered to his own satisfaction what is supposed to be the philosophy of Hinduism, namely the Maya Theory of Sankara, he thinks he has under-mined Hinduism and he waits for the harvest, fondly hoping to see the old superstructure tumble and fall down into ruins. He is hardly aware that the two principal religions into which the whole Hindu population can be divided, Saivism and Vaishnavism, are each based on an old, very old philosophy, and variations in the forms of belief and rituals are not so real as the differences in the field of thought; and divisions and sub-divisions of these principal religions are also in the main due to ontological differences. The masses of the people have a religion which is all-sufficient unto them, which appeals to all their emotional, moral, and intellectual and historical susceptibilities and which as a learned theosophic lady truly observed combines both freedom of thought and rigidity of conduct. It must become more and more evident therefore as our learned 'Shastri' points out that if this ancient citadel of religion and philosophy should come to be shaken, should come to lose its all-absorbing hold on the Indian mind, the cause should be looked for not in any foreign religion or religions, not in any reforming faiths in India but it should surely be found in the materializing tendencies of western education and western forms of Government. The education imparted by Government is wholly secular and non-religious; the standard of living furnished by western sojourners in this land, who live almost in gilded palaces and flower-festooned villas is simply fascinating; the administrative machinary is becoming more and more costly; and the improved ideas of sanitation forces on the people new wants, which all tend to increase the cost of living.

No religion stable unless broad-based on philosophy.

Indian Religion undermined by Western Education and Western Forms of Government.

And the excesses and vices of the west in regard to drink and food &c., are also obtaining a firmer and firmer grip on the land. And reformers preach too that unless you have a high standard of living you cannot rise in the scale of civilization.. All these influences induce a spirit of utter indifferentism to religious topics, a greater quest after wealth and luxury, and the formation of a new school of political and social reformers. And it was only the other day one of our respected countryman pointed out the great necessity that existed for counteracting such materialising tendencies by the starting of great educational institutions such as the central Hindu College of Benares.

The writer next proceeds to show what various influences moral, physical and religious, are are being brought to bear upon him and what his attitude generally is towards the Christian religion and after stating the old proverb that history is like an old almanac and the same events and modes of thought recur, though at different seasons and in a changed order, he proceeds to instance the case of the rise of Christianity itself on the Mediterranean coast and from thence to draw the parallels in the present case and the contrasts. He is good enough to point out that it was from Asia that Europe has drawn whatever was profound, philosophical and transcendental in the western creeds and that India was the fountain-head of all the higher and deeper religious ideas which had always flowed from the East to the West; and that the chief strength of Christianity consisted in its being a well organised and perfected theological creed sanctioned and upheld by the union between church and state and enforcing its tenets and dogmas with both temporal and spiritual power; and he also points out elsewhere how this led to persecution, whereas in the case of the Hindu religion it was not possible. He also proves that Hindusim is a Religion and not a theology, and that we have cosmologies and theosophies but no dogmatic rulings upon such questions as are settled by the Christian creeds, the result of which is that whereas the Indian Religion and theosophy is elastic enough to change and adjust itself with the change of the advancing condition and stage of the individual, the Christian formulas and dogmas have become stereotyped and hardened, and the sacred history has become

History, an old Almanac.

West undebted to the East for its philosophy.

Hinduism a Religion, Christianity a theology

so immobile that no body can lay his hand on it to explain it away as the Hindu does with his sacred History (Puranas) giving it a new allegorical meaning and significance to such facts ; and in consequence, Christian theology is under the disadvantage of coming into open conflict and contradiction with Science and Rationalism. The vivifying principle of Christianity is the securing of moral good, by setting forth authoritatively some powerful motives for conduct ; and on the mistaken impression,—the one of the very few mistakes we could discover in the whole article—that the Hindu system of Religious thought has its citadel in tanscendantal idealism he says that the Hindu ethical sanctions are weak and ineffectual. Another more serious mistake which he makes is when he wishes to mark the sympathetic connection between increasing devotion to God Siva, and open commemoration of the Mahratta chief Sivaji. A writer like *Vamdeo shastri* should have known better of India, with its vast extent and geographical differences, and political variations in the past and before the British advent, when India was divided into so many hundreds of petty states and kingdoms at open war with each other. And we have the written opinion of a great Scholar in the western presidency that Saivism as understood in the South of India is utterly unknown in his presidency. And we may further bear testimony to the fact that the greatest preachers and writers we have to-day in the south would scorn to look upon questions of policy or Government with any concern, and they live the life of retired recluses than of public men. What obtains in one part of such a vast country and in one town, should not at all be applied or extended to any other place or town. By the way in P 692 he

Hinduism not political.

is good enough to notice our magazine, and pay a fitting compliment to our learned contributor Rev. Father G. Bartoli And in the following passage, he nicely discriminates between the pursuit after higher and nobler spiritualism and yogic vision by the Hindu and the kind of spiritualism aimed at by his European brothers and sisters.

Hindu and European Yoga.

"Or, if the longing to see further through the outer husk of the phenomenal world overpowers and enthrals him, he may clarify the ordinary sense perceptions by ascetic exercises, which give the power of discerning subtle evolutes of matter and spirit. I have heard that certain rudimentary indications of this latent faculty, which has course, been known to us for centuries, have latterly attracted notice in England, where some sort of group or sect of initiates has been formed for necromantic experiments. But it is said that, in accordance with the utilitarian complexion taken by all modern research, the chief object of this sect is to communicate with the ghosts of dead kinsfolk or national celebrities. In our country the cultivation of such abnormal faculties is the stock-in-trade of wizards and other wonder-workers, whom I by no means brand as impostors; though they take a very low degree in the occult science, and the true spiritualist rather disdains their acquaintance. It is at best a naturalistic art, directed towards the extension of our bodily faculties into a new region of experimental discovery; but we are no more disposed than are the Christian Churches to find any solace within the confines of sensational experience; for to accept such conclusions would be a confession of spiritual ignorance, the dishonouring servitude out of which we are perpetually striving to escape."

MODERN ORIENTAL SCHOLARSHIP.

The thick mist that once enveloped the past history of India has slowly been dispelled by the study of the ancient literary documents suddenly set on foot by a handful of European orientalists towards the close of the last century. Not only the ancient literature of India itself, but the immortal remains of the hoary Greek lore, nay, the history of the overthrown kingdoms of Parthia, Media and Chaldea, were brought to bear upon the pages of Indian history. The history of India in those remote epochs when Greek philosophers took lessons from wandering Indian mendicants,* when the religion of Zoroaster was visibly influenced by the creed of the Brahmins, assumes a new meaning in the light of modern historical scholarship. The historian of India, the philosopher that would see in the life of the Indian peoples an immobile stagnation and the orientalist that observes behind the apparent incongruity of Indian religions a steady organic growth, are to be sought, by a strange irony of fate, in the same individual. When one dares come forward as a Sanskritist, he must needs be a sedulous student of Indian religions and a zealous arranger of Indian documents, to boot. Those are the complementary offices which, in combination, never fail to tire the attention of him that takes to the study of one of them. As we ponder over the exacting duties of a legitimate historian of India, we can not fail to think of hosts of "marketable" men who without any pretence whatsoever to a critical study of Indian languages, and sorely lacking genuine historical acumen, pose to write text-books of Indian History and memoirs on Ancient India by retailing second-hand knowledge under meretricious eloquence. To this band of men, historians like Elphinstone, Wheeler and Keene belong. A true historian of India, instinct with a love for Indian institutions, is yet to rise and competency for work is sure to be had when the harvest is ripe. When oriental research would have progressed to a fairly wide extent, when gladiatorial controversies had given place to settlement of solid facts, when noisy criticism results in leaving behind impeccable truths, there would be room for a historian to appear, and there would be facts for him to compare, collate and sift. In the midst of the sickening blare of trumpets in the dusty arena of presentday orientalists, when facts of Ethnology overturn theories of Philology, when a veteran student of Indian religions can not be convinced by the arguments of an Epigraphist, little work could be expected to be done by a conscientious historian of India. What can be done in the direction of history-writing with the present materials at an orientalist's disposal is best illustrated in Dr. Bhandarkar's "Early History of the Deccan" which, to say the least of it, is a dry-bone of dates and epigraphical results little animated by the true philosophy of history. Still we are not warranted in passing a malevolent criticism on such a noble work. The key to the whole secret of history-writing is less to be found in the individual capabilities of men than in the sufficiency of materials that inspires even an average man to undertake the work. But though a real historian, under the present circumstances, can not be seen, it is not uncommon to find a stately doctor of Indian religions, or a learned lecturer on Dravidian languages or Aryan folklore. To measure the benifit that has been derived by oriental learning we have only to compare the amount of knowledge we possess at this moment respecting the Vedic, Brahminic and Buddhistic India with what Warren Hastings knew of it when he laid for good the foundation-stone of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. The latter event must remain memorable beyond everything else in the annals of Oriental Scholarship. The impetus which Warren Hastings gave to the study of Indian languages by the establishment of the said institution and the keen interest he personally took in oriental studies have resulted in nothing less than an actual revolution in the thought of the West during the last half-a-century.

The illustrious names of Sir William Jones, Charles Wilkins, and T. H. Colebrooke still live on the lips of many a distinguished Sanskritist. These were the men who were in every sense pioneers of Anglo-Sanskrit learning and their labours will not be forgotten till Sanskrit scholarship ceases continuing to hold its present all-absorbing sway. It is intensely interesting to study how their work in small beginnings has eventually, after a long course of persisting influence, led in our own day to the production of such mighty oracles of Sanskrit learning as Prof: Max Müller and Cowell, Roth and Böhtlingk. The rapid strides with which oriental learning has been progressing, and the signal triumphs it has achieved as a pure labour of love with many men, are best seen in the enthusiasm with which the field of Sanskrit

* See, inter alia, Max-Muller's *Psychological Religion* pp. 83 *et seq.*

has in recent times been parcelled out by European and American labourers to specialise their sphere of work. Sir William Jones could scarcely have even dreamt of a day when men like Professors Keilhorn and Goldstücker should betake themselves to the study of Sanskrit grammar, when an authoritative scholar like Professor Max-Müller should confine his attention to the Rig-Veda, when Richard Garbe should take up only the Sankhya philosophy for his exclusive study Nor is this all. The degree of specialization has gone very far up. Even branches of Sanskrit studies have been subdivided and subsections of these sub-divisions boast at present of their indefatigable students. It may seem scarcely credible for many to be told that the department of the Indian systems of lexicography has an eminent expounder in Th. Zachariæ of Halle, that the repelling region of Vedic phonetics is ruled over by Liebich of Breslau, that Bloomfield has lightened the trouble of many would-be students of the Atharva-veda which is even now a sealed book to the orthodox Brahmins, that Indian astrology, astronomy and mathematics are laboriously understood by Thibaut and Sanskrit medical works are explained by Jolly of Würzburg. Specialization is becoming more and more the rule and fashion of Sanskrit scholarship and there are unmistakable signs in the times that this spirit will strive more ardently on for ever. An idea can be gained to what length specialization has extended in this direction from the magnificent royal octavo volumes entitled the "Encyclopoedia of Indo-Aryan Research"* now being issued by a German book-seller under the editorship of the famous Dr. Bübler. Among the list of collaborators we find a glittering roll of names which ought to be a pleasing pride to the new conditions of Sanskrit scholarship. More might be said also of the storehouse of learning which is placed at the disposal of the cultured public in the gorgeous Clarendon Press serials entitled "The sacred books of the East" and edited by that modern wonder of oriental learning, Prof Max Muller and in the "The sacred books of the Buddhists"† issued under the supervision of that same veteran Sanskrit scholar. We can also mention in this connection the rich "Indische Studien" ofProf Weber, the "Trübner's Oriental Series"and the "Proceedings" and "Journals" of the various learned oriental societies founded in nearly all parts of the world. Of the latter, "the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal" with its branches, "the American Oriental Society" and the "German Oriental Society" deserve prominent mention. The movement exhibited in the starting of "The Harward Oriental Series"* reflects great credit on the taste of American Scholarship. It is an agreeable contrast for a modern student of Sanskrit who is literally bored by the stupifying din of recent industry and achievements to transfer himself in thought to those times when Sir William Jones and Charles Wilkins learnt their Sanskrit. At a time when the Brahmin Pundits had not shaken off their time-honored prejudices for instructing a *Mléchha* in their sacred lore, when English students of Sanskrit had to learn even their Sanskrit alphabet from the very Pundits whom in these days of enlightenment, none but an advanced European scholar of Sanskrit is able to converse with without the help of an interpreter, when, learners who were usually filling high offices in the Indian courts had to leave much of their stiff reserve before willing to sit at a Brahmin's feet, the hardship of those early English students could scarcely have of been of a light nature. Suffice it to say that both Sir William Jones and Charles Wilkins learnt their Sanskrit under Brahmin Pundits and they went home with their "Note-books" full of "meanings" and "explanations" to be, in due course, given to the world. The former published a translation of *Sakuntala* which took the European world by an agreeable surprise and the latter, a Sanskrit Grammer and a book on "Sanskrit Roots" Their views on the resources of Sanskrit language are of the same nature and each has nothing to say but homage to the universal excellence of Sanskrit Literature. To quote, Sir William Jones, "The Sanskrit Language, whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more excellently refined than either"† He wrote a great deal in the pages of "the Asiatic Researches" and his style has a radiance and colour matched only by Prof: Wilson's later writings. CharlesWilkins'Grammar was in its own way a masterly product—we must not shut our eyes to the glaring truth that he was the first

*Nearly eleven volumes have now been published; Three are in course of rapid publication. The books are issued some in German and some in English.

† This is a new enterprise of Max Müller under the patronage of the King of Siam

* Till now, four volumes have been brought out. One of them is *Vijnana Bhikshu's Sankhyapravachana Bhashya* edited by Dr. Garbe and printed in transliterated English characters.

† *Op.* quoted in p. ix of the Preface to Wilkin's Sanskrit Grammar. (London 1808).

writer of a Sanskrit grammar for the European students, and hence ought to have experienced difficulties scarcely conceivable to us—which, without the serious troubles attendant on one bent upon mastering the indigenous works on Sanskrit grammar, enabled Bopp, one of the founders of the modern science of Comparative Philology, to become a profound Sanskrit grammarian. Bopp had not read even one Sanskrit work on grammar,* and yet, he was able, after a study of Wilkins' book to introduce his own epoch-making changes in the realm of Sanskrit Grammar. Every student of Sanskrit knows how much Bopp has simplified the principles regulating the declension of nouns† by classifying the case-terminations on a new basis altogether, and enunciating easily-understood rules to discriminate and apply them. Colebrook's interests lay in a different direction. He was not content with the study of Sanskrit grammar which was the one abiding passion for Wilkins, nor did he stop with reading Sanskrit dramas, lyrics and lawbooks in which Jones found intense delight. His extensive and reliable knowledge of Indian philosophy bore fruition in some of his most beautiful essays which are even now, after the lapse of nearly a century, looked up to as a clear and concise exposition of the Indian philosophical teachings. He studied many Sanskrit books bearing on mathematics including astronomy, and traces of this knowledge could be found in nearly all his writings. He wrote successively essays on the laws, the philosophies, the religions, manners and social customs, and "the Funeral Ceremonies" of the Hindus. To this day, what he has written on Sanskrit grammar holds its eminence for all the modern zeal of recent German scholarship. He was a man that worked his way with admirable patience and painstaking scrutiny, through the intricate labyrinth of Panini and other Sanskrit grammarians, and the unfinished fragment of his Sanskrit Grammar he has left to posterity is the best introduction now available anywhere to the study of indigenous grammars. To this period also belongs Johnson who translated *Hitopadesa*. The next great Sanskritist who was also a doctor of medicine, that had done capital service to the cause of Sanskrit scholarship was the memorable Professor H. H. Wilson. Alongside of Prof. Wilson must not omit to think of the venerable Serampore missionaries, Carey and Marshman who, without doing prejudice to their primary duties as missionaries acquired a knowledge of Sanskrit which enabled them successively to publish dictionaries and translate Sanskrit classics besides writing books on the religion and social customs of the Indians which breathe a singular freedom from those malevolent representations, and venomous carpings which are the common hall-mark of missionaries' works on India. Instances are not wanting now-a-days of missionaries, without either the slightest respect for the dignity of their labour, or the least sense of regard for humanity which they are supposed to uplift and ennoble by the new religion they bring for its acceptance, writing books with no better purpose than to insult a religionist or to outrage the feelings of a friend of India. A smattering of Sanskrit, or worse still, a second-hand knowledge of Anglo-Sanskrit books read with little broad-mindedness is all the equipage the missionaries carry with them whenever they begin inflicting the reading public with their blatant gabble. Marshman and Carey were in all ways, noble servants of Christ, and their translation of Ramayana* and Carey's "Grammar of Sungskrit Language" and essays, are, though rare, read with intense interest by all students of Sanskrit. But the outstanding figure at this period, which could count among good Sanskritists, besides Marshman and Carey, Ward and many a good-hearted Missionary, people like Gorrieso, Julius Mohl, Schlegel and Fauche, is certainly Professor Wilson. Julius Mohl is justly illustrious no less for his oriental research than for whetting the appetite of many an earnest student of Sanskrit in the forties by assistance rendered in the shape of munificent donations for pursuing Sanskrit studies and by his personal example as a scholar. Gorrieso, Schlegel, and Fauche, by a strange concurrence of aims, had each of them worked at India's master-epic, the Ramayana, without the other knowing of it. As a result of this we had a splendid crop of new translations of the epic within a very short interval. Gorrieso brought out an excellent edition of Ramayan at the expense of Charles Albert, king of Sardinia. The text is printed in a style that can not be surpassed in any country for the almost regal magnificence of paper, printing, and get-up. He translated Ramayana into Italian

* Cf. Max-Muller *Chips from a German Workshop* vol. II pp. 25

† See Monier Williams: *Sanskrit Manual* p. 16.

* For a sample of this translation, Griffith's Ramayan Appendix B. pp. 507 *et. seq*

"which" in the words of a discerning critic "may be equalled but not surpassed in any other of the languages of Europe. In his translation he has carefully preserved a Dantesque idiom and form of expression free from all local patois; his rendering is most faithful and his language elegant and spirited."[2] Schlegel published a Latin translation and Fauche, the most intrepid and indefatigable of translators from Sanskrit, has given to the world a highly-finished version into French. Professor Wilson whom it is nothing short of literary sacrilege to compare with other men of his time, was even a much greater figure than Colebrooke himself in combined knowledge of various branches of Sanskrit learning. He learnt in addition to what Colebrooke had already achieved for him, Hindu Music as treated in books (there is a story yet current among European orientalists that he was pronounced unfit by a Brahman songster to whom he applied for tuition in teaching singing) and studied Sanskrit books on medicine and surgery. His qualifications as a medical man rendered him eminently useful for this part of the task. The wealth of learning he acquired in India during his long stay, he has given to us in about three dozen volumes of royal octavo. His lectures on the "Theatre of the Hindus" and his vigorous, yet, literal translation of *Vishnu Purana* which preserves in a remarkable degree the devotional tinge of the original, are yet classics. He had a fine poetic vein and this served him in good stead whenever he translated Sanskrit books into English verse. His brilliant essays on almost every conceivable oriental subject are a treat in themselves for the general reader for abundant harmony of rhythm, for colour and movement, for energy and fragrance. His poetical translations of many dramas sound a chorus of ravishing music. As a triumph of the power which Professor Wilson possessed in suitably Englishing Sanskrit poems, we may look at his translation into verse of that delicate lyrico-pastoral of Kalidasa—*Meghasandesa*—which is unrivalled in preserving for us, the swing of tripping strength and the luxuriance of woodland associations the gentle perfume, the gay sheen and the chime of silver bells which ever are the reader's enjoyment when he sits to read the Sanskrit idyl. His version of *Meghasandesa* can only be compared to the delicious prose-version of Theocritus, Bion and Moschus from the pen of Andrew Lang. The pipings which we actually hear from the verdant alleys of a Persian garden on reading Edward FitzGerald's version of *Rubaiyat* of Omar Khayyam are those of another rare orientalist who is a-born player on flute. Many people have attempted poetical versions of important Sanskrit classics, notably Mr. Griffith of Ramayana, Mr. Muir of many Sanskrit texts from Mahabharat and elsewhere, Mr. Tawney of Bhartrihari and Sir Edwin Arnold of Bhagavad Gita. In all these cases there is not the faintest echo of the melody of the original. The shackles of versification by which the translators are bound impede their progress and cripple their strength. What perhaps they might have done better in prose they did worst in wretched verse. Cacophony jostles in our ear and we are tempted to cast away the version and seek much pleasanter reading in the original. The fault never lies with the original, nor does it remain in the translator's knowledge of Sanskrit, it arises in his mistaking the pedestrian-like prosy verse which is little else but versified rhymes and bald prose, for fine poetry which alone can give melody. As a relief from these dissonances we can turn to Prof. Wilson's poetry which unites the rare qualities of silvery melody, fidelity to the original, and nervous expression. When Prof. Wilson, near whom we have tarried rather long was doing good work in England as professor of Sanskrit at the university of Oxford, Eng. Burnouf was lecturing in France. The lectures of the latter drew to Paris many students from various universities all over the continent. His name will live in the memory of all men as an industrious Vedic scholar, as the founder of the modern "Science of Religion," as an unearther of ancient Buddhistic books and as the translator of *Bhagavat Purana*. He was a master of nearly all the oriental languages and was chiefly remarkable for having introduced into the study of Sanskrit that spirit of critical research which characterises all the labours of the existing Sanskritists. He died when very young and he is always regarded as a marvellous genius considering his very brief life and his very extensive and profound oriental scholarship. Prof. Max Muller was a student for some time under this illustrious man, and learnt from him many of the virtues he now possesses as the bulwark of Sanskrit learning. Between Burnout and Prof. Max Muller a few men might be noted. We may mention with emphasis the name of Thomson, the translator of *Bhagavad Gita*, Benfey, the author of a dictionary and a Sanskrit grammar and a painstaking contributor to

[2] *Op. Cit.* from Calcutta Review, Vol. XXIII. *The Ramayana.*

the etymology of Sanskrit language, Darmesteter, an authoritative scholar of Zend and a sympathetic expounder of the religion of the Parsis, Hillebrandt who has done much in the domain of oriental mythology and Whitney, a well-meaning but a down-trodden scholar who was more than once roundly snubbed by Prof. Max Muller for his hasty conclusions in the science of Sanskrit grammar. There are other names, not minor ones by any means, which we must omit for the present for want of space, names like those of Burnell and Goldstucker, Buhler and the rest. Prof. Max Muller's labours are too well-known to need any special enumeration. He is well received as a comparative philologist, as an authoritative and very useful Vedic scholar and an earnest and sympathetic student of world's religions. His notion of Christ's religion is coloured through and through with Vedantism, and his being prepared to recognise Christ as the *Pratyagatma* of the Indian philosophers, as the *Logos* of the Alexandrian School of thinkers, as the *Daimonion* of Socrates will be most unpalatable to the "Orthodox" divines.* His knowledge of many religions has widened his mental horizon and he is prepared to find nuggets of pure gold in all religious strata. To him "miracles" in the modern acceptation of the term is no longer necessary to heighten the value of any religious teaching.† To surround the founders of each religion with a half-mystic, half-spiritual halo is the birthright of humanity‡ and this, he says, is due to a disease that attacks the human mind in its transitional stage from a knowledge of the finite to a dim yearning after the Infinite in Nature. To him, as to Mohammad, the Sun rising everyday in the rosy east and flooding the heavens in a mellow effulgence of russet and silver is a greater miracle than all the "miracles" of Christianity put together. The *Siddhis* which the Yogis acquire are, with Max Muller, interesting studies in the pathology of the brain and nervous system and "Theosophical Mahatmas" and "Esoteric Buddhism" have little meaning and less foundation.§

According to Prof. Max Muller, if we have learnt to recognise the Christ in us, the Jivatma in our doings, the Logos in our life, we have learnt the best lesson which religion could teach. One step more and we find that Christ and God are one in essence, Jivatma and Paramata are only differences in degree. But the actual realization is not on this side of life but must be reserved for the activity beyond the grave. The so-called *Jivanmukta* state is merely a momentary mental rapture enjoyed, and not the real *summum bonum*. Not Prof. Max Muller alone has his views tinctured and his heart comforted by the study of Indian Philosophy, especially of the *Upanishads* and the *Vedanta*. Schopenhauer derived immense solace from the study of Upanishads and his philosophic creed was thoroughly permeated by the Upanishad doctrines. Prof. Duesson is another of modern men whom the balm of Vedanta has allayed and soothed when swayed by the pessimistic effects of recent science. He is a zealous propagandist of the Vedantic creed and an admirable student of all the European schools of thought. Not to speak of his solid additions to the modern "Science of Religion", Prof. Max Muller deserves the greatest praise in the interests of Sanskrit scholarship. He has been a tower of strength against the headlong innovations of modern men in interpreting old Sanskrit books, and chiefly instrumental in teaching European Sanskritists to elucidate Sanskrit texts according to traditional methods, and in persuading others to follow in the wake of native commentators in explaining Vedas and other ancient books, and not to desecrate the ancient documents coming down to us from times lost in the twilight of hoary antiquity, by laying the impious hands of rough-and-ready work. Sayana, he tells us, has solved many a real difficulty in the interpretation of Rig-Veda, and but for his assistance, the noisy clamour and despicable self-conceit of modern precipitate men would not have availed even one jot in unravelling the meaning of that venerable Aryan heirloom. His respect for native commentators finds a still more powerful expression in the writings of many of his pupils. Not only he is for following native authorities whenever there are difficulties in which it will be unsafe to venture on a desparate guess but he positively recommends the utility of reading Sanskrit books with the assistance of native Pundits. There are pitfalls in the study of ancient philosophy from which only the torchlight of traditional teaching will carry away one safe. Let us hear what his sometime pupil Dr. Keilhorn says in the introduction to his translation of Nagojibhatta's *Paribhashendushekhara*. He remarks in allusion to the benifit of translating works of Sanskrit with the help of native Pundits, "It is

* Vide Max Muller's "Natural Religion", pp. 576 Also his "Theosophy or Psychological Religion" pp. 538 *et*

† See Max Muller's Anthropological Religion, preface pp. *et seq.*

‡ Vide Max Muller's physical Religion pp. 350 *et*

§ M. M. Psychological Religion pp. 326 et seq.

sad to see the number of great Sastris distinguished no less for their humility and modesty than for learning and intelligence, diminish year after year, and to feel that with them there is dying away more and more of that traditional learning which we can so ill dispense with in the interpretation of the enigmatic works of Hindu antiquity, but it appears to me all the more to be the duty of both native and European Sanskrit scholars to save as much as can still be saved and to fix in writing what in less than half-a-century will otherwise be irreparable lost."* These are the words of a man that has at heart the welfare of Sanskrit scholarship and they will find a responsive echo in the feelings of many other friends of Sanskrit. We must mention one other man of note as a curious product of Oriental scholarship and that is Professor Weber. He is a scholar of considerable acumen and energy who seems to know no other mode of nourishing a talent or taste than by using it for malevolent purposes. A man of overweeing vanity and a rank hater of everything Indian, he wants to find in all the Indian products a subsoil of European influence. His rabid prejudices have evoked a great deal of censure from his fellow-labourers and he was more than twice violently cudgelled by Prof. Goldstucker. Very few of the living Sanskritists look upon his labours with an unsuspecting mind and the many ingenious theories he brought forward of Homer influencing Valmiki have been exploded by the late K. T. Telang. Yet we can not for all his blind prepossessions resist admiring his stupenduous *Indische studien*, a library in itself for learning and information. Monier Williams is his exact counterpart in England. He is the orthodox champion of missionaries among Sanskritists. His translation of *Sakuntala* has the rare stamp of having an oriental flavour. Weber's "History of Indian Literature" and William's "Indian Wisdom" have the singular merit of being the only books that give a connected survey of Sanskrit literature in a short compass, though the observations and reflections contained in them are open to much doubt and positive criticism. We can barely mention the names of Indian scholars who have been trained on European lines and who have had an Anglo-Sanskrit education. Men like Prof. Bhandarkar, the late Justice Telang, Dr. Rajendra Lal Mitter are easily brought under this division. There are others who without having an English education have caught the spirit of modern inquiry and tended to advance the cause of Sanskrit scholarship according to Western methods. Pundits like Taranatha, Maheschandra Nyayaratna, Rajaram Sastry Bodas, Durga Prasad belong to this class. The "Orthodox" scholarship has its ranks everyday thinning in numbers and that is not a very encouraging prospect for the modern Sanskritist, to whom its sympathy and assistance are of excellent use. Of the living Sanskritists Prof. Cowell is one of those who revere the indigenous learning. He has been chiefly devoting his attention to the post-vedic secular literature. His wife as it is well-known is one of the very few English women who have studied Sanskrit. Of Cowell's recent pupils Miss Ridding, an English lady, has come forward as the translator of Bana's greatest romance, *Kadambari*, a book which in point of difficulty of style, is rightly dreaded even by the Pundits. (Bana, by the way, be it remembered, was a PreRaphælite in Sanskrit Literature.) Of all the Sanskritists we have hitherto been mentioning there is little doubt that Prof. Max Muller is the prince. He has endeared himself to the hearts of the peoples of India by the manifest sympathy he feels for their institutions, the extreme good heart with which he has been striving to raise the level of excellence of Sanskrit scholarship and the open admiration with which he adores their great sages and philosophers.

V. V. RAMANAN.

*Op. Cit. pp. XXIV *et seq.* Also cf. *inter alia* Macdonnel's edition of Max-Muller's Sanskrit Grammar, Preface pp. iv *et seq.* and Introduction to Cowell's translation of Sandilya Sutra, Bibliotheca Indica Series, pp. V. *et Seq.*

REVIEWS

Ancient Tamilian Civilization.—'S. S.' contributes an article to the '*Indian Social Reformer*' of the 4th instant on 'South Indian Civilization' Of course, he would not drop this cumbrous phrase nor the inappropriate word 'Dravidian'; neither would he condescend to mention our name, though he is good enough to accept our theory and he observes, "So, it is probable that *the Dravidians might have landed in Southern India by sea,* (as some think), settled there and gradually spread towards the north, long before the Aryans came to India." He discounts the idea also that the Brahmans were the pioneers of civilization in the south and remarks that there are ample and clear proofs to show that the Dravidians were highly developed in their civilization long before the advent of the Brahmans to the south. He refers to the independence of the language, literature and architecture and religion and art of the Tamilians in proof of its separate origin. He derives Tamil from the root 'தமிழ்' meaning 'independent,' but this is more fanciful than real, though it has the sanction of such a veteran Scholar as Mr. C. W. Damodaram Pillai. He would derive also the Adi Siva Gurukals from the ancient Tamilians also, but the arguments he adduces, in the matter of intermarriage and interdining, are not conclusive, as other sections of Brahmins, and even subsections do not interdine and intermarry; and Sankaracharya had also introduced an element of conflict by denouncing the old true Agamic worship, chiefly by reason of his difference with the true and old philosophy with which that worship was connected. 'S. S.' concludes, 'From these facts it may be maintained that the Dravidians were originally an independent civilized nation, and imparted to the Aryans more than what they derived from them, in point of civilization.'

The Upanishad Artha Deepika' We heartily welcome this new monthly magazine projected by Mr. A. Siva Row, Sub Registrar of Kuttalam, in which he purposes to translate the principal Upanishads into Tamil with Advaita, Dvaita and Vishishtadvaita Bashiyas. And the first instalment of the work is very promising and we earnestly hope he would succeed in his attempt. What we would however ask him to do, if he would kindly adopt our suggestion, is, to give first of all, a true and literal translation of the Sanscrit Text in the பதவுரை, untrammelled by any of the interpretations put on it by commentators and untrammelled by their peculiar terminology taking care that he does not leave this duty to be performed by his pandit friends. The special views of different commentators can be given in the foot notes. The commentaries more often clog our intellects than help us to their real solution. The peculiar thing about these commentaries we may mention. Sankara and his followers would always interpret such words as Isa, Iswara, Maheswara and Parameshwara, Isana, &c. to mean wherever they occur in the Upanishads as Atma; and the Vaishnavite commentator tries very hard to make out that they can mean only Narayana and nothing else? Don't these words convey such meanings as they appear ordinarily? Of course they are quite conscious that that is not the traditional interpretation (முகமாந்தரம்) of the words and the sense in which it is used is not the sense which they want to introduce into the word. They resort to its literal acceptation, (கௌணமாந்தரம்) to explain away their particular divergences. If the word only means Narayana, the first word of the very first Upanishad could begin with 'Narayana' than with 'Isa' and the commentator in page 25 admits that the ordinary rule of interpretation is that where a word has a particular meaning in common usage and also a literal meaning, the traditional meaning is the one to be accepted. Of course we would be glad to meet some Isa or Ishwara Iyengar or Achariar or Parameshwara Iyengar.

One thing more. We do not approve of the text being given in Devanagari. It will prove of no use to the ordinary Tamil man. And we do not acknowledge the high merit and great antiquity claimed for it by Mr. Siva Row. They were later than Tamil or Grantha characters and had a southern origin. He can maintain his position if he derives the Pranava Symbol ஓ (ஒ) Pillayar shuli from the Devanagari instead of from the Tamil.

EXTRACT.

THE POETS OF THE TAMIL LANDS.

By the Rev. G. U. Pope, M.A.; D.D.
(*Balliol College and Indian Institute, Oxford*)

VI. THE NALADI NANNURRU, OR 400 QUATRAINS, AND THE LATER TAMIL GNOMIC POETRY.

Continued from page 143.

§ 4. The "Three Spices": Tirikadugam.

Tirikadugam is from Sanskrit, and means *composed of three spices*. These spices are dry ginger, long pepper, and black pepper, and form a very popular stimulating and restorative medicine. Here each stanza, of which there are 100, introduces three things for comparison, contrast, or illustration. It is a fascinating though very fantastic little cento.

The reputed author is *Nallathanar*, mentioned as a member of the Madura College, of whom nothing is really known. It is impossible to assign an earlier date to this work as a whole than the fifteenth century, though many lines are exceedingly ancient.

Parallels to most of the verses will be found in Bohtlingk's Sanskrit Analecta.

Youth is by nature apt to slide away from right;
Folly is mighty to utter things forbidden;
And evermore
Meanness indulges in angry passions!—
These three the wise will shun. (14.)

The man undisciplined who raves, and thus his cause would win
The man who eagerly desires what cannot be;
From mere report
Who finds fault with others' learning;
These three beat chaff in a mortar! (28.)

"Self conciet and extolling one's self;
Anger fostered, and not suppressed;
And meanness
That covets the possessions of others; these three
Are instruments that destroy fortune." (38.)

A horse not well broken in to his paces;
An elephant that breaks the post to which he is tied;
And the school
Of him who grows angry while he teaches;
These three the wise will ever shun. (46.)

Acquire wealth in order to give; in virtue's way
That you may walk study great works;
With gracious purpose
Speak thou each word: these three paths
Conduct not to the dark and painful world. (60.)

To speak thoughtlessly about life while it is enjoyed;
To say *we've lost it*, when the end is nigh;
And to feel shame (for sins) when disease comes and the body fails:
These three are characteristics of short-lived mortals. (91.)

§ 5. "The Five Precious Perfumes" Elathi.

The name is Sanskrit. The five are (1) "cardamom" = a perfumed confection of cardamom seeds; (2) "camphor"; (3) *Erikaru*, "an odorous wood"; (4) "sandalwood paste"; and (5) "honey."

This mingling of perfumes is used for the hair. This title is given to a collection of 81 gnomic verses in which each quatrain is supposed to combine, compare, and illustrate five (or six) things.

The work is of Jain origin. Its author's name is *Kanimethaiyar* (= "he whose knowledge is appreciated (by all)"). It is one of the eighteen lesser classics: *Sanga-seyyul*. Of the author nothing is really known, except that he is styled a disciple of Makkayanar, a learned *asiriyar*, or pandit, one of the Madura Academy. It is probably not of much later date than the *Naladi* itself; and is once quoted by the Commentator on the Jivaga Chintamani. The Madras edition of 1887 is here referred to. There is a very useful commentary. Perhaps a careful study of *Elathi* will more than that of any other minor poet, help the learner to understand the *Naladi*, and the whole body of Tamil didactic verse. We give a few specimens.

"Sages of gentle soul have laid it down, enlarging on the theme, that six qualities belong to loving souls (1) neither survives the other, (2) they share their wealth, (3) they hold sweet intercourse of speech, (4) they joy to meet, (5) share one another's pain, (6) and grieve to part." (69.)

"To die is easy; to attain perfection hard!
To desire good is easy; to put on truth hard!
To set out in pursuit of the right is easy; to be steadfast hard!
To gain triumphs as accomplished scholars easy; hard to reach heaven!" (40.)

"Thou whose dark eyes is beautiful and wide.
O swan in form! Who feel the truth will speak
The truth alway!
Lying, slander, harsh words and useless words—these four
From lips of fools alone proceed." (29.)

The following contains a striking description of the goal reached by the sage

Heaven.

"If one would tell of the excellence of the pure and loftly goal which sages from falsehood free have sought out and desired as the only reality; (in that place) there is no light that dispels darkness' no speech, no change, no weariness, no suffering, no sweet sleep. (67.)

(*No light, since no darkness* ... *words; no increase or diminution of joy;* ... *no sweetness of repose, because no toil.*)

The Perishable and Imperishable.

"Youth passes swiftly away, disease and eld draw nigh
Bright flowers of wealth and strength fade fast.
While life is thine, desire thou not earth's gifts,
(Thou whose words as milk are sweet!)
Desire release.—The law is this." (22.)

(A finished verse in Tamil.)

Sympathy is noble Courtesy.

"When death, or loss, or hate, or griefs, or joys,
Or foolish babble of the people's tongues,

Befall one's friends,—
To feel with them, and share their joys and griefs,
This is in truth the noblest COURTESY." (80.)

DEATH.

"He fears not sword: dreads not bravery: respects not beauty shrinks not from any hero; is not dismayed by any assemblage of resources; fails not his day:—therefore, if you see death's coming, imminent, betake yourself to the *studies* that relate to *release*. (38.)

"He goes not away though one weep; he knows no dread; if one lament aloud he hears not; if one spring up he does not relinquish his hold; he does not depart, saying, *these are helpless ones*: though one pay him reverence he goes not! Why do men not ponder *death's* power, and labour in works of penitential expiation? To remain idle is surely a fault!" (39.)

§ 6. NANMERRI—"THE GOOD WAY."

This consists of forty quatrains by Siva-piragasa suvami of Turraimangalam. He was a Saivite Guru. They are printed in "Minor Poets," and separately. These though comparatively modern (seventeenth century) are classical and of great value. Every verse has its apt, and often very ingenious simile.

The whole would well bear translation. We give four.

"The great wealth of those who render no assistance to others
Shall become the possession of those who render such help!

Thus the mighty sea
Whose accumulated waters render aid to none,*
The cloud shall drink up, and pour in rain upon the world." (35)
The excellent think not of their own wants
But supply the wants of others!

Thus the moon
Seeks not to remove the stain of its own spots,
But chases the darkness that spreads over the world. (33.)

In the wide ocean-girt world delight thou
In pleasant words, and not in harsh ones!

Damsel with golden bracelets!
The eye rises not up to meet the sun's fierce fiery rays,
But rises at the bidding of the cool-rayed moon. (40.)
The friendship of the good will daily increase in sweetness;
Others' friendship will ever more and more become worthless!

Hear, O beloved!
If the tender fruit ripen, it becomes sweet to the taste;
If the twig grow mature what pleasure's there? (51.)

§ 7. SIRRU-PANJA-MULAM.

This is a collection in which five things are compared, and from this fact it gets its name, which really signifies "the collection of fivefold analogies." It is not very much in use, but is like the others remarkable for terse graceful expression of quite common place or obvious ideas; but to give to homely pleasant thoughts such form and expression as shall make them dear to successive generations, to all classes, and to every age, is a distinguished merit, and these quatrains possess it. We shall give a few specimens only. The Tamil scholar will doubtless find easy access to good editions with commentary.

* It quenches no man's thirst, and invigorates no man's field.

GAINS.

"The learned man will gain gold.
The gain of good verse is its meaning.
What gain is there from disputation?
What gain from the musical instrument which a man has not beforehand learn to use?
When the unlearned seek the society of the learned their gain is derision!"

AMBROSIA.

"A chaste wife is ambrosia.
A learned man of disciplined mind is ambrosia.
A country well taught is ambrosia.
To a country whose banners reach the clouds the king is ambrosia. And *the servant that does his duty is ambrosia!*"

RUIN.

Forgetfulness is ruin; the pride of wealth is ruin;
Immaturity is ruin; so is obstinacy;
To be at variance with his labourers is always ruin to the cultivator!

BEAUTY.

"The beauty of the eye is benevolence;
The beauty of the leg is firmness;
The beauty of calculation is correct numbering;
The beauty of music is its charm for the ear;
The beauty of the king is the prosperity of his land."

"The beauty of wavy locks, the beauty of rounded form,
The beauty of nails and ears,
The beauty of the teeth, these are not real beauty.
To speak as true wisdom teaches is beauty."

§ 8. "THINGS SWEET AND BITTER."

There are forty Tamil quatrains in which are enumerated the things that are supposed to yield abiding "pleasure" to men; and forty in which are given those things which on the contrary cause "pain." These verses are not of any particular merit, but are constantly quoted. The author is said to be by an old Madura sage named *Benthanar*, but nothing is really known as to their origin. They are quite classical in style. We give a specimen of each.

GARDENING.

Let pleasant words be the fertile soil, benevolence the seed,
Weed out harsh words, add manure of truthfulness,
Water the crop with love, and so cultivate
The tender herb of virtue from thine earliest days.

LOVE.

Right pleasant is life with those with whom we are at one;
Pleasant to see the full moon in the wide fields of heaven;
But to be unblameable in deed, and with a tender soul
To be loving unto all is truly sweet. (4.)

The weapon wielded by a powerless arm is nought;
The beauty of a flower no fragrance breathes is nought;
The resolution of the man without clear knowledge is nought;
And so the speech of him who knows not use of words!

The desire of the destitute to do benevolent deeds is vain ;
To dwell in a city of palaces to the poor man is vain ;
To feast upon the mere sight of a cookhouse is vain ;
Friendship of those who desert you in adversity is vain !

§ 9. "OLD WORDS": *Para-mori.*

Under this title a number of quatrains exist which are of considerable interest, and are founded on actual proverbs. From this the collection takes its title. In our account of the *Naladi* it will be seen that two collections of verses were supposed to have been preserved with that work, though they reached the bank at different places (See Introduction, p. ix). Their actual antiquity is perhaps doubtful, but their value and classical character cannot be questioned. We subjoin a few specimens.

When our friends speak in our praise it is well
To ignore the soft words, and disclaim the praise.
Lord of the Hill where bamboos wave ;
Men put not on jewels that become them not,
Even though the jewles are their own !

When worthless people chatter senseless things
'Tis hard to stop their tongues.
Lord of the shore,
Where ships are seen reeling like drunken men !
There are some who can tie up the winds.

When a man possesses wealth and worldly greatness,
If he be not of a truly disciplined mind,
The exaltation of such an ignoble person
Is like *putting a torch into a monkey's hand.*

The silly man who speaks evil words, and hides his malice,
Will bring himself to grief by his speech,
O lovely maid !
The frog hides himself in the sand, and lies concealed,—
But by his croak he betrayes himself.

Wealth that knows no sum, high birth, all kingly adjuncts,
And to be named as worthy by the king,
Are not great things. Here and hereafter
To possess one's self is greatness !

Those who possess stores of rare wealth
Need not to seek men to perform their behests.
Lord of the land
Where the heron sleeps on the buffalo's shoulder !
When you've dug a tank you need not seek for frogs.

§ 10. "THE ESSENCE OF THE WAY OF VIRTUE": *Arra-nerri Saram.*

This is a small collection that like "Old Words" is reputed to have escaped the flood with the Naladi. It is like the former, but not quite so proverbial in character.

PROCRASTINATION.

"The men of excellence will say we will perform
Deeds of virtue betimes, and do them thoroughly.
At eventide
Man lays him down, never to rise again !—
Why do men not perform virtuous deeds betimes ?"

Soul ! I cannot gain entire power
Over thee ; whom then can I rule ?
On earth if I gain control of thee,
I have the key that opens heaven.

MONKS AND MEN.

If they abide amidst their fellow men yet rule their souls,
They are as virtuous as those who live in thickets
Where wild flowers bloom.
And in those wilds who dwelling govern not their soul,
Are as those that dwell in midmost of the town.

The housewife beloved, and one'self—
The two together yoked,—must draw the car !
By one alone
The chariot of domestic virtue pure
Onward rolls not, but standeth still.

From day to day though it lie in the water,
The stone rarely becomes softened
Like that stone
Base men from day to day hear virtuous teaching,
But their hearts are harder than the stone.

§ 11. NITI-NERRI-VILAKKAM: *A lamp in the way of right.*"

Passing over an immense number of minor poets, I must add a mention of a work of purely native origin which within the last hundred years has been added to the undoubted classics of the language. It is the *Niti-nerri-vilakkam*—"The lamp in the path of righteousness." An edition of this has been published by an admirable Tamil scholar, the late Henry Stokes, Esq., of the Madras Civil Service. The work consists of 102 quatrains, and is every way admirable ; but it would require a chapter by itself. The date is about 1700 A. D.

This gives his idea of mysticism :

"Nought doubting, wav'ring not sages explore by reason's aid
Till all grows clear ; with eye of apprehension true op'd wide.
They sleep, and see the vision clear.* In that pure mystic light
When waking life arrays itself. 'tis being's perfect gain." (99.

The following is its first quatrain :

Youth is a bubble on the water ; wealth's plenitude
Is as long waves that roll on its surface ;
This well-knit frame is writing traced on the water. My friends,
Why bow we not within the courts of Him, our Lord ?" (1.)

The idea, that man should not survive the loss of his honour, is expressed in

"If any would cherish sweet life, having incurred the loss of strength and honour, let them cherish it ; if only they can be sure of immunity even for a little while from death !" (43.)

"However many subjects learning may be conversant with, if there be not understanding to employ it in the right place, it is profitless ! Tho' thus employed, if power of speech be wanting, what good is it ? If this too be present, it is as if a golden flower were to possess fragrance also." (5.)

(To be continued)

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA

A Monthly Journal, Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897

VOL. II. | **MADRAS, JANUARY 1899.** | **No 8**

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRA WITH S'RI'KANTHA-BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page 150.*)

By backward reference. (I. iv. 15).

Because of the backward reference, in the passage "non-existent, verily, this at first was," to the Omniscient spoken of in a previous passage "He desired 'may I become many'," and because of the backward reference in the passage "He who has penetrated here up to the tips of the nails," to the Avyâkrita described before, we understand that He alone is meant; so, too, here, by backward reference, we are to understand that the five "*pancha-janas*" mean the five *indriyas*. Hence no incongruity whatever.

The discussion of the question as to whether the Sânkhya's Principle (Pradhâna) is referred to (in the upanishads) is over. Again the sûtrakâra proceeds to explain how Parames'vara is distinct from Jîva:

Because it denotes the universe. (I. iv. 16.)

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Kaushitaki-Brâhmana-Upanishad. Commencing with the words "I shall teach thee Brahman," the Upanishad goes on thus:

"He who, O Bâlâki, is verily the creator of all these beings, and whose deed this is, he verily should be known," and so on*

Here a doubt arises as to whether it is Parame'svara or Jîva who is spoken of as the being that should be known

(*Pûrvapaksha:*)—In the previous passages, such as "That being who is in the sun, him do I worship;.. him who is in the moon... him who in the lightning "† it is seen that Jîva too can be the cause of all such beings as the sun here spoken of. The word "deed" denotes something newly produced (apûrva); and this new effect (apûrva) can only pertain to Jîva, inasmuch as it can never affect Parames'vara who is devoid of all connection with any deed whatsoever. So the being spoken of here is Jîva and no other.

* Op. cit. 4-1

† Ibid 4 1.

The Siddhanta: As the word "deed" is put in apposition with word "this," and is capable of being interpreted to mean 'what is done,' it means 'the universe' So that it is Parame'svara, whose deed is the whole universe, that is spoken of here. Jîva, indeed, can never be the creator of the universe.

Again an objection is raised and answerd:

If (you hold it is not the case) because of the characteristic marks of Jiva and the Prana proper, (we answer) no; that has been explained. (I. iv. 17)

It cannot be urged that Parames'vara is not referred to because of the characteristic marks of Jîva and the Prâna proper found in the following passages:

"As the master feeds with his people, nay, as his people feed on the master, so does this concious A'tman feed with the other A'tmans; and so the other A'tmans follow this A'tman."*

"When sleeping he sees no dream, then he becomes one with the Prâna alone"*

For, in the Pratardana-Vidyâ, the matter was clearly discussed. Here, too, when the preceding and the succeeding portions of the section are taken into consideration, it will be seen that the section treats of Brahman; so that the other characteristic marks should be interpreted accordingly To explain: At first, in the opening section, Brahman has been introduced in the words "I shall teach thee Brahman;" in the middle, the passage "whose deed this is" speaks of a being who is the creator of the whole universe; and subseqnently in the words "he who knows this conquers all sins and obtains pre-eminence among all beings, sovereignty, supremacy;" the s'ruti speaks of sovereignty—accompanied with the destruction of all sins—being the result; a thing which necessarily results from nothing but the worship of Brahman. It being thus shown that the section is devoted to Brahman, those attributes which seem to pertain to Jîva and Prâna proper should be so interpreted as to refer to Him alone.

Another view is now set forth

It is verily, as Jaimini holds, for the sake of the other, (as may be seen) from the question and the answer; and, moreover, even so do some (declare). (I. iv 18.)

It is with a view to declare the existence of Parames'vara distinct from Jîva that the existence of Jîva as a separate entity from the vital airs etc. is expounded—by way of showing that the vital air does not respond though called by its name and that the person rises when afterwards struck by means of a stick—in the following passage:

"The two together came to a person who was asleep. And Ajâtas'atru called him saying 'Thou great one, clad in white raiment. Soma, king.' But he remained lying. Then he pushed him with a stick, and he rose at once."*

That such is the case is shown by the following question and answer:

Question: "Bâlâki, where did this person here sleep? Where was he? Whence came he thus back?"†

Answer: "When sleeping he sees no dream, then he becomes one with that prâna;"‡
this answer being of the same meaning as the following passage occuring elsewhere:

"With the Existent, my dear son, he then becomes united"§

Some, that is, the Vâjasaneyins, have a section in which the same thing is very clearly set forth in the form of a dialogue between Bâlâki and Ajâtas'atru, as follows:

Question: "When this man was thus asleep, where was then the person, the intelligent? and from whence did he thus come back?"¶

Answer: "When this man was thus asleep, then the intelligence of the senses absorbed within himself all intelligence, lies in the ether which is in the heart."‖

Wherefore it may be concluded that it is Parames'vara Himself whose work is this whole universe.

Adhikarana 5.

This adhikarana proceeds to show how it is that, while Jîva and Is'vara are everywhere spoken of as one, they are treated as distinct entities occupying one abode.

The passages pointing (all to him) (I. iv. 19.)

The passage which forms the subject of discussion occurs in the Brihadâranyaka and reads as follows:

"Verily, a husband is not dear for the husband's enjoyment; but for the A'tman's enjoyment the hus-

* Kaushitaki. Up. 4-20.

* Kaûshitaki. up. 4-19.
† Ibid.
‡ Ibid 4-20
§ Chhândogya-Up. 6-8-1
¶ Bri-Up. 4-1-16
‖ Ibid. 4-1-17

band is dear..." "verily the A'tman is to be seen, to be heard. to be reflected upon, to be contemplated."*

(*Púrvapaksha*:). It is Jîva that is spoken of here, inasmuch as by such words as "but for the At'man's enjoyment" we are given to understand that the A'tman is a samsârin as endued with desire to enjoy.

As against the foregoing we hold that it is Paramesvara who is spoken of here.—Why?—The whole section opening with the statements such as

"But there is no hope of immortality by wealth;"

"When we see, hear, reflect upon, and know the A'tmam, then all this is known;"

All this is that which we call A'tman;"†

and ending with the passage "How should he know Him by whom he knows all this?" points to Paramesvara; and accordingly Paramesvara is propounded here by first speaking incidentally of the jiva who is endued with an attachment for pleasures, Hence no inconsistency whatever.

How, in all these places, may Paramesvara be spoken of by the word denoting the jîva?—This the sûtrakâra explains according to an alien system:

A mark as to the proof of the proposition, as A's'marathya holds. (I. iv. 20).

A's'marathya thinks that the designating of Paramesvara by a term denoting the jîva serves to show that the jîva, as an emanation of the Paramesvara, is not quite independent of him, so that the proposition may be held as proved that by knowing one the whole is known, as said by the s'ruti, "when we see A'tman all this is known."

Because of the emancipated becoming so, as Audulomi holds. (I. iv. 21).

Audulomi thinks that it is because the liberated soul attains to the state of Paramesvara that Paramesvara is designated by the word A'tman.

Because of His dwelling; thus holds Ka's'akritsna. (I. iv. 22).

Kâs'kritsna thinks that it is because of Paramesvara dwelling as A'tman in the jiva-A'tman that the Paramesvara is designated by the word denoting the jîva.

It may be concluded that this is also the sutrakâra's view, because of its being mentioned in opposition to two other views already expounded, and because of the absence of a mention of any other. There moreover, here a strong affinity to the teaching of the s'ruti. To explain In the first section of the Atharvas'iras, it is declared that Paramesvara is the being denoted by all words, as due to His having entered into all beings, *chit* and *achit*, sentient and insentient, in the following passage.

"Devas verily went to the Svargaloka and asked Rudra," "Who art thou?" He said, "Alone I was at first, I am and shall be; none else distinct from Me. From the inner into the innermost I have entered; into the four quarters and their very midst. Such a being am I; I am the eternal and non-enternal; I am Brahmâ; I am the Eastern and the Western, I am the Southern and the Northern; I am up and down, the (four main) quarters and the various (intermediate quarters; I am man, I am woman, Gâyatri I am Sâvitri I am; I am Trishtubh, Jagati, and anushtubh the metre I am: I am Gârhapatya; I am Dakshinâgni and A'havanîya; I am the true; I am the cow, and I am Gauri; I am the oldest, I am the best, I am the highest. I am the waters, I am light. I am the Rik, the Yajus, the Sâman, and the Atharvângiras. The perishable am I, and I am the imperishable, I am the secret, I am the forest. The sacred lake am I, as well as the holy one. I am the beginning and the end, and beyond and the front. I am verily the Light. He that knows Me all knows all."

In the second section also, as due to the very fact of His having entered into everything, it is declared that He is denoted by the words *Brahmâ Vishnu, Maheswara, Vinâyaka, Umâ*, and the whole universe of things, in the passage beginning with the following words:

"To That Lord who is called Rudra, to Him who is also called Brahma, to Him I bow."

Accordingly by an investigation into the harmonious teaching of the S'ruti, it is found that S'iva, the Parmes'vara, is the Being denoted by all words, as embodied in all, having entered into all beings, sentient and insentient as their Antaryâmin, the Inner Regulator. Wherefore, it [illegible] well to conclude that Kâs'akristsna's view alone agrees with the teaching of the S'ruti, of the Sutra, and of [illegible]

Adhikarana. 6

In a former adhikarana, I. i [illegible] it was briefly indicated that Paramesvara is the [illegible] material cause of the universe by quoting a passage which speaks of him by means of a word [illegible] he *ablative* case.*

* Bri-Up. 4-4-5

† Ibid

* Tatti up 3--1

"From whom all these beings are born."

This adhikarana proceeds to establish it at full length.

And He is Prakriti also, in accordance with the proposition and the illustration (I. iv. 23).

The passages to be discussed here are such as the following:

"From Him, verily, the Atman, was born the ákás'a."*

"The one God, producing heaven and earth."†

Here a doubt arises as to whether it is right or not to hold that Brahman is the twofold cause. Because the *nimitta* or efficient cause such as the potter is not found to form also the material cause such as clay, and that neither the material cause such as clay forms also the *nimitta* or the efficient cause such as the potter, how can we understand that he can form both the material and the efficient cause with the universe as the effect?

(*Púrvapaksha*):—He is only the *nimitta* or efficient cause of the universe, not the *upádána* or material cause—Why?—Because it is impossible. Indeed, the potter who is engaged in making a pot does not make the pot by becoming clay himself, nor does a weaver making a cloth do so. If he would try to do so, it would be quite impossible. Wherefore it is impossible for Brahman, the *nimitta* or efficient cause, to be the *upádána* or material cause as well. And it is useless to suppose that the efficient cause is also the material cause as well, inasmuch as the production of the required effect can be accounted for without such a supposition. For, we find the pot produced notwithstanding that the potter is distinct from clay. Wherefore Brahman is only the efficient cause, but not the material cause as well

Against this we say as follows: The material as well as the efficient cause is Brahman himself. It is stated that by knowing the Commander all becomes known, that the Commander, the efficient cause, being known, the whole of the sentient and insentient universe becomes known, as the following passage shows:

"You are so conceited; have you ever asked for that Command by which we hear what has not been heard, we think what has not been thought, we know what has not been known."‡

And in explanation of this, the illustration of clay has also been adduced in the following passage:

As when clay is known, all this which is made of clay becomes known."*

If Brahman were the efficient cause merely, knowledge of the whole universe would not be possible when He is known. By knowing the potter, we cannot, indeed, know the pot etc., the effect; but we can do so by knowing clay, the material cause of the pot. Wherefore seeing that this becomes possible when Brahman, the efficient cause, is also the material cause, we must conclude that Brahman Himself is the material cause.

"Command" (in the s'ruti) is put for Him who commands, namely, Brahman. To shew that the upádána or material cause is not a thing distinct from Him, the Sûtrakara adduces another reason:

And by the declaration of (His) desire (I. iv. 24.)

"He desired, may I become manifold;"† in these words the Sruti declares the desire of the intelligent and all-knowing Brahman Himself who is the *nimitta* or efficient cause to become the manifold existence in the form of the variegated universe. Wherefore the material cause is not a distinct entity from the efficient cause.

(*Objection*):—From the sruti—such as "Above the universe is Rudra the Great Sage and He saw the Golden-wombed (Hirnyagarbha) being born;"‡ we understand that the Parames'vara himself who is above the universe and is the efficient cause thereof casts his gracious glance upon the Hiranyagarbha, the first of all gods, being born by His (Parames'vara's) will from out of the Prakriti distinct from Him (the efficient cause). How can He ever become the Prakriti or material cause and assume the form of the universe. It is Máya that is declared by the s'ruti as Prakriti, in the following words "Let it be known that Máya is Prakriti."§ The s'ruti declares also that Purusha is Prakriti in the words "From Him was born, Virâj, and above Virâj is Purusha" ‖ Thus it is proper that those two alone are the Prakriti, and as such assume the form of the universe.

(*Answer*:) The Sûtrakâra answers as follows:

* Tait. up. 2-1.
† Tait. Sam. 4-6-2.
‡ Chha. up. 6-1-3.

* Ibid 6-1-4.
† Ibid 5—2—3.
‡ Mahanaravana uparishad. 10-
§ Svet, up. 4-1),
‖ Purusha Sukta,

And (He being directly declared as both (1. iv. 25.)

In some sections of the Vedantas, the Parames'vara is directly declared to be of the form of the universe as its material cause, and to be the Lord of the universe as it efficient cause, To explain: just as the passages such as "Rudra is above the universe" indicate His being the Lord of the universe, in the same way such passages as All verily is Rudra"* declare that, as the meterial cause of the universe, He is also of the form of the universe. In the s'atarudriya, He is declared to be the Lord of the universe, in the section beginning with "Bow to the Golden-armed" and closing with "Bow to the Lord of robbers",† and from there up to "Bow to the leaf-born and to the one born in the cluster of leaves" He is declared to be of the form of the universe. Elsewhere, too, the s'ruti declares Him in both the aspects:

"Brahman was the forest. Brahman became that tree; Brahman governed the worlds, holding them in their place"‡

In the Atharvas'iras, he is described to be of the form of the universe in the subsequent portion. Wherefore He being directly declared to be both, it is but right that the Supreme Brahman, Siva, who is Parames'vara, is both the universe and the Lord of the universe, as the material and the efficient cause thereof.

The sûtrakâra says that there is yet another authority:

Because of His creating (it out of) Himself (1 iv. 26)

He made it out of himself by himself."§ Thus, it is seen that Parames'vara made Himself to be of the form of the universe. Wherefore He is the material as well as the efficient cause.

(*Objection:*)—Paramasiva is quite free from all trace of evil He is the unlimited ocean of all excellent attributes; His glory is infinite and eternal, and He is above the universe. How can such a being ever become the Prakriti, the universe which is the basis of all illusion and change, and which has to be avoided as an evil?

By transformation (1 iv. 27

It is quite explicable how Paramasiva, the efficient cause, who is the Bliss, ever pure, and who by nature is the unsurpassed Good, should assume the form of the universe as the material cause thereof, by transforming Himself into the *chit* and *achit*, or sentient and insentient, forms of existence.

(*Objection:*)—Ah! Transformation (*parinâma*) means change in the form of the cause, inasmuch as *parinama* is defined to consist in a change from one form to another form. How is Parames'vara thus subject to what is regarded as an evil?

(*Answer:*)—True; but transformation (parinama) can take place in such a way that the Efficient Cause is not affected by the change, notwithstanding that He is the Prakriti or material cause.

(*Question:*)—What is this unique transformation? We are curious to know what it is. Please explain.

(*Answer:*)—Listen; we shall explain.

"When it was dark, when there was no day, no night, no existence nor non-existence, then was Siva alone by himself. That is the Imperishable, the Adorable (Light) of the sun; and from Him, Wisdom Ancient went forth"*

At the time when all this was darkness, without the light of the sun and the moon, without the division of day and night, devoid of the individual names and forms, undifferentiated into gross and subtle forms of the sentient and the insentient, into existence and non-existence, then there was Siva alone left by himself, without a second, self-luminous, with the potentialities of the sentient and the insentient existence inseparable from His being. That was then the Imperishable, Supreme Being: that too the Adorable light, as in dwelling in the sun, the primary source of the sun's light. From such a Being, wherein was latent the whole external universe of the sentient and the insentient existence, went forth the ancient supreme wisdom, the spiritual energy (jnânasakti,) secondless, eternally existent,—the Great Flash of light dispelling all the then darkness. Then "He desired, 'may I become many';† then, Parames'vara the Cause, embodied in the subtle form of the sentient and the insentient being which was undifferentiated yet in name and form, willed that He should become embodied in the sentient and the insentient existence differentiated in name and form. And then "all this did He create, and whatever else there is;"‡—He differentiated from himself His body, the sentient and the insentient being in its subtle form. Then having

* Mahanarayana-up. 16.
† Sarvarudriya 5.
‡ Taitt. Brahman 2-8-9
§ Taitt up. 2-7.

* Svera. up. 5-18
† Taitt. up. 2-6.
‡ Ibid

created it He entered into it;"* He entered of himself as their A'tman into the sentient and the insentient which had been differentiated from him. Then "He became the manifest and the unmanifest,"† he became variously transformed into the universe, manifest and unmanifest. Thus as man is a child and then a youth, Brahman whose body is the universe, is the cause and the effect. The s'ruti says.

"Know verily Mâyâ as Prakriti, and Mâyin (the possesser of Mâyâ) the Mahesvara.

By that which forms His limb is all this universe pervaded"‡

From this we learn that Mâyâ the Prakriti (material cause) of all, that Mahesvara is the being endued with It, and that the whole universe is pervaded by His limb, by a portion of Himself, by a piece of his sentient energy (Chit-Sakti) which, when regarded as the enjoyer, is known by the name of Purusha. Just as the hair and nails and the like are not born of the body alone or of Atman alone, so the universe is not born of Mâyâ alone or of Mahesvara alone. On the other hand,—like the hair and nails being born of the embodied mortals, Purusha, the Prakriti material cause) of the sentient and the insentient existence comes into manifestation from out of the Parames'vara united with Mâyâ. From I's'vara this form, are born the Avyakta (the unmanifested the four-faced (Brahma), and so on. And accordingly Sruti describes Is'vara to be Purusha Himself in the following words

Purusha verily is Rudra."§

Wherefore it becomes quite explicable how Paramesvara, who endued with the sentient and the insentient nature, forms the cause as well as the effect, according to the several stages through which He passes.

And it is indeed sung that He is the Prakrithi (I iv. 28.)

It is directly declared that Paramesvara Himself is the Prakriti of all beings.

Him whose helpmate is Uma; who is the supreme Lord (Paramesvara), mighty, three-eyed, dark-necked, and serene, having mediated thus, the sage reaches him who is the womb of all creatures, the witness of all, transcending darkness *"

Thus the Sruti declares that the Prakriti of all creatures is the Parames'vara himself, who is the witness of all, the omniscient; transcending all darkness, above all universe; associated with Umà, the supreme energy (*Parama Sakti*). Therefore the Supreme Brahman Himself is the Upâdâna (material cause) as well as the *nimitta* or efficient cause.

Adhikarana 7.

By this, all have been explained; all have been explained (I. iv. 29.)

This exposition of Vedantic passages, carried on from I. i. 2 till now, forms also the exposition of those portions of the *Mantra* and *Brâhmana* which, as speaking of the characteristic marks of Brahman, are of the form of the Vedanta, such as the Purusha-sûkta and the Satarudriya which form integral portions of Karma-kanda; as also of the Smritis, Itihasas, Puranas, and the sayings of the adepts. Repetition of the words "all have been explained" is intended to shew that the adhyaya is over.

Here a doubt arises as to whether the Satarudriya and the Purushasukta which occur in the ritualic portion (Karmakanda), as also the Smriti, Itihasas, and Puranas,—whether they do or do not point to Brahman, when we take into account the various marks by which to ascertain the purport of a scriptural text; this doubt arising from the sections being of a different character (as devoted to karma).

(*Pûrvapakshah*) It is proper to maintain that the Purusha-sûkta and the like which occur in the ritualistic portion karmakanda) are devoted to an exposition of jiva, the performer of actions; and that they do not point to Brahman, because there is no purpose served (by treating of Brahman). Even the smritis, Itihasas, Puranas, and the like do not treat of the oneness of Atman for some of them speak of Brahma as the Parabrahman some, of Vishnu some of Rudra some, of Sakti; Some, of Agni some of Sûrya; some, of Vayu; some of another. As thus, no definite conclusion can be arrived at, these cannot be held to treat of Brahman.

(*Siddhantah*) As against the foregoing, we held as follows:

* Ibid.
† Ibid
‡ Svata-up. 4–10.
§ Mahanarayanopanishad.
* Kaivalya upanishad 7.

The Purusha sûkta and the like do teach Brahman, because of His characteristic marks being described therein. We find here described the characteristic attributes of Brahman, that He is the cause of all, that He is beyond darkess, that He is the cause of immortality,—as the following passages shew

"From him Virâj was born."*

"Of the colour of the sun, beyond darkness."*

Him thus knowing, one becomes immortal here.' *

Wherefore Is'vara Himself is here described as Purusha. And in Satarudriya we find Parmesvara described as the Lord of the universe, as the Atman of the universe, as darknecked and so on. It is therefore but right to hold that He is treated of in the section.

(*Objection*) :—It would seem unreasonable that the Paramesvara who is the repository of the finest of the attributes should be the being treated of in the Satarudriya. For, in the very beginning, we find the Being associated with wrath —which is a despicable quality,—as the following words show : "Bow to Thy wrath (*manyu*) O Rudra."†

(*Answer*) :—We should not proceed thus. For here, the word "*manyu*" means 'knowledge.' Or, it does not matter even if we understand the word in the sense of 'wrath'; for 'wrath' being a quality inhering in the Prakriti which has been voluntarily put on by Him, it has nothing to do with Paramesvara.

The marks which serve to indicate the main drift of the Puranas etc. point to the inevitable conclusion that they, treat of Siva, the Paramesvara associated with Umâ, who, as the Atman of all, is the being denoted by the several designations such as Brahma and Vishnu ; who is Omniscient and Onmipotent ; who is above all ; whose glory is unequalled ; the being to whom the name Brahman can be fully applied and who forms the final import of all the Vedantic texts interpreted in harmony with each other.

As to the contention that these occur in the ritualistic portion, we have only to say in reply that it is but right that 'section' must be made to yield to characteristic marks' in determining the main drift of the teaching. On the same principle, wherever in the Vedas and other authoritative texts a sentient or an insentient being is declared as the cause of the universe and so on, we are to understand that it is Siva, the Atman thereof, who is there referred to. Wherever we find such attributes as mutability and nescience are predicated, it is a sentient or an insentient being forming the body of Parabrahman that is meant. Thus everything becomes explicable when properly understood.

End of the first Adhyâya.

A. MAH'ADEVA S'A'STRI B. A.

(*To be Continued.*)

* Purush sukta.

† Satrudriya, 1.

SIVAGNANA SIDDHIAR
OF
ARUL NANDI SIVA CHARIAR

(*Continued from page 152.*)

PANCHARATRI'S STATEMENT,

21. You said the Devas partook the ambrosia by the aid of Vishnu who swallowed the earth. When the fearful poison arose from the sea, and Vishnu and other gods fled to the supreme kingand cried "Save us OLord from this untimely death", then if the Supreme Pasupathi did not swallow the poison, how could the gods have partaken of the ambrosia?

22. When Vishnu fled from fear of the Asura *Sura Padma*, the latter was killed by God Kumara, the Son; Asura Tharuka was killed by Sakti Kali; the three forts of the Asuras were burnt down and Jalandhra was smashed. Did not Ishwara protect the world by all these mercies?

23, When Partha (Arjuna) seated on the car saw the assembled hosts and all of them his kinsmen and he refused to slay them with his sharp arrows and reign as king after their death, the wily words uttered by Vishnu to induce him to fight, you accept as your high authority. Why dont you also accept the words of the Buddha Avatar of Vishnu, propagated for the conquest of the Tiripura Asuras.

24. Maya cannot become souls; nor souls maya. Mayan cannot become these last nor they, Him. These padarthas, Pasa, Pasu and Pathi are eternal.

21. This story is given in Valmiki's Ramayana. This story is the aptest illustration of the nature of the supreme being as defined in the Kural " "

23. God Vishnu is said to have taught Buddhism to the Tirupura asuras, to prepare them for their defeat, on the principle laid down by the Mahabharat "The man for whom the gods are preparing defeat, is deprived by them of understanding; he sees everything perverted ly." Dr. Muir also quotes the parallel lines from Latin and greek.

"God deprives of reason those whom he wishes to destroy But when the God brings evil upon a man, he first injures his understanding" and he cites from the Bible also passages containing the same sentiment.

24. It is this nature of the union of souls and matter and God that people would not understand This union is advaita and is not dualistic nor external and internal nor Parinama nor Vivarta. Have any of the schools of modern Hinduism compared the simile of vowels and consonants postulated by the Siddhanta, with the similes of rope and snake, gold and ornaments &c. &c Everything is in Him and He is in everything. God is immanent in all nature nd yet he is beyond all Light is in darkness and yet beyond it so. God has no opposite. In his Presence everything else is naught. " " Says Saint Manickavachaka. In this single sentence is exhibited the Highest Doctrine of Pure monism or Advaita

He being omnipresent He appears as the All in-all; (and cannot become these).

25. When the pure Agamas assert that mukti is obtained by the soul ridding itself of its Pasa and uniting itself to the Pathi and when you would senseless say that your Immaculate Vishnu will become ignorant and the ignorant soul, will not the wise feel ashamed and leave this confounded theory to yourself.

26. When Brahma and Vishnu fought for each other's superiority as the Supreme Brahman, and the Supreme looked on and stood in their midst as a Pillar of flaming fire, He was not understood by the fighting Gods. Such Vishnu you say is the Supreme!

27. He cannot be God who in his fight with the Maharishi Dadichi was vanquished by the latter.

28. He cannot be God who was punished by the Rishi Durvasa; and from the scar left on his chest, is he not called *Tirumarumarbhan*, 'He with the scar in his chest'?

29. When Maharishi Brigu found marks of violence left on his wife's body by *Mal*, and swore on the strength of his true allegiance to Isa, that such a violator of women's chastity should undergo ten evil births, *Mal* fell down shuddering.

30. When in fear of this curse, he prayed to the Supreme (Para) the latter appeared and comforted him and asked him what he wanted and when he preferred his prayer that he should be rid of Bhrigu's curse, the Lord replied that Bhrigu was his Bhakta; and when he further prayed that he should be redeemed at every one of his births, the Lord of the world promised to do so.

31. He cannot be the *Nimmala* God who bound by the curse of Bhrigu was born ten times and endured sorrow and pain. As such be assured Hari cannot be divine. Be advised and worship the lotus feet of the Blue-throated God of gods.

J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B. A., B. L.

(*To be Continued.*)

25. The novel doctrine sometimes broached is that the so-called God though clothed with three gunas (the substance of Prakriti) as any other mortal is, is not contaminated by it. The Puranic traditions we possess of these Gods only prove the contrary.

31. The unfortunate part of it is, that in such an orthodox and philosophic Vaishnava treatise as the *Tiruvaymoli*, the truth of this story is accepted, and the explanation offered that the God only *sought* this curse as an excuse to be born and do good, certainly cannot commend itself to the intelligent.

THAYUMANAVER'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page* 154.)

பாடாத பாடெப் பயத்தனில் சமயமும்
பஞ்சுபடு சொல்லினைப்
பாம்பினே பாம்பினே வென்றசைவ கூடவும்
பரமசித்த மிதுவென்னவே
கூடாத மாடிநெஞ் சருகெக் காடவே
யமலமே யேகமேயெம்
ஆதியே சோதியே யெங்குநிறை கடவுளே
யரசே யெனக்கருளினாள்
வாடாத வாடமென் முகவாட்ட முற்கண்டு
வாடா வெனக்கருணைதீ
வைத்திடா வண்ணமே சகலேத மாயிருத்த
வணைமலை வளர்ப்பித்ததார்
தேடாத நேடிவோர் தெட்டற்ற தேட்டமே
தேடரிய சத்தாங்கென்
சித்தமிகச் குடிகொண்ட வறிவான தெய்வமே
தேசோ மயானந்தமே

115. O Bliss of teeming Splendour, O The Supreme Intelligence, being the indiscernible Sat that hast filled my heart!

Many alien religionist assemble very often and point at me in contempt "Behold! Behold! Pity that this man is bent upon mere utterances and hymns purely emotional in their nature."

Nevertheless, I would take to the emotional worship * alone as *Summum Bonum* and dance and dance and grow slender and slender in announcing Thy Solemn attributes 'O The Nirmala Being! The Ancient One! The Light Transcendent! The Supreme All pervading Lord!'

Exhausted and faint-hearted as I became in this manner, yet Thou wouldst not be moved to invite me to Thee.

O the Inestimable Treasure, revealing Thyself to the pious-minded seekers, did any one ask Thee to be so hard with me?

R. SHUNMUGA MUDALIAR.

(To be Continued).

* *Emotional worship is the Summum Bonum in this life.* It is the crowning excellence of this Saiva Siddhanta school that it is the Religion of Love or *bhakti*. Love is the animating fire of the sadhana *Sariya, Kiriya, Yoga* and *Gnana*. Some erroneously hold that this sadhana and love can benefit the aspirer of Moksha severally i. e., either sadhana or love benefit him independently. Not at all. Saria, Kiriya, Yoga and Gnana are indispensable and inseparable with love (bhakti). Hence it was the *successful* saints like our Thayumanavar though accomplished in *Yoga* or *Gnana* (knowledge), yet, were not, for a moment, wanting in true bhakti or *love of devotion* to the *Supreme siva* and that even the Holiest four *Gnanasambanthar, Appar Sundarar* and *Manikavachakar* went from temple to temple sung and danced and shed tears of love of extreme reliance on Siva for His Boundless Grace. So in this verse (115) the saint reveals the emotional worship and prayer as the sole aim of existence in this world in spite of censure of the antagonists like the followers of Patanchal &c. Authorities are abundant to support the truth that emotional prayer in temples is the necessary antecedent of bhakti or love to the Supreme Siva and that bhakti or love to the supreme Siva is the essence to be extracted from the Siva-Sariya, Siva-Kiriya Siva-Yoga, Sivagnana. And as such and as supported by the authorities below stands superior to the said action (Sariya, Kiriya &c.), to the said Yoga, and to the said Gnana.

1. AUTHORITIES. Love, as has been declared in the scripture, is superior to action, wisdom and yoga. Sandilya Sutra 62.

TIRUMANTHIRAM.

INTRODUCTION.

Continued from page 32.

திருமந்திரம்.

அந்திவண்ணனு மாலோ னிவனேயென் றென்றுதன்
சிந்தைசெ யிருவர்க்குந் தேவாதி தேவனாய்
முந்திவந்து முதலவ னாமே யென்று
வந்திவ் வமண மெம்மானை புகுந்தானே. (சுசு)

46. He was praised by His Bhaktas who knew the way as 'O Thou of the colour of the evening sky, O Hara, O Siva.' I also prayed 'O Father, O The first cause, O The Supreme,' and being pleased, he entered my heart.

மனைவி மிருந்தவர் மாதவ ரோப்பர்
கனைவி னிருந்தவர் தேவருங் காணிற்பர்
பனைவி னிருங்கை பறந்தது போல
நினையா ரவர்க்கிவ்வி நின்னினை காணே. (சுஎ)

47 Even the house-holder will become like unto the sages doing great penance. The Lord enters their heart and fills them with Love. Those who forget Him derive no bliss like the kite poised on the Palm tree.

அழி யாத வுயிர்மையா யாரினை
முழு யாம லுலகெங் முதல்வனை முளனிற்
பழு யாத பரமரு பாரம் வெனுந்தை
விழு யாத விளக்கெங்கு மேனிறை வானே. (சுஅ)

48 Our Father, the Supreme of supreme, who shows His grace even to those who do not worship Him, shines as the undying light in the hearts of those who bow their heads to Him.

பரைபசு பாசத்து தாதனே யுள்ளி
வரைபசு பாசத் தொருங்கவல் லார்க்குத்
திரைபசு பாசச் செழுங்கடல் நீந்திச்
கரைபசு பாசங் கடந்தெய்த லாமே. (அ)

49. They who would think of Him Who by the power of His Sakti transcends both souls and their bondage, and try to get rid of the bonds of sin, will really cross the sea of bondage and land themselves in the shore of Heavenly Bliss.

சூடுவ னெஞ்சிடை வைப்பன் பிரானென்று
பாடுவன் பன்மலர் தூவித் தொழுதுநின
ரூடுவ னுடி யமர்ர் பிரானென்று
காடுவ ஞனின் றறிவது காணே. (ஙி0)

50. His Foot is my crown; His Foot I will place in my heart; I will speak of Him as my Supreme Lord. I will adorn Him with flowers and adore Him and dance and delight in Him. This is what I have learnt today.

NOTE—Cf. Chandog. vii. 25. 2. "He who sees, perceives, and understands this, loves God, delights in God, revels in God, rejoices in God—he becomes a Svaraj; he is lord and master in all the worlds."

* * *

GURUPARAMPARIAM.

(THE LINE OF GURUS)

குருபாரம்பரியம்.

நந்தியருள் பெற்ற நாதரை நாடிடின்
நந்தி நுவல்வர் சிவயோக மாமுனி
மன்று தொழுத பதஞ்சலி வியாக்ரமர்
என்றிவ ரென்னை யெண்மரு மாமே. (க)

1. When the line of gurus who had obtained the grace of Nandi is named, we will find four Nandis among them, as also, Sivayoga Mahamuni and Patanjali and Vyagrapada, who worshipped in Chidambaram, and including me, they are eight, all of them.

நந்தி யருளாலே நாதனும் பேர்பெற்றேம்
நந்தி யருளாலே மூலனே நாடினேம்
நந்தி யருளா தென்செயு நாடடினில்
நந்தி வழிநாடட நானிருந்தேனே. (உ)

2. By Nandi's grace, we obtained Him; by His grace, we obtained (the body) of Mulan (the shepherd). What all cannot be achieved if we only procured His grace. His grace showing me the way, I stand firm to the way

மந்திரம் பெற்ற வழிமுறை மாலாங்கன்
இந்திரன் சோமன் பிரம னுருதிரன்
கந்துருக் காலாங்கி சஞ்ச மலியனே
டிந்த வெழுவரீ மென்வழி யாமே. (கூ)

3. Those who pursuing the same path as mine have derived the same teaching (mantra) are seven namely Vishnu, Indra, Soma, Brahma, Rudra, Kalanki, and Kanjamalayan.

நால்வரு நாலு திசைக்கொரு நாதர்கள
நால்வரு நானுவிதப் பொருள் கைக்கொண்டு
நால்வரு நான்பெற்ற தெல்லாம பெறுகென
நால்வருந் தேவராய் நாதரா னாகளே. (ச)

4. Of these, the first four masters (four nandis) become each a Lord for each corner of the universe; they attained various siddhis and offered them all to the whole world, becoming gods and Lords.

மொழிந்தது மூவர்க்கு நால்வர்க்கு மீசன்
ஒழிந்த பெருமை யிறப்பும் பிறப்பும்
செழுஞ்சுடர் மூன்றெரி யாகிய தேவன்
கழிந்த பெருமையைக் காட்டக லாமே. (ஙி)

5. The seven masters (Vishnu &c.) were taught the greatness of Isa (Pathi) and the nature of death and birth (Pasa and Pasu). The God with the three eyes of Light did thus manifest His greatness.

எழுந்துநீர் பெய்யினு மெட்டித் திசையும்
செழுந்தணியா மங்கள் செய்மினென் றண்ணல்
கொழுந்தண் பவளக் குளிர்சடை யோடே
யழுந்திய நால்வர்க்கருள் புரிந்தானே. (ஞ)

6. We four (Sivayogamahamuni and others) who understood His gracious nature were taught to carry out strictly our duty (Niyama) even though it rained in torrents from every side.

NOTE—Nyama prescribed for yogis are of ten kinds namely Tapas, contentedness, faith in God, giving to the needy money well-earned, respect to the elders, listening to spiritual teachings, humility, knowledge of good and evil, Japa, and vratu.

THE HISTORY OF TIRUMULUR.

திருமூலர் வரலாறு.

நந்தியினே யடிநான் றலைமேற் கொணடு
புந்தியி னுள்ளே புகபபெய்து போற்றிசெய்
தந்தி மதிபுனை யரனடி நாடொறுஞ்
சிந்தைசெய் தாகம செபபலுற் றேனே. (க)

1. Placing the feet of Nandi on my head, and becoming filled with Him in my heart and worshipping

him there, and meditating ever on Him who wears the evening moon, I begin to proclaim the great truths of the Agama.

செப்பும் சிவாகம மென்றுமப் பேர்பெற்று
எப்படி நலகு மருணந்தி தாள்பெறுது
தப்பிலா மன்றிற்றனிக்கூத்துக் கண்டபின்
ஒப்பிலெழு கோடி யுகமிருந் தேனே. (உ)

2. After I attained the Foot of the gracious Nadi, who first gave out the Sivagama and after I saw the Supreme Dance in the immaculate Hall, I remained in Yoga for 70 crores of years.

இருந்தவக் காரணம் கேளிந் திரனே
பொருந்திய செல்வப் புவனு பதியை
யருந்தவச் செல்வியைச் சேவித் தடியேன்
பரிந்துடன் வந்தனன் பத்தியி னாலே. (ஊ)

3. Hear, O Indra, why I remained so! The wealthy and most powerful mistress of the Tamil land, I worshipped in earnest and with love.

சதாசிவந் தத்துவம் முத்தமிழ் வேதம்
இதாசனி யாகிருந் தேனின்ற காலம்
இதாசனி யாகிருந் தேன்மன நீங்கி
யுதாசனி யாதுட னேயுணர்ந் தேமால் (எ)

4. When the goddess of the triple Tamil learning born of the Sadasiva Tatwa, appeared before me on her seat of purity, I too leaving all indifference, assumed an attitude of love and attention and by her Grace I understood Her learning.

மாலாங்க னேயிங்கி யான்வந்த காரணம்
நிலாங்க மேனி நேரிழை யாளொடு
மூலாங்க மாக மொழிந்திருக் கூத்தின்
சீலாங்கு வேதத்தைச் செபபவந் தேனே. (ஏ)

Hear O Malanka, why I came into this earth! I came here to proclaim in Tamil, the mystery (vedic mantra) of the Dance of the sky-hued and well-bedecked Uma's Consort.

Note.—Lo! Look at the great spirit of the great Tirumular who with heart filled with love, and to benefit the Tamil land with the best readings of the Agamas in sanscrit would graciously venerate the people's language and speak to the people in their own tongue; and modern-day reformers would even force our girls to master a foreign language to make them participate in the fancied benefit of the lore of the West.

நேரிழையா ளாணி சதிசய னத்தப்
பேருடை யாளனை பிறப்பறுத் தாண்டவன்
சீருடை பாற்சில மரவடி தண்டுறை
சீருடை யாபபரசே சேர்ந்திருந் தேனே. (ஐ)

6. The Well-adorned maid, The mother with the love-filled bosom, my Lady, who removed the sin of my birth and death, the Consort of Siva of Thiruvavaduthurai * Her feet I reached in yoga!

சேர்ந் திருந்தேன் சிவமங்கை பங்கனைச்
சேர்ந் திருந்தேன் சிவனடி கண்டுறை
சேர்ந் திருந்தேன் சிவபொதியி னீழலில்
சேர்ந் திருந்தேன சிவனுமங்கா ளோதியே. (ஒ)

7. I lived with the Consort of the mountain Maid, with Siva of Thiruavavaduthurai. I lived under the shade of the sacred Bo tree; I lived repeating the names of Siva.

இருந்தே னிச்சாயத்தே யெண்ணிலி கோடி
இருந்தே னிராப்பக லற்ற விடத்தே
இருந்தேன் இமையவ ரேத்தும் பதத்தே
இருந்தே னென்னந்தி யீனையடிக் கீழே. (ஓ)

8. I lived in this body for innumerable ages; I lived where there is neither night nor day; I lived in the Heaven praised by Devas; I lived under the Foot of my Nandi.

பின்னே நின்றென்னே பிறவி பெறுவது
முன்னே நன்றுக முயல்தவஞ் செய்திலீர்
என்னே நன்றுக* விறைவன் படைத்தனன்
தன்னே நன்றுகத் தமிழ்செய்யு மாறே. (ஔ)

9. What is the good of being born? You dont perform good actions to deserve it. My good Lord created me, so that I may praise Him well in Tamil.

ஞானத் தலைவிதன் னந்திருக் கூத்தினுள்
வூனுமி லொளபது கோடி யுகந்தனுள்
ஞானப் பாலாட்டி நாதனீ யர்ச்சித்து
யானு மிருந்தேன் நற்போதியின் கீழே. (க)

10. Entering the city of the Wisdom-Mother and Her Nandi, and for countless ages, anointing them with milk of wisdom, and worshipping the Lord, I lived under the Bo tree.

* The great Shaivite shrine, adjoining the famous mutt of the same name is here meant. Tirumular's shrine can be seen there. The Arasa tree (Ficus Religiosa) sacred to this temple referred to in the next stanza is peculiar in that it does not grow straight up but spreads in the ground like a creeper, and hence called(படர் அரசு)

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, JANUARY 1898.

A WEEK OF GREAT PROMISE.

Since we wrote last, the plague has sensibly diminished and though the shadow of death has not passed away from our midst altogether, yet we have every reason for hearty congratulation and fervent prayer to the Great God. Father of all. And we have also passed through a week of great promise which closed the year 1898. And it is a week to remember by; most stirring appeals and earnest exhortations were addressed to our sense of loyalty and patriotism, to our duty to God and our motherland and ourselves, from a variety of platforms, by some of the most distinguished and talented and earnest friends of our country, both Indian and European, so as to wring our hearts and draw our tears; and the remembrance of them should carry one very far. And they were words of hope and encouragement, whether they fell from the lips of "the People's Governor," or Mrs. Beasant, Mr. Justice Ranade or Mr. A. M. Bose, Rev. Mr. Fletcher Williams or Mr. Grubb.

A week of great promise.

***

The first event of the week, of importance to us, was, of course, the speech of His Excellency Sir Aurthur Havelock at the opening of the Madras Educational Conference. And we quoted in our very first article, on the subject a sentence from Mr. Hodgson's letters. Writing about 1835, he said. "Let us begin in the right way or fifty years hence, we may have to retrace our steps and commence anew;" and these fifty years have more than passed, and we added, we do not want to retrace but to reconsider and remedy the defects. (Vol. I. p. 20). And to-day we find His Excellency voicing the public feeling, and measuring its strength "that the system of education upon which so much talent and so much labour has been expended does not, in cultivating the intellect and in forming good men and good citizens, attained the full measure of success which was expected of it." And we also stated then in the very next page that it is useless to ignore that English is primarily learnt as a means of breadwinning and his effort in this direction is enormous. His Excellency clearly recognizes the fact that the efforts of pupils and teachers is simply to secure this end. And then we stated it as our conviction (p. 19 Vol I.) that the barrenness of the Indian intellect so often bewailed of, is due in a great measure to the waste of energy involved in early life, when the young mind must be fully engaged in the gathering and receiving of facts of knowledge and experience and ideas direct, instead of sounds and symbols by having to learn a foreign language, not akin, but alien in every respect and we also quoted an opinion Sir Raja of T. Madhava Row to the effect that to this foreign education should be traced that want of clearness of thought and expression noticed Indian graduates, both of which His Excellency sums up the simple question, "Does not learning a foreign tongue cause waste of energy in the pupil, and does it not impair accuracy of the knowledge acquired?" And in suggesting a vernacular medium he quotes the opinion of Sir Mountstwart Elphinstone about the necessity of building the regeneration of the people on their own indigenous literature And after referring to other defects which we have also touched upon, he has actually formulated certain proposals to a body of educational experts with regard to the abolition or gradual modification of the secondary and Primary tests, and to the establishment of a teaching University and to the substitution of vernacular for English in the Primary department and even up to the secondary or High School Dept. We only hope that our learned seniors would soon bring to bear their heart and soul upon the consideration of the subject, instead of wasting time in mere dialectic disquisitions, and return a reply to His Excellency's questions at the earliest opportunity.

H. E. Sir Aurthur Havelock on Education.

***

And then Mrs. Beasant deserves all our praise and admiration for her noble enthusiasm and noble work and daresay she will appreciate our remarks, coming from our heart as they do, though not from one within the pale of her own brother hood, for it is not to be ignored that the feeling of 'I' and 'mine' has not even left the precincts of the Theosophical Society. However one could not listen to her noble words, without the tears glistening in one's eye, however one might differ from her on points of theory and practice of a metaphysical nature. She rose to her highest level when she appealed to our past greatness and spirituality and when she referred to The Father of all, Mahadeva, the great God, not the destroyer, but the Regenerator, as she calls Him, She was most solemn and simply grand. She insisted that unless this conception of Siva was well understood, it is not possible to understand the mysteries of the universe, and we have once before referred to her views of God

Mrs. Beasant.

Śiva, the Yogi of Yogis, dwelling in the *mashan*, and yet the gracious Lord of Uma, of Love and Life and Light. We shall take another opportunity to revert to the subject of her discourses.

***

The Unitarian church.

And our thanks are also due to the Rev. Fletcher Williams, who tried bring home to the Indian minds a form of Christianity which was much more acceptable to them. And the Unitarian Church which he represents is a slow and rationalistic upheaval and growth out of the shackles of the old orthodox and rigorous Christian creed. And in our review of Mrs. Humphry Ward's Robert Elsemere, contributed to the Madras *Weekly Review*, we have noticed at great length the importance of this great struggle in the West and its bearing on Indian Problems. We shall be glad to welcome him whenever he again chances to come into our midst.

***

The Temperance cause.

And the Temperance cause was warmly pleaded by Mr. Grubb as the spokesman of the Anglo-Indian Temperance league in England, to whom our warmest gratitude is due. The Demon drink is only numbering more and more victims within his grasp and we are more and more despairing of any improvement in this direction, where for one Mr. Grubb, we have thousand other Englishmen to set us the example and the fashion. We expect of education accomplishing many great things, but when the flower of the educated fall victims to this Demon drink, where is the hope?

***

Love and serve.

And then the National Congress and the National Social Conference. We cannot help referring to the Congress, if only to allude to the grand peroration of Mr. A. M. Bose which was divine in its tone. And somebody remarked in the hall itself that it was a long winded sermon, and we wish we had more such men to preach to us on the same text "Love and serve", which sums up the ideal of our own noble Religion.

***

The Social conference was a great success in every respect, though we could not help remarking how all our grand and reverend seniors were sitting aloof, except a very few, and the whole work fell on very young shoulders, guided of course by the master hand of Mr. Justice Ranade. We approve of the entire programme of work gone though; and we commend specially the conference passing a strong resolution as to the necessity for speedy legislation, on the Temple endowments question, which it declined to do at its previous sessions. In regard to the readmission of converts to other faiths, and of foreign travelled men we hope to collect and publish the texts bearing on this question in these pages; but we would respectfully ask of what use is their readmission, if not to participate in Social advantages, if they would not in fact cherish love for their old country and religion and their people and their habits and customs and would not give up the habits and practices acquired by them anew and which are obnoxious to the community? What the community says to such people is "better be outside, than be in and corrupt us."

***

We publish elsewhere Mr. J. M. N's. criticism of Mr. Justice Ranade's address, and we wish to add one or two other facts The hill-men in the Palney hills call themselves Vellalahs; and among them the custom of breaking the tali and remarrying is still in full force. And then the etiquette of uncovering the upper part of the body is in full force even now in the extreme south, though of course confined to males. And of course we fail to understand whether the South Indian savages forced the Brahmans to introduce or sanction all these rigorous customs for their own benefit or for the benefit of the Brahmans themselves! There is nothing in the whole of the Tamil literature sanctioning these enormities. And we are also glad to find that our contemporary of the *Indian Spectator* also takes the same view of Mr. Justice Ranade's address as Mr. J. M. N. does. And in its issue of 8th January, the learned Editor refers to the discussion that was going on in the columns of our magazine and of the *Indian Social Reformer* about the ancient Tamilian Civilization, and he quotes from M. Barth to show the antiquity of Saivism and Vaishnavism.

KAIVALYA AND AMIRTABINDU UPANISHADS.*

The translation of the first of these upanishads by Pandit R. Anantakrishna Sastri of Adyar, with notes from the comments of Narayana and Sankaranabda has been lying on our table for some months past and we have got our own Pandit to add his comments; and it will be apparent when they are printed what the difference is between the two modes of interpretation. The one mode, as in the book before us, takes for its certain guide, one's own inborn and inbred conviction produced by an immediate or intuitive cognition of "the Thing in itself," as opposed to "the conclusions professedly based on pure speculation", as our learned translator puts it, or as we would put it, it follows for its guide what the professors of the Mayavada School or the Hindu Idealists regard as

* Minor Upanishads by Pandit A. Mahadeva Sastri B. A., Madras 1898.

the outcome of their innate cognition as opposed to dictates of all human reasoning; and one might possibly cavil at the high position claimed for professors of this School by our learned translator, over teachers of all other Schools; and when this so-called intuitive conception of Truth is so opposed to all human reasoning and common sense, one might also question the correctness of this Aham Brahma Gnana and doubt whether, after all, this boasted Self-knowledge may not be an illusion of illusions. And we know on the authority of the commentator quoted by the learned translator, what havoc our manas plays with us. After all, such a mode dealing cannot have a very high value; and another man can as easily say that his own intuitive and immediate cognition is different and it would be simply impossible to decide between the two sets of intuitive experiences. And the effect of it on the possible student is that he must choose the one or the other on the principle of "Believe and be saved." The other mode of interpretation is not so ambitious nor so presumptious. It does not seek to interpret things as it suits one's own fancy or preconceived bias. At any rate, it advances one step higher, and instead of quoting this and that Acharya, and his followers, it only quotes from authorities or works left to us in the prehistoric period, and whose authorship is unknown, but which were anterior in date to this and that Acharya, and the authority of which is accepted by or at any rate cannot be denied by this or that Acharya. And what our own Pandit has done is to quote in elucidation of the wordor passage, a passage from some other sruti or upanishad, some Itihasa or Purana fulfilling the characteristics above set forth. And where modern Oriental Scholarship has failed is in ignoring the Puranas and Itihasas of undoubted authenticity as invaluable helps to understand the much more ancient Veda and Vedanta. For it is a fact which our pandit proves by his quotations that the difficult words and passages in the Upanishads and Vedas are explained and illustrated and commented on at great length in the Puranas and Itihasas. Col. Vans Kennedy had remarked "I cannot discover in them (Puranas) any other object than that of religious instruction. In all the Puranas, some or other of the leading principles, rites and observances of the Hindu Religion are fully dwelt upon and illustrated, either by suitable legends or by presenting the ceremonies to be practised, and the prayers and invocations to be employed in the worship of different deities." Speaking generally of the value of Puranas, Prof Wilson also remarks, that "A very great portion of the contents of many, some portion of the contents of all, is genuine and old. The sectarial interpolation, or embellishment is always sufficiently palpable to be set aside without injury to the more authentic and primitive material; and the Puranas, although they belong especially to that stage of the Hindu religion in which faith in some one divinity was the prevailing principle, *are also a valuable record of the form of belief which came next in order to that of the Vedas*" and which was in vogue about the time of the Greek invasion, and as such more than 11 or 12 centuries before Sankaracharya. Further, our own Mahabharata sets forth the value of Puranas in its very first chapter (p 2. P.C. Roy's book) "The purana highly esteemed, which is the most eminent narrative that exists diversified both in diction and division *possessing subtile meanings logically combined and embellished from the Vedas* is a sacred work. Composed in elegant language, it includes the subjects of other books. It is elucidated by other Sastras *and comprehendeth the sense of the four Vedas.*" And the ordinary rule of interpretation followed by Hindu writers generally is that the Vedas and Upanishad should be explained by the Agamas, the latter by the Puranas, the latter by the Ithihasas, the latter by Smrities and so on; and where there is a clashing of authorities, the more ancient one is to be preferred to the authority of the later one. And of course, this rule never contemplated that in course of time, we would come to get a body of Upanishads and Puranas which are palpable forgeries or cannot at least lay claim to that high antiquity as such writings generally command in the ordinary estimation of the Hindus. Ofcourse we quite agree with Mr. Mahadeva Sastri's opinion that simply because an Upanishad did not happen to be commented upon or referred to by Sankaracharya therefore that Upanishad is not to thought of as later than his time, but we are not prepared to accept his other dictum that there is no harm in calling anything as an Upanishad in which any man might choose to air his own views as the highest truth and the most intuitive Revelation. Under this definition, even an Allah Upanishad can pass muster. But what we generally mean by an upanishad is an integral part of the Veda called the Brahmana and following closely in time to the Veda itself and anterior to the Puranas and Itihasas. And in our own view, we would not give any importance to any Upanishad which in its view of Sankhya (Philosophy) and Yoga is inconsistent or

is not borne out by the teachings contained in the Mahabarat and which would introduce names and characters of the time of this great epic and of times subsequent. The Mahabarata occupies a unique position in our literary record; and being such a vast store house of ethical, religious and philosophic and traditional lore, and much less touched by interpolators than other works of the kind, we may safely put down any legend, or custom, or principle of ethics or religion or philosophy as recent if it does not find a place therein. Judged accordingly by the test we have set up, the first of the Upanishads translated by Mr. Mahadeva Sastri would be classed as recent, unless the last word is taken to be an interpolation and we have already objected to the practice of giving the yogartha (literal meaning) to every proper name, of translating 'Siva' as 'auspicious' 'Sankara' as 'the doer of good,' and 'Sadasiva' as 'the ever good' Maheshwara as 'the great Lord' &c. Ofcourse we could understand Ramanuja's anxiety to do so but to such of them we would ask to put their finger into the Mahabharat itself and explain away every word in this fashion. And we here take opportunity of recording our strongest protest against that mischivous mode of interpreting such names as they occur as the names of the Lower Saguna God, as opposed to what they consider as the Highest Nirguna, a most patent example of which is furnished in the comment on 7th mantra. The mantras commencing from what is marked 4½ to 7 mantras is one single sentence and it describes the posture assumed, and object contemplated and the end obtained by the Atyasrama yogi. The object of this contemplation the Dhyeyah is described by giving his attributes and and names, and it is a single clause; and yet our sastri following his Acharyas would make the words (in the 7th mantra) denote the Saguna, and the words preceding them though in the same clause describe the Nirguna! And he is not aware what a fatal error he plunges into! In his introduction he learnedly sets forth that Nirguna contemplation is for the highest perfected beings (of the Paramahamsa School) and the Saguna form to the lower order of human beings and so on, and yet in these mantras, which begin to prescribe the contemplation for the Atyasrami (explained as the highest Paramahansa marga by Sankarananda), he is made to choose the Saguna! We are well aware that there are different forms of Yogi and our own Pandit quotes the passage from Kurma Purana which names and describes three classes of yogis, who are called Bandika or Saguna yogis Sankhya or Nirguna yogis, and Atyasrama Yogis, and the Atyasrama Yogi called also Brahma Yogi, occupies the highest place; and our learned friend's Nirguna yogi has only to play second fiddle to him.

"The Yogis are of three kinds, Baudik Yogi Sankhya Yogi and the most excellent Atyasrama yogi. The first Bavana is in Saguna; the second Bavana dwells on the Akshara (Nirguna) and the third Bavana dwells on the *Parameshwara* (Kurma Puran 2 chap. p. 31). and the fuller descriptions of them are given in the first chap. of the Purva khanda and as we give them in our commentary, we refrain from quoting them here. Of course Mr. Sastri cannot or will not choose to understand the conception of the Godhead as held by the Siddhantis, and we would only quote here a verse from our saint Manickavachaka, to whom there are more shrines in Southern India than to Lord Krishna himself.

"சாவ முண்ணுட்டச்சன் வேள்விதச்ச தின்னு ளஞ்சமஞ்சி,
யாவவெந்தை யென்ற விதாவிவ் சம்பவாவதே,
மூவரொன்றே யெம்பிரானெனு மெண்ணி வின்ணுண்டு
மண்மேற்,
றேவரென் றேயிறுமாந் தென்ன பாவந்திரித்தவே."

Our saint asserts in the strongest possible language the distinction of his God from any of the Trinity and yet identifies him with the Lord who saved the host of Devas headed by Vishnu from the dire effects of the fatal poison and Who overthrew the great sacrifice of Daksha who had invited from Vishnu downwards. It would be too great labor if we are here to enter into the meanings of these allegorical legends themselves and the meanings are plain on the face of the puranic accounts themselves. And the subject of the high antiquity claimed by Mr Sastri for the line of his teachers like Sankara and Gaudapada and the subject of the most ancient records supporting Mayavada or Virvarta Vada are subjects about which such high authorities as Colebrooke, Wilson, Max Muller, and Gough, Col Jacob Thibaut and others have quarrelled and though we would have our say on this subject some day, we only note it to-day to mark our dissent from the postion taken up by our learned translator. We offer these remarks the best of spirit, and we in no way wish to disparage the work done by Mr. Mahadeva Sastri. The criticism herein offered is more of the subject matter than of himself or his work, and as for the work turned out by him is concerned, it is done in the best scholarly style

possible and the harvest being large and the labourers so few, our learned translator deserves as much support and encouragement our countrymen can afford

LORD SAMBANDHA AND AN UNKOWN DRAVIDIAN PROSODY.

(*Continued from page* 117.)

Before proceeding to point out and explainthe identity of the several non-Sanskrit verses in the three Dravidian languages, we shall be permitted to say one word more about the hard lot of these ill fated Dravidian verses. They have been treated with such great disfavour everywhere that even learned scholars have been induced to disown them altogether and regard them as foreign elements in the language. Mr. C. P. Brown the well known Telugu scholar and lexicographer, remarks in his Telugu Grammar with reference to these verses, that they were borrowed from Canarese by Nannaya Bhatta and others and were experiments in metre which never attained popularity. He does not however quote any authority for this proposition and we have had no opportunity of knowing how far Telugu scholars agree in his views But are we to believe that an author like Nannaya Bhatta trifled with such a big poem as Bharata and risked its popularity and his own reputation by introducing into it unknown metres from another language and making metrical experiments in an epic poem ? If we can satisfactorily show that such verses occur in our Lord's Poetry, what would be the result ? Are we then to suppose that Canarese borrowed from Tamil and tried metrical experiments which proved unpopular and failed ? We do not here wish to pursue the argument any further as we shall have occasion to discuss his views fully and refer to several arguments showing how such views are wholly untenable, when we come to deal with the metres themselves. But we refer to them here to show how unfairly these verses have been treated and what is still worse even disowned as Telugu metres, in the belief probably that Telugu could have nothing of its own except what came into it from the Aryan invaders. The fact however seems to be that these Dravidian verses, in spite of their elastic elegance and fluency as opposed to the unyielding, monotonous regidity of the Aryan verses, had to carry on a deadly campaign with Sanskrit verses against powerful odds until at last some of them died valiantly sword in hand and others fled the country unable to withstand foreign resistance, leaving no traces whatever of their existence behind and the remainder less courageous and independent, probably submitted to the conquerors, made peace and settled with them, losing their individual and social characteristics and becoming inseparably mixed up with them. The results of the campaign were apparent even in the time of Nannaya Bhatta and the success of the conquerors therefore became only a question of time. It is very curious to think that the same results should have been arrived at in Telugu and Canarese though in Tamil the results are somewhat different. The undeserved unpopularity of these verses, far from being the consequence of their foreign origin is in our humble opinion the result of powerful foreign forces working in the language. Even the Pre-Dravidic Tamil verses had been seriously affected and damaged and lost much of their power and popularity.

Mr. C. P. Brown's views on non-Sanskrit Telugu metres.

Telugu non-Sanskrit verses not borrowed from Canarese because they also occur in Sambandha.

Dravidian verses struggle for existence with Sanscrit verses.

Final success of Sanskrit.

Principally in Telugu and Canarese.

Main metres in Tamil also suffer.

With these remarks, we shall quote from Sambandha the verses which have similarities in the other Dravidian languages and hope the reader will kindly take pains to follow our arguments closely and attentively until we complete the subject. We specially entreat the reader to lay aside his ear impressions and using his eyes, firmly grasp the principles and understand their operations, The ear may help him in identifying vaguely a few modern stanzas that have specially pleased his ear but is perfectly powerless to compare the metres of one language with those of another. The subject may at first sight appear to be dry, dull, and uninteresting and even repulsive especially as the Tamil readers have not, to our knowledge and experience, been accustomed to exercise themselves much in scansion. Our following observations may not clearly be brought home to the reader unless he is thoroughly acquainted with the Tamil metrical formulæ, and has them at his fingers' ends, We shall as far as possible avoid complications and details and present the results as clearly and briefly as we can. We particularly wish that the reader would accept nothing on our authority but test our results by independent investigations at the places to which we

Reader's close attention requested. Eye and not ear to be used.

shall direct his attention and on the line we shall point out.

Sambandha's ... The first பதிகம் in Sambandha that we shall take up for consideration is இலம்பை யங்கோட்டீச்பதிகம் It is in the first திருமுறை. This பதிகம் by Sambanda is the only பதிகம் that the place possesses, there being no other பதிகம் relating to it either in Appar or Sundrar. The place இலம்பையங் கோட்டூர் is only a few miles from Kadambattur Station near Trivellore on the Madras Railway. The history of this பதிகம் is related in stanza 1005 in Sekkilar on Sambandha. We shall quote the 1st and last verses together with the 6th being the middle one, pointig out the scansion for every line and explaining the metrical principles, as it is absolutely necessary to understand metrically and determine the nature of our own verses as they occur in Sambandha, before we can hope to identify and explain the corresponding vesses in the sister languages.

... scanned. திருவிலம்பையங்கோட்டீர்.

	கனிச்சீர் or நிரையசை	Do.	Do.	தேமா or புளிமா
I				
1.	மகிலினர்	பருப்பதத்	தருத்திமார பேறு	
	மாசிலாச்	சீர்மறைக்	காடுசெய்த் தானம்	
2.	நிகிலினு	னைதுரை	தனதுரை யாக	
	நீறணிந்	தேத்துகந்	தேறிய நிமலன்	
3.	கலியினர்	மடப்பிணை	தழுவொடுந் தயில	
	கானலம்	பெடைபுல்கிக் கணமயி	லாலு	
4.	மிலியினர்	பைம்பொழி	லிலம்பையங் கோட்டீ	
	ரிருக்கையாப் பேணியென்	னெழில்கொள்வ தியல்		
VI				[பே.
1.	மனமுலவ	மடியலர்க்	கருள்புரி	னின்ற
	வகையலால்	பலிதிரிந்	துண்பது	மற்றேர்
	தனமிலா	னைதுரை	தனதுரை	யாக
	நாழ்சடை	யினமதி	நாங்கிய	தலிவன்
3.	புனமெலா	மருவிய	னிருவிசேர்	முத்தம்
	பொன்னெடு மணிகொழித்	தீண்டிவந்	தெக்கு	
4.	மினமெலா	மடைகரை	யிலம்பையங் கோட்டீ	
	ரிருக்கையாப் பேணியென்	னெழில்கொள்வ தியல்பே.		
XI				
1.	கந்தினை	மல்லினை	கடலொலி	யோதவ
	ரானலங்	கழிவளர்	கழுமல	மென்னு
2.	நறிய	ருறைபதி	யான்முறை	யேன்
	நற்றமிழ்	னின்றனை	ஞானசம்	பந்த
	னென்றையர் வளர		சிலம்பையங் கோட்டீ	
	ரிரைசெயாத	வுடைய	டத்தம்மல் வாய்போய்	
4.	வெந்தயர்	செறிதிட	வின்னவ	ரேறி
	யீர்ப்ப	ரின்பையி	னிடெளி	தாமே.

This is a very simple, easy flowing and elegant metre We shall try to point out its simple principles. As scanned above, each of its four lines consists of two equal halves and each half is made up of three விளச்சீர் with one மாச்சீர் at the end. In other words, each half consists of four feet of which the first three feet are each either கூவிளச்சீர் or கருவிளச்சீர் at the pleasure of the poet, and the fourth either தேமாச்சீர் or புளிமாச்சீர் as the poet likes. The principles of the two half lines are exactly the same and two half lines make up one line and there are four such lines in every verse. In the 1st stanza of the பதிகம் above quoted மகிலினர் பருப்பதத் தருத்திமார் பேறு forms the 1st half and மாசிலாச் சீர்மறைக் காடு செய்த்தானம் is the 2nd half and the two together form the 1st line and we find four such lines in the stanza.

The principles of இலம்பையங்கோட்டீர் ...

இலம்பையங்கோட்டீர் is எண்சீர் விருத்தம்.

We call them halves because they possess no எதுகை and if they did possess it, we should consider each half as a separate line and the stanza would then consist of eight lines instead of four. The abovestanzas, therefore to use the common phraseology, are எண்சீர்க்கழிநெடில்விருத்தம்.

We find in the above scansion that மாங்காய்ச்சீர் occupies occasionally some of the seats which we have pointed out : as belonging to விளச்சீர். For instance in the 1st stanza in the 2nd half of the 3rd line, we have பெடைபுல்கி which is புளிமாங்காய் in the 2nd seat which properly belongs to விளச்சீர் and so in the 2nd half of the fourth line, we have எழில்கொள்வ which is புளிமாங்காய் in the 3rd seat which ought to be occupied by விளச்சீர். This principle of using மாங்காய் for விளம் is a very old one and is recognised and constantly used in the three languages. When we come to the metres of Telugu and Canarese, we shall point out how clearly and nicely the principle is recognised and laid down by the shrewd prosodians of those two languages though the principle, while in constant and universal use in ancient and modern poetry in Tamil has not been openly laid down and clearly brought home to the student of

... equals விளம் in Tamil, Telugu and Canarese.

Tamil Poetry. This principle of the equality of *அசை* and *நிரையசை* is of very great antiquity and has been so constantly used in the three languages that if we only firmly bear it in mind and learn to detect its operation in Dravidian verses, we shall be able to understand many ancient metres and many irregularities will vanish away. We shall however refer to it more when we point out the Telugu equivalent of the metre under consideration.

Equality of *அசை* and *நிரை* ancient and important.

We must here caution the reader that *அல்லசை* here is not *நிரை* in disguise as he might suppose. By inserting a dumb consonant in the middle of *நிரை* it may apparently become *அல்லசை* though really *நிரை*. But the *அல்லசை* in question is substantial *அல்லசை* and not *நிரை* in disguise as we shall clearly show hereafter.

அல்லசை is not *நிரை* in disguise but real *அல்லசை*.

It must further be observed that in these lines *நிரையசை* or *அல்லசை* or any other foot is wholly inadmissible and does not occur at all and at the last seat no other than *மாச்சீர்* is allowed. We point out here these negative properties lest the reader might confound it with other metres apparently similar where the feet above prohibited do occur and form wholly different metres of a different origin.

நிரையசை or *அல்லசை* in *விருத்தம்* is *நேரசை* only.

In the light of these observations, we request the reader to examine the remaining eight stanzas of Sambandha's *தோடுடைய* and see whether there is a single instance of any deviation from the law we have explained. In the 1st half line the feet *விடைமேல்*, *பலபல*, *நாற்றிசை* are all *அசைச்சீர்* and the last foot *பூத* is *நேரசைச்சீர்*. So in the 2nd half the expressions *மலைமகள்*, *நிலைபெறு மதி*, are all *நிரைச்சீர்* being all *கனிச்சீர்* and in the 1st half of the 4th line the expressions *நின்மலா*, *வைகறை*, *நின்ற* are all *நிரைச்சீர்* being either *கனிச்சீர்* or *தனிச்சீர்* at the pleasure of the poet. We can fix the limits of the number of letters for each line excluding consonants if we remember that all the feet of a half line may begin with either *நெட்* or *குற்*. In the former case, each half line will have 15 letters for its maximum and in the latter it has 11 letters for its minimum. The number of letters in each half line therefore will range from 11 to 15 and a full line from 22 to 30 excluding consonants. All the lines of this *பதிகம்* run very smoothly and easily without a single instance of so called irregularity, eccentricity or deviation.

There is another *பதிகம்* in Sambandha in the very same metre being *தோடுடைய*. This is the 2nd *பதிகம்* from the preceding *தோடுடைய செவியன்* as arranged in *பன்னிரு*. The place *நல்லூர்* is only a few miles from *திருப்பூந்துருத்தி*. In fact Sambandha visited the latter place directly from *நல்லூர்*. It possesses only one *பதிகம்* which is by Sambandha, there being none either in Appar or Sundara. The story of this *பதிகம்* is related in stanzas 1036—1059 in Sekkilar on Sambandha. We shall as before quote the 1st, 6th and 11th stanzas pointing out the scansion.

Sambandha's *பதிகம்* is in the same metre.

நல்லூர் stanzas. *திருவேடகம்*.

	அடிமுதல்	ஈரடி	மூவடி	நாலடி
I				
1.	*வல்லண*	*கல்லெலி*	*யமனை*	*நற*
	வரைமல	*நலமிலை*	*வளரறி*	*நுவல்*
2.	*விளைவ*	*நிருமுற்*	*சமவை*	*கொற்றி*
	கலவெரி	*கமலம்*	*கமரை*	*சல*
3.	*மிளிவரை*	*நலமெழுநி*	*விளமர்*	*மன*
	வெளைவரிநு	*நறுவிர*	*நிலவெலை*	*மிறு*
4.	*வெளிவர*	*கிளமலி*	*புலமல*	*சல*
	விளைக்கை	*மெலிய*	*விளைவை*	*கொலிவ*
VI				
1.	*தேடல்*	*மகதியர்*	*சமவெலை கரந்*	
	கடலெர்	*குரிவர*	*தேறுவை*	*மலை*
2.	*பிரம*	*செல்கதேர்*	*பெறுமலை மூடல்*	
	பேர்	*குரிவர்*	*பெரிவை*	*பெறுவர்*
3.	*கொல்லை*	*சொலுகுல*	*முருகை*	*தல்*
	குலவு	*மரவு*	*மலரிய*	*புலை*
4.	*சொடிழ்*	*புறலர*	*வகமழ்*	*சரிவ*
	நிலக்கர	*பொலிவ*	*விளைவர*	*பெலிவ.*
XI				
1.	*வலக்கர*	*மறிவல*	*விரிவக*	*கடி*
	மறலிய	*வறலிவ*	*வருபுற*	*கழிர*
2.	*சலக்கரத்*	*தறைதொர*	*வேறுவல*	*புரிவை*
	சிலைதல	*பலிகிர*	*தருதல*	*பிலை*
3.	*புலக்கரத்*	*தருவலர்*	*புரைத்*	*சரத*
	புரிவல	*கலவலர*	*புலரிவ*	*பலர்த*
4.	*நிலக்கர*	*கொறிவ*	*விலமெரி*	*மல*
	விலமெல	*கலல*	*மெலிவர*	*நலல.*

From the scansion, it will be clear that the metre of this இடைச்சுரப்பதிகம் is the same as that of the preceding இலம்பையங்கோட்டுப்பதிகம்.

There is one more பதிகம் in Sambandha which is also in the same metre being திருச்சாய்காடு, பண் குறிஞ்சி. This பதிகம் occurs immediately next to the preceding இடைச்சுரம். சாய்காடு is an ancient name for Sivali, the birth place of Sambandha and has a good many பதிகம் relating to it and to distinguish the பதிகம் in question from the rest relating to the same place we have annexed to it its characteristic பண் குறிஞ்சி.

-1 Sambhandha's சாய்காடு, பண் குறிஞ்சி is also in same metre.

T. VIRABADRA MUDALI

(*To be continued.*)

MR. JUSTICE RANADE ON "SOUTH INDIA."

SIR,—Mr. Justice Ranade bears a great name, is a distinguished scholar, a great thinker, and a good student of history; and in my admiration and respect for him I yield to no one else. But however great our esteem may be personally, I cannot refrain from expressing my disagreement with them in some of his conclusions and inferences which he gave us the benefit of, as the result of his study of Abbe Dubois' great book, so far as they relate to South Indian civilisation; and I could not help remarking, at the conclusion of his great speech, to several of my friends that he was quite at sea so far as South India was concerned. And this only shows what, except the great Abbe's book, great paucity of materials really exists about the history of Anciet Southern India; and even the Abbe's book only proposes to state what he had actually seen about his time. Almost all the Oriental scholars have lived in and written about Northern India alone, and Mr. Dutt, in his "Ancient India," in which he summarises the results of all the previous investigations, hardly devotes more than a few pages to the history of South India, and does not at all notice the condition of the people and the literature of this part of India. Mr. Justice Ranade has the further disadvantage of not being a native of Southern India and in not possessing any acquaintance with the *Tamilian* language and literature; and being a great man as he is, I could very well understand the great diffidence with which he desired to speak, subject to correction; and I could have let him alone, if you had not yourself been carried away by his great name, and placed too great reliance on it for the test of the truth of his statement and inferences; though somewhere you discount it a great deal by your "if" you will therefore appreciate my natural desire to let some light on his facts and inferences, and I have accordingly taken the trouble to address you on the subject at some length. In the first place, I must express my agreement with the learned editor of the *Indian Social Reformer* in failing to see the distinction between the *Revival* he inveighed against in the previous year, and the *Liberation* from restraint he talked of at the Anderson Hall. The reference to "our ancient prisine purity" was very frequently on his lips, and he seems to think that all the calamities that befel the ancient Aryan pure civilisation and morals occured about the beginning of the Christian era, and after the rise of Buddhism and Jainism. Though Buddhism and Jainism had their rise in Northern India, yet they do not account for the downfall of ancient Brahminism in the North as in the South, and the learned Justice invokes the incidents of Scythian and Hindu invasions to account for the unsettling of morals and religion in almost the same wonderful way; and he seems to think that all the Puranas were written in the South and not in the North, and with special reference to the inroads on these made by South Indian barbarism. And he seems to think that modern Hinduism, in its adulterated form, was a compromise effected between the pure religion of the Aryan sages and the barbarous Demonism of the southerners. Among the catalogue of enormities with which he charges South Indians are the rigidity of caste, the fall of woman from her high estate, the introduction of *Sati*, the sale of girls in marriage, polygamy, and polyandry; and, to their discredit also, he traces the prohibition relating to remarriages, late marriages, sea voyages, etc., which the priests laid down as being unsuited to the Kali age. And he grows positive as he enumerates these sins of South Indians, and this seems to him as the only possible explanation for the degradation of the old civilisation, which not being entirely extinct, the great Achary, Sankara, Ramanuja and Madhvacharya, who with their great successors entered their protest against this cruelty and wrong and degredation of the priesthood, though their efforts were again frustrated by the establishment of Moslem power. And he recounts in glowing colours all the great things the Aryan people were capable of the Vedic and Epic periods; and my attempt herein is to show how fallacious this reasoning is and to prove by these very records the existence of these very enormities which he wishes to trace to South Indian barbarism.

As regards that first charge, the charge of demon and ghost worship to South Indians alone was once before made in your pages by Mr. Charles Jhoustone, in his learned article on the union of Hindu philosophies, and he stated that the gruesome description of God contained in the transfiguration scene in the Gita was probably derived from the wild faiths of the dark aboriginals

and demon worshippers of Southern India. A review of this appeared in the last March number of the *Siddanta Deepika*, and the writer has traced this very transfiguration scene in all its earlier forms through the earlier portion of the Mahabarata itself and back to the very Yajur Veda, the very central portion of it called the *Catarudriya*, beluded in several Upanishads and in the Mahabharata itself by Krishna himself; and the writer observes truly that if this be true this demonology of South Indians, instead of being thing repugnant, must have been glorious indeed, to be copied by the Brahmanadins of Yajur Veda days. The description of God as the fierce destroyer, the devourer of all men, Drona and Bhishma and the warrior hosts contained in verses 25 to 31 of Chapter XI of Gita are simply the same idea as is contained in Katha Upanishad (1-2-25). Leaving this great conception of God as the destroyer, I come to the minor question of the worship of demons and ghosts. And here are a couple of passages from the Sama and Yajur Vedas, which ought to outweigh the pound of inference of the learned Justice:—"May the gods, demons, benevolent genii, spirits called *Cashmanda*, trees and all animals which move in air or in water, which live on earth and feed abroad; may all these quickly obtain contentment through the water presented by me. To satisfy them who are detained in all hells and places of torment, this water is presented by me. May those who are and those who are not of kin to me, and those who were allied to me in a former existence and who desire oblations of water from me obtain perfect contentment." The same passage is also repeated in the Yajur Veda in a slightly different form. So these facts make it certain that if the pristine purity of the ancient Aryans was influenced by the demonism and savagery of South Indians, it was not after the rise of Buddhism and birth of Christ, but long anterior to the composition of these ancient Vedic hymns and Epic poems. As regards caste, Dr. Muir has collected all the passages bearing on the subject in his first volume of Sanskrit texts and they are traced back to the very Rig Veda itself and it occupies a prominent place in the Purusha Sukta daily recited by every Brahmin. If the Brahmins received any check in any part of India to introduce and stereotype their caste system and to assert their supriority, it was in Southern India, and for these reasons. The Non-Brahmins of Southern India never would done the badge of servility attempted to be put on them by Brahmins, and would not call themselves "Das" or Dasa" (slave) but they called themselves "Nayanars and Nainnars (Nairs) (Masters) and Menons, Nayagans and Nayudus, (Lords) Moodelliars (the first in rank), Chetty (Sresti) (chief) and Pillais (sons of God) etc. and the old Tamil words Aiyer, and Parpar and Anthanan were common words at one time meaning the learned and the pious, before they came to be appropriated specially by Brahmins. I have elsewhere pointed out that the only form of caste, if caste it can be called, was the distinction into Moodelliars, Idayar and Kadayar, first, middle and last, and it is this that has still been preserved, though Brahmins tried hard to impose their fourfold distinction; and portions of the South Indian community who display greater punctiliousness in the matter of caste are all people who have become more and more under the sway of Brahminism; and even now if there are instances of Pariahs entering temples and non-Brahmins officiating as priests and non-Brahmin women cooking for Brahmins (in Malabar for instance) they are vestiges of the older influence of non-Brahmins before they were subverted by the dominance of Brahmins, and especially during the days of the great Acharyas, whom Mr. Ranade chooses to eulogise for redeeming wrongs, etc. For it is a remarkable fact that the followers of these Acharyas are the most orthodox and intolerant men on earth which in the case of Srivaishnavas has created distinction between man and man of their own sect.

As regards the position of women, in what part of India do women possess sole rights to property to the exclusion of males, as in South India (Malabar)? In what part of India had female Sovereigns reigned and do still reign? In what part of India is marriage based on love and love alone as the tie and not on contract or religious sacrament? In what classes of South Indians is widow marriage still prevalent? Among what classes is infant marriage still practised (to instance a stray instance is of no historical value)? A large section of *Idayars* and those below practice remarriage even to-day. If a portion of the Idayar class (middle class) and those above have given up the practice, it was by copying Brahmins. If there are classes of non-Brahmins that now practise infant marriage, they are those who are known to be notorious imitators of Brahmins. And we cannot also forget the fact that the references to widow marriage in the old texts are so few and so guarded that it must be evident that widow marriage was rather an exception than a rule, even before the days of the Epics: and the passages we will quote below from the oldest texts in regard to *sati* will show how a widowhood was even then dreaded. And these passages are from the Rig Veda downwards, thus disproving that South India had anything to do with the conception and introduction and maintenance of this custom. The passages are all collected by Colebrooke in his easy on "The Duties of a faithful Hindu widow" (Pages 114 to 122 Vol I), and I will only quote a few of them from the early records so much relied on by Mr. Justice Ranade:—

"Om! let these women, *not to be widowed*, good wives, adorned with collyrium, holding clarified butter, consign themseves to the fire. Immortal, not childless, nor

husbandless, well adorned with gems, let them pass into the fire whose original element is water." (Rig Veda.)

" The wife who commits herself to the flames with her husband's corpse shall equal Arundhati and reside in Swarga" (Griya Sutras of Angiras.)

Though the husband died unhappy by the disobedience of his wife ; if from motives of love, disgust (of the world), fear (of living unprotected) or sorrow, she commit herself to the flames, she is entitled to veneration" (Mahabarata).

This text, by the way, clearly explains the motives and the reasoning which lead to the establishment of *sati*, and not, as was suggested by the Hon'ble gentleman, to any panic. And in a contribution to the *Siddhanta Deepika* (Vol I P 87), I have tried to give a more rational explanation for the prohibition against widow marriage "Independent scholars and pundits with some honesty will freely admit that the custom was not one unkown in India in remote times. In lower clases of society they still prevail. But the pundits say that such remarriage is prohibited in the bad Kali age. Who prohibited it, we ask? Is it not the fact that the slowly and steadily dawned on the mature minds in this Kali age. Be it said (rather to its credit) that singleness is better than wedded life (one of the checks to population in the Kali age) and that a widow would do well to keep faithful to the memory of her first lord, if she can afford to do so. It marks the highest sentiment in love that the lovers should remain true unto death. The Europeans have also built their faith on St. Pauls words :—'I say therefore unto the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot countain, let them marry ; for it is better to marry than to burn.' It was only the other day that the *Indian Social Reformer* praised Her Most Gracious Majesty for her noble widowhood. If such is the sentiment in Modern Europe, need we wonder that in India, where the people attained an early civilisation, these thoughts became crystallised and handed down as custom (unfortunately some evil practices have had this tendency too) and the higher castes began to prohibit it altogether ; and the mistake was made in not remembering the wise caution of St. Paul that it is better to marry than to burn. Besides, this rigorous custom is opposed in one sense to the generally recognised freedom in Hindu principles, as deduced from the doctrine of Karma, etc."

And in the previous page I also remark that the much despised Kali age has seen much greater reforms in religion and morals and much greater advancement in Philosophy and Science than the three preceding Yugas, so much belauded by the learned Justice ; and I have given instances of the same. And the editor of the *Indian Social Reformer*, (which by the way extracted this whole article at the time,) is also good enough to recognise that the statement in the Puranas, that what was allowed in the other Yugas is not allowed in the Kali Yuga, does not necessarily prove a conscious and selfish surrender to any prejudices, but it is only a way of reconciling old texts with new customs, these new customs, it being remembered, having come to prevail even in the life time of those ancient writers. And before I leave this question, I refer again to the passages quoted by Colebrooke in the same essay referring to the disabilities of the widow in regrard to food and drink, and to the fact that no non-Brahmin ever knows any such restrictions and the only women who shave their heads in Southern India are Brahmins and Komatis.

I may also here refer to some Ramayana incidents as serving to illustrate and support the above remarks of mine. Regarding caste, the story related in the Ramayana Uttarakanda sections 73-76, which stated shortly is as follows :—" A Brahmin's son had died young, his death was ascribed by Narada to the enormity of a Sudra presuming to perform austerities. Rama goes and finds the Sudra in the act and kills him. The gods applaud the deed, and on being solicited to restore the Brahmin's boy to life, say that he had recovered his life as soon as the Sudra had been killed." And to this act of *liberalism* of the Dwapara or Krita (I don't remember which, we are tempted to use very strong language) our great thinker wants us to turn our eyes with respect and admiration! And as a contrast, where, if not in Southern India, did the holiest of Brahmins set up images of Non-Brahmins in their holy shrines and worship them as their great Acharyas? And some of their divine outpourings (not the result of their barbarism certainly) are read daily as the very Veda itself by Brahmins and non-Brahmins. And what is strange is that most of these writings came into exitence just about the time when Mr. Ranade thinks the ancient Aryans were corrupted by the barbarism and brute force of the South. To revert again to the importance of Ramayana, do we not there read of King Dasaratha's three principal wives and sixty thousand other wives, and was not a whole holocaust of these latter sixty thousand made at the funeral pyre of Dasaratha ? And what do we see in the intrigues of the wily stepmother except what you may almost every day meet with in our Law Courts of to-day ? Another holocaust was made also after the great batile of Kurukshetra, and the loves and amours of Lord Krishna are certainly worth imitation! And the heroine of Mahabharata, how many husbands had she, and she wished for one more ; and this sentiment of hers could only be appreciated by readers of Thomas Hardy's A pair of blue eyes," where the heroine explains her apparently inconsistent conduct by

asserting in the most pathetic manner that her old love had none the less diminished and we have the scene there of three of her lovers standing uncovered over her coffin! So it is not to savagery and barbarism alone that we have to look for most of these phenomena; and if we had instances of polyandrous communities in the Thothyars and Todas, they were exceptions which proved the rule: and one might also ask why did not the Brahmins copy their example. Nor could it be asserted that the Brahmins were able to reform everybody else but these, which would again cut the ground under the honourable gentleman's thesis.

As regards Malabar, all that I can say is that Abbe Dubois is entirely mistaken, as are many even to-day occupying the Coromandel Coast. And the family tie is held as much sacred there as in any part of the world, a circumstance no doubt due to the law of property prevailing there. As regards the uncovering of the upper part, it is merely a question of dress and etiquette, and in these matters many differences may prevail without involving questions of right and wrong. One might insist on the head being uncovered, another the feet, and another the middle part of the body. And one might do this as a duty and another might do it as a fashion. And nations admire the semi-nude figures of ancient Greece and Rome! The charge against sea travelling is not worth refuting, as the Tamils have for long colonised Ceylon, and the Eastern Archipelago, and their struggles in the West are matters of ancient history, and I know a man who returned from British Guiana, and none of the Moodelliars and Naidus who ever went to Europe ever felt any difficulty. And our Good Old Mother Avvei says:—"Seek wealth by crossing the foaming seas." And I may also remark that these prohibitions do not find any place in the entire Tamil Literature ancient or modern.

Nandyal, 14th January. J. M. N

EXTRACT

THE POETS OF THE TAMIL LANDS.

By the Rev. G. U. Pope, M.A.; D.D.
(Balliol College and Indian Institute, Oxford)

VI. THE NALADI NANNORRU, OR 400 QUATRAINS, AND THE LATER TAMIL GNOMIC POETRY.

Continued from page 168.

§ 12. Summary.

We have taken a very cursory view of the incomparable stores of didactic poetry existing in South India. In conclusion we may emphasize a few facts which are necessary to a full understanding of the claims of this department of Tamil literature.

I. The metre of all these gnomic bards is the *Venba*. This is fully explained in the Introductions to the Kurral and Naladiyar. We have only to say here that this metre is absolutely unique. The Tamil poets have not imitated the Sanskrit, as those of the other dialects of India have. They have elaborated a species of verse more nearly resembling the Alcaic than any other, but affording greater scope for variety than that charming measure. The originality of the Tamil poets is signally shown in their metres, which are melodious, infinitely varied, and thoroughly original. The rhyme in the beginning of the line, with the constant use of alliteration and assonance, are matters that render it akin to old Keltic and Saxon poetry.

II. There has been a good deal of speculation as to the origin of many of the ideas in this South Indian poetry. It is quite certain that no part of India has been subject to so many foreign influences as the extreme south of the peninsula. From the very earliest times coasting vessels have come down the Red Sea and sailed along the western coast. Navigators borne by the Trade winds have come over from the African shore,—Arabs, Moors and legions of others. Solomon obtained ivory, apes and peacocks from the Tamil lands. (The Hebrew word for peafowl is the Tamil "*togai*.") Greeks and Romans visited Madura, to which Augustus sent an embassy. In Tamil lyric poetry we read of the *Yavanar* (a common name for western foreigners) bringing choice *liqueurs* in golden vessels. Brahmans, Buddhists and Jains have come down at different periods from the north, and swept over the Tamil lands. Learned men from Alexandria have taught in Mailapur. Armenians have had mercantile settlements, certainly from the fourth century (A.D.). Christians and Jews have had extensive settlements in the south; and at one time Nestorian Christians seem to have pervaded the whole of the Travancore country. Portuguese and Mohammadans have had wide dominion and lasting influence, and now English thoughts and convictions are making themselves felt wherever the Tamil language is spoken.

Thus the proverbial philosophy and traditions of the Tamil people contain gleanings from many and varied fields of human thought. It has been of singular value to the Tamil people to have had such a variety of influences brought to bear upon them, and especially on their proverbial poetry. We need not wonder to find here things that closely resemble Hebrew proverbs, old Sanskrit saws, Jain, and Buddhist aphorisms, Arabian sentences, and in fact signs of influences wafted from every corner of the earth. Tamil men need not complain that their literature is felt by many to have traces of foreign influence, for it is only by the mingling of the thoughts of many and various minds that anything permanently valuable can be evolved. No doubt there are villages in Central Africa, or Islands in the Pacific, where their thoughts are wholly their own,—but the thoughts are shallow, and the literature scanty!

III. This gnomic poetry has had a vast influence upon Tamil character, and possesses it still. There is no doubt that in many respects the Tamil people are among the foremost in the British empire. Wherever Englishmen are found these make their way. There is no Indian dialect a knowledge of which will carry a man further than the Tamil. Tamil soldiers were with Clive in Arcot, with Coote at Porto Novo, with Forde at Masulipatam,—and, in fact, wherever a good fight had to be fought. We believe that Tamil ethical poetry has tended very much to fashion Tamil character.

IV. It is therefore to be desired that in schools and colleges the study of classical Tamil should be maintained. These quatrains are a well of good, old, strong, wholesome Tamil. They are calcu-

lated to strengthen and invigorate the character of the people. It is never good for a race to forget its old genuine literature.

V. It must be added that here and there an expression occurs that we should wish to see altered. Especially it must be noticed that a vein of fatalism and pessimism runs through a good deal of Oriental verse. The question of eliminating such things is a very difficult one, but I think the time is at hand when it will be dealt with by competent Tamil scholars. Of course nothing should be permitted to be issued with the sanction of Tamil scholarship which is not in every respect healthy literature: and this on the whole Tamil gnomic poetry is.

I sleep, but my heart waketh.

HIS EXCELLENCY SIR ARTHUR HAVELOCK SPOKE AS FOLLOWES AT THE OPENING OF THE MADRAS EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMAN.—I understand that the purpose of this Educational Conference is to give an opportunity to teachers to take counsel together and for mutual encouragement. A worthy and useful purpose this is. The determination of the Educational Policy of India has been a work of stupendous difficulty, the best efforts of the best intellects that India has known have been broght to bear on it. An interest in the subject reaching almost to enthusiasm is found among the more enlightened classes of the people, and yet the feeling exists,—a feeling which I believe is growing in strength—that the system of education upon which so much talent and so much labour has been expended does not, in cultivating the intellect, and in forming good men, and good citizens, attained the full measure of success which was expected of it. Probably the body of teachers whom I address, are quite as much alive to the imperfections of the result of their own work as are outside critics and observers. A modern French writer in comparing the Educational system of France with that of England says that the French system has as its essential and prominent result the manufacturing of functionaries, that it is little capable of turning out other product and that it is above all badly adapted to the making men. The French Educational system is, in common with other branches of French administration, a comparatively recent creation based upon theory, and worked out with watchful regard to method and symmetry. Our system in India is of much the same educational value. The result in both cases seems to be not dissimilar. Our Educational system provides for little more than cramming the heads of the pupils with a certain amount of facts and theories trusting to them to assimilate these things, leaving the formation of mind and character mainly to their own unguided perceptions, and to the influence of their surroundings which are not always healthy. The pupils are prone to look upon Colleges and Schools we have up many factories for turning out the raw material of youths into the manufactured article of clerks, lawyers and Government officers. The youths themselves regard education from much the same point of view. Our teachers and professors are, I fear, not free from the same weakness. I ask the same teachers now before me whether they are not tempted to regard the obtaining of the passes and diplomas as their chief aim and object, and whether the formation of mind and character is not left somewhat out of sight. Criticism of our Educational System is easy, but to propose a remedy for the defects of that system is difficult. An article in a recent issue of one of our local journals alluded to the imperfections in our system such as the examination mania, and the same article proceeds to say that the Government are to a great extent responsible for the creation of this examination mania which exists not only in our College-department but also in our Schools. It proceeds to condemn our lower Secondary Examination and our Primary Examination as being a most widespread and active cause of the examination mania and recomends their abolition. A very rudimentary acquaintance with the subject leads me to think that the author of the newspaper article has put his finger on the sore spot. I understand that these examinations are meant to serve as a test to enter the Government service. The inducement thus offered of possible Government employment leads thousands of boys to submit themselves to these examinations. The unwholesome lesson that Government employment is the end and object of education is widely taught, and it seems to me that the actual system of teaching itself is corrupted by a system of cram. As a further remedy for the examination mania a suggestion is made that a teaching University should be made to take the place of the present University which, as you know, as at present constituted, is nothing more than an examining Board and which, useful as it is, is not a University save in name. After long reflection and discussion the University of London is about to add to itself a teaching branch, and I apprehend that the grounds for this action, which exist in the case of the London University, are not absent from the case of the Madras University. Yet another possible remedial expedient for the alleviation of the examination mania and for the infusion of sounder health into our Educational Policy is substitution of teaching in the Vernaculars for teaching in English. English is taught as a language only and that not untill a fair ground work has been laid say till the fourth standrad of primary department has been reached. To begin with such a measure obviously tends to reduce the temptation which exists to treat these Examinations mainly if not solely as qualifying for a Government or other employment; but apart from this, the consideration whether or not the Vernacular forms a more effective medium of education than the English Language, gives a strong additional ground for suggesting a careful examination of the desirability of change on its own merits. Does not learning in a foreign tongue cause waste of energy in the pupil and does it not impair accuracy of the knowledge acquired? Incidentally, too, such a measure is calculated to facilitate and stimulate in the higher educational grades the study of the classical and Vernacular literature of India. The strongest advocacy which I can suggest for this line of study is contained in the words of that illustrious statesman, Mounstuart Elphinstone, who writing in 1824 said

It would surely be a preposterous way of adding to the intellectual treasures of the languages to begin by the destruction of the indigenous literature, and I cannot but think that the future attainments of the natives will be increased in extent as well as in variety by being, as it were, engrafted on their own previous knowledge and imbued with their own original and peculiar character. So much for the examination mania. There are other circumstances which obstruct completely sound educational policy in India. First, the immaturity of the Indian minds for the reception and assimilation of much Western teaching. No system of education is possible that does not teach Western ideas social and political and yet such ideas suddenly introduced among an alien people, different from the West in religion, social

and political habits and training, must at first produce an unhealthy condition. Much that is absorbed remains unassimilated, and undigested. Time is the only remedy for this, but much time will be needed. I am one of the many who feel strongly that no system of education can be sound unless religious teaching forms part of it. The difficulty of giving effect to this principle, I fear, is insuperable.

And now gentlemen, I must confess that I have not put before you any orignal observations or any fresh suggestions. All I have done is to describe to you a condition of things which has already formed the subject-matter of your deliberation, but with regard to which no definite action has as yet been taken and for which no solution has as yet been found. The only practical proposals I am able to make to you are the following:—

(1) Should Secondary and Primary tests or Examinations be either abolished or gradually modified. (2) Should a teaching University take the place of the Examining University of Madras. (3) Should the Vernaculars be substituted for English in the Primary department, or, possibly, until the Upper Secondary or High School department is reached.

Mrs. Besant delivered her address, at the anniversary celebration of the Theosophical Society and we extract the following brilliant period relating to India.

"As you stood with India of the past, as you saw piles of her jewels, her treasures bursting with gold, as you saw piles of her riches, shops of her merchants, cottages of her peasants, everywhere you found one pervading atmosphere, that atmosphere of spiritual life, of reverence to religious wisdom, to worship and pay homage to the gods. If India to-day is poor while once she was rich, if India to-day is ignorant while once she was learned, if India is to-day asking for food from abroad as she was a year or two ago, instead of sending food from her overflowings after meeting her needs, asking for the assistance of distant nations, it is because India has fallen from her spirituality, and this has dried up the very source and fountain of prosperity * * * India in the past was given by the supreme the one great duty amongst the nations of the world to be the mother of religion, to be the cradle of faith, to send out to all other people the truths of that spiritual life. That was the primary duty of India, and all other good things were hers as long as she fulfilled her Karma. As she gradually fell away from the position of that mighty imperial mother of the world's faith, and as she abdicated the throne of the world's thought, she lost all else that made her glorious in the past. Her wealth diminished, her independence was gradually undermined, and lower and lower she sank until her people well nigh lost their place among the nations. Other nations have trodden the path before us. There were mighty civilisations in the elder world, and there is nothing but the the ruins remaining to-day to mark where once they ruled, taught and lived. There was a Chaldia. Broken tiles tell the story of her greatness. There was Egypt. The pyramids are but tools of her greatness, but ruined monuments bearing the epitaph of her life. There was a Greece; but Greece has vanished, and the degnerate Greeks of to-day play no part in the moulding of the world's thinking, and no longer give beauty to fascinate the imagination of the world. There was a Rome, and Rome lies in her ruins, and her eagles have closed their wings on the capital and never again shall fly as the mighty conquerers of nations. Nation after nation dead and buried, people after people, whose dust scarcely remains, and India, an India older than the oldest of these, not yet dead and buried, her dust not yet on the funeral pyre nor to be found in the urn of the monuments that are well nigh gone, India still alive, though grieving faint and low. India still alive, though even her sons despair of her and will not live her life nor think of her thought, India the ancient mother, the most ancient of all, but India still stands as Dhurga stands with enternities lying behind the goddess; but she remains ever young, immortal in her youth, for the spirit knows no age, no birth, and no dying, and where a nation stands as an emblem of the spiritual, she must live, though her sons deny her, and though her lovers stand far off. And the mother looking over her land and seeking for some to serve her, she raised her eyes to her mighty gods and said. "Lo! I will take some of my children's souls whom I have nursed on the breast of my wisdom, souls that are penetarated with the love of my knowledge, the souls that are waiting to serve me. Lo! I will call them and send them forth on earth, I will send them to other nations, they shall be born among other peoples. I will clothe them in bodies that they knew not and make their faces changed in the land that really gave them birth, they shall carry with them the wisdom they had from my breast, their love shall remain warm; when the love of my children of the land has grown cold, then I will bring them back to household; I will draw them over ocean and land, from the far-off nations of the earth, and I will plant them here to tell my children what they should be and to recall amongst them the memory of their ancient faith and the possibility of revival that lies in the spiritual nature". As I said, India was not dead. No, India has begun again to climb the ladder, she is no longer on the lowest step, her feet are no longer held by the mire of materialism, by the binding mud soaring for earthly gold, she has begun to climb up the great ladder, she is living, and she is showing the reality of her life. And I tell you, the children of India, that the future that lies before you shall be greater than your past has been, mightier in spiritual knowledge, grander in spiritual achievements, and more potent in spiritual life, that the very Rishis themselves who are without standing waiting, shall again find their home on Indian soil, that India that gods have blessed—and their blessing shall never be withdrawn—shall take again her place on the throne of the of spiritual empire, shall again find other nations coming to her for spiritual truths, and shall again see the peoples of the world ask for her spiritual riches; and as she rises to that spiritual pre-eminence and is again reverenced as mother, as teacher of the nations, in the train of that shall come with the love and reverence of the world that shall surround her every blessing that lies waiting on the knees of the gods, all the prosperity, the comfort and the wealth that men in the childhood of the soul desire; but these can only safely enjoyed and can only be wisely used when the greatest in the nation live the life that is simple, frugal, holy in the discharge of duty, and show that the spiritual man is the ideal of humanity, and that while leaders of the nations are spiritual there all else the heart desires shall obtain.

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal, Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science &c.,

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897.

VOL. II. | MADRAS. FEBRUARY 1899 | No. 9.

TRANSLATIONS

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page 175.*)

SECOND ADHYAYA.

Adhikarana. I.

If (you argue that) it would lead to the fallacy of making no room for the smriti, (we reply) no, because (otherwise) it would lead to the fallacy of making no room for the other smritis. (II. i. 1.)

It has been shewn that all Vedântic texts as well as the smritis which are consonant with their teaching, point, as the main drift of their teaching, to the most highly merciful Si'va, the Parabrahman, who is Existence, Intelligence, and Bliss in His essential nature; who by nature is omniscient, omnipotent, and so on; who has been defined by His occasional attributes, that He is the Being from whom the universe is born, and so on; who is distinct from all, the Atman of all; who voluntarily assumes the beautiful form, divers-eyed; dark and yellow, dark-necked, and so on; and who is known by such specific designations as *Bhava, S'iva, Mahâdeva, Parameswara.* Now, this adhyâya is intended to answer objections on the ground of the said construction being opposed to the smritis and arguments which point to a different conclusion from that of the vedânta.

The main subject of discussion in the whole of this adhyâya is the construction of the Vedânta made out in the preceding adhyâya.

First a doubt arises here as to whether the vedic teaching thus made out has to be modified or not in accordance with the teaching of the Sânkhya-smriti.—How?—The Veda teaches that Brahman is the cause of the universe, while Kapila's smriti declares Pradhâna to be the cause of the universe. Kapila is indeed, one of great wisdom (*rishi*), and, therefore, his word, too, is an authority. And the Blessed Veda is the Sovereign authority of all and cannot so much as smell of untruth. Accordingly a doubt arises as to which of them should prevail against the other.

(Purvapakshah:)—Now, the Sânkhya-smriti serving no other purpose, is stronger in its claim to be considered as an authority in this matter; whereas, the

Veda serves its purpose as teaching Dharma (ritual) and is therefore weaker in its claim. Thus it is but right to modify the Vedic teaching in the light of the smriti.

(*Siddhânta :*)—We say, no.—Why ?—Because, other smritis, such as that of Manu, which are unopposed to the Veda, would then receive no recognition. To the Sânkhya-smriti whose foundations lie in a sruti of which the very existence has to be inferred from the existence of the said smriti, the orthodox enquirer should prefer that smriti which says "waters alone did He create in the beginning, and in them did He cast His energy,"* and thus declares that Brahman is the cause, as taught in the now extant srutis such as the following :

" He saw the Hiranyagarbha being born."†

And because it is not found (in the Smritis) of others. (II. i. 2.)

Since Kapila's doctrine that the Prâdhâna is the cause of the universe etc., is not recognized in the smritis of the omniscient teachers such as Manu, it is but right to say that the doctrine of the Pradhâna has no foundation in the sruti. Hence no necessity for modifying, in the light of the Sânkhya-smriti, the given construction of the vedic teaching.

Adhikarana. 2

Thereby has Yoga been answered. (II. i 3.)

The Smriti of Hiranyagarbha, too, which treats of the means of attaining yoga speaks of the Pradhâna as the cause; so that a doubt arises as to whether the construction of the vedic teaching has to be modified or not in the light of that smriti, though it has to undergo no modification such as may be caused by its opposition to the Sankhya-smriti declaring that the Pradhâna is the cause.

(*Pûrvapaksha :*)—We say that modification is necessary.—Why ?—In the S'vetas'vatara—Upanishad Yoga-vidyâ is elaborately described as a means to the *sâkshâtkâra* or intuitive perception of Brahman. So that, though the Sânkhya-smriti is founded only on a s'ruti whose very existence is a matter of mere inference, it would seem proper to modify the construction upholding the doctrine that Brahman is the cause, in the light of Hiranyagarbha's smriti which declares that Pradhana is the cause, and which is founded on an extant s'ruti.

(*Siddhânta :*)—As against the foregoing we hold as follows. The given construction of the vedic teaching has to undergo no modification in the light of the yoga-smriti. From the sûtra "yoga is the restraint of the thinking principle," onwards, it is devoted to the exposition of the vedic yoga with its eight *angas* or subsidiary stages, as the main point of its teaching, but not also the non-vedic doctrine that Pradhâna is the cause. If it should lay stress on this doctrine also it is but right to reject it as we have rejected the Sankhya smriti. Wherefore, it quite stands to reason that the construction of the vedic teaching as tending to the inculcation of the doctrine that Brahman is the cause should undergo no modification in the light of Hiranyagarbh's smriti which teaches that Pradhâna is the cause.

Adhikarana, 3.

Again the sutrakara first sets forth and then refutes an objection on the ground that the given construction of the Vedantic teaching should be modified in the light of the Sankhya's course of reasoning.

(The universe is) not (an emanation of Brahman), being quite distinct. And that it is so (is known) from the Word. (II. I. 4.)

A doubt arises as to whether the given construction of the Vedânta has, or has not, to undergo a modification in the light of the Sankhya's reasoning, while it need not undergo any modification in the light of his smriti.

Pûrvapaksha:—From all points of view, the doctrine that Brahman is the cause has to be modified in the light of reasoning.—How ?—The universe being of a quite distinct nature from Brahman, it cannot be an emanation of Brahman. If you ask how this distinction has come to be known, we reply, it is from the Sruti itself. For, the sruti "Intelligence as well as non-intelligence,"* and so on, describes the universe as subject to change, as unintelligent, as something not to be sought for by man. It is, therefore, distinct from Brahman who is Existence, Intelligence and Bliss. How can they be related as cause and effect, any more than the cow and the buffalo.

Because of the specific mention and of association it is only a mention of the presiding Intelligence (II. I. 5.)

Objection against the Purvapaksha :—If this universe be insentient and, as such, distinct from the intelligent Brahman, then how is it that the created

* Manu I. 8.

† Mahanarayana. up. 10

* Tait up. 2-6.

objects are spoken of as sentient, in the following passages :

"Him, the earth addressed."*

"The waters, verily, desired."†

"Listen, O wise stones."‡

Wherefore, the whole of this universe is sentient. Hence no distinction between Brahman and the universe as sentient and insentient.

Purvapakshin's answer:—Not so. For we are to understand such a mention of an intelligent procedure in every such case as referring to the Devatâ or Intelligence associated with the object, the word 'Devatâ being specifically mentioned in such passages as the following :

"Ah ! I shall enter into these three Devatâs and differentiate name and form."§

and the constant association, with the material object, of the presiding Devatâ or Intelligence being expressly stated in the following passage :

"Agni became speech and entered the mouth."‖ Wherefore, owing to its insentiency etc., the universe is quite distinct from Brahman. Thus the construction that makes Brahman the cause, and this universe the effect, should be given up in the light of reason.

It is, however, seen. (II. I. 6.)

(*Siddhanta*) :—Though distinct in their nature, Brahman and the universe can be related as cause and effect, because the sentient scorpion is seen to take its birth in the insentient cow-dung, and that the insentient hair is found growing out of sentient man. Hence the conclusion that mere unaided reasoning cannot prevail against the exegetical interpretation of the sruti.

Again an objection is raised answered :

(If you urge that the effect would be) non-existent, (we reply) no, because it is a mere denial. (II. I. 7.)

(*Objection*:)—The cause and the effect being distinct from each other the effect does not exist in the cause ; and so the S'ruti, says "Non-existent, verily, this in the beginning was."

(Answer :)—You should not say so. For, the s'ruti merely declares that the cause and the effect are not necessarily of the same nature. It does not, therefore, detract from the theory that the cause and the effect are one thing essentially.

* Tait Samhita, 5-5-2.
† Tait Brâhmana, 3-1-5.
‡ Tait Samhita, 1-3-13.
§ Chha. up-6-3
‖ Aitareya-upanishad 1-2-4

Adhikarana 4.

Because of His being subject to them like it in dissolution, it is not right. (II, 1, 8.)

If, in accordance with the doctrine that the effect exists in the cause before manifestation and after disappearance, it be held that the universe and Brahman are one thing essentially, then a doubt arises as to whether the harmonious teaching of the Upanishads as to Brahman has to be rejected or not in the light of reasoning.

(*Purvapaksha* :)—It has to be set aside.—Why ?—Because it has been said that the universe and Brahman are essentially one thing. Then, indeed it is an inevitable conclusion that, like the universe, Brahman is subject to all such evils as change and ignorance. Accordingly what is taught by one accordant voice in all the Vedantic texts becomes incongruous. Thus, the given interpretation of the Vedantic teaching must be rejected.

But no, because there is an analogous case (II. 1. 9.)

The word "no" shows that the Pûrvapaksha has to be rejected. Such passages in the sruti as "Whose body is Atman," "whose body is Avyakta," and such sayings in the Puranas as "The body of the God of gods is this universe, moving and unmoving; this thing the *pas'us* (ji'vas) know not in virtue of the bond (pâs'a) ;" such passages show that *chit* and *achit*, the sentient and the insentient, are the body of Siva, the Parabrahman. Though He exists as both the cause and the effect, there is no incongruity whatever in the doctrine taught in one harmonious voice in all the Vedântic texts, since there is an analogous case as to the proper distribution of good and evil.—How ?—Just as when the human body and the like pass through the states of childhood, youth, and dotage, childhood and other changes of condition pertain only to the body, and pleasure etc., pertain only to the A'tman ; so, here, such evils as ignorance and change which are found in the sentient and the insentient beings forming the body of Brahman pertain only to the sentient and the insentient being forming the body ; and such attributes as faultlessness, immutability, omniscience, and unfailing will pertain only to the Parames'vara, the A'tman. Because of this analogy, there no incongruity whatever in the teaching of the S'ruti concerning Brahman.

And because of inconsistency on his own side. (II. 1. 10)

By trusting to reasoning alone, the Pradhâna-vâdin will find the mutual confusion of the attributes of

Prakriti and Purusha difficult to explain according to his theory which holds that Prakriti acts in the mere presence of Purusha who is immutable. Purusha, immutable as he is, is not capable of this act of confusion which consists in attributing in thought the properties of one thing to another; and Prakriti which is insentient is altogether incapable of thought. Therefore, the theory which holds that Pradhana is the cause should itself be set aside in the light of reasoning.

Because of the infinality of inference. (II. i. 11.)

Inference being not a final test in itself, and the doctrine of Pradhâna being founded thereon, and it being possible to infer even to the contrary, it is the doctrine of Pradhâna, not the doctrine of Brahman, that has to be rejected.

(If you say that It) has to be inferred otherwise, (we say) even then there can be no deliverance. (II. i. 12.)

It is not right to maintain that the Pradhâna should be so inferred in another way that there can be no room for an inference to the contrary. For, even then, it is possible to suppose a contrary inference to this inference; and therefore there can be no release of the test of inference from the defect of being not a final test. Wherefore properly speaking, it is the doctrine of Pradhâna, based as it is on bare inference which has to be rejected, but not the doctrine of Brahman based on the strong authority of the S'ruti.

Adhikarana.—5.

By this, even the heterodox doctrines have been explained. (II. i. 13.)

Just as the Sânkhya system has been rejected as being founded on inference, as not being final, and so on, so also, and on the same ground, it may be held that the heterodox systems of Kanâda, Akshapâda, etc., have to be rejected. That is to say, even the atomic doctrine of Kanâda and others has hereby been refuted.

Adhikarana.—6.

(If you say that) as He would become an enjoyer, there will be no distinction, (we reply) there can be (a distinction) as in the world. (II. i. 14).

As to the declaration in the preceding adhyâya of the Vis'ishta Sivâdvaita or the unity of the conditioned Siva as based on the ground that Siva without a second, associated with sentient and insentient universe, is Himself cause and effect, a doubt arises as to whether this idea of unity derived by an exegetical interpretation of the Vedântic texts will have to be set aside as opposed to reason.

Now the *pûrvapakshin* says: If it be admitted that Parames'vara has for His body the sentient and the insentient universe, then he becomes an embodied being. Being thus embodied, like the jîva He too may become subject to pain and pleasure attendant upon contact with the body. Then there will be no distinction between Parames'vara and the jîva who is in a state of bondage. Thus since nothing serves to distinguish the one from the other, it cannot be proved, on the theory of Parames'vara's being intimately associated with the universe, that He is by nature free from all evil.

Siddhanta.—There is no incongruity whatever. A distinction can be made between Jîva and Parmes'vara inasmuch as His form is free from all taint and blessed in every way. One becomes subject to evil not because one is embodied, but because one is subject to the control of another. For example, in the human world, the king who is an embodied being is not subject to punishment consequent upon the disobedience of his own command, simply because he is not subject to the control of another. Thus He is not an enjoyer in the same way that the other is. The independence of Is'vara and the dependence of Jîva are self-evident, as the S'ruti says:

"Knowing and unknowing are the two, the powerful and the powerless."*

Hence no absence of a distinction between Parames vara who is independent and Jîva who is a dependent being though they are alike embodied.

Adhikarana.—7

Although a distinction can be made between jiva and Parames'vara on account of their mutually opposed attributes of independence and dependence and the like, still, it may be shewn that, as cause and effect, they are one, not distinct from each other.

They are not distinct, because of the word 'creation' and so on. (21. i. 15.)

A doubt arises here as to whether it is reasonable or not to maintain that Brahman and the universe, the cause and the effect, are not distinct, as the S'rutis declare in one voice. This doubt arises because they are marked off from each other by the mutually opposed attributes of sentiency and insentiency.

* S'veta. Up. 1-9.

'Pûrvapaksha :)—How can their unity be explained? In the preceding adhikarana, Parames'vara and jiva have been distinguished from each other, the one being possessed of cauniscience etc., the other being ignorant and subject to enjoyment and suffering. As to the insentient beings, they being of a quite different nature, there is no shadow of reason to hold that it is not distinct from Brahman. The fact of their being related to each other as cause and effect cannot prove that they are not distinct from each other; for we hold that the cow-dung and the scorpion are distinct from each other notwithstanding that they are related as cause and effect. Even in the case of clay and the pot, we find that they are quite distinct from each other because they are found in experience to serve quite distinct purposes, and so on. Or thus: if the cause and the effect are quite identical, the universe and Brahman must be quite homogeneous, so that we should not experience any distiction among things, such as we daily make between an act, its agent, and the object sought to be attained.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: The universe, as an effect, is not distinct from Brahman, its cause.—How do you know it?—From the word 'creation,' and so on, in the following passages:

> "A creation by speech is change as well as name; what is called clay is alone real."*
>
> "Existent alone, my dear, this at first was, one only without a second.....
> It willed 'may I be many, and be produced.'
> ..... All this is ensouled by It; That is real; That is Atman; That thou art, O S'vetaketu."†
>
> "The whole being, the variegated world, what has become in many forms, and what is becoming, all this is Rudra.‡

As to the contention that the relation of cause and effect cannot prove unity, the Sûtrakâra says.

And because of the perception (of the cause) during the existence (of the effect). (II. i. 16.)

During the existence of the effect as the pot, we perceive that the very substance of clay is the pot. Therefore, the effect is not distinct from the cause. The same thing is taught also in the following passage:

> "A creation by speech is change as well as name. What we call clay is alone real"§

That is to say, change of state as well as name merely enable us to speak of a thing and to use it for certain actual purposes. The very substance of clay, when assuming the form of a pot and named as 'pot,' serves certain actual purposes and enables us to speak of it in that form. In point of fact, the pot is real only as clay, so far as logical proof is concerned; for apart from clay, we find that no pot exists. Or, the above passage may be explained as follows: The effect, namely the pot, exists in so far only as we speak of it. It is the very substance of clay, and it is not a distinct substance,—only undergoing a change in state to serve certain purposes in our actual life. It is because the pot is mere clay—but not a distinct substance—that the term "clay" applied to the pot refers to a real substance, a substance whose existence can be proved by proper evidence. Because a pot is nothing but clay, therefore the effect is not distinct from the cause As to the difference in the purposes they serve in actual life, it can be explained as due to their being different states of the same substances, while they (clay and pot) are in fact one in substance. Wherefore, like clay and pot, Brahman and the universe are one in substance, the one pervading the whole of the other. Hence the Purânic saying:

> "From the S'akti down to earth, everything comes from the principle of S'iva. By Him alone is it pervaded, as the pot etc., are pervaded by clay."

(*Objection*) We hold that the pot is pervaded by clay because we cognise that the pot is mere clay. Not so do we cognise that this universe is Brahman; and therfore the universe cannot be said to be pervaded by Brahman.

(*Answer*): We do find that Brahman as the existent pervades the universe, as we cognise that a pot exists, that a cloth exists, and so on everywhere. If the universe were not pervaded by S'iva in His aspects as the existent and the conscious, then how could we cognise that a thing exists and becomes an object of consciousness, detached as it is from existence and consciousness? It cannot be a reality at all Wherefore, it may be concluded that as the pot etc. are pervaded by clay, so this universe, as the effect, is pervaded by S'iva, the cause, and is one with Him.

And because of the existence of the other. (II. i. 17.)

Because the effect exists in the cause, the effect is not distinct from the cause. It is because the pot etc. were clay itself before, that we now perceive the pot etc. to be mere clay.

* Chhandogya Upanishad 6—1.
† Ibid.
‡ Mahanarayan Up. 16.
§ Chhâ. Up. 6-1.

(If you hold that it is not so) because of its being mentioned as non-existent, (we say) no; because it is due to a different condition, as shown by the sequel, by analogy, and by other passages. (II. i. 18.)

(*Objection:*)—The effect does not exist in the cause, because the S'ruti says that the effect was non-existent:

"Nothing whatever of this (universe) existed at first."*

(*Answer:*) No. The universe is mentioned to have been non-existent because it was in a different condition, *i. e.* in a subtle form as opposed to its present gross form.—How do you know?—Because in the sequel the S'ruti says "While non-existent, it thought 'may I be.'" Even thinking is possible only in an existent thing. There is also an analogy pointing to the conclusion that the mention of the universe as non-existent is due only to a change of state. It is only in reference to the clay's mutually opposed, but positive, states of being as lump, as pot, and as potshred, that we say that the pot did not exist before, that it now exists, and that it will not exist at a certain time in the future. When we thus see how clay itself which exists in all these states may be spoken of as a pot non-existent, it is unnecessary to assume a state of 'abhâva' or "nullity," a different state of being altogether, corresponding to a pot non-existent. Accordingly the S'ruti says elsewhere:

"This, verily, existed then undifferentiated it was (since) differentiated in name and form."†

The main conclusion may be stated as follows: At first Siva is pure, endued with the Paras'akti, the Supreme Energy inseparable from Himself, and composed of the sentient and the insentient existence in so subtle a form that they cannot be differentiated in name and form. Then He projects out of himself and evolves that Sakti, which is Himself, in a gross form as opposed to the previous state, in the form of the sentient and the insentiate existence capable of being differentiated in name and form. When the Energy is withdrawn from manifestation, then takes place *pralaya* or dissolution; when it is manifested, creation takes place. Accordingly, the authorities say:

"It is, verily, the Divine Being Himself, the Chidâtman who manifests the whole objective existence out of Himself from within like a yogin, by His will, without resorting to an upâdâna."

That is to say, without resorting to an upâdâna external to Himself, by Himself becoming the upâdâna or material cause. Wherefore, the created universe is one with the Supreme cause, S'iva, the Parabrahman.

Another example is given as follows:

And like a cloth (II. i. 19.)

Small when folded, a cloth becomes when extended a large one, and in the form of a hut becomes an effect. So, too, Brahman is the cause when contracted, and when extended in form He becomes the effect.

And like prana and the like (II. i. 20.)

Just as the Vâyu, one in itself, assumes different forms as prana or upward breath and so on, according to its several activities, so, too, Brahman, in virtue of the various activities of S'akti assumes manifold form such as Sadâsiva and so on. Wherefore it is but right to maintain that the universe as the effect is one with Brahman, the cause.

A. MAH'ADEVA S'A'STRI, B. A.

(*To be continued.*)

* Tait Brahmana 2—2—9.

† Bri. up. 3-4-7.

KAIVALYA UPANISHAD

INTRODUCTION BY THE EDITOR.

It is not well understood that the word 'Upanishad' really means the same thing as the word 'Yoga' Yoga means the sadana required for bringing the soul and God in *union*" and Upanishad is also the teaching of the Sadana whereby man can *come nearer* and *nearer* God by destroying the bonds that bind him. The root meaning (Upa-near, ni-quite, sad-to perish) is hit off to a nicety in the famous line in *Tiruvachakam*, 'The House of God,' 7th Verse, சென்று சென்று அணு அணுத்தேய்ந்து தேய்ந்து ஒன்றும், "*nearer* and *nearer* to Thee I drew, *wearing away* atom by atom, Till I was *One* with thee."

And in the passage we quote below, and in several others, the Upanishad is used as a synonym for yoga. And this derivation really explains the scope of an Upanishad, a misunderstanding of which has led to no end of confusion. The Siddhanti takes the Upanishad as the text book of the Yoga-pada or school. And the other padas are Sariya-pada, Kriya-pada, and Gnana-pada. And the *bavana* or *sadana* is peculiar to each. The bavana in the *Sariya pada* (Dasa-marga) is that of master and servant; in the Kriya-pada, (Satputra-marga) that of Father and son; in the Yoga-pada, (Saha-soham marga), that of friend and friend (or equal and equal) and in all these bavana, there is duality (consciousness of duality); and in the gnana-pada, there is no duality (consciousness of duality). Whatever, there is complete blending as that of lover and loved; though love is also the requisite in the other bavanas. In Yoga, the soul by lovingly contemplating that God and himself are saha, equals, or identical, (Soham) approaches the truth nearer and nearer, and as its fruition, it reaches a stage the Sannyasa Yoga, when it can hardly recognize any individuality of its own (தன்வடிவு) blends itself so well into the Bliss that it dedicates (as Arpana, Sivarpana) all its acts to God, then its bonds are sundered, and it is exalted into the Highest Bliss. Perhaps there is just a little consciousness as the Yogi passes into the gnani, and it is during this moment, the Yogi breaks out into that pæan of Triumph, "I am all; I am Brahman, the secondless" (mantras 18 to 22). In the preceding mantra, (17), the Yogi is actually practising "*Soham Bavana*" and carrying out what he was taught to do by his Guru (mantra 16). 16th mantra is further identical with 8 sutra of Sivagnanabotha, 17th mantra with 9th sutra and 18 to 22 with 10 sutra. And Yoga pada or Upanishad stops so far; and does not go further. And seeing that these Upanishads, almost every one of them, end with this "Soham" doctrine, we identify "*Vedanta* with Yoga-pada, and distinguish it from Siddhanta or Gnana—whose postulate is contained, not in the Upanishads but in the Agama, 11 sutra of Sivagnanabotha (see notes there under for difference between this and 10 sutra.) And it is one of the principles of sound teaching, that in the various lower stages though we deal only with symbols (bavana) of Truth, and not with absolute Truth, the learner cannot be told that that is only a symbol and not the Truth, and he has to be taught to believe in the teacher who puts its forward as absolute Truth; though a caution now and then is absolutely esssential, so as not to lead the learner altogether astray. And it is the form in which the teachings of the respective Pada have been set forth that have misled people into mistaking the symbol (bavana or sadana) for the Truth. In the Madhwa system, the bavana of master and servant have become petrified or dogmatic; in Christianity, the sat-putra Marga, (Father-hood of God and brother hood of man) has become petrified (dogmatic); in the Maya-Vada, the saha (soham) Marga has become petrified People will care to understand the difference we have here attempted to draw between the true Vedanta (not the petrified or dogmatic Vedanta of the Maya Vadis) who really understand the difference between Yoga and Gnana. Dogmatism has entered even among Saivas; and we have among them the School of Siva-Sama Vadis, to which Srikanta (the true Vedanti) belongs; and two such eminent persons as Gnanapragasa Swamigal and Sivagnana Swamigal have crosed their lances in this fight.

A genuine scholar and aspirant after Yoga like the late learned Editor of the Saddarshana Chintanika has just a fair perception of the differneces we have above explained; and in his Commentary on the Vedanta Sutras, he expresses himself to the following effect. He points out that the main body of the sutras of Vyasa, and texts of Vēda support and maintain the doctrine of the essential difference of the Human spirit and the Supreme spirit and in following them, he says Madhwacharya and Ramanujacharya are right; but there are other clear texts also which affirm as positively "That Thou art,' 'Tattwam Asi,' I am God," "Aham

Brahmasmi" &c.. one for each Veda; and he says that the last two Acharyas attempt no explanation of these texts; whereas Sankaracharya simply adopts them. But Sankara does not himself explain the previous sets of sutras and texts. "All these four interpreters find it equally easy to graft their systems on the Brahma Sutra, the general style of which seems at first sight to admit of different interpretations. But all these Acharyas find it hard to offer *consistent* interpretation of some Sutras. Under these circumstances, they are compelled *to over strain* and to propose *far-fetched interpretations*, for making Badarayana conform to their doctrines." (p. 206). He however thinks that this is no case for despair and that there must be consistent explanation forthcoming; and the following explanation he gives as his own, though the real truth has been with the Siddhanta School ever so long.

"What is to be done? There are doubtless a few texts in the Veda which support Pantheistic views. Most, however, support the Theistic principles. But so long as Pantheistic texts are not explained, the proposition that the Vedas do not teach Pantheism cannot be accepted. Again, the adjustment and interpretation of these proposed by the Theists cannot be accepted, because of their being far-fatched and forced. But we do not see how the few Pantheistic texts come in the way of Theism, because we believe that though they be interpreted as the Pantheists do, yet they support Theism. How can this be? The essence of the Dualistic doctrine is *adoration* (bhakti). While engaged in adoration, the mind discovers two states-the one consisting in being intent upon serving the Lord, in doing that which He approves, in offering to Him the best things one has, and in obeying His commands. Thus as good parents are to be served by a child in the same manner God is to be served and worshipped by his servants. This kind of worship includes all the nine sorts of adoration mentioned in the Bhagavata Purana. 1. Exclusively listening to the praises of God, 2. exclusively singing his praises, 3. remembering and constantly thinking of them, 4. falling at His feet, 5 worshipping him, 6. His adoration, 7. exclusive devotion to Him. 8. constant association with Him, 9. laying one's sorrow or happiness before Him. But there is a special feature of such adoration—a feature not included in any of these. It is the ecstatic condition of the spirit—a condition which can neither be explained nor understood without an illustration. Let the reader realise the love a mother has for her child. A mother or her child sometimes experiences a state of mind—an indescribable state. That which either of them expresses can alone convey an idea of their feelings when they are in the ecstatic condition. The mother directly addresses the child thus:—"Oh my piece of gold—oh, my soul, oh, my life—can I eat you up?" Under these circumstances, the *mother* forgets that her body is different from that of her child which experiences the same feeling. Such an identity is the form of the ecstatic condition of the mind. This is a special feature of adoration. This sort of ecstatic identity the Yogis feel. Hence there are such worshippers. The life of Jesus Christ can be referred to in this place as described in (14-20) of the Gospel of John. It is this: "At that day ye shall know that I am in my father, and he in me, and I in you."* Though a thorough Dualist or Dvaita, Jesus expressed himself in this way. His utterances can be easily explained when this ecstatic condition of mind is understood. Hence in the Vedas and in the Upanisads, the Pantheistic doctrine of the identity of the human and Supreme Spirits if enunciated is enunciated in this way. Again the Brahmasutra of Bâdarâyana does not inculcate it."

And he states below that the Yoga is the backbone of the Vedanta. And it must be clear to every body, that in the ordinary yoga, in 'soham bavana, and even when the perfect Yogi bursts forth into the pæan, "I am all," there is thought, consciousness dualism, and it is only when this consciousness ceases, there is perfect Nirvana and Advaita Bliss. And so it is, that a true saint like Thayumanavar, says that Sariya, Kriya, and Yoga was enough for him, as this will lead to Gnana; and he also shows how this *soham* sadana leads to Gnana. And does not the excellence of the *Siddhanta* system consist in that it embraces all the four-fold path of Sariya, Kriya, Yoga and Gnana ("சன்மார்க்கமுதலாம் தாதமார்க்கத்தளவும் தன்மார்க்மான வெங்கள் சம்பந்தன்,") and the Four Great Teachers, Appar, Sambanthar, Sundarar and Manickavachaka acted out the Four Paths for our guidance and following, though they were the greatest Gnanis; and the Siddhanti could without the least hesitation kneel before his maker and say, "O my master show

* Our christian friend showed us how he had noted against this text, the reference in *Pattinattar's Hymns*. Saint Thayumanavar thus reverently speaks of this famous text also.

"எனக்குமெனக்கென்ற [illegible]
முனக்குறைவென்ற யுறுதிகள்வ தெனதுகோ."

mercy to thy slave. தன்னைநான்* அருளுஞ்சோதி ஒன்னை" ; O my Father, my Mother," O my Life, My Self, My Love," And this Four-fold path, in what books do they find mention and full exposition ? And in this fact of Broad Universalism, lies the reason of our attitude towards all other religions and if we criticize at all, it is not in any carping and fault-finding spirit; but simply because we equally accept the Kantian dictum, that "the greatest and perhaps the sole use of all philosophy of Pure Reason is after all mostly negative, since it serves not as an organon for the enlargement of knowledge, but as a discipline for its delineation, and instead of discovering truth, has only the modest merit of preventing error;" and we have already pointed out how useless it is to refer to one's own experience, when we theorize and philosophize and proceed to condemn as unsound another's doctrine whether it be dualism, or nondualism, materialism or spiritualism.

We began by saying that Upanishad and Yoga means the same thing ; and this Kaivalya Upanishad may be said to be *the* Upanishad of the Yoga School and it well sets forth the nature of Dhyeyah, (God) Dhyatah (soul) and Dhyana or mode of contemplation, and the fruit of such contemplation. And Sri Nilakantacharya quotes mantras 5 and following as the illustrative text under. 4-1-7 (Brahma sutras), ('Asinnasambhavat') and this upanishad will as such be older than Badarayana's sutras. This is also ranked as one of the Pancha Rudram, the others being Swetaswatara, Atharva sikha, Atharvasiras and Kalagni rudram. Atharva sikha will appear in our next.

KAIVALYOPANISHAD.

1. Then A's'valâyana approached Lord Parameshthi and addressed him thus :

2. "Please teach me, O Lord, that Brahmavidyâ which is the highest of (sciences), which is always practised by the wise, and is concealed, knowing which the learned soon get rid of all sins and reach the Person who is beyond (Param).

3. To him the Pitâmahâ replied :

4. It is by the unity of faith, (sraddha) devotion (bhakti) and meditation (Dhyana Yoga) that thou knowest. Not by Karma, nor by progeny, nor by wealth ; but by renunciation, (tyaga), some attained immortality.

5. That which is dwelling in the cave of the supreme Akasa and is radiant, that the Yatis enter who are possessed of a firm conviction resulting from a knowledge of the Vedanta and whose minds are

* The Tamil Mahomedans invariably use the word "தன்னை" when speaking of God, and The Tamil Christians, "ஸ்."

1. *Narayana's comentary.*—'Parameshthi' Brahma: called because he occupies the highest place in creation.

Sankaranada's com.—Like a mother who wishes to give something good to her children, this s'ruti introduces the story of one A's valâyana in order to instil into the minds of students faith in the authenticity of Brahmavidyâ.

'Then' *Atha* ; this is an auspicious term with which a treatise is begun. as a benedicton ; 'then' means after attaining the four fold qualifications (Sadana chatushtaya) which are *Sine qua non* for initiation into the Vedânta Sâstras. 'A's'valayana' is the Achâryâ of the Rig-veda.

2. *San*—'Lord': *Bhagavân* ; one who possesses *Aishwaryam, Viryam, Yasas, Sri, Gnanam, Vairagyam.* 'Brahmavidyâ': Brahman is beyond time and space, and is not attached to things of the world. It is beyond argument and illustration. 'Vidyâ': science which develops Buddhi, the cause of the direct realization of Brahman. 'The wise' are those that do not identify their *selves* with their bodies —those that are free from *Dehatma abhimana.* They always practise Brahmavidyâ ; ever retain it in their hearts. 'Concealed' A'tman exists in all beings, and yet is veiled from the creatures by Avidya.

'*All sins*' : *the effects of ignorance and impressions of past karma.* Ignorance and Samsâra are the sources of misery and all pains. 'Beyond Para': *Para* is the unmanifested cause of the universe. Brahman is even beyond that *Para.*

3. *S'an.*—'To him' to the student who is athirst to be initiated in Brahmavidya ; here it is A's'valayana. 'Pitâmaha' grandfather ; Bramâ the lotus-seated, is so called because he is the father of Daksha and other Prajâpatis who are the progenitors of the human race.

4. *S'an.*—'Meditation' continuous flow of particular thoughts uninterrupted by extraneous or contrary ones. 'Karma': actions enjoined in s'ruti (the Vedas) and in the Smritis (Dharma Sastras). 'Wealth' possessions either celestial or terrestrial. 'By renunciation' by giving up all actions whether ordained by S'ruti or by Smriti ; by rising above Karma to the Paramahamsa stage which is the highest order of Sannyâsa. 'Some some Mahatmas versed in the traditional lore.

5. 'Go first to the world of Brahma' notwithstanding their qualifications to attain Brahman itself, supposing they do not reach Brahman while in this body, they go first to the plane of manifested Brohmâ (Kârya Brahmâ) and remain there till the end of that Kalpa and then reach Supreme Brahman.

purified by Sannyasa-yoga. All these go to the world of Brahma (Supreme Being) at the end of Para's life and they are libe rated from all the bonds and become immortal.

6. Retired to a lonly place, seated (there) in a comfortable posture, pure, with his neck, head and trunk erect;

7. Observing Atyasrama-Vrata, with all his senses under restraint, prostrating himself with devotion (in reverence) to his Guru, directing his attention to the lotus of his heart which is devoid of passion and highly pure; (thus) is the self-effulgent (centred) without sorrow.

8. (Who is) unthinkable and unmanifested; (whose) forms are infinite; who is (S'iva) peaceful, immortal and all-pervading, and who is the cause (of all); and, who has no beginning, nor middle nor end; who is one and omnipresent; who is chit and Ananda; who is without forms and wonderful.

9. Umâ's spouse, (Umasahaya) the supreme Lord (Parameshwara) who is powerful (Prahbu); the three-eyed and beneficent Nîlakantha; by meditation, a Muni reaches Him who is the origin of all beings, the witness of all and passes beyond Tamas.

10. He is Brahmâ, He is S'iva, He is Indra, He is imperishable, supreme and self-luminous. He is Himself Vishnu. He is Prâna, He is Kâlâgni, He is the moon.

11. He is all,—what is past and what is to pass, and eternal Knowing Him one crosses death. There is no other path to liberation.

12. He who sees the Supreme being (as residing) in all beings, and all beings in the Supreme reaches the supreme Brahman. There is no other method (than the above).

13 With the soul for Arani (a wood) and Pranava for the churning rod, by the continual churning of knowledge, the wise sunder the noose.

14. 'It is He,'* (Jivatma and not the Supreme soul) with his self bewildered by Mâyâ, that takes hold of a body and does everything; and it is he that enjoys the diverse objects, women, food, drink, &c.,—in the waking condition.

15. In the dreaming condition, the state in which everything is created by his own Maya, the same Jiva enjoys pleasure and pain. During sleep when everything is immersed in sushupti, he (the Soul) is blissful being overpowered by Tamas.

16. The same Jiva again returns to the dreaming state (from sushupti) as he is entangled in his previous actions, and then to the waking state.

Jiva thus plays in the three cities (bodies) from which originated all these diverse things.

17. He is the support, is Bliss itself, the fountain-head of knowledge, in whom the three cities are

8 *S'an.*—'S'iva' the form of beneficance. 'Peaceful, devoid of the fault of Avidyâ.

14. S'an.—'It is He': although unattached to worldly objects, it is He (Jivatma) and none but Him. 'Maya' Avidyâ, possessing the two-fold functions of A'varana (veiling) and Vikshepa (producing modifications of mind). 'Enjoys' feels pleasure and pain.

* Our sastry and those whom he follows would take this 'He' as identical with th supreme Soul; but how they could reconcile *Brahman* who gets his senses bewildered by maya, ('dargged and constrained' as the Gita puts it) it is difficut to conceive. But it is more reasonable to hold that the mantra above having stated how the wise man sundered his noose, the next mantra and mantras 15 and 16 should proceed to describe the nature of man and his bond. Mantra 17 shows whence the material bodies evolve and resolve and the next mantra prescribes the *Tatvamasi* Sadana or Bavana, 19th mantra, the Palan of following the sadana, and the following mantras the condition of the freed soul, who could say like Vamadeva, I am all, which is interpreted by Sri Nilakanta as follows. "Or thus: When, by the contemplation of the harmonious nature of Brahman and A'tman brought about by Vedântic knowledge, Vâmadeva attained to the state of Brahman and was freed from all the imaginary limitations due to the identifying of himself with the human body and so on, and his mighty ego expanded so as to embrace the whole universe, he saw that he was present everywhere and accordingly spoke of himself as one with the whole universe including Manu and Sûrya. So, it may be concluded, it was in the case of Indra. In the passage "I am Prâna, the conscious Atman,"* Prâna refers to Para-Brahman, inasmuch as He, blissful by nature, is the cause of all life, as said in the s'ruti "Prâna is the conscious self, the Bliss, undecaying and immortal." Accordingly it is from the standpoint of Brahman that Indra taught "I am Brahman," "Me do thou worship" So, too, Krishna taught to Arjuna, and so several others."

15. *S'an.*—'Dreaming condition' the svapna state when all the senses retire. In the waking state the senses perceive the external objects, while in dream Jiva himself creates the objects by his own Maya, in his own mind. 'Sleep': in sushupti *i. e.*, during sound sleep Jiva perceivef nothing—neither the external objects of the world as in jakrata nor the creations of his own mind as in svapna. The difference between Sushupti and Moksha is in the former he is veiled by Avidya, while in Mokshâ there is no such impediment.

16. *S'an.*—'Three cities' gross, subtle and causal (here ajnana) bodies.

17. *Nârâ and S'an.*—'The support' the Turiya or the fourth state is here referred to. 'From Him' from the Turiya, the seer of Buddhi. Prana energy; Kriyasakti. 'Manas'; stands for Jnanasakti.

merged. From Him originate Prana, Manas and all the senses, ether air, light, water and earth which is the supporter of all.

18. That which is Supreme Brahman. the soul of all, the support of everything ; (that which is) great, subtler than the subtlest, and eternal is) indeed yourself, (soul) and yourself (soul) is that Supreme soul.

19. That which appears as the universe consisting of waking, dreaming and sleeping states, &c—recognizing it to be (in the light of) 'I am Brahman' one is freed from all bondages.

20. Object of enjoyment, enjoyer, and enjoyment in the three states,—from these I am different; (I am) the witness, Conciousness ; and I am Sadás'iva.

21. In Me everything originated ; in Me everything established ; and in Me everything merges. That non-dual Brahman am I.

22. I am subtler than the subtle, likewise big ; I am the various worlds ; I am the ancient, the Spirit, the Lord ; I am golden, I am S'iva.

23. I am without hands and without feet, and possess unthinkable energies. Without eyes I see, without ears hear. (Everything) I know distinctly. Independent of me there is no knower. Ever I am Conciousness.

24. It is by the many Vedas that I am to be known. I am the author of the Vedas and I alone know them. To Me there is neither Punya (merit) nor Papa (demerit), neither impermanency nor birth ; nor do I have body, senses and mind.

25. No Earth and Water to me, no Fire, no Wind ; nor ether. Thus knowing the nature of Paramatman who resides in the cavity, who is without parts and non-dual, who is the witness of (all) and is above Sat and Asat—(such knowledge) leads one to pure Paramatman.

26. He who reads the S'atarudriya become purified from fire, from spirituous liquors and from Brahmanicide ; becomes purified from all sins committed intentionally or otherwise. By (reading) this he takes rest in S'iva. He who has risen above the A's'rama (rules) should read always,—or (at least) once. By (reading) this, knowledge is got which is the cause of the destruction of the ocean of Sams'ara. Therefore knowing Him thus, the result Kaivalya is attained, Kaivalya is attained.

THUS ENDS "KAIVALYOPANISHAD" IN THE ATHARVA-VEDA.

R. ANANTHA KRISHNA SASTRY.

26. *San.*—'Satarudriya' is a chapter in Yajur-Veda in praise of Siva. 'Purified from fire' by repeating this he will attain all the virtues which result from a performance of Vedic and Smarta ceremonies (relating to the sacrificial fire.)

NOTES BY THE EDITOR.

1. The meaning of *Atha*, is clearly brought out, as gainst the foregoing interpretation by another Upanishad which we quote below. (Svetaswatara. VI.)

22. "This highest mystery in the Vedanta, delivered in a former age should not be given to one whose passions have not been subdued, nor to one who is not a son, or who is not a pupil.

23. If these truths have been told to a high minded man, who feels the highest devotion (Bhakti) for God, and for his Guru, as for God, then they will shine forth, then they will shine forth indeed."

Bagavan. Haradatta says in his Sruti Sukti mala, that Bagavan is properly the appellation of The One true God (Siva), and it is applied to all those also who have attained to the knowledge of the One. The following verse from *Kalika kandam of Skanda Purana* speaks of Brahma and others as having reached the *Atyasrama Diksha.*

"Pasu Pasa Vimokshaya sirnanthu munibih Pura Vishnuna Brahmana Devahr Markandeya Dhathichina."]

2. *Paratparam.* Same as Paraparam (பரபரம்) very familiarly used in Tamil. The first *Para*, in addition to the meaning noted above also means, Hiranyagarba, atma (soul), and what is superior to these, Vishnu. Vide Saiva Bhahya I. 3-12.

See also. Mantra 7 ch VI. Svetaswatara, where the full force of His Transcendal character is brought out.

"Iam Isvaranam Paramam Maheshwaram tam Devatanam Paramamcha Daivatam

Patim Patinam Paramam Parastat Vidama Devam. Buvanesham ediam."

Purusha is this Highest Lord and God and master that is spoken in the above mantra that is meant here, and not the soul nor a Saguna Brahm (Lower self) (a common fallacy).

Rudra is called Purusha. vide.

Taitiria Maha Narayanopanishad. 13-2.

"Purushovai Rudraha."

"Tat Purushaya Vidmahe. ibid. 3-2.

The same Upanishad speaks of this Purusha as 'Dark and Golden hued' Umasahaya' "Purusham Krishna Pingalam." 12-1.

Isa is called *Purusha* in the following Mantra in this very Kaivalyopanihsad.

"Purâdanôham Purushôham Isam." 20.

Katha upanishad speaks of this Isa and 'Purusha' in 4th Valli. 12 mantra.

"Angushtamatraha *Purusho* madhya atmani thistati.

Isano bhutbabavyasya na tato Vijugup-Tatheyeh."

This *Isa* and *Purusha* seated in the middle of (inside of) the atma (soul) can never be identified with the 'Saguna God.

This Rudra is the Highest Brahm and not a 'Saguna Brahm, Rudra' will be evident from comparing the following mantras.

"*Ekameva Rudro nadvitiyaya thastheh.*" (Swetas 3-2. Atharva siras. 5.)

"*Ekamevadvitiyam Brahma*" (Chandog VI 2-1.)

"Sarvam Kalvitam *Brahma*" (Chandog. 3-14-1.)

"Sarvo hyesha *Rudraha*" (Mahanar. 13-2.)

'*Reach.*' This mode of reaching God is thus described in *Sivagama*.

"Sivarka Sakti dideitya samasti kritachit drisa, Sivam Saktiadibissartam, Paschyatyatma gathavritih."

"*Siva Surya* and *Sakti light*, lighting up the eye of wisdom, Siva with his sakti is perceived by the atma (soul) his darkness removed."

Here Siva is sun, and His sakti is sun's light and with this explanation, see how the following mantra in Prasna IV. 5. seems to be the very text repoduced in the Agama verse cited above.

"Again, he who meditates with this syllable Aum of three matras on the *Parama Purusha*, he comes to *light* (Tejas) and *the Sun*. And as a snake is freed from his skin, so is he *freed from evil*.....he *learns to see the all-pervading, the Highest Person* (*Parama Purusha*"):

Brahmavidya is the Dahara Vidya or upasana taught in Chandogya, Taitriya, Brihad aranyaka, and in this upanishad. In this, the Gnana Yogi contemplates the supreme Being as dwelling in the Parama Akasa in the cave of his heart.

A. Sraddha and Bhakti. Sraddha matures into Bhakti. This is Love of God a: 'the causeless, the incomparable, Gnanakriyasorupi, the Highest and the Supremest and the Holiest, the One, hidden in all beings, all-pervading, the Soul of souls' the spectator and supporter, the Nirguna Being, the Immaculate the Eternal, the Supreme Intelligence, Self-luminous, the Creator and Preserver, and Dispenser of Happiness and the Refuge of all.

Dhyanayoga. There is just a little shade of difference between the two words; Dhyana when it matures is called Yoga. The contemplation is Dhyana or Yoga, the Being contemplated is Dhyeyam. The person contemplating is called Dhyata.

The Dhyeyam is Sivam. "Siva eko Dhyeya. Sarvam anyat Parithyajya," says the Atharvasikha. As such He is called the Yogi of Yogis and the Swetaswatara calls Him the '*Maharishi*': As in Yoga, the Bavana is that of a friend, or equal 'soham' Siva is usually symbolized as a Yogi, with braided hair, &c. and the Rig-Veda calls him 'Kapardin.' The Dhyana Yoga mentioned here is the Atyasrama Yoga. The two lower kinds of yoga are Sankhya Yoga or Nirguna Yoga and Bhoudika Yoga or Saguna Yoga.

"Says Kurma Purana (2 chap 3 page).

Yogicha trividho gneyo Baudikas Sankhya evacha.

Tritiyotyasrami Prokto yoga muttamam asratah.

Prathama Bavana pûrve Sankhyethvakshara Bavana.

Tritiya Chantimaprokta Bavana Parameswari."

"The yogis are of 3 kinds, Baudika yogi, Sankhya yogi and the most excellent Atyasrama yogi. The first Bavana is in Sagnna; the second Bavana dwells on the Akshara (Nirguna) and the 3rd Bavana dwells on the Paramesvara (The supreme God)."

Says Kurma Purana (Purva chap 1)

"Tell me O, Brahma (Vishnu or Kurma) about the 3 kinds of Bhavana which are worth speaking about"? "One kind relates to myself (Saguna Bhavana). The second relates Avyaktam (Nirguna Bavana). The third relates to Brahman, which is beyond the Gunas (Brahmi Bhavana or Atyasrama yoga). Let the wise man practise one of these kinds of Bavana, the weak minded can follow the first named Saguna Bavana." This Suguna Bavana chiefly relates to the worship of the Trinity, Brahma Vishnu and Rudra for the same Purana says in its last chapter.

"Atrapi Asaktota Haram Vishnum Brahmanam Archiyeth."

Nirguna Bavana is defined in the following verse of the Same Purana (Purva. 1 chap.)

"Beyond the Tamas (mulaprakriti) the Jyoti, the Akshara Satchida-nanda, the Avyakta, Higher than Param, Paratatva is the Brahman. Greatness is its essence. The world is produced from It as effect. While it is the cause of all, the Pure, and Avyakta (unmanifest). This In-Dweller in everybeing, this Paramesvara is myself; creation and preservation, and resolution all proceed from me. So learning the truth, let him practice Karma Yoga." This Karma Yoga or Sankhya Yoga, it will be observed is precisely the Bavana of Mayavadis; and the author of Siddantalesa Sanghraha establishes its identity, *vide* Gita. V 2. where this Karma yoga is exalted

above mere Sannyasa and the third verse explains the practical identity of Sankhya Yoga and Karma Yoga.

The third kind is higher than these, and the Purana says. (Kurma. Purva. 1 chap.)

"Leaving the love of children and other desires, relinquishing all karma, and becoming full of great vairagya seeing God (Paramata) in his own soul (Atma) and all the worlds, in the Self of himself, the Yogi attains to the Highest Bhavana called Brahmi Bhavana, which is attained after and through Akshara Bhavana (Avyakta or Nirguna) and sees the One." This is the Highest Yoga spoken of in verses 6 and 7 of 5 chapter of Gita as Parama Sannyasa Yoga as distinguished from the Yoga spoken of in verses 2 to cf. Sannyasa Yoga ...ntra 7 below. This of course is what this very sruti speaks of in mantra under comment.

Kailasa samhita (10-126) defines Atma (Paramatma).

Chaitanyami Viswasya sarvanja Kriyatamakam.

Swantantriyam tat swabhavayaha saatma parikirtitah.

"Chaitanyam is what knows all and produces all. That is called Atma in whom this Chaitanyam is *inherent*."

This Chaitanya and Atma are respectively called Pragjna and Brahma in the Maha Vakya.

"Pragjnanam Brahma" (Aitar 5. 3.)

This Paramatma or Brahman is further defined by the same samhita (10. 134) as

"Siva sakti samayogah Paramatmeti nischitam"

"Siva and Sakti in union is Paramatma without doubt."

This chaitanyam or sakti is the Para Sakti or Devatma Sakti (Swetas. 1-3) or Uma (Kena. 3-12.) which is in eternal samavaya or thadatmya Sambantha with the supreme God like fire and heat. (vide texts quoted by Srikhanta page 29 and 30 of this vol.) and should not be confounded with Maya sakti or adhyasa sakti or Anirvachanya Maya.

This Atyasrami Yogi is the Atyasrami, spoken of in mantra 7 below and in swetas Vol 21 and for further comment see under separate note.

Parame vyoman nihitam Guhayam Dwelling in the cave of the supreme Akasa.

This text and the words below 'Hridpundarikam' refers to the Highest Vidya called Dahara Vidya practised by the Atyasrama Yogi.

The words used in this connection frequently are *Dahara, Guha, Pundarika, Brahmapura, Hrid, Akasa, Vyoma, Antas.*

The word *Dahara* simply means sukshuma or subtle or the Highest. This word occurs in Chandogya 8-1-1 and in Mahanarayana 10-7 and is used in conjunction with other words as 'Dahara Pundarika' or Dahara Akasa Daharam pahanam, Dahara Vidya. *Brahmapura* is the human body and applies to the physical plane of our existence.

Guha (cave), *hrid* (heart) and *Pundarika* (lotus) all denote the inner mental plane or planes ascending up to Sivatatwa or Nadatatwa. Mayavadis, according to whom there are only 24 tatwas the highest of which is Buddhi, accordingly identify this heart or lotus with Buddhi. But look at the beautiful way this lotus of the heart is described by St Meikandan (9-3. C). If the real nature of the heart of the Lotus be examined, its stalk will be the 24 tatwas from earth to Buddhi its 8 petals willbe *Vidyatatwas* and *Suddha vidya*, its stamens the 64 kalas of Iswara and Sadasiva the pistil is the Sakti tatwa and the seads are the 51 forms of Nadam, and the Arul Sakti of the Lord Siva rests on it. Therefore contemplate on the Sri Punchakshara.

Akasa and *Vyoma* are synonymous and in the following passages we quote they do not mean Bhuta *Akasa* or material ether. In these passages also, God is called Akasa, as also the person within the Akasa. The question arises what is the meaning of this Akasa and whether it is different from God himself. The commentators do not throw much light upon this and some mayavadis try to interpret it as Avyakritam or mayasakti or Avidya, which will make nonsense of all these passages. The Puranas themselves explain what its real meaning is which we also quote below. Akasa as interpreted by the Purana means Chit, or Gnana, Light or Arul which is Parasakti, Sakti of Parameshwara. The words *Chitakasa*, and *Chitambara* so familiar to every one will remove all doubts, if there should be any, as to the truth of the Puranic interpretation. It is the height of folly to identify this chit sakti with maya Sakti. If therefore this Chit sakti (Devatma* Umasakti.) stands for Akasa, then the passages which speak of God as Akasa and as dwelling in Akasa will not conflict with each other. There can be no difference between the sun and its light or radiance. fire and heat much less between Sivam and Sakti.

The Sruti itself declares why God is called Akasa, because of its characteristic mark that it is all pervading and larger than all and everything rests in it. And God is all pervading or omnipresent because He is Chit or Intelligence, and this Chit is of course Sakti or Parasakti of the supreme (Vide Sivagnanabotham 2-4, and pp 14, 30, to 32).

It will also be observed that in some passages, the Akasa is alone said to dwell in the heart or Guha. When this

* See Prof. Max Muller's Note p. 232. Vol. II (Upanishads). He evidently confuses Devatma Sakti with Maya and Pradhana Akshara or Avyakta (all synonymous). The difficulty which the learned Doctor feels in giving a consistent explanation of several passages will all be removed if our explanation is borne in mind.

Akasa and Guha are identified respectively with God and chittam there is apparently no place for man, or Jiva or Soul, and the Mayavadis, accordingly mistakenly conclude that the soul (Atma) and God (Paramatma) are identical. To remove this doubt, in fact, other Srutis declare that "These are the two entered into the cave (guha), dwelling on the Highest summit (Paramakasa or Parasakti)" Tait 3-1), "Two birds cling to the same tree, Isa and anisa" (Mandak 3-1 & Swetas IV 6.). As of these two one is dwelling within the other, and God is the innermost as it were, the epithet *Antas* is applied in the srutis to God; and the passages like the one in Brihad III. 7., 22 where God is spoken of as the Atma within the Atma and the one in Kata (II 12 and 13) where the wise is spoken of as perceiving God within their atma, are accordingly intelligible also.

The passages we collate in this connection are as follows.

1. There is this *Brahmapura* and in it the palace, Dahara Pundarika' and in it that Dahara Antar Akasa; now what exists within that Dahara Akasa, that is to be sought for, that is to be understood (Chandog 8-1-1.)

2. "He who is called *Akasa* is the revealer of all forms and names" (Chandog. 8-14-1.)

3. Manifest, near, moving in the cave (Guha) is the Great Being (MahatPadam) (ஆதியபாதம்) In it everything is centred which ye know as moving breathing, and blinking, as Sat and Asat, as Adorable, as the Best, that is beyond the understanding of creatures" (Munda. 2-2-1.)

* *cf* "அரைமாத்திரையில் அடக்கும்அடி
அக்கமலத்திற் பாரில்லாவடி."
இல்லையம்பலத்தில்
"ஆதியபாதம் என்றெஞ்சுளிருக்கவே."
St. Appar's. Devaram.

4. "In the Highest Golden sheath (Hiranmaya Parakosha,) there is the Brahman, without passion (Nishkalam) and without parts. That is pure, that is the Light of lights (Munda 2-2-9). See also (3-1-7.)

"There is the Akasa within the heart, and in it there is the Person (Purusha) consisting of Gnana. Immortal, Golden. (Hiranmayaha) (Taitr ar. 1-6-1).

6. He who knows Brahman, which is Satyam, Gnanam, Anantam, as hidden in the cave (guha) in the Parama Vyoman, he enjoys all bhoga, at one with the Omniscient Brahman." (ibid 2-1-1.) see also. 2 6-1.

7. Who could breathe, who could breathe forth if that Akasa was not Bliss (Ananda). For he alone causes Bliss (Anandam) (Ibid 2-7-1).

8. He is who within the heart, surrounded by the Pranas, the Person of Light, consisting of knowledge (Brihad, IV. 3-3).

"நீயெநிறைவை மறைநான்குடன்
ஓலையொருவர்க்கு மறிவொணா
சோதியைசுடர்ச்சேம் பொன்னம்பலத்தாடியை
அடியேன்மறக்கலுய்வனே."

9. And he is that great unborn Atma, who consists of knowledge (Vignana) is surrounded by the Pranas, the Akasa within the Hridya. In it there reposes the Ruler (Vasi) of all, the Lord (Isana) of all, the King of all. Brihad. 4-4-22.

10. "The shrine (Paramalaya) which consists of the Akasa in the heart, the blissful, the highest retreat, that is our own, that is our Goal, and that is the heat and brightness of the fire and the sun." (Mait. 6-27.)

11. "The person not larger than a thumb *as* the Antar Atma is settled always in the *heart* of men (Purusha) (Katha 6-17).

"Beyond the senses there are the objects, beyond the objects there is the *manas*, beyond the *manas*, there is the *Bhuddhi*, beyond the *Buddhi* is the *Mahat*, (chittam).

"Beyond the *Mahat*, there is the Avyaktam, beyond the the Avyaktam is the Purusha. Beyond the Purusha there is nothing-this is the goal, the highest road.

"That Atma (God) is hidden in all beings, and does not shine forth but it is seen by subtle seers through their sharp and subtle intellect." (Katha. 3, 10 to 12).

"Beyond the Avyakta is the Purusha (God), the Vibhu (All pervading) and entirely imperceptible. Every creature that knows Him is liberated and obtains immortality." Ibid. 16-8).

12. Maheswari Saktiranadi Siddha Vyomabhidanadi Virajativa"

The Eternal fullness, Maheswara Sakti (Parasakti) shines forth by the name of Vyoma (Akasa).—Kurma-Puran

"Yasya Sa Paramadevi Saktir Akasa Sanjnita"

"Whose supreme spouse, Sakti, is called Akasa (ibid.)

13. Why is It called *Sarva Vyapi* (all pervading)? It is called so because like ghee diffusing and soaking itself through and through the *Pinda* (milk or oilseed). It pervades every created thing through and through as warp and woof (Atharva Siras. 6.)

Brahmaloka—is the Highest Brahman's place. Here the text (Tait 2. 1. 1) already quoted, and the texts herein below quoted have to be considered.

1. He who behaves thus all his life reaches the *world of Brahman*, and does not return, yea he does not return. (Chandog 8. 15. 1.)

In what then are the worlds of Prajapati woven.

'In the *worlds of Brahman*, O Gargi' he replied.

"In what then are the *worlds of Brahman* woven like warp and woof."

'Yagnavalkeya said :- 'O Gargi, do not ask too much, lest thy head should fall off. Thou askest too much of a Deity, about which we are not to ask too much, do not ask too much, O Gargi.' After that Gargi Vachaknavi held her peace." (Bribad 3. 6. 1.)

3. "One hundred times that bliss of Prajapati is one measure of the Bliss of Brahman; and likewise of a great sage who is free from desires. (Tait 2. 8. 4.)

4. "He who knows that (Brahmi) Upanishad (Yoga), and has shaken off all evil, stands in the endless inconquerable world of Heaven (svarkaloga) Yea in the world of Heaven (swarkaloha). (Kena. 4-9.)

Now that serene being, which after having risen from out this earthly body, and having reached the Highest Light (Paranjyoti, Parasakti) appears in God's true Form." (Chan. 8. 3. 4.)

6. "But he who has understanding for his charioteer, and who holds the reins of the mind, he reaches the end of the (6) *Adhwas* and that is the *Padam* beyond that of Vishnu." (Katha. 3. 9.)

"Gneyam Vishnupada dûrtvam Divyam Sivapadam Jagat."

"அதற்குமே லுமையாள் புர மறபுதம்
அதற்குமேற சிவலோகமென் றுய்கவே
அதற்குறும் வளம் வாக்கினடங்கா
அதற்குப்புக்கவர் மீள்பவரல்லரே."

"Beyond the known Vishnupadam, let the world perceive the Bright *Siva Pada*" (Sivadharmottara).

8. பொன்னர்மாடமீடுஞ் செலவப்புறவம்பதியாக,
மின்னுரிடையா லுமையாளோடு மிருந்தவிமலனைத்
தன்னுர்வஞ் செய்தமிழின் விகலுரைத்த தமிழ்மாலை
பன்னுள் பாடியாடப பிரியார்பர லோகந்தானே.

9. "தண்மதியதிருடிய சங்கரனுர்போலத்
தமமடியார்க்கும் இனபமளிப்பவர்."

10. "வானுலகொன்வோகாம மாயப்படையாரமே."
"அணடாகாடாளவோகமல்லற்படையாரமே."

11. "மலர்மிசையேகினுன் மாணடிசேர்ந்தார்
நிலமிசை நீடுவாழ்வார்."

12. "Paratparataro Brahma. Tatparatparoto, Haris Tatparat paratror Isa.

"What is beyond everything is Brahma, what is beyond Him is Hari. What is beyond Him is Isa" (Sarbopanishad and Siva Sati kalpa Upanishad.)

From the foregoing passages it will be clear that the words Brahmaloka' and 'Swarakaloka' used in the Aryan and Tamil Vedas mean not the lower worlds (to be obtained by Saguna and Nirguna Bavana, but the Highest state to be obtained by the Atiyasrami Mukta by Brahmi Bavana) or Yoga. It is of course by a figure that it is called Brahmaloka or Swarakaloka or Sivaloka or Kailasa, and should not be confounded by the mere resemblance of names into the lower ones from which of course there is return. It is this Brahma Loka or Siva loka, attaining which, there is no return, there is no return, says the sutrakara. For further coomeent see Srikanta Bhashya on the very last Sutra.

Sannyasa Yoga as against Sankarananda's interpretation see the truer definition contained in Gita 9-27 and 28.

27. Whatever thou doest, whatever thou eatest whatever thou offerest, whatever thou givest, in whatever austerity thou engagest, do it as an offering (Arpana அர்ப்பணம்) to me.

28. Thus shalt thou be liberated from the Karma Bhanda of good and evil results; equipped in mind with *Sannyasa-Yoga* and liberated, thou shalt come to me.

Chap 18-2 also defines sannyasa and tyaga.

"Sages understand by sannyasa, the renouncement of Kamya works; the learned declare the abandanment of the fruits of all works to be tyaga."

The word *Arpanam* is a very important and technical word and in the combination, as 'Sivarpanam' 'சிவர்ப்பணம்' is more pregnant of meaning. All acts have to be dedicated to God and in this surely is possible his liberation. This the highest condition the seer has to rise to, it is, that is enunciated in 10 Sutra of Sivagnanabotha.

அவனோனே பாதியவர்தெரி
சகலாதிறைபணிநீற்ற
மலமாயதன்னெதி வல்வினையின்றே."

"**Sugasanastha** The *Sugasana* is one of 64 postures or seats assumed by the Yogi, and it is defined in *Tatvaprakasa*. That *Asana* is an essential of the Yogi, is insited on in Vedanta sutras. IV 1-7, and Sri Nilakanta quotes in his Bhashya this very passage from Kaivalya Up. in illustration—Sankara quotes no sruti on which this Sutra is based—which would certainly make the date of *Kaivalya* far older than the Vedanta Sutras.

Controlling the senses.—The yogi must first accomplish this control before all things. The senses are usually compared to wild and tamed horses. Vide Katha III 3 and 4 and Siva Gita, 12. 21.

Gurubhakti.—The following passage in Vayu samhita (uttara. 13. 26 to 30) sets forth fully the importance and efficacy of Guru Bakti. As one by the society of the wicked becomes a sinner, so one becomes purified by the society of his guru. As gold is freed of its dirt by fire, so does the guru cleanse him of his sin. As the ghee-pot near the fire melts away so does one's sin melt away at the approach of his guru. As fire burns away wood, so does the Joyous guru burn away in a momen' one's sins.

[illegible] us as your guru by word, deed or thought. By this anger are long life, and wealth and power and gnana all destroyed."

For fuller elucidation of the subject, see Sivagnana-bodha 8 sutra and notes pp. 82. 88.

He is Siva. This Siva is not to be confounded with Siva spoken of as the highest in the presiding mantras. He is the Vibhuti of the supreme Siva, as Brahma, Vishnu, Indra and others are. See the discussion on these passages in Sri Kanta Bhashya p. 50 Vol II. S. Deepika.

He sees God in all beings and all beings in God.

This occurs very frequently in the upanishads and has to be carefully understood. This is a part of the Dahara upasana or Savana. The souls and the worlds constituting the Chetana and Achetana Prapancha constitute as it were God's body; God is the very life of this universe: in which figure of course, God is described as seated in the inmost recess of the heart and soul not bigger than a thumb, the "Dahara Akasa"; but the yogi is at the same time to remember that that his smallness is no smallness; He is inside and outside of us. He is inside and outside of this world of ours. His greatness passes beyond the solar and stellar systems, and millions of worlds like these. As it is we have frequently taken objection to people, (men and women) who in the present day affect Yoga Sadana speaking always of God, of the Atman, as dwelling *within* them, as though their own personality is the utmost limit of God's nature and as though God is not outside them and these worlds the following text have to be considered in this connection. Chandog. 3. 14. 3 and 8. 1. 3. Brihad. 3. 7. 22 and 3. 7. 3.

Vayu Samhita: II. 6ch. 12. 13. "This Great world of Sat and Asat form the body of Parameshti (God). As Siva is the Lord of the Sat and Asat He is called *Satasat Pathi* Sivagnana Siddhi. 8 Sutra [illegible] &c.

ATYAS'RAMAM.

This is a technical word and should not be literally interpreted to mean anything. The word only occurs in one other Upanishad but more frequently in the Puranas and Samhitas where its meaning is set forth. The following are the illustrative passages. It will be observed that the same Asrama or Vrata is denoted by different names by people of different Sakhas.

1. Swetaswataropanishad 6 21

   Tapah Probhava'dde'va prasadachcha Brahmaha swe'tas'wataroshtha Videsa

   Atyasramibhyah param pavitram provocha samyak Rishi Sangha jushtam.

"Though the power of his penance and through the Grace of God has the wise Swetaswatara truly proclaimed Brahman, the Highest and Holiest to the *Atyasramis* as approved by the company of Rishis

2. Suta-samita—Uddhu'lanam tripundrancha gun'anangatwena sa'dhanam

   Amananti muni sreshta'h swe'ta'swataraka sakhinah

   Ayam *Atya'srama* dharmo yaih sama'charito mada'

   Tesha'm eva sivajjnanam sivasa'ras chheda kara'nam

   Uddhulam tripundaramcha papapasa nivrittaye' amananti munisre'shta' atharva sirasi sthita'h.

"Besmearing the holy ashes is regarded as an emblem and gnana *Sadana* by the chief Munis of the Swetaswatara Sakha: This *Atyasrama* Dharma, lovingly followed will induce *Sivagnana* and destroy *samsara*. This besmearing the holy ashes will free the Pasu (soul) of his Pasa (darkness). So also do they regard, the chief munis ofthe Atharva Siras sakha."

3. (Synonyms of tyasramam)—Suta-samhita—Sarvan'goddhulanam Yattat Vratam Proktam maneeshibhih.

   Etat Veda Siro Nishta'h Prahuh Pasupatam mune

   Ke'chit Sirovratam Prahuh Ke'chit *Atya'srama*m viduh.

   Ke'chit that vratam ityu'chuh Ke'chit Sa'mbhavam aiswaram.

   Asya vratasya mahat myam agamanteshu samsthitam.

The *Vratam* of besmearing the whole body with holy ashes, praised by people is called by *Pasupatam*, sages following the *Atharvasiras* some sages (belonging to Mundakopanishad sakha) call it sirovratam: some sages (belonging to Swetaswatasa sakha and Kaivalya sakha) call it Atyasrama: some call it *Vratam*: some call it *Sambavam* (belonging to *Sakha* of *Kalagini rudropanishad*); some (belonging to Taithriya sakha) call it *Aiswaram* (*Bhuti*) The greatness, of this brata is well set forth in the agamas

4. Sutasamhita—

   Atyasramibhyeh San'te'bhy Vaktavyam *Brahma vedanam*

   I na' prasante'ya dataryamm'a putraya Cachchana.

"The man who is an *Atyasrami* and has attained peace can alone be taught Brahma Vidya. The man who has not attained peace—sml is no son cannot be thaught athis."

   Bramo'ttara khandam—Ayam asya'sramo dharmo yaih samacharitas tathal

   Tesham eva puram jnanam samsaraschetta karanam.

(This is almost the same text as the one from Suta Samhita, Param and Sivam being identical).

6. V'ayusamhita—Vratam pasupatam sroutam atharva sirasi srutam
Vratam e'tat parkurveeta sa tu vai naish tikah smrtah
So'stya'sramī cho vijjne'yo' maha'pasu patas tatha

"This vadika Pasupata Vratam is spoken of in Atharva Siras; the man who follows this vrata (as detailed in Vayu Samhita Purva. 29 chapter) attains to nishta (yoga) He is called *Atyasrami* and *Mahapasupatee*."

7. Kurma-purana—Tadatad aiswaram jananam swa-sasakha-vihita vratam
Ase'sham ve'dasaram tat pasupasa vimochanam
Atya'sramam iti khyya'tam Brahmadi bhiranushti tham.

He (sage swetaswara) initiated him into the mystery of the Aiswaram gnana vratam of his own sakha. This vratam is wholly the essence of the Veda; This will free the Pasu (soul) from all bonds (pasa). This is called Atyasramam; Brahma and other Gods followed this Vrata.

8. Linga-Pura'nam—E'vam Pasupatam yogam yogasi-waryamanuttamam.
Aty'asramam idamjne'yam muktaye' Ke'nalabhyate.

"This Pasupata yoga is the most excellent and transcendant yoga; This *Atyasrama*, is considered so by persons desirous of Mukti.

9. Mundaka 3-2-10. Tat etat richasbhyuktam Kriya'-vantah srotriya' Brahmanishta'h swayam juhnte' e'karshim sraddhantas teshamevaita'm Brahma-vidya'm Vede'ta Siro'vratam vidhivat yaista cheernam.

"And this is declared by the following Rik verse "Let a man tell this Brahma Vidya to those only who have performed all acts, who are versed in the Vedas and firmly established in Brahman, who themselves offer an oblation to the one, Rishi, full of faith, and by whom Sirovratam has been performed, according to the rule (of Atharvanas)."

10. *Sourasamhita*: sarvasa'kha'aritam tatwam tijjna'tum priyatetuyah.
Ac'haret vise'shena nityam preetya'sirovratam.
Sirovrata viheenastu sarvadharma samanvitah.
Api Brahma'tma-vidya'yam na'dhika'rina samsa yah.
Sirovratamidam Sarvam Pa'pakanta'ra da'hakam.
Agniritya'tibhirmantriah Shabdhih Suddhenabhasmana'.
Sarvangoddhulanam kurya't Siro-vrata samanwayam.

One desirious of attaining the tatwagnana must chiefly and ever practice lovingly Sirovratam. One not following the sirovrata though possessed of all other virtues, is surely not qualified to enter on Brahmatma Vidya. This sirooratam consume the forest of all kinds of sin. One must purify oneself by besmearing the body with holy ashes, by uttering the 6 mantras begining with Agni (as found in Atarvasiras) connected with the siaovratam.

11. Kalika.khanda.—Sirovratam to ismivaihyvda cheerambhakti-tatparaish.
Tesham eva Brahma Vidhyam vadet na'nyeshu sattam

The superior Bhaktas who follow the Sirovratam accoring to law are alone entitled to be taught Brahma Vidya and none else.

13. Atharava-siras—Tasmat Vratam etat pas'upatam Pasupasa vimoksha'ya &c.

Therefore this Pasupata vratam will free from all bonds (Pasa).

14. Kalikakhandam—Vratam etat pa'supatam pasupasa vimoksha kriti.

15. Sivarahasyam—Vratam pa'supatam kritwa, mama jna'nam ava'pnuya't.

16. Shiva geeta of Pa'dma purana—Munayas tat pravakshya'mi Vratam pasupatam Chidham.
Kritwatu viraje deeksha'm bhu'tirudraksha dhari'nah Bhavatam drisyatam e'tya Kaivalyam vah prada'syati.

"O munis! I will now decare to you the vratam called Pasupatam. By undergoing viraja Diksha and wearing the Bhuti (ashes) and Rudraksha beads, you will know God and attain Kaivalyam (the Highest Bliss)."

17. Kalika K'handa—Vaidiki' viraja deeksha khya'te-yam papanasinee.
Mantrasamskara deeksheti kathiteyam latha'game.

The vaidika viraja Deeksha, capable of removing all sins, is called in the agamas Mantra Samskara Diksha.

18. Taittiriya-Upanishad 1. 11. 1. Bhutyai na pramadi tavyam.

"Don't neglectBhuti (literally ashes)or pasupata vratam."

19. Bodha'yana—vidhim vya'khya'mah Bhu'tyai' na pa'rmaditavyamiti hi ani'mayate'.

I will explain the law. "Dont neglect Bhuti or Pasupatavrata."

20. Ka'la'gnirudra-Upanishad-Vratame'tatsa'm havam Sarve'shu Vedeshu Vedava'dibhiruktam bhavati tasm'at sāmachare'n mumukshur na punar bhavaya.

"This Sambava vrata is spoken of in every Veda by every vedavadi therefore let the Mumumkshu follow the vrata so that he may not be born again."

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika

MADRAS, FEBRUARY 1899.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Soul versus Body.

We have before us the opinions of two Madras Indian Journalists. One says "To be plain, no soul is perishing in India, from want of spiritual consolation. But bread is wanting; therefore support Mr. Tata's scheme in perference to Mrs. Besant's Benares College." The other in reviewing '*Studies and Translations,*' says that it is not a great thing to show that great religious truths exist in Tamil, but that Tamil should be made a medium for conveying Loukika truths. We wish we could lay the flattering unction to our heart that no souls perish! and we wish that people knew so little of bread wining ways. The real truth is man's whole time from start to the finish is occupied in bread-winning pursuit, and we are all *Loukikas* and fully alive to the importance of Loukika truths. No man can afford to neglect his body. But can it be good to an individual, to a community, to a nation to have only one ideal before them, the filling of their belly? Have we not instances before us, of how this actual quest for power and pelf tends to really deprave and degrade humanity and to introduce more evil and suffering and cruelty?

***

The churning of the ocean.

And then are you sure, when you put your belly before your soul in this ardent quest, you may not reap more evils, physical and moral, than any thing beneficial? Does it really matter much that your puny body should perish than that your vices should pollute your soul for many and many a life to come, your example contaminate a whole nation? Why, we have an ancient example. What did the Gods and Asuras churn the ocean for? Not for saving their souls surely but for gold and silver, rubies and diamonds, for horse and cattle, for wine and women and for long life to enjoy them to their heart's content. What gigantic efforts did they not make to achieve their object? What havoc did they not commit, and what suffering did they not inflict? Whole nature abhorred and shuddered! And the poison came forth! Did they expect to reap this? Did they contemplate that, when they sought life and pleasure, they could come to forfeit both? And what did they do? Then they began to think of God but they had never invoked his aid at first! They then thought they could secure all the wealth and long life by their own efforts. But now? God saved them from the fearful poison. And then they clean forgot Him; and deceit and chicanery was brought into play when the distribution of the gathered wealth began! One half of the workers (instance the cry of workmen against their employers) were cheated by the other half; and with the other half also, might determined right; and the more powerful the Gods, the greater was their share of this world's goods.

This is our plain reading of a plain tale, whatever other esoteric meanings there may be; and it sharply distinguishes Humanity, with its likes and dislikes, reaping sin and sorrow and death, and Divinity which has neither likes, nor dislikes ('வெஃப்சு வெண்டாமை யிலான்' Kural) and consequently no suffering and sorrow, and is eternally Blissful, A Yogi and yet a Bhogi, the oldest of the old ('முன்னேப்பழம்பொருடே முன்னேப்பழம்பொருளே'), yet with His Love (Uma) ever fresh "mother of millions of world-clusters, yet Virgin by the Vedas called."

***

Self vs. Selflessnes.

By the way, do you know why our great sages, Agastya, Vashishta and others are always represented as 'odious old husbands' (to use the language of the *Reformer*) with young wives? We have, however, in the sacred cause of Reform, no mention in any of these Puranas or Itihasas of these old sages remarrying these young virgins after 55 or 60. They all boast of only one wife for all their life-time. and the personality of the wife is as distinct in history as that of her old consort. And yet how are we to account for the old age of the husbands, and the eternal youth of the wives? And how is it also that these old sages are not represented as Brahmacharis or Sanyasis? The meaning may not be plain if understood from the purely physicial standpoint. But even in the English language, an old head is associated with wisdom, and we could understand the perfect sage, who has subordinated

all his lower animal instincts and physical environments to the power of his intellect and broad beneficence. to possess His Sakti (Love and Intelligence) ever fresh and ever unimpaired. And what could we compare to the spirit of the old sage that could try out of the over flowing of Love in his heart,to ever make its business to seek the happiness of all mankind, (எல்லாருமின்புற்றிருக்க நினைப்பதன்றே, யல்லாமல் வேறொன்றறிவேன் பராபரமே), that great spirit that could invite the whole world to come together before ever their bodies perish, to eat and drink of the great flood of joy of limitless Siva Bhoga, which is ever rising and filling and flowing over (அகண்டாகார சிவ போகமெனும்.....சேவாரும்சகத்தீரே), and that great spirit, that could say, "Let the whole world partake of the Bliss obtained by me" (யான்பெற்ற இன்பம் இவ்வையகமெல்லாம்பெருக).

***

The four Purusharta.

We have observed once before that the Hindu Sociology is built on the four great Purusharta. But in seeking wealth or pleasure, our conduct is not to be divorced from all laws of ethics and good religion. And no body has ever summed up the whole duty of man in more beautiful words than our good old mother *Avvei* has done.

சதவறம் தீவினைவிட் டீட்டல்பொரு ளெஞ்ஞான்றும்
காதலிருவர் கருத்தறனவத்—தாதரவு
பட்டதே யின்பம் பரனினைந்தும் மூன்றும்
விட்டதே வீன்ப வீதி.

***

The Purusha sukta the sandhiyavandana.

We have to congratulate Mr. Kameshwara Iyer M.A., of the Pudukota College on the excellent manuals he has brought out on the Purusha Sukta and the Gayatri Mantra. Here we have an instance of what an Indian scholar can do to interpret his own books according to the traditional mode of interpretation untrammelled by the prejudices and fancies of western scholars. We have no doubt when Mr. Iyer follows Vidyaranya in preference to Colebrook and Muir, he is mainly in the right. 'Purah' as in 'Tripurah' means traditionally 'body' '*Annena*' in the second Rik applies more to the eater, the soul, 'Anisa' than to the 'Isanah' the lord. And his reply to Mr. Dutt's view that there is no reference to the caste system in the Rigveda is really able and cogent. We however fail to see the *rationale* of the distinction which he wishes to draw in his first comment on the 13th Rik as between the first 3 castes and the fourth, even when the great Vidyaranya failed to note any such distinction; and when, as he points out in his 2nd comment, the whole thing is figurative, the whole paragraph is mischivous and ought not to be allowed to stand in a subsequent edition.

***

Parinama V Vivasta.

There is however one more serious error, which Mr. Aiyar falls into when he seeks, to interpret the Sukta according to the lead of Sankaracharya. Of course he is free to think that we are in error in saying so; but when as he is himself forced to admit, (*vide* pp. 18 and 22) that several riks in this sukta, nay portions of the same rik, clearly set forth in unmistakable language the *Parinama Veda theory*, it is not too much to ask him to consider whether the author of the sukta is himself guilty of inconsistency or he is wrong in attributing to the author anysuch inconsistency. But we forget that he and those of his ilk do not set very great store by logical precision and consistency, as examples of which we may quote the following sentences from his comments.

1. The Supreme Being is Spiritual and Imperishable

   This Supreme Being is this Universe; a fourth of His Essence (p. 12.)

   This Universe is Material and perishable.

   This Supreme Being exists simultaneously in both forms (as Perishable and Imperishable.) (p 13.)

2. This Universe consists of two distinct elements matter and spirit (Jiva).

   Matter is evolved Maya.

   Maya is but a Power of the Supreme Being.

   Jiva is only The Supreme Being conditioned by Maya.

   Thus both matter and spirit are really of Brahman.

3. The Supreme Being is Infinite, Unconditioned, Self-luminous and beyond Maya or Ignorance,

   Maya is but a power of this Supreme Being Maya is that by which Brahman is conditioned limited, and deluded, enveloped in a material case, bound in the trammels of samsara, undergoes suffering and sin &c.

   Read the Veda and follow the Acharya to get free from Maya.

4. The Supreme Being is not Mayobhadika. He is real.

Even I'svara is Mayobhadika, is not real
Much less is Jiva real.
All because Maya is illusory and unreal.
And this Maya (illusion) is a power of The Supreme Being.

5. The only one without a second willed 'I will multiply and be born.'
The individual souls that are tossed about in the sea of Samsara are not entities distinct from Him viz., they are even He.
The Jiva is but the reflection of the Supreme Deity and not the Deity Himself.
Jiva is contaminated by impurity and suffers.
But the Deity is not contaminated and does not suffer.

Verily the logic involved in these sentences is difficult to grasp, and can only be reserved for the last stage of—. But one may well exclaim even with Prof. Huxley :—"Les extremes se touchent; the shibboleth of materialists that thought is a secretion of the brain, is the Fichtean doctrine that the phenomenal universe is the creation of the ego, expressed in other language."

And so indeed do the Indian Materialists and Idealists claim kinship with one another. Mr. Chatterji says that the Brahmin and the Buddhist have a common meeting place. Mr. H. Dharmapala raises the question in the October number of the Journal of the Mahabodhi Society, and answers it in the affirmative to the satisfaction of every body, and cites for his authority, the very God Siva Himself, who gave out that the teachings of Sankara are Buddhistic. But the Buddhists also possess legends to show that Buddhism was the most esoteric of truths which God Siva taught to His spouse Uma on the seashore and which He himself learnt from Adi Buddha (see legend cited by Prof. Wilson in his first Vol. of Collected Works). And what sectarians do not similarly use the name of Siva to recommend each their own separate dogmas? We read in the pages of the "Light of the East" that God *Siva* told Sankaracharya, the greatest exponent of the Mayabhada doctrine, to go and conquer the *Shaiva* Nilakanta in the South. Tulsi Das in all seriousness tells us that this was the very sacred history narrated by God Siva to His Uma, as the only one calculated to secure salvation. Another Vaishnava writer gives out that the tale of Krishna was narrated originally by God Siva. And funnier than all, the writer of the Brihat Katha Sarit Sagara also seeks the same authorship to his pure fiction; and we know a pandit of Tanjore, who writing a *Puranam* of the silk weavers of Koratad, near Mayaveram, says that the author of the Puranam was God Siva Himself. May we ask here why if Saivism is a new sect, and the worship of Siva a late one, these professors of the only Universal truth invoke God Siva's sanction and grace?

And we make a present of this opinion of H Dharmapala and Mukopadhyaya put together, that Sankaracharya was a Buddhist, and a propounder of Mayavadha, an opinion supported by many another European and Indian scholar besides, to our critic, 'Aryan' who has been pleased to devote more than 80 pages of closely printed type in refutation of our article of a few pages, entitled "Another Side," in a number of Vol. I of our magagine.

***

The Black stone of Mecca.

The January number of the Asiatic Quarterly has an interesting account of the sacred stone of Mecca. In spite of their violent denunciations of idolatry, there is no object so sacred to the moslems as the Kaaba, and one of their fondest dreams in life is to be able to visit this shrine and to have the privilege of kissing and embracing the *stone* and circumambulating it, much in the same way as Hindus perform '*Alingana Darsan*' and '*Pradakshana*.' They say that this was a relic of worship of days long anterior to Mahomet, and though he tried his best, to uproot this worship he could not succeed. "*In form it is an irregular oval*—the inequality of its two longer sides imparting to it a somewhat semi-circular appearance. It measures about six inches in height and eight in breadth." The surface is not perfectly smooth, but these are protuberances or blotches, due to the image having been once broken and cemented together. The colour at present is of a deep reddish brown; and according to some, a metallic black. This image is surrounded on all sides by a border, 2 or 3 inches in breadth, which, rising at the outer edge a little above the surface of the *stone*, gradually slopes down in the direction of the middle of it. This border is encircled by a silver band or zone about a foot broad, but broader below than above and on the remaining two sides It has also a considerable swelling below as though there were a portion of the *stone* hidden under it. The lower part of this band

is studded with silver nails. From the outer edge of this arch also, there is a gradual sloping down towards the middle of the surface of the *stone*. The entire relic, as thus described, is carefully built into the wall on the outside of the wall of the Kaaba in the north-easterly angle; Burton however says that it is in the south-easterly angle (*Isaniya Mulai* ஈசான மூலை). The image is placed about 4 or 5 feet from the ground. The original colour is represented to have been of a dazzling brightness, whiter than milk, though in course of time it has assumed the present colour. The image is called *Hasa* (Isa or the Lord of Hosts, and Ka'ba means the House (*Cannal*). We have also heard that a perforated water pot is hung over it, the water trickling over it. From this description, our readers cannot fail to see the copy of it in almost every temple of Siva, the only difference being, Sivalinga instead of being fixed in the wall is fixed in the centre of the 'House.'

***

The Religion of the Future.

Our Christian friends will do well to ponder over the last para of the Bishop of Ripon's Presidential speech at the last Church Congress held at Bradford, England.

"The future of the world does not belong to sectarianism, and the dream of catholicity will be fulfilled. Of another thing, I am certain. As increasing light falls upon great problems, and men begin to realize how much of judaistic, pagan and scholastic thought is mingled with popular Christianity, how many accretions due to human weakness, and race prejudice have been incorporated in our conceptions, they will distrust the church. For every new epoch has added new dogma to faith, and with every new dogma, has gone further from the simplicity of Christ. The future of the world does not belong to Latinism, and so the vision of Protestantism will be fulfilled. But of a third thing I am convinced even more surely. The *Religion of the future will neither be Protestant nor Catholic but simply Christian.* The dogmas of the churches which have separated communion from communion, will fall off as autumn leaves before the fresh winds of God. Many views which in the very providence of God have played their part in clearing the thoughts of men will pass into forgetfulness. Men will not grieve to see the old things go, for a larger faith will be theirs; they will not think God's world will fall apart because we tear up parchments more or less. The church of God will renew its youth. It will be content with a simpler symbol, because it will have learned Christ. It will not need any longer Trent, Westminister, or Lambeth or the Vatican to lead it. It will be satisfied with a simpler thought and a purer faith. It will be satisfied to realize that there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all."

***

Oriental side and The University.

The *Madras Mail* announces that some of the Indian fellows of our University with the strong sympathy of the Hon'ble Dr. Duncan are exerting their best to make the movement a success. Even if the senate should throw out the proposals for an Oriental side, the department of Public Instruction will at no distant date formulate a scheme for the encouragement of Oriental Literature, by the institution of searching public tests in the chief Classical and Vernacular languages of this Presidency, with the object of securing the supply of competent persons for employment as teachers of Oriental languages in schools and colleges, and the production of works in the Vernacular languages specially adapted to bring within the reach of the masses of the population useful knowledge on scientific and industrial subjects. It is also announced that proposals for the formation of a *Sangam* are on foot, with the object of

(1) Encouraging by offer of suitable honoraria the production of books on any specified subject on which it may appear necessary or expedient that there should be text-books or standard works.

(2) Approval, after a careful examination by a select committee, of books published in Tamil and submitted for its opinion or patronage.

(3) Acquirement on payment of honoraria, when necessary, of copy right in books submitted for approval and their publication, and

(4) Reclaiming from oblivion old Classical and Vernacular works, and annotating and publishing the same.

With these may be compared our own suggestions contained in p. 45. Vol. 1. and made for the first time more than a year and a half ago. We are glad that after all something is to be done. We hear also that a meeting of Pundits and Scholars and others interested in the question will be held on 1st April.

PROF FAIRBAIRN
ON
THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

I

There is one remark in the learned Doctor's lectures which we appreciate and commend to the attention of our Hindu countrymen, and that is how little we really know of the Philosophy of Christianity. If this is so, it is not the fault of the Hindu, but of those Professors and Propagandists of Christian Religion in the East who pay so little regard to the subject, and waste more time in dwelling upon the purely dogmatic and personal and ceremonial aspects of Christianity, and by exciting the purely sectarian questions succeed more in alienating the feelings of Hindus, than in drawing them towards their fold. Years ago, we took the occasion of a Review of *Robert Elsmere* and *Shaik Sadi* to show how much of real and genuine philosophic lore was to be found in the expositions of Christian and Mahomedan teachers. It is with this view also we have opened our columns to our respected Missionary friend The Rev. G. Bartoli. We need to know not only what our religionists tell us of our own great truths but also what other great religionists conceive to be true, and how our truths strike them. And no little credit is due to those great minds of the West who have done so much for the elucidation of Eastern religions and philosophies, and who have done so much for the spread of truth and knowledge and science as conceived by them. No doubt they have been selfish in doing all this, namely, to convert the heathen, it may be said, but this is a conception of selfishness which is more commendable in spirit than otherwise. No man's conviction is worth anything, if he could not feel that that is a conviction worth possessing by all his fellow beings; and the satisfaction which one feels, when he can convert another to unison with himself in thought and conduct, is really genuine and highly commendable, especially when the evident object is to lead man to a higher and better life. And we think the Rev. Doctor is for once wrong when he would not credit the Hindu and His Religion with this feeling of reciprocity and desire to impart to others his own great truths. We once before took objection to a Rev. Gentleman's observation that the Hindu keeps his light under a bushel, and quoted to him the words of our Saint Thayumanavar, which we have elsewhere quoted this day in inviting the whole world to share in his eternal joy and bliss; and the reply of the Missionary gentleman is well worth quoting:—"All that I meant to convey by the use of it, is the fact that India's truest and best things are hidden from the eyes of the multitude there, and where students in England and zealous propogandists have catalogued the sects and the idols of India, they have not seen how much truth is in the land. The truth is known to those in India who take pains to know it, to these it is not latent but manifest."

Christ himself has declared, "Dont throw pearls before swine," "Let those who have ears, hear; let those who have eyes, see." Superficial critics of Hinduism wonder at the great gulf which they fancy divides so called popular Hinduism from Philosophic *Hinduism*; and herein consists the unique character and glory of Hinduism. We demur to the definition of Universal Religion given by the Haskell Lecturer; and here is what we conceive to be the Universal Religion:

தெரு மதமெலாஞ் சென்ற திசை
நிறையு மிவையன்ன மொழிந்தருளு மவை
என்று மறையுரு சமயச் சமரசம்.

"That Religion is the true which does not conflict with this religion and that, and yet reconciles all and stands supreme in the conscience of man."

Whose supreme Ideal is such that, once seen, every Religionist can exclaim, "what is there here of sect and creed, All is His Supreme Glory and Bliss", and perceiving which, even the hardest heart can melt in love and joy eternal. It is the historical personality, with its accidents of time, place, race and language, which tends to narrow the views of religion and God, and leads to the formation of sects and creeds, though this personal element may be necessary for the multitude from time to time to look up to and follow. These great leaders of men are necessary, whether in purely secular and political movements or in religious movements. They are the salt of the earth; they, by their great personality and power for good attract the ignorant masses, and control them and prove a veritable beacon-light to them. They furnish watchwords which, however, in course of time when the spirit is forgot, degenerate into mere unmeaning shibbôleths. If we can watch the life-history of every great seer or leader, we may notice how infinitely careful he was himself to hide his own personality from the public gaze,

and did all his best to reveal the Face of Truth and Justice; but the curious crowd has been more intent on observing the face of the seer himself, and seeing the reflection of Truth and Justice in his face, than in looking up or comprehending Truth and Justice by itself. As such, historical personality may be important and useful to the particular place and time and race, but when such a particular historical personality is held up to the whole world and for all time, as the only panacea that can cure all ills of humanity, this will be overshooting the mark. In Hinduism itself, we find many historical personalities exercising very great influence from time to time; and modern Saivism or Vaishnavism is more marked by their votaries adhering to the personalities of their great Saints or Acharyas; and we have the worst effects of this personality, exhibited when devout and enthusiastic Vaishnavas break each other's heads in proclaiming the superiority of Manavala Muni or Vedanta Desikar.

And we accept the Rev. Doctor's view of True Religion also in that, "A True Religion was a great moral force. It contributed to social unity (we omit that in reference to political unity; each of the great nations of Europe are keenly fighting for this honor.) A religion that lacked such humanising influences, and only created class distinctions, and a spirit of racial superiority, and prowd exclusiveness, stood by itself thoroughly discredited." But our Reverend Doctor is evidently anxious that Christianity should not be judged by its association with European nations and Christian Government; and so would every other religionist desire that his religion should not be judged by the idiosyncracies, social and political, of the people themselves." It is not true to say that the Eastern had no truth in his soul; but impartial observers say that there was truth, not only in the east but also in the west, among even the Greeks and Romans, who occupy such low estimtae in our Doctor's eyes so much in fact to surprise him and gladden his heart, and sometime even to put him to the blush before the birth of Christ. For what says father of the church?:—"Let us admit with shame and sorrow that some among these heathens showed themselves to be nobler, loftier, holier, freer from insanity, freer from meanness, freer from special pleading, freer from falsehood, more spiritual, more reasonable, on some points even more enlightened than many among ourselves. The very ideal of Christian life seems to have been dwarfed to a poor, vulgar and conventional standard."* But Christian bigotry and sectarianism can also go so low as not to recognize that there could be any truth or morality which is not derived from Christianity. And Dr. Farrar himself meets the view of M. Fleury, as regards the Greeks and Romans; and Dr. Muir deals with Dr. Lorinser's peculiar veiws, so far as they deal with the truth in Hinduism, in his excellent introduction to *His Metrical Translations from the Sanscrit writers*.† Even liberal thinkers would not call such truths by their own name, but will dub them as truths of the Christianity of Nature, much in the same style, as modern Theosophists speak of any truth, Christian or otherwise, as a great truth of Theosophy.

THE AGE OF THE DIFFERENT *BHASHYAMS ON THE VEDANTA SUTRAS.*

The editor of the Brahma Vidya, a Journal in Sanscrit and Tamil, devoted to the exposition of Sankara's Philosophy, in answering a question as to the priority of the different commentaries on the Brahmasutras, places Srikanta before Sankara. This fact does not seem to be well-known to European scholars as it ought to be; and as the writer is impartial so far as Srikanta is concerned, and expresses the old and genuine traditional view of the matter, we have thought it fit to lay before our readers a translation of the whole article.

"There are now in current use five commentaries on the Vyasa Sutras. They are those of Sri Nilakanta Sivacharya Swamigal, of Srimat Sankara Bhagavatpadacharya Swamigal, of Srimat Ramanuja chariar, of Srimat Ananda Tirtar or Madhwacharyar, of Vallabhacharya. Besides these, there are two other commentaries belonging to the Advaita School, namely *Baskariyam* and *Yadaviyam*. Of these, we have seen an old copy of *Bhaskariyam*, in the Sanscrit Library, Vedanta Divartani, established Tiruvalankadu in Mayaveram Taluq. (Will any friend intimate to us if this is still found there?) Of the other, Yadaviyam, we have only heard in stories. From what we gather from some of the ancient commentator's statements, there was one commentary

* Farrars' "Seekers after God," p. xii.

† The publishers ought to make this excellent volume available to every Hindu student. The cost of the book (Rs.) is almost prohibitive.

called *Bodayana Vritti*, ascribed to Bodayana Muni. This is difficult to get in whole now. Besides, we understand there is a commentary in recent times composed by a Veerasaiva, and native of Bellary District, Somanadaradittyar and hence called Somanathiyam. There are two means of determining their relative priority among them, *i. e.*, by means of the history of each Acharya, and by means of their works. By these tests, Srimat Nilakanta Sivacharya's commentary appears to be first. Because, this Mahatma's doctrine is *Vishistadvaita*; to refute him *i. e.*, to establish the identity of Jiva and Brahman, Srimat Sankaracharya quotes the very words of the other; besides, his history shows that Sankara met Nilakanta, who had already written his Savia Bhashya, at Gokarna; and also because Srimat *Appaya Dikshita* Swamigal in his work *Sivadvaita Nirnayam.* states that Sirkanta's Bhashya was first, and Sankara's commentary was next. Next comes *Yadaviyam.* Because, we read that Sri Ramanuja was learning under Yadavacharya, and beame dissatisfied at the interpretation of Sutras, according to Sankara, and so wrote his own commentary refuting both Sankara and Yadavacharya; and also because, Vedantacharya in his stotra called *Yatirajapaddati* praises Ramanuja as one who refuted both *Sankara's* and *Yadavacharya's* Systems. In many places in the latter commentary, sentences from Sankara's occur. Srimat Ananda Tirtar's comes next. Because in his history, he is said to have refuted the writings of 21 commentators, and especially that of Sankara, and in some respects, that of Ramanujab also. Every body knows that Vallabhacharya's is quite recent. Because, many of those who became the disciples of Balaswamigal, when he visited South India, are still alive, and this Balaswamigal was a disciple of Vallabhacharya. But, though we do not know positively any thing as to the age of *Bhaskariyam*, yet in as much as it belongs to the Advaita School, and explains the text with reference to Upanishad texts, and it does not quote from any other commentators, and as we find passages in Srikanta's Bhashya on *Pasupada Adikarana*, very much like his, and the introduction to Srikanta's states that Srikanta removes by his commentary the doubts created by the commentaries of Purvacharyas. We may conclude this commentary is prior to that of Srikanta. So it is, that people speak of Bhaskariyam as even prior to that of Vidyaranyar's Veda Bhashya. This Bhaskarachariar being a Vaishnava, it appears that Ramanujacharir has adopted portions of his commentary. Srimad Bhodayana's is prior to all; because, other commentators have quoted him here and there. From this we say, Bodayana's, is first; Bhaskariyam, second; Sri Nilakanta's, third; Sri Sankara's fourth; Yadaviyam, fifth; Ramanuja's, sixth Madhwacharya's seventh; Vallabiyam is eighth; Somanadiyam, nineth (p.p. 89 to 91).

We hope, from the above fact Prof. Deussen will see fit to retract his opinion that Vishistadvaita, Dvaita, &c, are the misinterpreting variations of Sankara's Advaita.

EXTRACT.

INDIAN VERNACULAR EDUCATION.

We are favoured with two important pamphlets on the "Encouragement of Vernaculars," being reprints of the very able articles by Mr. C. V. Swaminath Aiyar which have appeared in the *Madras Mail* and *Madras Review*. In earnest and forcible language, the author points out the radical defects of the present system of education in the Universities and Government Schools. Too much stress has been hitherto placed on the desire of parents to see their children educated in English with the view of speedy employment, and on the side of those who control the University system, to prepare students for official appointments. The author shows that each of those views is radically wrong, as violating the first principles of social life and educational training. In the elementary and secondary schools, the youth ought to be taught in the "vernaculars," in order that they may grasp their own tongues, and be useful in their various spheres of social life; and in the Universities, the study of vernacular literature ought, at least, to have an equal place with English. Thus, by English modes and training, from the University down to the lowest elementary school, the acquisition of knowledge in native languages and literature would be encouraged and promoted, instead of being, by the present system, allowed to fall into desuetude. This is a natural and most reasonable mode of procedure, and the only way by which the masses of the people can be truly educated, and inspired, not only with a love of their own language, but a love of their past literature and history. As it has been indicated by the able writer, true education is not to "manufacture candidates for office," but to make them men—good parents, loyal citizens, enlightened and capable administrators, and just and beneficent rulers. We most cordially recommend the perusal of these pamphlets by all who desire to promote the happiness and permanent welfare of India.

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA

A Monthly Journal, Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science &c.,

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897

VOL. II. } **MADRAS, MARCH 1899.** } **No. 10.**

TRANSLATIONS

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page 198.*)

Adhikarna 8.

The Sûtrakâra raises and refutes an objection to the foregoing theory :—

(Jiva) being mentioned (to be one with) the other, there follows an incongruity such as neglecting what is good. (II. i. 21)

(*Objection*) :—Because in the words "That thou art,"* and "This A'tman is Brahman,"† Jiva, the effect, is mentioned as one with Brahman, the cause, it has been shown that they are not distinct from each other. In that case it would follow that the all-knowing and all-pervading Parames'vara undoes the universe for His own good and creates it for His own evil. Then it may be asked, how is it that I's'vara, who is all-knowing and of unfailing will, and who knows that the pain of jiva who is no other than Himself is His own pain, engages in the creation of the universe, which as leading to samsâra is an evil, and does not abstain from creation for His own good. Accordingly once it is proved that Jiva and Parames'vara are one, there follows this incongruity, that Parames'vara, though all-knowing, is guilty of a want of sense in so far as He abstains from what is good to Himself and engages in what conduces to His own evil. Wherefore it does not stand to reason that Jiva and I's'vara, the cause and the effect, are one.

(*Answer*) :—In reply we say as follows :

But (the Cause is) superior, because of the mention of a distinction. (II. i. 22).

Though the cause and the effect are one, the Cause is declared in the S'ruti to be superior to the effect, to the sentient and insentient in such passages as the following

"Superior to the universe Rudra the Mighty Sage."*

So, a distinction is is also made between Jiva and Parames'vara in the following passages

* Chhâ. Up. 6-8.
† Mandûkya. Up. 1

* Mahânâ. 10.

"But he who controls both, knowledge and ignorance, is another."*

"The one God rules the perishable (Pradhâna) and Atman."†

"Thinking that A'tman is different from the Mover (the Lord)."‡

"Two birds, inseparable friends, cling to the same tree."§

"Two Brahmans ought to be known, the superior and the inferior."‖

"There are two, one knowing, the other not-knowing; both unborn; one strong, the other weak."¶

"He is the eternal among eternals, the sentient among the sentient."**

"Having entered within, He is the Ruler of the creatures."††

"Know then Prakriti is Mâyâ, and the great Lord the Mâyin."‡‡

"From that the Mâyin sends forth all this; in that the other is bound up through that Mâyâ."§§

"When he sees the other, the Lord, contented... then his grief passes away."‖‖

"He is the master of nature and of man, the lord of the three qualities."¶¶

"Of these creatures (pas'us), the Pas'upati is the Lord."***

Wherefore quite superior to the universe is Brahman, otherwise called S'iva.

(*Objection*):—By establishing non-duality in II. i. 15, and duality in II. i. 22, you have only proved duality-and-nonduality of Brahman and the universe.

(*Answer*: —No; we do not establish that sort of Vis'ishtâdvaita which takes the form of duality-and-nonduality. We are not the advocates of an absolute distinction between Brahman and the universe as between a pot and a cloth, because of its opposition to the sruti declaring that they are not quite distinct from each other. Neither are we the advocates of an absolute identity as of the mother-o'-pearl and silver, one of them being illusory; for, it is opposed to the sruti which points to a difference in the inherent attributes of Brahman and the universe. Nor do we hold to duality-and-nonduality, which is opposed to the nature of things. On the other hand, we maintain that the unity of the conditioned Brahman—as the cause and the effect—is like that of the body and the embodied, or like that of the substance and its attribute. By unity of Brahman and the universe, we mean their inseparability like that of clay and the pot as cause and effect, or like that of the substance and its attribute. A pot, indeed, is not seen apart from clay nor is the blue-lotus seen apart from the colour blue. Similarly, apart from Brahman, no potentiality of the universe can exist; nor is Brahman ever known apart from His potentiality of the universe just as fire is not seen apart from its heat. Whatever is not known apart from something else, the former must ever be conditioned by the latter, and this latter is naturally one with the former,

Wherefore Brahman who is in no way separable from the universe is said to be one with the other. And there is a natural distinction between the two; so that the supreme Brahman is ever higher than the universe. As to their distinction as the cause and the effect, it has been already explained in II. i. 9. Wherefore this theory is quite unopposed to the S'rutis declaring distinction as well as non-distinction.

And as in the case of stone etc; it is incongruous, (II, i, 23.)

(*Objection*:)—Under all conditions, Jîva and I's'vara are one, because of the s'rutis declaring non-duality.

(*Answer*:)—No, because of an incongruity. Jîva and Is'vara cannot be identical, because, like the insentient stone, timber, grass, etc, the jîva also is, on account of ignorance etc, said to belong to quite a distinct class from the Is'vara who is possessed of such attributes as omniscience. Therefore Is'vara is a distinct entity from Jîva. Thus even the Jîva, sentient as he is, cannot be identical with Is'vara owing to this difference, that the latter is superior. Much less can the insentient existence which is essentially different be identical with Is'vara. From all standpoints of view, by Sruti, Smriti and reasoning, we see that the omniscient and omnipotent Parames'vara is quite

* Svetu. Up. 5-1.
† Ibid. 1-10.
‡ Ibid. 1-6.
§ Ibid. 4-6
‖ Maitrâyani Up. 6-22.
¶ Sve. Up. 1-9
** Ibid. 6-13.
†† Tait. A'ra. 3-11.
‡‡ Svet. Up. 4-10.
§§ Ibid. 4-9.
‖‖ Ibid. 4-7.
¶¶ Ibid. 6-16.
*** Tait. Samhitâ, 3-1-4.

superior to the whole universe, sentient and insentient though, as His own emanation, it is not altogether distinct from Him.

Adhikarana 9.

(If you urge that) it is not so, because we see an assemblage, (we say) no; as in the case of milk, indeed. (II. i. 24).

In such passages as "One alone, without a second;" and "The one God, producing heaven and earth"; we are told that one alone, Parame'svara, is the cause of the world. Is it reasonable or not that He, one alone as He is, is the cause of the variegated world?

Such a doubt arising, the *Púrvapakshin* says: It is not reasonable, as involving an incongruity. This creation, made up as it is of ether, air, fire and water, is various. How can this be without the cause being variegated? Indeed, we find an assemblage of many factors in producing such things as car. Wherefore it cannot be that the cause is one.

Siddhantin says: Such a view cannot be maintained. It is possible for even a single cause to be transformed into an effect, as, for example, in the case of milk which, alone, becomes transformed into curd. Wherefore the universe is the effect of the single cause, Brahman.

As to the contention that variety in the effect presupposes a variety in the cause, we say it is wrong, because we see the formation of a variegated effect such as hair, nail, etc., out of the one sentient man. Wherefore in producing the variegated effect of the universe, Brahman requires no other cause. Now, the sutrakara says that everything is possible for the mighty:

And also, as in the case of Devas etc., in the world. (II. i. 25).

Just as the Devas, of whose powers we are told in the Sastras, can put on as many forms as they like, so also, in the case of Paramesvara, of whose powers we are told in the sastras, everything is possible. The sruti declares that the power of Parame'svara is infinite, in the following words:

"He who rules these worlds by His highest creative and ruling powers." What is impossible for Him?

Adhikarana 10.

Either it leads to the whole (becoming the effect), or there will be a contradiction of the teaching as to partlessness (II i 26).

Now, there arises a doubt as to whether the aforesaid doctrine that Brahman becomes transformed into the universe, is consistent or not with reason?

(*Púrvapaksha*):—How can we reconcile with reason the doctrine that the One alone is transformed into the universe? In case that He becomes entirely transformed into the universe, as milk is transformed in its entirety into curd, then it would follow that Brahman as a whole becomes the effect, that no Brahman is left as such. Or, if it be only in part, it will contradict the S'ruti which declares that Brahman has no parts. Wherefore Brahman's transformation is not consistent with reason.

(*Siddhánta*:)—As against the foregoing we hold as follows:

But (it is so) by S'ruti, revelation being the only source. (II. i. 27).

The doctrine that the universe is a transformation of Brahman is quite explicable, because the s'ruti says so S'ruti is the sole authority on the matter, there being no other authority. Because it is taught in the s'ruti, the doctrine is not stultified by Brahman's possession of uncommon powers, He being quite different from all the things we know of from other sources of knowledge. Thus it is quite possible for Him who is quite full to be Himself the cause as well as the effect. The doctrine of genus, for instance, holds that the one genus is present as a whole in each of the individuals of infinite number and utmost variety; no objection being allowed in the matter on the analogy of other things Hence no incongruity whatever, Revelation being the only source of knowledge regardig the nature of Brahman.

And so in A'tman. They are, indeed, various. (II. i. 28)

Simply because Jîvâtman belongs to a distinct cl[illegible], we find him possessed of the attributes of the sent[illegible]nt as opposed to the attributes of the insentient ex[illegible]ce. Even the individual objects of the insentient class such as fire, water, etc, are found to be possessed each of a distinct class of attributes, and are therefo[illegible] quite various. Accordingly Brahman, too, of whom our knowledge is based solely on the authority of the Revelation, is possessed of various and innumite potentialities. Hence no contradiction whatever.

And because of an incongruity in his own theory. (II. i 29).

As to the incongruities, such as the whole cause having to become the effect, they can only vitiate the theories of Pradhána and other such causes, which are said to be without parts and which are brought under the category of the insentient existence, but

not the theory of Brahman based solely on the authority of Revelation.

The Sûtrakára proceeds to declare that everything is explicable because Brahman is omnipotent.

And His Sakti is all-embracing as declared in the sruti. (II. i. 30)

We are given to understand that all potentiality is centred in Brahman, in the following passages:

"His Supreme Energy (Parâ-S'akti) is declared to be various, His inherent energy of knowledge and strength."

"Let it be known that Mâyâ is the Prakriti, and that the Màyin is the Mahes'vara. By His limb, as it were, is all this universe pervaded."

Wherfore, possessed as He is of all powers, what is not possible for Him?

If you say He cannot be (the cause) as having no sense-organs, (we reply) it has been answered. (II. i. 31)

(Objection) :—Brahman is said to be without sense-organs in the following passage.

"For Him there exists neither body nor the senses." Wherefore He cannot be the cause.

(Anawer) :—No; this objection has already been answered by saying that Brahman should be known as declared in the S'ruti which is the sole authority in the matter. The Holy Divine S'ruti—such as "Let it be Known that Mâyâ is the Prakriti, and that the Máyin is the Mahes'vara: by His limb, as it were, is all this universe pervaded;"—is the sole authority as to Parames'vara, endued with the Supreme Sakti of Mâyâ possessed of various and infinite potentialities,—assuming the form of the universe by a piece of His Sakti, while in Himself He is beyond the universe. On this subject the Purâna also has the following:

"Bow to Him, whose thoughts are various and rise higher and higher above the universe; in a piece of whose power the whole is comprehended; whom, as the Master of all paths, the path-knowers declare as the Path; who is distinct from the whole universe."

Thus there is no room whatever for any discussion as to what is possible or what is impossible in S'iva, the Parames'vara, the Parabrahman, who is devoid of all taints, and whose omnipotency is based on the sole authority of Revelation.

Adhikarana II

Again, the Sûtrakâra raises an objection and answers as follows:

No, because of every action having a purpose (II. i. 32).

It has been decided that Brahman who, as the Sâstra says, possesses all powers, can be the cause of all effects. Still, all activity having some purpose in view, a doubt raises as to whether it is consistent or not to hold that Parames'vara who has attained all desires engages in the creation of the universe and other such acts.

(Pûrvapaksha) :—How is that possible? Indeed, S'iva is said to be the unsurpassed Bliss itself and is contented, in such passages as the following:

"Bliss is Brahman"

"All-pervading Consciousness and Bliss; formless and wonderful; associated with Umâ."

How can He engage in creation and other activities without any purpose in view? If His activity should have a purpose in view, then he could not be ever-contented; if not, He would be doing something out of the way like a senseless being.

(*Siddhanta*) :—As against the foregoing we hold as follows

Still, as in the world, it is a mere sport (II. i. 33).

It cannot be urged that the Ever-contented Brahman cannot consistently engage in the creation of the universe and other such acts, which, having no purpose to serve, must be purposeless. Even purposeless activity is consistent on the part of Paramesvara, as a mere matter of sport. Just as, in the world, such activity as the beating of a ball goes on as a matter of mere sport without any purpose in view, so also Paramesvara, though He has attained all desires, engages in creation etc., as a matter of mere sport. Hence no incongruity whatever.

Adhikarana 12.

No partiality nor mercilessness, because of reference to an external standard. So, indeed, the Sruti declares. (II. i. 12).

It has been shown that, notwithstanding the absence of all purpose, Paramesvara engages in the creation of the universe etc., as a mere matter of sport. Here again a doubt arises whether this is possible or not.

(*Purvapaksha*) :—The act of creation, even as a matter of sport, is not consistent on the part of Parame'svara, who, as all-full, is devoid of likes and dislikes.

As equal to all, Parames'vara must be quite indifferent. Creating happy bodies, like those of the Devas etc., for some beings, and painful bodies like the human for some others, He cannot but be guilty of partiality. Moreover, creation being preceded by destruction, Parames'vara who instantaneously destroys the whole, is also guilty of mercilessness. Therefore of what avail to Parames'vara is the act of creating the universe which brings on what is undesirable?

(Siddhânta :)—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: All things considered, Parames'vara cannot be charged with partiality and mercilessness when He creates the universe, inasmuch as variety in the creation is determined by Karma. So the sruti says:

"Those of good conduct attain good birth, and those of evil conduct attain evil birth."

If you urge that no Karma exists because of the absence of differentiation, (we reply) no, because it is beginningless. It is quite consistent and found in experience (II, I. 35)

(*Objection* :)—Before creation there is no karma, because of the absence of kshetrajnas (jivas); and the absence of these is indicated by the state of non-differentiation, declared with a determinateness in the words, "Existent alone, my dear, this at first was."

(*Answer* :)—No; just as the Jivas are beginningless as declared in the sruti, "one knowing and the other unknowing are the two, the unborn, one strong, and the other weak," so also their Karmas are beginningless. Indeed, we do see that Samsara is the result of a continuous stream of Karma. Paramesvara, indeed, omnscient as He is, sees the various Karma of the jivas; and by means of Sakti He creates the seat of enjoyment, the body of a Deva or the like, just suited to their respective Karma. Thus, variety in creation is due to Karma. And the destruction of the universe cannot render Parmes'vara guilty of mercilessness, inasmuch as, like sleep it is a source of rest to those jivas who are oppressed with the mundane life.

(*Objection* :)—If Karma alone is to decide the happiness and misery of the jivas, of what avail is Parames'vara, a useless being?

(*Answer* :)—Even Karma being subject to His control, it does not detract from His independence. Against this it should not be urged that, like a thief who wants to evade payment of toll arriving at dawn at the very toll station after wandering the whole night with a view to get beyond the city limits by an uncommon route, this contention again makes the Parames'vara guilty of partiality and mercilessness, inasmuch as Karma is not independent of Him. For, Parames'vara merely assorts the infinite Karmic potentialities latent in Mâyâ. Karma being, thus, by its own power, the cause of variety in creation, there can be no partiality on the part of Him who merely assigns to each Jiva his respective Karma.

(*Objection* :)—The insentient Karma being unable to create the bodies of jivas when uncontrolled by the sentient, it should be admitted that Parames'vara who is a sentient being, is the sole efficient cause. How can it be that Parames'vara, so merciful, again unites the jivas with the body which is the cause of samsara, though they have been free from all pain of Samsara with all the organs of enjoyment destroyed?

(*Answer*): Without Karma becoming ripe no knowledge can arise in the jivas; without knowledge, there can can be no Moksha, the unsurpassed bliss; and Karma cannot become ripe without enjoyment of fruits. With a view to the enjoyment of the fruits of Karma, the all-benign Parames'vara again creates the body etc, for the jîvas. When Karma thus becomes gradually ripe, He enables the pure-mined jivas to attain to a knowledge of Himself, and manifests to them the wealth of Mokcha, the unsurpassed bliss.

A. MAHADEVA SASTRI.

(*To be continued.*)

THA'YUMA'NAVAR'S POEMS.

Tha'yuma'navar* was the second son of Ke'diliyappa Pillai, who lived more than 150 years ago and held the office of steward at the palace of Vijaya Ranga Chokka Na'yakar, the native chief who ruled Trichinopoly for 26 years from 1705 to 1731. He was greatly loved by his parents, as their first-born had been given in adoption to Ke'diliyappa's brother who was childless. Tha'yuma'navar grew up handsome, intelligent, and virtuous, but even at an early age discovered signs of a religious turn of mind which heeded little the attractions of the world. He had the good fortune, besides, to come early under the congenial influence of Mouna De'sika, a sage of exalted piety and profound wisdom. Years passed, years during which religion grew and stuck deep expansive root in the soul of Tha'yuma'navar. Then, Kediliyappa died; and Tha'yuma'navar was called to office as Palace-Steward in place of his father. Though he externally did all the duties of his position with punctilious care, his heart within was centred in the Lord; even as the rope-dancer, while seemingly busy with amusing the spectators by his pranks, is really intent on keeping his balance and preserving his safety. But the chief, finding casually signs of spiritual greatness in his servant, begged to be saved from the sin of having for servant one who was fit to be his master. Thereupon, Tha'yuma'navar relinquished office and began to devote all his time to prayer and meditation. But the chief's widow, now supreme in authority, conceived a violent affection for Tha'yuma'navar, drawn to him by his great personal charms, and tried to seduce him from the path of righteousness, offering to make him the virtual chief in her husband's stead, if only he yielded to her sinful desires. Tha'yuma'navar declined; and fearing unfair pressure might be brought to bear on him, left Trichinopoly secretly and went to Ramna'd where he spent the rest of his life. Thither his relations followed him, and anxious for the perpetuation of the family compelled him much against his will to marry. Of this wedlock one child was born; and in giving birth to it the mother died. Now that there was but little to bind him to home, Tha'yuma'navar gave up all, and went from one holy place to another, singing hymns in praise of Siva, elevating and drawing to himself and his God the hearts of all who saw or heard him, by the sweet serenity of his presence and the honeyed melody of his song. His life was one continuous incense of fragrance to the Lord; and is it strange that, to such as he, Death comes not, but only "a Clear Vision of his being's whole." ?

The subtle yet deep religious emotion that permeates Tha'yuma'navar's poems defies all description or translation. It steals into our hearts, keeps us spell-bound, often raises us into ecstasies of piety; we feel it, we are filled with it, but we cannot express it. Besides, the music, the "linke'd sweetness long drawn out," of Tha'yuma'navar's Tamil verse can hardly be reproduced in a comparatively unmusical language like English; and with my own feeble mastery of the resources of English, I cannot presume to extract even the fullest little of the music, which English is capable of yielding forth under the delicate touch of talented artists like Dr. Pope or P. A. But my ambition is not high; for the following translations of some of Tha'yuma'navar's devotional sonnets (taken almostat random) are intended merely to allow foreign readers a glimpse of the deep-lying wealth of the original, and show to them that, go prospecting where they may in the field of Tha'yuma'navar's poems they may be sure to hit on veins of pure and lustrous gold.

இனியேதெமக்குனருள் வருமோவெனக்கருதி
யேங்குதே நெஞ்சமையோ
இன்றைக்கிருந்தாரை நாளைக்கிருப்பரென்
றெண்ணவோ திடமில்லையே
அனியாயமாயிந்த வுடலோனென்றுவரு
மந்தகற் காளாக்கவோ
ஆடத்திருந்தான் சற்றதுங்கேட்டது
மவலமாய்ப் போதனன்றே
கனியேனும்வறியசெங் காயேனுமுதிர்சருகு
கந்தமூ லங்களேனும்
கனல்வாதைவந்தெய்தி னள்ளிப்புசித்தருள்
கண்மூடி மௌனியாகித்
தனியேயிருப்பதற் கெண்ணினேனெண்ணமித
சாமிநீ யறியாததோ
சர்வபரிபூரண கண்டசித்துவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே. (க)

Will yet to me Thy Grace be giv'n? So fears
My heart and pines. Alas! None bold can be
To hope who lives to-day will live to-morrow.
Should Death come vaunting "Here, I am,"

* The word literally means "He who is mother likewise." It is the name by which Siva, worshipped at Trichinopoly, is known.

"A thousand names we give in praise,
To Him that has nor form nor name."

"முந்நீர் மேனிமு னின்றுநிலாவிக் காவிரி
நீர்நாடன் பாடுந் தன்னேரன் மலைட்டபேர்."

Have I to sadly yield this frame a slave?
Is't fair the lore, I wearying roamed and sought,
Studied and learnt, should fruitless thus become ?*
When hunger's fire assails, fruit ripe, unripe,
Or leaves withered and sere, or yam or root,
To gather eat,—and Silent,† eyes fast closed
On world, alone with Thee I thought to be.
This wish of mine, O Lord, hast not thou known?
O Sivam, all in all, infinite, true,
That art Reality, Intelligence pure, and Bliss. (1)

அன்னேயனேயெனுஞ் சிலசமயநின்னேயே
யையாவை யாவெனனவே
அலறிடுஞ்சிலசமய மல்லாதபேய்போல
வலறியே யொன்றுமிலவாய்ப்
பின்னேதமறியாம லொன்றைவிட்டொன்றைப்
பிதற்றித்திரிஞ் சிலசமயமேல்
பேசரியவொள்ளியென்றும் வெளியெனறுமாதாதி
பிறவுமே சிலயென்றும்
தன்னேரிலாததோ ரனுவெனறுமுவிதத்
தன்மையாஞ் காலமென்றுய
சாற்றிடுஞ்சிலசமய மிவையாதிவேறதாய்ச்
சதாஞான வாகந்தமாய்
என்னேபெனேகருணே வினேயாடமருந்தவா
றெம்மனோர் புகலவெளிதோ
இகபரமிரண்டினு முயிரினுக்குயிராகி
யெங்குநிறை நின்றபொருளே (2)

"Mother, Mother," some creeds appeal to Thee;
"Father, Father," in variance some exclaim;
While some, devil-like jabber much, and fast
Losing all thought, and knowing nought, now one
And now another rave; some talk of Thee
As Light unspeakable; some as Space; and some
As being Sound and all; still some as most
Minute of Atoms; some as present, past,
And future Time. But, Lord, Thou art all these
And other than these‡ Thou art the lasting Bliss
Of Intelligence pure. Ah! can one like me
Describe the sportive ways of Thy Grace divine?
Thou, Life of life in this world and beyond,
And Substance true, pervading all in all. (2)

மத்தமதகரிமுகிற் குலமென்னநின்றிலகு
வாயிலுடன் மதியகடோய்
மாடகடச்சிக ரொய்சதசந்திரகாந்த
மண்மேடை யுச்சிமீதி

முத்தமிழுமுழக்கமுட னுதயவெய்சொரி
முத்திமுத் தாய்க்குலவிக்
மோகத் திருந்தமென் யோகத்தி னிலின்ற
மூச்சைப் பிடித்தடைத்துக்
கைத்தலகேப்பட விர்த்தபுலிகையொடு
*கரடதுழை தாழுமகொண்ட
கானமலியுச்சியிற் குகையுறிருந்துமென்
கதலா மலைமென்னச்
சத்தமறமோகமில பெற்றவர்களுய்வர்களை
சனகாதி தனிவிதன்றே
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டத்துவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே. (3)

If steeped in bliss of love, with women fair
Of pearly teeth, in dalliance soft to kiss
Returning kiss, mid triple Tamil's* peal,
We rest on terrace high, refulgent paved
With moonstone smooth, spires soaring high around
To touch the lunar orb, of mansion grand,
In whose court-yards, looming dark like clouds
In massive pack, elephants proudly stand
With lusty strength,—Or bent on Yoga, breath
Confining, all renounced, we live on hills,
In caves or wilds, where tigers, lions, and bears,
With claws well armed abound—what matters it?†
'Tis clear, as light of day,‡ those alone are saved
Who reach, all noises§ ceased, the Silent State.
Is not this what Janaka‖ held of old?
O Sivam, all in all, infinite, true,
That art Reality, Intelligence pure, and Bliss. ¶ (3)

---

* *cf.* Omar Khayyam :—
"We sojurn here for one short day or two,
And all the gain we get is grief and woe;
And then, leaving life's problems all unsolved
And harassed by regrets, we have to go;"

† *i. e.*, with the soul calm and still

‡ *cf.* Tennyson :—
"Our little systems have their day:
They have their day and cease to be;
They are but broken lights of thee,
And thou, O Lord, art more than they."

* *i. e.*, இயற்றமிழ், இசைத்தமிழ், நாடகத்தமிழ் (Tamil colloquial, Tamil poetic, and Tamil dramatic). The meaning is that, from their seat on the terrace, they could hear the sounds of discourses preached, songs sung, and plays acted, in the town around.

† *cf.* Marcus Aurelius :—
"Men seek retreats, houses in the country, sea-shores, and mountains; and thou too art wont to desire such things very much But this is altogether a mark of the most common sort of men; for it is in thy power whenever thou shalt choose, to retire into thyself. For nowhere either with more quiet or more freedom from trouble does a man retire, than into his own soul, particularly when he has within him such thoughts that by looking into them he is immediately in perfect tranquillity."

‡ The original, "சாதிபலகம்," means literally: "as *nelli* fruit on palm"

§ *i. e.*, the delusive distractions of the senses and the mind

‖ King Janaka lived a pure and highly spiritual life, though surrounded by the luxuries and the gorgeous splendour of an oriental court; and taught by his own example that such life was possible even in the midst of unfavourable circumstances.
cf. Emerson :—"The great man is he who in the midst of the crowd keeps with perfect sweetness the serenity of solitude."

¶ The central idea of this sonnet is very tersely put in திருவிசைப்பா :—
"கிடந்தே சென்ற திசையெழுந்து சின்றுமென
சுடந்தே யெல்லாஞ் செய்திடுவெஞ்—கூடற்கோன்
சாந்திபே சின்றிலேற் றன்னஞ் சேனிசெய்த
மாந்திரமே யாக்கையாய வாறு."

cf. Amiel :—"Do not despise your situation; in it you must act, suffer, and conquer. From every point on earth we are equally near to heaven and to the infinite."

A HYMN FROM DE'VARAM.

The beautiful hymn quoted below, to which I have added a translation in English verse, is from the Devaram (Garland of Praises for God) of Saint Thirunavukkarasu.* In this hymn, the saint records some facts of his own spiritual experience and exhorts all men to lead lives of piety and godliness in the world. No one can feel, more than I do, the feebleness and inadequacy of the translation; and I fear I have but vainly tried to reproduce in English the music of the original. Still, the translation is given, as a mere attempt, and not as a finished product worthy of the critic's scrutiny.

திருச்சிறம்பலம்.

மாசில் வீணையு மாலை மதியமும்
வீசு தென்றலும் விரிபொழில் வேனிலு
மூச லண்டமை பொய்கையும் போன்றதே
யீச னெந்தை யிணையடி நீழலே. (1)

The faultless harp,† the evening moon‡
The fanning breeze the South bestows,§
The early summer's swelling time,‖
The pond where bees do humming swarm,¶
—As soothing is the shelter sweet
Of God my father's holy feet. (1)

சமச் சொலையே ஞானமுங் கல்வியும்
சமச் சொலையே ஞானமி விச்சையும்
சமச் சொலையே நாவின் றேத்தமே
சமச் சொலையே சன்னெறி காட்டுமே (2)

Lord Siva's praise**—my wisdom, lore
Lord Siva's praise—the art I know;
Lord Siva's praise—my tongue proclaims;
Lord Siva's praise—the right way shows. (2)

[illegible] யடைந் தய்யர்
மீசை வாட்செய்து மெய்ம்மையு ணிற்கிலார்
தேசமே சுரையே தொழும்பர் செலி
வாசா மாய்ந்து மண்ணுஞ் கழிவரே. (3)

These men of world won't serve thee, Lord;
From those that serve, won't learn and live;
Engrossed in works that chain them down,
On truth's firm ground they will not stand;
Think they the men of God so deaf ?*
They vainly live, and vainly die,
To dust dissolve, and pass away (3)

கடலே வாழ்வு கொண்டென செய்தீர் காணில்லீர்
கடலே சேவது சொற் பிரமாணமே
கடலி னஞ்சமு துண்டவர் கைவிடில்
வடலி ஞாலிடங் தாமுனி பண்டமே. (4)

Unblushing men, what have you done?
You lead a life but wretched, base.
Mere tale† is it to grave you go?
If He that saves forsakes you all,
You earthlings grow the country's scorn. (4)

பூக்கைக் கொண்டரன் பொன்னடி போற்றிலார்
நாக்கைக் கொண்டர னும நவிற்றிலார்
ஆக்கைக் கேயிரை தேடி யலமந்து
காக்கைக் கேயிரை யாகிக் கழிவரே. (5)

With blooms in hand, they worship not
The holy feet of Hara Lord;
With willing tongue praise not His name
Confounded, wearied,‡ seeking stuff
To feed the flesh, they perish, fall.
Their body feeds the clam'rous crows. (5)

குறிகளு மடை யாளமுங் கோயிலும்
நெறிகளு மவர் நின்றதோர் கோலமும்
அறிய வாயிர மாரண மோதிலும்
பொறியி லீர்மன மென்கொல் புகாததே. (6)

Though signs and symbols, temples fair,
And creeds and thousand scriptures speak
To teach His ways that you may learn,
O stupid men, why, why is it
Your minds to Him do scarce incline? (6)

வாழ்த்த வாயும் நினைக்க மடநெஞ்சம்
தாழ்த்தச் சென்னியுந் தந்த தெவனைச்
சூழ்த்த மாமலர் தூவித் தொழாதே
வீழ்த்தவா வினையே னெம்மகாலமே (7)

The Lord that gave us mouth to praise,
A head to bow, and mind to think,—
To Him not praying, at His feet
Not laying flowers, lovely, sweet,
Why wasted I long years of life?§ (7)

* This is the honorific title, said to have been given to the saint, on account of the exceeding beauty of his verse, and means literally "Lord of speech."

† The word in the original is Vinai (வீணை), an Indian musical instrument for which there is no English name, so far as I know.

‡ The moon that appears in the evening is a full or nearly full moon.

§ The Zephyr of South Indian Poetry.

‖ i. e. the season of Spring, when Nature bursts forth in her splendour.

¶ Expanded, the meaning is:—

"The flow'ry pond where swarm the bees
With humming tune on honey's quest."

** The word in the original is "சதசிவமே"—the holy word of prayer to Siva.

* The meaning is that the Lord's servants are not deaf, that they will listen and help ungrudgingly if only men appealed to them.

† i. e. it is a fact.

‡ *cf.* Wordsworth:—

"The world is too much with us; late and soon,
Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers."

§ *cf.* பிரபுலிங்கலீலை:—

"பிறவி மனிடப் பிறப்பு வாய்த்தால்
லேடவிழ் மலரிரு சரைகடை பிரியார்
பாடலை சாலெல்லாம் பழுத் தொப்பன."

ஏரு பாய்ந்த வரம்பிற மிட்டோரை
ஏரு மேனின் றெதிர்ந்து சூழ்ந்தோரை
ஏரு மாதர் மேவரு வாய்மொழிப்
பாரு மெஞ்சும் பதம்பெ னென்றதே. (அ)

Plough runs in ease where plough has run.
As just I stand prepared to scape
The charm of women like picture fair,
My dullard mind, by habit bound,
To lure me wise to ways of old. (8)

ஒன்று மொன்று கீளவாய் நெஞ்சமே
புன்று கிறையு மென்னுட் சடைப்புண்ணியன்
பொன்ற மிக்கவர் பூவுகிருங் கொன்றை
சென்று கிற்ப ரவர்தமை யாளியே. (க)

The Lord abides in hearts of men
That think of Him and love and pine.
He smiles at water, flowers, shed
In worship by the false within;
Ashamed for them He smiling stands. (9)

கிறகிற் தீயைக் கடைந்துகொ ளெய்போல்
மறைய கின்றவ் வாமனிச் சோதியான்
உறவு கோலாட் டினைவு கயிற்றினை
முறைய வாய்வை மடைய முன்னித்துமே. (கo)

As fire in wood, as ghee in milk,
The Lam'nous one lies hid within.
First fix the churning-stick of Love,
Pass round the cord, Intelligence,
Then twirl*,—and God will bless thy sight. (10)

N. B.

KUNDALAKE'SI AND VALAIYA'PATHI.

Of the five great Tamil poems (*Pancha Kavya*), Chintamani, Silappadikaram, and Manimegalai have been made accessible in print through the zealous devotion, patient research, and ripe scholarship of Pandit Swaminatha Iyar of Kumbakonam. But the remaining two, Kundalakesi and Valaiyapathi (குண்டலகேசி, வளையபதி), are mere names to us; and almost nothing is known of them except the fact of their existence in the hoary past. Hence I hope the following sketch of the stories of Kundalakesi and Valaiyapathi will be interesting to students of Tamil literature. This sketch has been translated from chapters 34 and 35 of a Tamil poetical work, named Vaisyapuranam (வைசிய புராணம்), by Chudamani (சூடாமணியார்) of date unknown, which was published in print nearly thirty years ago with a prose-paraphrase by Komalapuram Rajagopala Pillai. Chapters 31, 32, and 33 of the work deal respectively with the stories of Jivakachintamani, Silappadikaram, and Manimegalai; and the stories given in the next two chapters are explicitly stated by the poet to be the stories of Kundalakesi and Valaiyapathi. For in (stanza 1 of Chap. 35,) the poet says:—"we have thus given the story of the great poem Kundalakesi" ("கோசிகண்டலை கேசிப்போர் தெற்றலின் சிலைசாத்தும்)"; and in stanza 49, of the same chapter,:—"The poem which narrates this story is one of the five great Tamil poems" (அருமையான வைகாலியத்தன்னிலே, உரையிக் கதைக்காலிய மொன்றோர்).

The Story of Kundalakesi.

Chola, king of kings, and Kaveri, descended of the great Vakkuvan, were friends so dear that they could never brook separation; and no friendship was on earth to equal theirs. These had learnt almost to perfection the 64 arts and sciences, highly spoken of in the world. In the neighbouring country, however, was King Pandiya, who had also drunk deep of all knowledge both worldly and spiritual, and considered himself without an equal. Setting great value on his skill in the game of ball, he had it inscribed in a conspicuous place on his royal banner of victory that he was unrivalled in it, and challenged open opposition from all who dared to do so. Akalanga Chola, likewise proud of his power and skill in war, arrayed his great army and issued a general command to them to proceed against and defeat any ruler who had the audacity to dispute his claim to sovereignty and pre-eminence.

King Pandiya came to hear of this and calling his hearld ordered him to go at once to King Chola and deliver the following message:—"O Chola, you and I are doubtless great. There is none to equal either of us. Only we two can worthily oppose each other. Why then should we not compete and prove who, of us two, is the greater? Lay aside ordinary tests of merit, war or learning or anything else, for they are of hardly any importance; and vie with me in the noble game of ball. If you accept this challenge, well and good. If not, you are no worthy king." King Chola heard this message with rising anger, and, instantly calling his ministers, told them to make all haste and prepare everything for his journey to Madura, for he must go there without loss of time and quell the pride of the impudent Pandiya. Among the courtiers who were then present

* Refers both to drilling out fire, and churning out butter. Note how light, fire and ghee are allied to one another.

was Kave'ri, the Vaisya of pure lineage, who in charity and munificence was not surpassed even by the Kalpa tree or Karna. He rose up, and making obeisance said :—"O Chola, great lord, it is not meet that one king should go into the country or the capital of another. If so be your pleasure, I, your servant will forthwith proceed to Madura, and return hither, before you expect, with the glad news of the defeat of king Pandiya in his own game of ball."

The ministers hailed this proposal and besought the king to send Kaveri in his stead, as they said the victory won by a subject would belong virtually to the sovereign. The king reluctantly yielded; and Kaveri accordingly set out for Madura with a numerous and powerful army for his body-guard. When he reached the Pandiyan capital, the king received him with the honours due to a royal messenger, and after a decent interval asked him to explain the object of his visit. Whereupon, Kaveri told the Pandiya that he was sent by king Chola to contest with him in the game of ball and that he went there for no other purpose. King Pandiya objected that a Vaisya, one of the merchant-class, was no worthy antagonist for a warrior-king; but Kaveri remonstrated that as he, the king, had made an open and unconditional challenge in the inscription on his banner, it was only proper that, whoever came to oppose him, him the king should meet and vanquish. Pandiya then appointed a day for the tournament; umpires were chosen; and each staked immense wealth and a large army as the victor's prize.

The day came round, and the contest began. King Pandiya and Kaveri, riding horses of high mettle passed and repassed hitting at the ball. In all acts of the game, the combatants were equal, and it was hard to adjudge victory for one or the other. Time passed, but the contest did not seem as if it would be over soon. Then Pandiya, somewhat impatient, thought to end this tedious struggle with one final game requiring the greatest quickness and skill, in which he excelled and felt sure of beating Kaveri—viz., that of throwing a ball across a square tank of water, riding round and hitting the ball before it strikes the ground. But, in this too, Kaveri out-rode Pandiya, and, with marvellous agility, hit the ball back before Pandiya could. Thus the victory was won by Kaveri; so the umpires with one voice decided; and proud Pandiya had to acknowledge himself beaten and give the successful Kaveri the wealth and army he had staked. Anxious to lay the glory of this great victory at king Chola's feet, Kaveri left Madura, taking with him his new acquisitions, and on his way home to the Chola capital halted at a city to break the journey.

Meanwhile, Kollathayan, the general of King Pandiya's forces, who had been away waging war with the Chera king, now returned to Madura; and finding his master sad over his recent discomfiture, fell prostrate at his feet and begged permission to pursue Kaveri and win back from him the wealth and the army, the honour and the glory that had been lost, by engaging him in battle and defeating him. Pandiya's assent was given; Kollathayan, with his army, overtook Kaveri, and the battle came off. It lasted many days and raged very fiercely. At last the armies closed; the Pandiyan army was beaten; Kaveri met the Pandiyan general in single combat and with one blow struck off his head; and thus once again victory came to Kaveri.

Kaveri then resumed his journey, carrying with him Kollathayan's head as a trophy of victory which of right belonged to his master, King Chola. But Kollathayan's wife, Arambaiyarathibai (அரம்பையர் தேவி), hearing of the sad fate of her husband, followed and begged Kaveri to give her the head of him she dearly loved. Kave'ri, though sympathising with her in her grief, replied that he could not please her then as the head was his master's property, but that, if she went with him to the Chola capital, he would himself entreat the king, and get her the head. So she did, and Kave'ri, true to his word, begged it from the Chola King and gave her the head.

The Story of Valaiya'pathi.

In Kalve'rippu'mpattinam there lived a merchant, named Vairava'niban, far famed for his goodness, piety and charity, and known in the town and the country around as Navako'ti Nara'yana ("Lord of nine crores") on account of his immense wealth. He took to wife a woman [from his own caste (வாணியர், the oil-pressing caste), and also another from a different caste, and lived with them both happy and prosperous. But the elders of the community to which he belonged, disliking the relation he had with a caste other than his own, threatened to excommunicate him if he did not give up that alien wife of his. He accordingly cast her off, in order to retain his position in society and the

esteem of his relations and friends. Sometime after this, it happened that he had to take ship on the western sea and cross over to foreign countries on business connected with his merchandise.

Meanwhile the young woman, who was with child at the time of her desertion by her husband, went to the temple of the goddess Kali at an adjoining Village, and prostrating addressed the deity :—"O Mighty Goddess, Victorious one, Pure Immortal, Spotless Being. Hear me, and pity my poor, helpless condition, and grant unto me thy boon that my husband may take me to his bosom again." Before her who thus appealed for help with stricken heart and streaming eyes, the merciful goddess appeared and said :—"O Beautiful one, be consoled. Grieve not. Come and live in this village. In course of time all will end well, and I shall make you happy." So the woman did ; and after some months was born a fair little boy, a delight to the heart and eyes of his mother and a promise of greatness and glory to his family and village. Years passed. The tiny infant grew into a strapping, handsome, intelligent lad.

Then, once on a day when at a game of ball with his companions, a quarrel took place between this lad and another, in course of which the enraged opponent called him—"Thou son of an anonymous father." Stung to the quick with this taunt, the young fellow ran to his mother, and explaining to her what had passed asked her to tell him his father's name. With tears in her eyes, she told him that his father was Vairavaniban, a merchant of Kaverippumpattinam, and also made known to him the circumstances which led to his separation. Hearing this, the brave lad, bursting with indignation at the cruel treatment accorded to his mother, hastened to the town whither Vairavâniban had already returned, and seeing the merchant, unceremoniously introduced himself as his son born of his discarded wife. But Vairavaniban, who when leaving her had not suspected her approaching maternity, now naturally thought this boy might be the fruit of her later unchastity and asked the youth to go his way and not trouble a peaceful merchant with his impudent talk. The lad, however, persisted in advancing his claims to filial relationship ; and the merchant thereupon appealed for help to the Council of Caste-Elders. The youth offered to prove the legitimacy of his birth by adducing unanswerable witness. The council appointed a day for enquiry.

The boy went home and told all to his mother ; she went and prayed to Kali ; and Kali promised that she, the goddess, would herself bear witness. On the day fixed, the council of elders met. The boy, his mother and Vairav'aniban, the father in dispute, were there. The lady was asked to call her witness and prove her chastity and fidelity to her husband, Vairav'aniban. She invoked Káli ; and the benignant goddess appeared before them all, and declared that the woman's chastity was unquestionable and that the boy was the merchant Vairav'aniban's own son. All were now convinced. The merchant received the joyful lad as his son ; and gave him, as the share of property to which he was entitled, a village named 'Alagapuri,' and a large sum of money and a weighing balance, with which, with his father's blessings, he may start business as a merchant.

N. B.

ART. VIII.—*Extracts from the Tamil "Purra-porul Venba-Malai," and the "Purra-nanuru."* By the Rev. G U. POPE, M.A., D.D.

THE *Purra-porul Venba-Malai* is a very ancient work, professing to be founded upon a still older composition called "The Twelve Chapters," by one of the twelve disciples of *Agastiyar*.[1] This points to a mythic origin, but we cannot historically go further than its Tamil author, or compiler, as he would represent himself. It is quite essential for a Tamil writer who would become a classic to cite his original, or the authoritative first work from which he draws (or professes to draw) his materials. (See *Nannûl*, 4-19, and Pope's *3rd Grammar*, p. 142.) Where there is no such first work (முதனூல், Muthanûl), he his commentators must suppose or invent one, and ascribe it to some venerable personage. The real author here is AIYANA'RITHAN, of whom nothing is known but that he is said to have been a descendant of the old Ce'ra kings, and the compiler of this very interesting composition. It can hardly be less than ten centuries old. It has recently been for the first time printed under the editorship of Ve'. Saminathaiyar of Uttamatâna-puram, the very learned and worthy Tamil Head-Pandit of the Kumbakonam College and has probably never been seen by any European till now though the late Sir Walter Elliot (*clarum et venerabile nomen*) obtained and caused to be translated some fragments of it. These were edited for private circulation by R. Sewell, Esq., M.C.S. Some were also printed in the Asiatic Quarterly.

[1] In the commentary on the *Tol-Kappiyam* by Nacchinârkkiniyar, Porul-adhi. iv, 94 (Ci. Vai Tamotharam Pillai's edition, p. 807, Madras, 1885) reference is made to this statement.

Málai means 'garland.' *Venba* (see Pope's *Kurral*, Int. xxv, and *Naladi*, Int. xxvi) is the name of the metre—very artistic quatrains like those in the *Naladiyar*.

Porul is a subdivision both of grammar and of treatises in general, and signifies 'substance, reality, subject.' This *Porul* is divided in the most ancient grammar, the *Tol-kappyam*, into Agam ('inner') and Purram ('outer'). Of these, *Agam* ('the *subjective*,' treats of love, its various emotions, incidents and accidents. *Purram* ('the *objective*') relates to all 'other things'—life in general, and especially war, and the affairs of kingdoms. This work, though professing to treat of practical subjects in general (*Purram*), has portions, as will be seen, which belong to the other division (*Agam*)—emotional and passionate. The ideas and even the phraseology of these verses are cited and used by all commentators upon the other classics, as being of absolute authority.

It is divided into twelve chapters (Padalam: Skr. पटल), or as they are generally termed, *Tinai* (திணை)[1], containing 360 quatrains.

It seems probable that the work itself is more ancient than the Kurral, and suggested many of its couplets. It is closely allied in subject and in tone to the *Purranannurru* (P. N. N.), with which and the Tol-kappyam it must be studied, though it is more recent than the *text* of these works.

It will be necessary to give some account of the Purra-Nannurru, or 'Four Hundred Lyrics of Life.' This anthology has been lately printed for the first time, though it has been in existence for upwards of a thousand years, and contains ballads which in substance must have been sung in the early centuries of our era. We owe it also to Saminath-Aiyyar, the learned and indefatigable Professor of Tamil in the Kombakonam Government College, that it is now carefully edited and put forth with all necessary apparatus in such a way that it may find an entrance into the house of every Tamil scholar. This is the fifth large work issued by the same editor. The industry and learning which have been employed in the editing of these books would have gained for Saminath-Aiyyar a very high place among scholars in Europe, if the subject had been one which the scholars of the West were disposed to value. But, although the very ancient, copious, and refined Tamil language is inferior to none, it is regarded by most people as the (probably barbarous) vernacular of a people living somewhere in a remote district of Great Britain's imperial possessions. Neither does our Indian Government nor do our Universities fully recognize the value of Tamil literature; and so those who spend their lives in the study of the great South Indian classics must resemble men seeking for pearls under water. Our editor's compatriots, however, will not be slow to recognize the benefit that his studies are conferring upon his people. Nor is it too much to hope that his labours may be so far recognized as to procure for him such pecuniary assistance as may save him from absolute loss. Tamil scholarship is a direct road to poverty!

To return from this digression. This work consists of 400 Lyrics, varying in length from six lines to fifty, being for the most part songs sung by Court minstrels and wandering bards in honour of the kings of the South, including not only the Pandiyan, the Coran, and the Ceran kings, but about 120 of the petty Rajas and chieftains who then divided the South, and were more or less independent, having their fortresses on every hill and coign of vantage throughout the Southern land. Of these ancient rulers and heroes scarcely anything is known but what these, and a few similar works, enable us to conjecture. Their names have not yet been found or recognized in inscriptions or coins, and it is very doubtful whether we shall ever be able to recover many authentic details of their history. Still, the glimpses of ancient manners, thought, and conditions of life afforded by these poems are exceedingly interesting. The ancient bards, about 150 in number, fragments of whose songs have thus been rescued, were of very unequal powers; but some of them display, if I am not mistaken, very great poetical genius, and some of the fragments are veritable gems.

It is worthy of note, also, that of these poems, except the introductory invocation (which is of much later date, by Perum Devanar,[1] the translator of the Maha-Baratham), none make any decided allusion to Civa worship. Demons are constantly referred to and various charms and ceremonies for driving them away from the battle-field, where it was their delight to hold their 'eery' festivals, are mentioned. Throughout all the petty kingdoms of the Tamil lands there seems to have been a system of demon-worship much like what now prevails in the extreme south.

Feasts and dances in honour of Murugan (from T. 'murugu,' a fragrant wood: *Agallochum*) are often alluded to. He was evidently the tutelary god of the aborigines of the South, and is now promoted to be the younger son of Civa.

I shall reserve a more minute account of these poems, their heroes and their bards, for another occasion, and return at once to the *Purra-porul Venba-Malai*.

1 *Tinai*. This much used Tamil word-of-all-work really signifies 'genus,' and is applied to the main divisions of any subject. These are divided into sections (*turrai*=துறை). This latter is equal to 'species,' and is used for the subdivisions of a subject. Here, each chapter is preceded by a small summary; and every quatrain has a curious little couplet giving the pith of the quatrain. This couplet is called *Kolu* (='substance, contents': from கோள்)

1 He seems to have edited a series of works for the Madura literati

PADALAM I.

Vedchi, OR THE CATTLE-RAIDERS.

The first *tinai* is called *Vedchi*, and the following seven divisions have titles of a similar import. They are taken from the garlands worn by warriors in the contests in which the tribes of South India in those times seem to have been incessantly engaged. The Tamil rhetoricians enumerate eight species of distinctive garlands worn by kings and warriors when going forth on various expeditions, the garland being supposed to indicate the character of the undertakings, and the feelings of those engaged in them.

This is to us a novel form of the 'language of flowers.'

The *Vedchi* (ஒமவ்சி) is the *Ixora coccinia*, which is commonly called 'Flame of the Forest,' or sometimes 'the country geranium.' It bears a profusion of flowers, sometimes of quite dazzling brightness, and of a deep scarlet hue. These garlands were intended to strike terror into the eyes of the opposing hosts, and to some extent supplied the place of military uniform. The armies of Europe have never been unmindful of the moral effect of the soldier's headdress; though it would be a novel experience if our troops went forth to war like a marching garden of flaming and fragrant flowers! The warriors who wore the *vedchi* were cattle-raiders. It would seem that this constituted no small part of the duty—and duty was delight—of the ancient South Indian soldier.

This *Padalam*, or chapter, contains twenty verses, and illustrates with exceeding clearness several phases of the thoughts and habits of the people in those 'good old times'! A translation is given of the more important verses, and a summary of the remainder.

§ 1. *The King's Call to the Cattle-raid.*

VERSE 1. THE KING SUMMONING HIS PEOPLE.

"Youthful warrior, who bearest the wondrous three-pronged dart, go forth, seize and bring home the herds of cattle with the bulls their leaders! See your foes bending their bows, as though they would cut down whole forests and set them on fire, and inspecting their arrows as they fit them to the string. Put their ranks to flight!"

§ 2. *The Toddy-booth.*

This introduces the idea, which is always coming to the front in these poems, of the 'toddy-jar.' [§ 15.] The raid begins and ends with the *canteen*.

VERSE 2.

"Forget not, O thou with the loving large eyes, the clear sweet boiled palm-juice in the standing jar of toddy, never empty. The warrior on whose feet are the heroes' anklets, who is fierce of eye, endures not debt. To-morrow's morn shall see the foeman's herds thronging thy wide-extended gates."

It would seem that these champions cleared off their scores with the nymph of the palm-wine jar by means of the plunder they brought home. [§ 16.]

All classes except Brahmans, even the ladies, are represented as indulging freely in the use of toddy. The same thing is illustrated in the Kambar-Ramayanam, where the whole Court—king, queens, princes, counsellors, and warriors—are represented as indulging in a most unedifying debauch of many days' duration. [Pala-Khandam xviii: 'The Canto of the Festivities.']

§ 3. *Eager for the fray.*

VERSE 3.

"The raven's hoarse cry arises in the jungles of our foes who own the beauteous herd—omen of ill to them; while beating their drums our warriors armed with long spears put on the *vedchi* flower and go forth upon the well-nigh impervious paths, where the raven croaks."[1]

EVIDENCES OF NATURAL RELIGION.

ON CREATION.

II.

(*Continued from page 139.*)

The question proposed.

In our first lecture on Creation we examined whether the Universe always existed as it is now; that is, whether it is uncreated and eternal not only as to the matter out of which it might have been made, but also as to the form or shape which it now bears; and we came to the conclusion that the world in its present form cannot be uncreated and eternal, whether retrospectively or progressively. Now we shall proceed to demonstrate that neither was the world made out of an unformed and pre-existing matter, eternal, uncreated, self-existent, as, Plato and the followers of the Sankhya system of Philosophy taught.

The chaos theory, ancient and universal.

Yet this was the general belief of mankind before the Christian Era. Philosophers as well as uneducated people believed that the world did not exist for ever in the form in which we now see it, but that there was a time, when it either did not exist at all, or existed only as Pradhana, or as a mass of elementary matter without form, void, and empty, out of which in progress of time all things were formed by the creative power of God. This elementary matter or

[1] Cf. P.N.N., 280.

chaos corresponds in a striking manner to the nebulous masses of modern astronomy, and it was beautifully described by Milton in the second book of "Paradise Lost" as follows:—

..... a dark
Illimitable ocean, without bound,
Without dimension, where length, breadth, and height
And time and place are lost, where eldest Night
And Chaos, ancestors of Nature, hold
Eternal anarchy amidst the noise
Of endless wars, and by confusion stand.
For, hot, cold, moist and dry, four champions fierce,
Strive here for mastery, and to battle bring
Their embryon atoms
..... Into this world abyss,
The womb of Nature, and perhaps her grove,
Of neither sea, nor shore, nor air, nor fire,
But all these in their pregnant causes mixed
Confusedly, and which thus must ever fight,
Unless the Almighty Maker them ordain
His dark materials to create more worlds—"

There was then a time, when nothing of all that we see around us existed. There existed no heaven, no earth, no sun, no mountains, no river, no sea, no animals, no men, nothing whatever. The history of all peoples, the cosmogony of all nations, the myths of all religions, the primitive traditions of mankind in general, go to prove that the creation of heaven and earth, or their formation out of a pre-existing chaotic matter, is taken for granted or presupposed by all philosophical systems that ever arose about the nature and origin of the Universe. (Cfr. Encyclopaedia Britannica XVII. p. 156).

Matter not self-existent.

Now, is really Chaos or Pradhana, that is, the primeval and plastic matter of the Universe, uncreted, self-existent, without any cause of its existence, and eternal? Among the Greek Philosophers Plato assumed three principles as necessary to explain the origin and present existence of the world. Matter, the underlying basis of the physical world, God or the efficient cause, and ideas, the models or prototypes of things. Matter, so Plato argues, existed, and exists eternally, side by side with God. It was not created by him, and being absolutely devoid of quality and possessing no proper reality, was at first in disorder and assumed a variety of changing irrational shapes, until God, who is absolutely good and without envy, came forth as a world-builder and fixing his gaze upon his eternal unchangeable prototypes or ideas, after this model transformed this wild, fluctuating, chaotic mass into a well-ordered world. (cfr. Ueberweg. History of Philosophy V I. p. 113.—Dr. A. Hockle, Hand book of the History of Philosophy p. 84.)

In like manner we read in the Vishnupuranam, Book I., Section II. "Day was not, nor night, nor sky, nor earth; and there was neither darkness nor yet light. And there existed then Pradhana, Brahma and the Purusha incapable of being apprehended by ear and the other organs or the intellect." Now in the sankhya system of philosophy which is chiefly followed here, Pradhana means the unformed Nature, as the material cause of the world, the root or plastic origin of all, and it is assumed to be self-existent, eternal, productive, but not produced.

But it is not so. Matter cannot be self-existent, uncreated, and eternal, in the sense that not only it had no beginning at all, but moreover it owed its existence to none. For, if it were so, matter itself would be the only true God because self-existence is the absolute characteristic of almighty God. As the characteristic of light is to shine, the characteristic of heat to warm, that of food to nourish, so God's characteristic is to be Self-existence in His nature, His essence, His character, the root of all his other attributes and perfections. Indeed, God exists really, and creatures also exist really; God is, and the creature also is. Yet the divine being and the created being differ infinitely from one another, in that the former is independent, the latter dependent; the former is uncaused, the latter caused; the former has all things of itself, and the latter has absolutely nothing of itself but is itself produced out of nothing according to a pre-conceived idea derived from the Divine essence This infinite difference is indicated by saying that God not only is but is of himself in virtue of His own essence, in a word, He is self-existent. Therefore unless we feel strong enough to swallow the absurdity of a God-matter, we must come to the conclusion that matter is not self-existent or uncreated, but is itself an effect produced out of nothing by God.

Matter, not God.

If matter self-existent, independent of God.

Moreover, if matter existed and exists eternally side by side with God, uncreated, self-existent, as Plato argues, it is clear that in its being matter is independent of God. But if matter is not indebted to God for its existence and being, why should it depend on God for its forma-

tion, manipulation and shaping into the countless creatures that constitute this visible Universe? Self-existence implies power, nay, infinite activity, because power, activity and action spring from being as from their root, and follow closely the nature of being. Therefore if matter could exist by itself, no one can tell why mankind should have attributed the formation of heaven and earth to an agent external to matter itself, namely, to God.

Atheists can meet these arguments in two ways only First by asserting that matter is self-created or born of itself; secondly, by saying that matter, being self-existent and uncreated, is wholly independent of God with the necessary consequence that the world evolved out of matter in virtue of a spontaneous evolution, which is intrinsic to matter itself, so that the chaotic or primary matter by endless and spontaneous evolutions turned into the existing world.

Matter not self-created.

Of these two hypothesis the first is evidently absurd, as it implies the most glaring contradiction, namely entity and non-entity at the same time. Entity, because the first condition of every agent is that at least, it be existing itself before it can act. Non-entity, because that which is to be called into existence is presupposed not to be already existing. Therefore matter cannot be self-existent or born of itself, but is indebted to some external cause or agent for its existence.

Matter not self-developing.

Neither is the second hypothesis tenable on scientific grounds. For let us suppose by the hypothesis that everything has been spontaneously developed from matter. But matter in itself is inert; of itself it remains quiescent until set in motion by some external impetus. This truth needs not be demonstrated as it is the foundation of mechanics. Therefore if matter in itself is inert and has no motion, how could the world have been developed spontaneously from it? Whence that motion in matter? Whence that impetus, without which any change in matter is inconceivable? "The first being," says St Thomas, "must be in act and in no kind of potentiality." But primary matter, according to all Philosophers, was absolutely inert, and devoid of all qualities, capable of being determined by an external agent, but in no way determined in itself.

Matter itself inert.

Some answer with Buchner that "eternal matter is necessarily endowed with perpetual motion; and therefore the movement of matter is eternal as itself." (Buchner, Kraft and staff pag 55.) But this assumption is purely gratuitous, and no argument was ever brought to prove it. For, movement is an effect, and every effect implies a cause, and matter itself cannot be the cause of its own motion, because matter, in itself is inert and dead. Moreover, modern science, as it was shown in the first lecture, proves beyond any reasonable doubt that eternal movement is impossible and absurd, and that "consequently there was a beginning of the universe, and that for it no force whatever whereof science takes cognizance can account." (Rev. John Gerard, S. J, Modern Science and Ancient Faith).

To sum up: the world neither evolved itself, nor was it evolved by God from a primeval, chaotic matter, which existed eternally side by side with God, uncreated, self-existent, eternal, because if so, matter itself would be God, which would involve glaring contradictions.

G. Bartoli, s. j.

THE POETRY OF STEPHEN PHILLIPS.

When some hare-brained "press-men" and noisome "clique-critics" took it into their heads to doubt in the few months following Tennyson's death whether British poetry which survived the death of Chaucer would ever recover from the loss of such an ingenious master of rime-craft, the contribution* of Edmund Gosse to the pages of "The New Review" sufficed to check somewhat the alarming mania for Tennyson's verse. What with the even-toned estimate of Tennyson, and what also with the brave defence with which it sought to blow aside the vindictive tirades of a few "review-men", Mr. Gosse's article exercised a very wholesome influence in restoring balance of judgment to the literary world.

After speaking about the relation of Tennyson to the past poets and his station in the history of English Poetry, Mr. Gosse ventures to tell us "that a generation that can boast of Mr. Swinburne and Miss Christina Rossetti, of Mr. William Morris and Mr. Coventry Patmore, of Mr. Austin Dobson and Mr. Robert

*Tennyson by Edmund Gosse. *New Review* November 1892

Bridges, has no reason to complain of lack of fire or elevation, grace or versatility." This was spoken when the article considered the out-look of English Poetry in the year 1892. Since then the rapid multiplication of the quantity of poetry and the appearance of new men as poets of name have proved that Mr. Gosse's statement is true in more ways than one. Mr. William Watson for the excellent quality of verse and the sonorous grace of diction has become the hobby of many Mr. Gosse himself, though decidedly an excellent artificer at word-jewelling, has been steadily improving in versification both in matter and manner. Mr. William Watson's "Wordsworth's Grave" and Edmund Gosse's "Russet and Silver" are perhaps the best specimens of recent new-blown buds of song. Startlingly enough a fresher individual has made his *debut* with a delightfully printed green-covered volume of poems,* and his poetry has all the purity and subdued fragrance of Matthew Arnold with the somewhat dismal dignity of Wordsworth. The book must be the sensation of the year, since Mr. Stephen Phillips is one who might evidently be able to extort a recognition even from a grudging public. He is fond of allegories and many of the poems that appear in the present collection have a silent under-current of a most beautiful modern optimism.

"The Woman with the Dead Soul" is gracefully misty though it is possible here and there to see what the poet strives to say. It deals with the purpose and nature of death in large and liberal contemplation, and manages to be sermon-like and moral-breathing, without being sickeningly didactic. It seems to have an almost physical effect on the reader when such lines as

> "On to the mirror silently she goes
> Lightly a loose tress touches at her ear;
> She gazes in her own eyes without fear;
> Deliberately then with fingers light
> She smoothed her dress, and stole into the night."

strike our ear. The blood-curdling effect is spared only by the discerning setting of ideas and the studied art of cloudy yet suggestive expression. The appalling disgust with which the reader retires from Marie Corelli's minute and undisguised description of the slow expiry of a woman's lust-cankered frame under the action of a self-administered deadly narcotic, flashes on his mind by way of remote association when he reads about Phillip's symbol of the London Woman. The association is useful to teach him the deftness with which the poet manages what the lady novelist in her wild hysterical aberrations makes intensely horrid.

The next piece is "Marpessa" and a refreshing change indeed from the grim sulkiness of "the woman with the dead soul." The theme is classical being taken from a Greek legend while the manner is Miltonic, we could even say almost Dantesque, with the quaint grace and balm of Keats, and the scenes and thoughts are throughly modern. The story is simple and best told in the author's own words "Marpessa, being given by Zeus her choice between the god Apollo and Idas, a mortal, chose Idas." The poem is a model of artistic perfection and the deep and even note of its lines is a mark of the master-hand that worked at them. The graceful and melodious verse, lawless in construction, dignified in form, does show everywhere signs of heart-felt conviction and grand stress. It has none "of the perilous stuff that weighs upon the heart." What capacity for original observation and what facility in weaving gossammer-webs of delicate-tinted fancy could be expected of a genuine poet are seen in

> "When the long day that glideth without cloud,
> The summerday, was at her deep blue hour
> Of lilies musical with busy bliss,
> When very light trembled as with excess,
> And heat was frail, and every bush and flower
> Was drooping in the glory overcome."

Marpessa, the rosy-cheeked maiden, of auburn hair and of hazel eyes, the very cynosure of greek gods and heroes stood between her suitors Apollo and Idas,

> "Just as a flower after drenching rain
> So from the falling of feliocity
> Her human beauty glowed, and it was new."

The almost angelic form of the girl is finely reflected in Apollo's speech to her

> "Yet when I saw thee, I imagined woe
> That thou who art so fair, shouldst ever taste
> Of the earth-sorrow: for thy life has been
> The history of a flower in the air,
> Liable but to breezes and to time,
> As rich and purposeless as is the rose:
> Thy simple doom is to be beautiful."

How much more is suggested than what myriads of lines would fail to hit off with half as much richness or fineness, about the radiant loveliness of that heavenly maid. Apollo in his passion for the mortal girl begins to philosophise :—

> "What is the love of men that women seek it?
> In its beginning pale with cruelty,

* Poems by Stephen Phillips. John Lane The Bodley Head, London and New York 1898.

But having sipped of beauty, negligent
And full of langour and distaste :—"

And the poet's wrapt-adoration before the sublime in external nature is well seen in Apollo's words of encouraging exhortation tempting Marpessa to marry him and picturing to her her future glory and comfort if only she should do so :

"—Continents
Shall lighten, ocean unto ocean flash,
And rapidly laugh till all this world is warm.
Or since thou art a woman, thou shalt have
More tender tasks; to steal upon the sea
A long-expected bliss to tossing men.
Or build upon the evening sky some wished
And glorious metropolis of cloud ;
Thou shalt persuade the harvest and bring on
The deeper green ; or silently attend
The fiery funeral of foliage old
Connive with Time serene and the good hours."

The rich bloom and frail and delicate form of Marpessa is exquisitely acknowledged by Idas when he says

"I love thee then
Not only for thy body packed with sweet
Of all this world, that cup of brimming June,
That jar of violet wine set in the air,
That palest rose sweet in the night of life."

Not for all these does Idas love her; He strikes a higher and spiritual note than Apollo and his passion for her has not even the remotest shade of animal love, but it is the same that inspires a poet to sing of the surging sea and a sensitient average mortal to look with awe on the lurid splendour of the setting sun. To Idas her infinite physical charm has the supreme use of a divine reminder, and he sees in her angelic expression and superb loveliness the Manifestation of the infinite "Idea" as he says

"Not for this only do I love thee, but
Because Infinity upon thee broods
And thou art full of whispers and of shadows.
Thou meanest what the sea has striven to say
So long, and yearnéd up the cliffs to tell ;
Thou art what all the winds have uttered not.
What the still night suggesteth to the heart."

Idas goes on to remember in the fascinating form of Marpessa what Kant and Schopenhauer might have gladly felt and believed :—

"Thy voice is like to music heard ere birth,
Some spirit lute touched on a spirit sea ;
Thy face remembered is from other worlds,
It has been died for, though I know not when,
It has been sung of, though I know not where,
It has the strangeness of the luring West,
And of sad sea-horizons; beside thee,
I am aware of other times and lands,
Of birth far-back, of lives in many stars.

The poet's dignity of diction and appositeness of epithets are excellently seen when Marpessa is saying to Apollo

"—All Asia at my feet spread out
In indolent magnificence of bloom !
Africa, in her matted hair obscured,
And India in meditation plunged !"

Her Heaven-protected security Marpessa avows in

"—All my days
Like perfect lilies under water stir,
And God has sheltered me from his own wind ;
The darling of his breezes have I been.

Her aversion for the base animal passion of Apollo and her perfect accord with the noble moral sentiments of Idas is followed by the thought of her human origin, and the ostensible incapacity of hers, therefore, to wed an immortal, when besieged with earthly cases for

"My mother; often as a child I pressed
My face against her cheek, and felt her tears ;
Even as she smiled on me, her eyes would fill
Until my own grew ignorantly wet ;
And I in silence wondered at sorrow.

What a frank out-pouring of child-like maidenly nature is this, and how well Austin Dobson pleases our soul when he dedicated his "Old World Idylls" to the English village girl whom he would describe :—

"But most to you with eyelids pure,
Scarce witting yet of love or lure ;—
To you, with bird-like glances bright,
Half-paused to speak, half-poised in flight ;—
O English girl, divine demure,
To you I sing !"

How quaintly the manners and the very atmosphere of the bracing English rural life are reflected in the pure person of the Greek-named Marpessa could be fully enjoyed only by those who read the poem through. Her willingness to rest content with the lot of humankind in preference to the unlooked-for dole of favours from Apollo fills our mind with a sympathy for her resigned willingness and complacent attunement to earthly pleasure and pain, when she calmly rejoices

"Yet I being human, human sorrow miss.
The half of music, I have heard men say.
Is to have grieved ; When comes the lovely wail
Over the mind ; Old men have told it me
Subdued after long life by simple sounds."

And on she continues with stoic equability

"To all this sorrow was I born, and since
Out of a human womb I came, I am
Not eager to forego it ; I would scorn
To elude the heaviness and take the joy,
For pain came with the sap, pangs with the bloom :
This is the sting, the wonder.————"

And her deep thought-out passion for human intercourse and longing for the company of things of this earth are thus mirrored with the rapture of Keats,

"But if I love with Idas, then we two
On the low earth shall prosper hand in hand
In odours of the open field, and live
In peaceful noises of the farm, and watch
The pastoral fields burned by the setting sun.
And he shall give me passionate children, not
Some radiant god that will despise me quite,
But clambering limbs and little hearts that err."

Her notion of wedded life and of the sweets and stings that accompany it have a subtle charm of their own, as Marpessa tells Apollo,

"And on the crowd I will take his arm, and feel
Him closer for the press. So shall we live.
And though the first sweet sting of love be past,
The sweet that almost venom is; though youth,
With tender and extravagant delight,
The first and secret kiss by twilight hedge,
The insane farewell repeated o'er and o'er,
Pass off;"

She is sure that according to human experiences, there shall be a faithful peace, following married life and her mortal husband will value her company even though the first fervour of young love be gone. With the decline of years and the dim-grown old age the mutual attachment would strengthen and life would become a benign blessing as the husband and wife shall have learnt to be

"Still like old friends, glad to have met, and leave
Behind a wholesome memory on the Earth."

The graceful scorn in which she held the alluring smile of the cunning Appollo comes up when she seriously interrogates him

"And thou beautiful god, in that far time
When in thy setting sweet thou gazest down
On this grey head, wilt thou remember then
That once I pleased thee, that I once was young?"

And the bewitching stillness of sundown is echoed with all the vividness of a painting of Turner's when the poet concludes

"——Then slowly they,
He looking forward, and she gazing up,
Into the evening green wandered away."

The effect these lines bring on the reader's mind can only be compared with that of the closing lines of Matthew Arnold's "Sohrab and Rustum." The poem deserves the greatest praise for its persistent loftiness of tone, for the impassioned accuracy of a high imagination, for its extremely poetical quality and for that suffusion of greately-marked joy for Nature's lavish life which is the one jubilant note of Keats.

The grim and tragic story narrated in "The Wife" is of a piece with "The Woman with the Dead Soul," and if "Marpessa" displays the author's wonderful mastery of blank verse "The Wife" is an excellent attempt at rhyming poetry. There is an intensity and vividness, a suggestive reservation, and a picture-wording with stinging innuendo, that might have done credit to some of the best creations of George Eliot's fancy. The poem is sure to have an uncanny look for the Hindu mind but still the reader ought to know that it pourtrays an individual situation, a true story. The key-note is struck when the poem begins

"Her husband starved; and gazed up in her face
There was no crumb of bread in the bare place."

The story shows the cruel extremities to which a young wife with a few children might run when her dear-loved husband is steeped in indigence and helplessness. The self-sacrifying affection of the young woman, and the inscrutable bondage tying her to him are well seen when

"——Like a martyr robing for the flame,
She wound the shawl about her without shame;
Lo in the red shawl sacredly she burned,
Her face already into ashes turned."

As she gets into the streets her little son follows her, and after pacifying his sorrow, she forcedly smiles at him effectually hiding her mental agony. With true daughter-like devotion she tries to do what best she could to bring and give her husband food. The duty to her husband is with her a more sacred thing than even the love for her children and she says to her child in sweet softness when it caught at her dress with the famished face of misery and starvation,

"——O cruel new-born thing!
The years to you a gentleness will bring;
Then think of me as one that not in thought,
But out of yearning into woe was brought."

The next poem is named "Faces at a fire" and the title tells us what the poem speaks about. It is in rhymed hexameter displaying the same mastery of versification and fancy which we saw in the poet's "Marpessa." A hazy moral lurks beneath the poem and that is,

"Wonderful souls by sudden flame betrayed,
I saw; then through the darkness went afraid"

The poem teaches us that in the grip of an unforseen crushing catastrophe the true nature of mankind

comes to the surface. and we see every one in his true complexion. Examples await us with ruthless misery and careless bliss in

" The hungry tramp with indolent gloating stare,
The beggar in glory and released from care.
A mother slowly burning with bare breast,
Yet her consuming child close to her prest!
That prosperous citizen in anguish dire,
Beseeching heaven from purgatorial fire!"

The next poem " the Lily " is a plain allegorical vision; and under the parable of a garden with sweet-smelling ephemeral flowers and slow-destroying hand of Death hovering over them, the poet points to the transient human existence, and the relentless end that awaits it. He alludes to a "rose" as being "a passionate Eastern queen," and a "poppy" as "a dreamer frail," and to him

" ——from those human flowers,
A tragic odour like emotion rose.

"To Milton——Blind" is a powerful apostrophe, and a grand outpouring of sympathetic reverence and admiration. Mr. Phillips in verse of undoubted sublimity tells us that the darkness which had fallen on the eyes of Milton was but the shadow of Gods' protecting wings. The poem is in blank verse and has the serene majestic march of Milton's poetry. The poet addresses Milton

" He gave thee back original night, His own
Tremendous canvas, large and blank and free,
Where at each thought a star flashed out and sang."

And then says

" Thy hand was taken by angels who patrol
The evening, or are sentries to the dawn,
Or pace the wide air everlastingly."

After "To Milton——Blind" there follow a collection of neat little poems, more or less didactic in aim, faultless and facile in expression. Of these "Lazarus" is written in memory of a dead friend with excellent pathos. It paints under the cloak of an apostrophe the yearning mind of the true lover or friend left on this earth below to have a look on the form of, or at least to have communion with, the soul which once was his. What more can we require in the way of a true tribute of amity at the hands of a cordial friend than the thought

" Thy face, dear friend, whom I so long have known.
Have we not wandered with turned arms, and walked
Through evening fields together?"

"Faith" is the next little poem which is a gem. It gives expression to the silent feelings of a man who has lost a dear female child, and who after the first pangs of misery and sorrow are over, brings himself to see the justness of the Law whose action is nothing but order, harmony and love,

" Yet I discern with clearer brow
A high indulgence in the blow,
Light in the storm that o'er me broke,
A special kindness in the stroke,
A gentleness behind the Law,
A sweetness following on the awe.

Further on the poet speaks,

" Thy Judgement still to me is sweet;
I feel, I feel, that we shall meet."

"By the Sea" is a delicate piece narrating in finest poetry the recollections of a ramble with a young friend by the sea-side. It contains beautiful passages and an invidious quotation will mar the value of the poem as a whole. Yet a passage will not be out of place to give an idea of the true poetic quality of the piece. The poet addresses his young friend

" And the sea-bloom, the colour of calm wind,
Was on your cheek; like children then we kissed,
Innocent with the sea and pure with air;"

As the friends were returning home the heavens were rapidly changing tints,

" While veil on veil the heaven was bared;
And a new glory was on land and sea,
And the moist evening fallow, richly dark,
Sent up to us the odour cold of sleep,
The infinite sweet of death So we returned,
Delaying ever, calm companions,
Peacefully slow beside the moody heave
Of the moon-brilliant billow to the town."

"A. S. P." is another poem speaking about a woman who seems to have been in the relation of the author's friend, and her moral convictions breathe a fragrance of the modern "Religion of Humanity" so well spoken about by John Morley in his "Rousseau." For

" She drugged her brain against realities,
And lived in dreams, and was with music fed,
Imploring to be spared e'en sweetest things"

and

" She craved no Paradise but only peace."

In "the Question" we see a father and son converging in a somewhat unwonted fashion. The son asks the father to assign a reason why he was born so weak and vigourless and the father replies that it might be due to his own indiscretion in his early days and says,

" My son, when I was young and free,
When I was filled with sap and glee,
I squandered here and there my strength
And to thy mother's arms at length
Weary I came, and over tired;
With fever all my bones were fired;
Therefore so soon thy strength is flown."

One might think the poem savours a little bit of the indelicate but the earnestness and paternal sympathy of the father covers his replies with a pathetic and tear-compelling charm.

Of all the small poems it is little doubtful that "Beautiful Death" is the brightest and most mellifluous. The poem is worthy of Shelley and is instinct with a passionate love for communion with "the Spirit of Nature" to have which the soul of Shelley would indeed thrill with thirst. The key in which Shelley sings in "Queen Mab" rises to a chime of exhilarating symphony in "Beautiful Death." Death is nothing but the snapping of life-immuring bonds and the liberty to join and become one with Nature. It is not the painful sting of inanition and decay but the glorious metamorphsis enabling the buzzing golden bee to emerge from the less gay-tinted chrysalis Our poet's view of Death may not be welcome to the rabid clergy but it has a nobilty and loftiness which is the poet's own. He asks,

"Why dreadest thou the calm process of death?
To miss thy wife's illuminating smile?
No more to proudly touch thy child's bright hair?
To leave this glorying green, this flashing sun?
Yet Death is full of leisure and of light;
Of compensations and of huge amends."

The dead man is according to Mr. Phillips everything in creation and his spirit becomes the pulsating life of every element of visible Nature. He might wander as a breeze

"thro' the ward,
Balm to the sick, a cool and vagrant bliss."

He will drop like dew on the thirsty place and hasten to the eager land like a cloud. He can move on

"Conspiring with the summer plans of lovers, scent
From evening hedge the walk of boy and girl."

and can live

In solaces, caresses and in balms.
Nocturnal soothings and nutritious sighs.
The unhappy mind an odour shall be breathed;

and he shall

"Assist this bland and universal scheme,
Industrious, happy, sweet, delicious, dead!

"The Prisoner" is a small piece of five quartrains telling us how a young husband that returned from incarceration met with a strange welcome at the hands of his wife. He entered jail as a blooming young man enjoying all the respect and admiration of his wife and returns in decrepitude and poverty scorned and taunted by her.

"The Wound" grapples with the disputed Christian theological problem whether souls that believed not in the vicarious redemption of Christ could ever be saved. The poem may not be tasteful to the Christian divines since it ends by an imaginary person introduced to the presence of Christ speaking against the narrow nature of the Christian doctrine in a glib spirit.

"The new De Profundis" is the counterpart of "The Wound." The poet does not much mind about a Heaven or a Hell, in fact, about any sort of *post mortem* experience, provided only he can be sure of a persisting life,

"Ah, welcome fire, eternal fire
To burn for ever and not tire!
Better Ixion's whirling wheel,
And still at any cost to feel!
Dear Son of God, in mercy give
My soul to flame, but let me live!"

In "The Apparition" a living lover and a dead love are introduced, and the mental yearnings of the lover and the apparitions of the love are described.

There are only three lyrics and every one of them is delicate and balmy, having the quaint odour of Burns. The first lyric longs for "the laughter of a girl that's dead" the second for the presence of a wife that "has passed," and the last, which is the best, mourns the death of a dear lady-love. From the last, one can not refrain from quoting the lines,

"Thy soul shall be upon the moonlight spent
Thy mystery spread upon the evening mere
And yet!....."

"Christ in Hades" is the last long poem in the present collection of poems and it, as the author calls it, is "a phantasy." There are a good deal of excellent lines in this piece, and the blank verse reminds us of "Marpessa." A whole band of miserable souls including poets, commanders, kings, peasants and what not crowd in Hades and their queen is Persephone. A disgust is felt by the queen as well as by the sojourners in Hades that the ways of God are going wrong and the prevalence of the so-called moral law is an empty dream. At this juncture Christ comes in and many souls make prayers to him bringing forward their respective complaints. Christ is at first minded to release the souls from their present misery on the strong representations of a Titan but ultimately after a good deal of wavering and on account of inability to judge by himself He does not do the souls any good. Then they all get sullen and dissatisfied and

"Hades her interrupted life resumed."

The poem merely seeks to deal a deathblow on the untenable doctrine of vicarious suffering and the

unbending rigidity of the Law of Nature. Christ himself is not free from it and must pay the penalty for his mal-actions if any. Christ's suffering can not do any good to any man and every one will have to reap his own fruit consonant to the nature of action he has done According to the poem when Christ was asked to pardon the sins of Hades-bound souls, He thought over and over,

"But as he stood, gazing, from time to time
He seemed to swerve, as though his hand grew red,
Or move, as though to interrupt some sight."

The poem as a whole is masterly in treatment having such a richly-varying combination of details and such beautiful descriptions.

We have reviewed Mr. Phillip's poems one by one and it is now left for us to consider his general excellences as an artist and a poet. The great truth he strives to teach is to love beauty in every form as long as life lasts, and to be sure of becoming the beauty itself after death. To him as to Keats the great dictum is "a thing of beauty is a joy for ever." To love the greenness of the meadows, to love the blue hills and sparkling cascades, to love the rosy-cheeked maidens, to love the sweet-scented flowers, to love the colour-changing heavens, these are the passion for Phillips as well Keats. To both of them life is for beauty's sake and death is only becoming one with the beautiful "Spirit of Nature." A prospect of Heaven never buoys them up and a frightful Hell never depresses them and they live for "the beautiful" in Nature and they must be united to the "beautiful" in Nature. Such is the teaching of Mr. Phillips' poetry.

The poetry of Phillips is delicate-scented and can not stand the rough-handling of anatomical criticism. It is suffused with true melody, with the true balm of delicious flowers, with the gentle colours of the rainbow. The first point that strikes any careful and critical reader of Mr. Phillips' poems is the steady and virile mastery of versification which gives to his numbers such a rippling flow. "Marpessa" is a graceful, tender poem, of sensuous and picturesque, but, essentially superficial and sweet verse. A certain philosophy, epicurean in tone inspires the poem. In "Christ in Hades" there is a strong and manly note audible. Intensity there is in Mr. Phillips' poems but it is the intensity of sensuous enjoyment. His muse is full of the spirit of the sunlit wood, the breezy headland, the fragrant garden-walks at dusk; his poems are redolent of the cheerful felicity that plays about the romance of young wedded life, the happy and ardent love of wife and husband, leisurely and unnoticed meetings of lovers in cool and delicious orchards, and unrestrained freedom to breathe the pure air of the blue sky, rambling along moss-grown walks gay with new-blown flowers. Mr. Phillips' "Marpessa" is clad in classical dress. In this he catches the true spirit, the unadorned sweetness of the Greek idyl. The ardent natural sense of enjoyment, without morbidity even in its sadness which is the essence of Greek feeling, needs no setting to declare itself. Hence the poet has felt, I venture to think, that there is no need to shift his readers to an earlier age and sunnier scenery than beyond in name. The Greek feeling can exist in the sweet seclusion of an Indian village, in London smoke, in the monastery of a Tibetan *Lamah*. From end to end "Marpessa" bespeaks the genial mirth of one who feels a happy youth useful, with promise of calm and gracious hours to come. But at the same time, as far as poetical power goes, both "Marpessa" and "Christ in Hades" are more nervous and vivacious than any of the author's other works. "To Milton Blind" and Beautiful death" are the high water-mark of Mr. Phillip's genius. The haunting melody of "Marpessa," its serene and equable sweep, exalt the writer among his contemporaries; and for ardent feeling and pure workmanship his three lyrics rank nearly as high. Mr. Phillips is not always free from mannerism or misty expression. There is, however, a sweetness and dignity about his handling both of metre and rhyme which never degenerates into commonplace, and yet is never affected. In the difficult matter of epithets Mr. Phillips is a master. They are sometimes parodoxical at first sight but they justify themselves on examination. To give an expression or two as examples taken at random from his poems we may look at "sweetest surgery," "nutritious sighs" "indolent magnificence" and the rest.

Delicacy rather than intensity, fragrance rather than strength, is the key-note to Mr Phillips' poems. Though we can not definitely seal him of a certain tribe, we are not safe in saying that Mr. Phillips is *sui generis*. He is not, however, an obsequious follower of any one. No doubt his dignity of versification has the near echo of Wordsworth and the spirit he is imbued with is that of Keats. Yet on examination we may also detect the subdued fire of Matthew Arnold and the passion for wood and stream of Tennyson. But still the poet like the forest-flower may have self-grown and self-blown. We cannot on the whole deny that Mr. Phillips deserves a place in the front-rank of present-day poets, and for natural loveliness of passion and fire he claims a yet more honourable station.

V. V. RAMANAN

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, MARCH 1899.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Prof. MaxMuller's conversion.

It is with the greatest pleasure that we record the great change in the Professor's views. We refer to his acceptance of Dr. Thibaut's conclusions in regard to the true interpretation of the Vedanta Sutras of Badarayana. This is what he says in his last book, "Ramakrishna," p. 71. "It is difficult to say which of the two schools (Sankara's Advaita or Ramanuja's Visishtadvaita) was the more ancient, and *I am bound to acknowledge*, after Professor Thibaut's luminous exposition, that the Visishtadvaita interpretation seems to me more in keeping with the Sutras of Badarayana." And it took him nearly nine years to come round to face the real truth and acknowledge it. With all this change, of course we do not mean to say, he has changed his real faith in Sankara's doctrine. Yes, Sankara's system may be really a superior system but as we have often contended, it would not do to prove it by citing authority which does not support it and claiming antiquity which it does not possess.

***

And we have been claiming attention for Dr. Thibaut's view since 1895, and not even a single Indian writer condescended to notice it. Such is the firm-hold bigotry has in the minds of the so-called liberal-minded people in this so-called liberal age. Dr. Thibaut's summary of opinion we give, in full, below. On p. 100. of his Introduction, he says,

"If now, I am to sum up the results of the preceding enquiry, as to the teaching of the Sutras, I must give it as my opinion that they do not set forth the distinction of a higher and lower knowledge of Brahman; that they do not acknowledge the distinction of Brahman and Iswara in Sankara's sense; that they do not hold the doctrine of the unreality of the world; and that they do not, with Sankara, proclaim the bsolute identity of the Individual and the Highest Self."

***

The illusive Theory of Maya or Mayavada.

In his lectures on the Vedanta, p. 128, the learned Professor had already expressed his agreement with Colebrooke in holding that the illusive Maya-Vada was not the doctrine of the Vedanta. But his agreement was more fancied than real. The conception of Maya as Colebrooke understood it, and as the Professor understands it cannot be the same. And Dr. Thibaut draws a clear distinction betwen the two in the following word

***

"The Upanishads no doubt teach emphatically that the material world does not owe its existence to any principle independent from the Lord, like the Pradhana of the Sankhyas; the world is nothing but a manifestation of the Lord's wonderful power and hence is unsubstantial (Asat) if we take the term substance (Sat) in its strict sense. And again everything material (Achit) is immeasurably inferior in nature to the highest spiritual principle from which it has emanated and which it now hides from the individual soul. But neither unsubstantiality nor inferiority of the kind mentioned constitutes unreality in the sense in which the Maya of Sankara is unreal. According to the latter, the whole world is nothing but an erroneous appearance as unreal as the snake for which a piece of rope is mistaken by the belated traveller, and disappearing just as the imagined snake does as soon as the light of true knowledge has risen. But this is certainly not the impression left on the mind by a comprehensive review of the Upanishads which dwells on their general scope, and does not confine itself to the undue urging of what may be implied in some detached passages &c."

***

And yet if we may believe some prominent followers of Sankara, this Mayavada or Vivartavada is the root of Sankara's system and if this Mayavada is not borne out by the Upanishads (Dr. Thibaut points out that the word Maya does not even occur in most of the Upanishads except in Swetaswatara and Maitrayaniya and our challenge to point out the similes of "rope" and "snake" &c. in the 10 upanishads as yet remains unanswered. And then what becomes of Sankara's position? Our 'Aryan' critic no doubt has plenty of quotations and illustrations from the so-called Upanishads but unfortunately for him, they are all ignored by our learned Doctor and other great European scholars much in the same way as they are treated by our own Siddhanta writers.

***

Professor Seshagiri Sastrigal's Report on the search for Sanscrit and Tamil Manuscripts

When we read para five of his report we recall the memorable words of the late Professor P. Sundram Pillai. Speaking of the meek and loyal son of the Tamil land he says, "Our Dwarf to boot is the most self-denying of ethnical units imaginable, claiming nothing, rejoicing in small mercies, and glorying in any nickname his proud, disdainful partner may be pleased to bestow on him." Like people, like language; and nobody thinks of the Tamil language, or of offering any inducement for its preservation or development, nor has any care been taken to preserve itsoldest writing from falling into decay and obscurity, and yet many a rare manuscript must have been inexistence within the last few decades. The Veteran Tamil Scholar no doubt truly remarks that Tamil Scholarship is the direct road to poverty, in the extract which we elsewhere publish today. However better days would seem to be in store for Tamil when a Scholar like Prof. M. Seshagri Sastrial speaks up for it in the following words.

"A noteworthy feature of these Reports is that they include the catalogues and notices of rare and important Tamil manuscripts acquired during the search of Sanskrit manuscripts, and these additions will, undoubtedly, enhance the usefulness of these Reports in Southern India, which possesses a vast and very ancient Tamil literature claiming as much attention on the part of Government as the literature of Sanskrit, and which deserves to be explored as the latter literature has been for the last many years. For this purpose I intend to apply to Government for an annual grant of Rs. 1,619, which, I earnestly hope, will be sanctioned"

We hope Government will see it fit to render justice even at this late stage. The report and the other contents, by the way, are most useful and we have to congratulate our Professor in already unearthing some rare manuscripts. The extracts from the Tamil manuscripts give a fair idea of their contents though a proper handling of them will require several volumes.

We have to thank the Professor also for his Tamil Edition of his rare work on Philology.

***

Gnana Darsani.

This is a delightful book we read, full of old saws and maxims, happily illustrated and explained. The column containing these sayings was the attraction of Mr. Nataraja Iyer's '*Lokopakari*' and we are glad he has seen it fit to reprint them in such a handy and neat form as he has now presented to us. We hope the book will have a good sale as it well deserves to be, and thus stimulate Mr. Nataraja in his labours.

The Pudukota Sanscrit Journal and Bhagavata Purana.

The last number contains in the English part an extract from Professor Wilson's essays in which he discusses the question of the age and the authorship of the Bhagavata Purana. The Professor upholds the traditional view which ascribes it to one Bopa Deva, a famous grammarian, who lived about the 11th century. Our contemporary publishes the extract without any comments but we should like him to discuss the subject in a thoroughly historical and critical spirit with reference to the external and internal evidence. And this would make an advance in Indian scholarship, which hitherto has concerned itself in quoting and imitating, and accepting every old tradition as true.

***

The Dravadian Sangam.

The preliminary meeting has come and gone. The chairman opened the proceedings with a most hopeful speech. There was some useful and varied discussion. Every body seemed however animated with the spirit of achieving some practical good. We hope the committee would soon present a workable scheme ere long. We hear the inaugural Meeting comes off on the 22nd April.

Dr. Pope's latest work.

We elsewhere publish the extract from the *Madras Mail*. We are informed that learned men who had an opportunity of looking into the work are of opinion that nothing has yet been published at all like it, concerning Siddhanta, and it will be an unique book when published. The readers are to bear in mind what the veteran Savant himself writes about Tamil authorship in another portion of this magazine. We firmly hope that the Tamil public would do its duty and warm the heart of the only old Tamil Scholar in England.

***

We beg to acknowledge with thanks Mr. Govinda Charlu's "Bhagavat Gita with Ramanuja's commentary" and his Pamphlet on "Inspiration, Intuition and Ecstacy" and Mr. Billimora's Zoroastrianism, and the Tamil congress reports from Messrs. G. Subramania Iyer and Durasami Pillai. We hope to notice some of these publications in detail ere long.

EXTRACT

"GOD HAS NO OPPOSITE."

(A SERMONETTE FROM THE PERSIAN.)

By Professor Lawrence Mills., D.D., Oxford.

(This little piece was suggested to me by a fresh consideration of the doctrines of rational dualism as set forth in the Pahlavi literature. See the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for July, 1897, pp. 103-110.)

We have all of us noticed that ideas develop not so much in circles as in spirals. We find the old thoughts coming again, as history unfolds itself, but they always reappear increased. This is perhaps as apparent as anywhere in the familiar argument by which we try to harmonise for ourselves the blemishes which observe everywhere in our personal destiny and in that of others—that is to say, in the argument by which we accepted these miseries on the score of antithesis.

Hegel, and Fichte before him, used this procedure more fully than others among moderns: but devout clergy whose religion no longer includes a cold acquiescence in human sufferings have often urged upon their hearers as a consolation the necessity of evil to the development of the good, of sorrow to the possibility of happiness.

But obvious as such thoughts may be, and vital as they certainly seem to all men in their attempts to smooth out the wrinkles on the face of things, we little expect to find them expressed to a nicety at such a time as the thirteenth century, and in such a place as Persia; and it is equally startling to find their very detail worked out in a style which reminds us of the much-praised but sometimes

bewitched philosopher of Stuttgart.* The Masnavi is the Bible of the Persians, and *Jelal u-din Rumi* is their apostle of the prophet. No book of antiquity, or modern days, is, all things considered, more remarkable than his productions. Wit, humour, poetry and rhyme express its sometimes postprandial pantheism, and these are offset with conceptions which are often sublime and a piety which was doubtless sincere. When he comes to philosophical hair-splittings in the style of the mystics he is very acute, although, as he himself confesses, he often sews himself up. On this matter of antithesis he is especially rich, and he gives us in many a place "Hegelianism before Hegel." Here is a bit of his doctrine of limit.

"Errors occur not without some truth. If there were no truth, how could error exist. Truth is the Night of Power hidden among other nights in order to try the spirit of every night. Not every night is that Night of Power, nor yet is everyone devoid of power. If there were no bad goods in the world every fool might be a buyer, for the hard act of judging would be easy; and if there were no faults one man could judge as well as another. If all were faulty, where would be the skill? If all wood were common, where would be the aloes? He who accepts everything is silly, and he who says that all is false is a knave....

"Discern form from substance, O son, as lion from desert. When thou seest the waves of speech know that there is an ocean beneath them. Every moment the world and we are renewed. Life is like a stream renewed and ever renewed (compare Hegel's 'All is flow' as borrowed from Heraclitus). It wears the appearance of continuity of form; the seeming continuity arises from the very swiftness of the motion (p. 3): a spark whirled round has the appearance of a circle."*

He expresses the principle of this on page 31, book i. Here he begins and slowly works his way up to a statement so great as nearly to silence us with respect for him. Commencing with the usual instance of light and colour, he goes on: "and so with mental colours. At night there is no light, and so no colour, but by this we know what light is, by darkness. Opposite shows up opposite as the white man the negro; the opposite of light shows us what is light; hence colours are known by their opposites. *God created pain and grief show to happiness through its opposite.* † Hidden things are manifested thus." And then come the (to a scholastic) magnificent words. *God has no opposite; He remains hidden.*" God has no opposite; He is all-inclusive. We are all of us a little pantheistic nowadays, although on Hegel's law we may still claim to be orthodox; and who that thinks has not been, or will not be, mentally moved by the conception of that inclusiveness. "He has no opposite."

All that exists exists through His will, and has ever so existed. The discoveries of physical science, the still more far-reaching ones of the purely mental, only define his indefinableness, and make Him greater.

He has no opposite, not in the realms of the moral idea, not in the close distinctions of the exact or the quasi exact sciences, not in the physical astrologies of the skies not in the range of mathematics surpassing imagination, nor in the scope of æsthetics which are as minute as they are expanded. The telescope and the microscope are as powerless as is that world of sensibility which is called into life by music or colour. Nowhere is He arrested or described. Sorrow cannot say to Him "Here is your limit," nor Pain declare "Me you never made." Even the old conceptions of future torment which exist clear and distinct as ideas at least, almost as dreadful as the supposed realities; nothing, nothing is without Him, or so opposed as to define Him; He has no opposite. But He has detail, if we might so express ourselves. He has no opposite, but His actual deeds and attributes are made up of them. He can never be defined, but we can approach a definition. Every opposite that we discover brings Him nearer. All the thronging results of science may be said to be the discoveries of opposites. Every opposite, found out by brain, or eye, or glass, or measure; every tool with its adopted edge, every structure in the subdivisions of mechanics is an added item in the rearing of that great edifice made up of difference out of which we approach Him. Without the recognition of difference no conciousness can exist, and the pang of misery is the actual condition to the thrill of rapture as to the calm of peace.

Surely it is a consoling as well as an impressive thought to the thinker, that notwithstanding the conflicts in his mental processes he does not think in vain that to the universe of opposites on which he works there is a unity towards which he may indefinitely progress.* "God has no opposite"; it gives consolation to the *doer*, for he knows that every result which he brings forth, sharply facing either menace or defect, brings him nearer to the Harmonised. Well may we accept the "pulse of thought," "the grasp," "the split," "the combination."† What consolation above all it gives the *sufferer*! How oppositions tend to make us doubt! How can there be a purpose in so much treason, such equivocation, and such oppression as we see? How is it possible that there can be anything so mean? Surely here, if anywhere, is God's Opposite. Yet even here the old Persian's ward holds good. God means the catiff as the only being that can define the good. That good is somewhere, and all of us will be sure some day to find it out. God has no opposite, and He perhaps never makes us more acutely sensitive to His Goodness than when He permits us to recoil and disgust from what seems the contradictory opposite of all that He can be.

* Hegel was born in Stuttgart where a marble slab bearing his name is seen in the facing of the house which claims to be his birthplace.

* Compare book ii. page 168. I have not followed Mr Wynfield's more impressive and effective translation literally, but I have preferred it to others.

† The Italics are mine.

* Compare Kant's "Ad Indefinitum."

† Compare Hegel's "Begriff, urtheil, schluss."

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science &c.,

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897.

VOL. II | **MADRAS, APRIL 1899.** | **No. II.**

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page* 221.)

(*Objection*):—Parames'vara being thus mighty and extremely merciful, why should He not instantaneously cause the Karma of all jîvas to ripen and manifest the bliss of Moksha to all alike?

(*Answer*):—Yes, Parames'vara is equally benign to all. But those of ripe *mala* (sin) are alone liberated, while those of unripe one have still to bide their time. Though, for instance the rays of the sun are equally distributed, it is only the ripe lotuses that open, but not the unripe ones. Thus, Parames'vara, blessed in Himself, does everything for the sole benefit of others. Accordingly the Purâna clearly sets forth the whole of the foregoing doctrine by way of showing that Parames'vara is all-benign

"As without the sun all this world would be dark, so would this whole world be dark without S'iva. As without a physician unhappy patients would suffer, so without Siva, the world would be unhappy and suffer much. As medicine is by nature an antidote to diseases, so, it is in the nature of Siva to be an antidote to all evil of Samsara. As this terrible sphere of samsara has been in time without a beginning, so, Siva, the Deliverer from samsâra, has been in time without a beginning."

Wherefore it is possible that Paramesvara, who acts only for the benefit of all, engages in the creation of the world and other activities.

And because of the applicability of all attributes. (II i 36)

In short, whatever attributes cannot be applied to Pradhâna, to the atoms, to Karma, to Time or the like, are all of them applicable to Brahman. Wherefore it is but right to say that Brahman, who is above all, is the cause of the creation of the world, and so on

End of the first *Pâda* in the second *Adhyâya*

SECOND PA'DA.

Adhikarana. 1.

The inferred (Pradha'na) cannot be (the cause), because then there can be no creation; and because of its possibility (in the presence of a sentient agent.) (II ii. 1)

In the preceding Pâda, the Vedantin's own theory has been established by answering the objections

raised by the Sânkhya and others on the strength of reasoning. Now, again, on the strength of reasoning the Sânkhya and other opposed schools are criticised. First, an enquiry is started as to whether the Sânkhya doctrine of Pradhâna is reasonable or not.

The cause of doubt in all these cases is clear and may be easily made out.

(*Pûrvapaksha*:)—We see that the doctrine that Pradhâna is the cause of the universe is alone reasonable. For, Pradhâna is made up of *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*. This alone is fit to be the cause of the universe, inasmuch as we find everywhere its effects, namely, pleasure, pain, and delusion. Such things as cloth are pleasurable when found, as serving us to cover our bodies with. When taken away by others, they are sources of pain. When neglected as serving no purpose they are committed to oblivion. As pleasure etc. are thus constant in all things, the cause of the universe must be Pradhâna, made up of the three *gunas* or constituents.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: Pradhâna is not the cause of the universe, because it is insentient. To explain: We see that a piece of wood or the like, when not acted upon by a conscious agent, can be effectual in building a car or a palace; and we see that when acted on by a conscious agent, some effect is produced. Wherefore Pradhana, not governed by a conscious agent, cannot be the cause of the universe. As to the allegation that pleasure etc. is constant in all effects, we say that it cannot be, because pleasure, and the like are internal *i. e.* subjective, whereas the cloth etc. are external, *i. e.*, objective. Wherefore the theory that Pradhâna is the cause is not consistent with reason.

A question is raised and answered:

(If you say it can be the cause) as milk and water (we say) even there (it is not so), (II. iii2).

(*Objection*):—Just as milk and water become curd and hailstone without being acted on by a conscious agent, so Pradhâna can become the universe.

(*Answer*):—No, even there, the reason cannot hold good; for milk and water, being insentient objects, fall within the sweep of our inference. Moreover,

And because, when it is independent, the opposite state can never come about (II. ii. 3).

If the insentient being can evolve effects without being acted on by a conscious agent, then creation will be constant, and there can be no *pralaya* or dissolution, the opposite of creation. Wherefore, the insentient cannot be the cause of the universe.

It cannot even be as in the case of grass (eaten by a cow), because of failure elsewhere (II. ii. 4).

It does not stand to reason to contend that, like the grass eaten by a cow becoming milk, Pradhâna, though insentient, can be the cause; for, since we find no transformation into milk in the case of grass eaten by a bull or not eaten by any being, even grass must be acted on by a conscious agent.

(If you say it is possible) as in the case of man and loadstone, (we reply) even then (it cannot be) (II. ii. 5).

(*Objection*):—The Purusha causes Pradhana to act by his mere presence, though the latter is insentient, like a lame man leading another who is blind, or like a loadstone causing iron to move. Thus there is no necessity for a conscious entity.

(*Answer*):—Even then, it is not possible for Pradhâna to act, since Purusha remains unaffected. The lame man and the loadstone do undergo a certain change by way of teaching the way or by way of being taken to the proximity of iron, and so on. Wherefore, mere presence of the immutable Purusha cannot account for Pradhâna's activity.

Also because of the inexplicability of (the relation) as the main (and the subordinate) (II. ii. 6).

The Sankhyas say that the universe comes out of the Gunas which become related to each other as the main and the subordinate, when one of them gets an ascendancy over the others. This relation, as the main and the subordinate, assumed to come into being at the time of creation, cannot be explained, inasmuch as the Gunas which attain to a state of balance during dissolution, undergo no disturbance whatever. For this reason also, the creation of the universe cannot be properly accounted for according to the theory of Pradhâna.

Even when inferring to the contrary, (it is inexplicable) because of the absence of the power of intelligence (II, ii. 7).

Even if you infer that Pradhâna acts otherwise than in the manner referred to, the theory will still be open to objection, inasmuch as, in the absence of intelligence, Pradhana is not capable of the intelligent plan (we find in the creation of the inverse).

Because, even when assumed, it serves no purpose (II. ii. 8)

If any purpose has to be served by assuming Pradhâna, we may assume it some how or other.

There is no purpose whatever served by the assumption. For, Purusha being immutable, he cannot be affected by way of perceiving Pradhâna or undergoing any other change, and therefore it is not possible to maintain that Purusha becomes subject to enjoyment and suffering by ascribing to himself the properties of Pradhâna and that he attains liberation by right discrimination thereof. Wherefore, in the absence of all purpose, there is no need to assume Pradhâna.

And owing to contradiction, it is unsound. (II. ii. 9.)

We see a thousand contradictory attributes assumed, such as that Purusha is the perceiver, the enjoyer, immutable, and so on. For this reason, too, Kapila's theory is quite unsound.

Adhikarana 2.

Thus it has been shewn that the doctrine of Pradhâna being the cause of the universe has no support of a proper authority. Now this adhikarana proceeds to refute the theory which maintains that atoms (paramânus) are the cause of the universe.

What is big or possessed of length (comes out of) the short and infinitesimal ones (II. ii 10).

Here a doubt arises as to whether the theory which maintains that the atoms are the cause of the universe is consistent with reason or not.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—The doctrine of Pradhana not admitting a supreme Lord (Parames'vara) governing the universe, it is no doubt opposed to reason to maintain that Pradhana is the cause of the universe. But, the theory that atoms are the cause of the universe is supported by reason. To explain: When the universe is in a state of dissolution, on Parames'vara conceiving a desire to create, by Karma of the sentient beings is induced first activity in the motionless atoms. In virtue of this activity one atom conjoins with another atom, and from that conjunction a *dvyanuka*, *i. e.*, a molecule composed of two atoms, comes into being. Three dvyanukas form one *tryanuka*. and so on. In this way the whole universe is created. Thus there is no objection to the theory that atoms are the cause of the universe.

(*Siddhânta:*)—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: According to the theory of Kanâda, from out of short and extremely small atoms (called *paramânus*) are produced *tryanukas* which possess length and appreciable size, and *dvyanukas* which are short and possess the size of an atom. How is this possible? To explain: *Paramânus* are endued with the size called *pârimândalya*, with the size which is smaller even than an *anu* or atom. But of two such paramânus which have not the size even of an *anu* or atom is produced, as the Vaiseshikas say a *dvyanuka* (two-atomed molecule) which has the size of an *anu*. So also, out of the paramânu which are short, a dvyanuka is said to be produced which has no length. From out of three such dvyanukas, they say, is born a tryanuka which possesses length, but not the size of an atom (anu) All this is inconsistent, because it is opposed to their theory as to what takes place in the qualities of the cause. Parts of a whole, having each six sides, combine with one another and produce that whole which is bigger in size than any one of the parts. Since paramânus have no sides, they cannot combine together to produce a bigger substance. Wherefore the doctrine of paramânus is unsound.

The Sûtrakara points out another inconsistency:

In either way, no activity; hence its absence. (II. ii 11).

Because of the absence of first activity in atoms, there can be no conjunction of atmos, caused by that first activity. If the activity be independent of the ripeness of the *adrishtas* (Karmas) of the jivas, then activity may arise in the atoms even before the Jivas' adrishtas become ripe. If, on the other hand, it should depend on the adrishtas of the Jivas, then it cannot be that those adrishtas produce activity in the atoms only on certain occasions. No such quality as ripeness residing in the adrishtas is ever perceived by us. On the other hand, we can say that an act becomes ripe only when and where according to the sruti enjoining the act, the act is destined to produce its effect. Those acts as to which no specific time is mentioned, become ripe in the absence of all other acts which are stronger than the act and obstruct its natural course. Adrishtas are by nature, such as tend to produce effects in accordance with the acts of which they are results. Wherefore it is not possible to suppose that acts, done by the infinite number of souls, as productive of fruits of different sorts and at different times, become ripe all at one time and in one form. Hence the untenability of the doctrine of atoms as the cause of the universe.

There is again another inconsistency, as the sûtrakâra says:

And because it likewise (involves the fallacy of) infinality, owing to the postulate of samava'ya. (II. ii. 12).

A relation called *samavâya* or intimate relation is postulated. Hence an inconsistency.—How?—Even in the case of samavâya, as in the case of jâti (genus) and gunas (qualities)—the postulate being that these are supposed to become related to the substance by the relation of samavâya—we will have to postulate a separate relation by which samavâya may become related to the substance, and so on, infinitely. This involves the fallacy of anavasthâ or infinite regress. Hence another inconsistency in Kanâda's doctrine.

(The members conjoined must also be) quite eternal, because, (Samava'ya is constantly) present. (II. ii. 13).

It is postulated that samavâya is an eternal relation; and this is not possible unless the members related to each other by samavâya are also eternal. Thus, it would follow that the parts and the whole made up of those parts are also eternal. Wherefore the theory is unsound.

And as endued with colour etc., the reverse, must be the case as we find it in experience. (II. ii. 14).

It is here postulated that paramânus possess colour etc. Then they cannot be eternal; for we find that pots etc. which are possessed of colour etc. are perishable. Wherefore also, the theory is unsound.

And because of inconsistency in either way (II. ii 15).

If, to avoid the conclusion that paramânus are perishable, it be postulated that they are devoid of colour etc, then it cannot be maintained that all qualities in an effect are produced by those inhering in the cause. If, again, with a view to maintain this, it be postulated that the paramânus are endued with colour etc, this postulate would lead to the undesirable conclusion that they are perishable, and so on. Thus, in either case, Kanâda's theory is open to objection and is therefore unsound.

Having no following, it has to be aside altogether (II. ii. 16).

The Sânkhya theory, though opposed to S'ruti and reason, is accepted by the orthodox followers of the Vedic doctrine in some points, such as satkâryavâda, the doctrine which maintains that the effect exists in the cause even before its mainfestation. Kanâda's theory being, on the other hand, not accepted in any of its parts, those who seek Moksha should neglect it altogether.

Adhikarana 3

In both the causal aggregates, it (the aggregation) cannot take place. (II. ii. 17)

The theory of the so called Vedic systems has been refuted. Now, the theory of the non-vedic systems, will be refuted. First the question is started as to whether the doctrine of aggregates, as propounded in the Buddhistic systems, can be upheld by reason or not.

Pûrvapaksha:—It is reasonable. They propound the doctrine as follows:

There are two aggregates, external and internal. The external aggregate comprises earth etc. The internal one comprises the mind and its functions. The whole universe consists of the two aggregates. To explain Pramânus are the cause of the external aggregate. They are of four sorts, those of earth, of water, of light and of air. Out of these simultaneously combining together, the external aggregate is born. Of the internal aggregate the cause is the five skandhas or bodies. These Skandhas are respectively composed of forms (rupa), feelings (Vedanâ), ideas (Vijnâna), names (sanjnâ) and tendencies (samskâra) as perceived by the mind. The Rupa-skandha, the body of forms, is composed of sound, touch, colour and the like. When manifested in thought they constitute the Vijnâna-skandha, the body of ideas. The pain caused by this last forms the Vedanâ-skandha, the body of feelings. Devadatta and other names compose the Sanjnâ-skandha, the body of names. The latent impressions of these make up the Samskâra-skandha, the body of tendencies. Out of these combining together, the internal aggregate is formed. Thus in the doctrine of aggregates there is no inconsistency whatever.

As against the foregoing we explain as follows The theory that the two aggregates are the cause of the universe is untennable. They (the buddhists) hold that everything is momentary. How is it possible for momentary things to form an aggregate. The causes existing only for one moment, they vanish as they come into being and are therefore incapable of producing any effect.

If you say that it is possible because (avidya' and attachment) are the cause of each other, (we say) no, because (avidya') cannot cause aggregation (II, ii. 18)

(The Buddhist)—The avidya which regards the impermanent as permanent, and such feelings as attachment, are the cause of each other, and thus aggregation becomes possible.

(Vedantin):—No, for avidya cannot cause aggregation. The mother-o'pearl cannot actually serve the purpose of silver, by mere avidya, i.e., when the

mother-o'pearl is only mistaken for silver. To one who knows the truth, the avidya vanishes then and there, and then no attachment or anything of the sort caused by avidya can possibly arise. Wherefore the theory that the aggregates are the cause of the universe cannot stand.

The sutrakara adduces another argument:

And because of the disappearance of the first at the birth of the second (II. ii. 19.)

Because when the second moment of a pot comes, the first moment thereof has disappeared, and because abhâva exists ever the same as the cause, everything may be produced everywhere and at all times.

If not existent, there is a contradiction of the hypothesis. if otherwise, there is a simultaneity. (II. ii. 20.)

If the cause does not exist when the effect arises, then it will be contrary to the hypothesis that the sense-organs, light and such other auxiliary circumstances produce cognition. Now, if the cause were to abide till the effect is produced, then two pots* would be simultaneously seen in one. If the cause were not to abide till the effect is produced, then the contact of senses with objects will be simultaneous with the (resultant) cognition.

Cessation accompanied with an act of thought and cessation unaccompanied with an act of thought cannot be established, because there is no interruption complete.

Cessation means destruction without leaving any residue. This is not possible in either of its two alleged forms, gross or subtle. For, the destruction of a pot, for instance, consists in its being reduced to the state of fragments; and thus something continues to exist when the pot is said to be destroyed. Wherefore momentariness of things cannot be established.

Because of its being objectionable in either way (II. ii. 22).

Whether it be that what has come into being is reduced to nothing, or that something comes out of nothing, in either case the theory is open to objection. For, it is not possible for any thing to come out of nothing; and what comes out of nothing must itself be nothing. As the theory is open to these objections, it is untenable.

Not even as to Akasa, there being no difference whatever. (II. ii. 23).

Even âkâs'a cannot be regarded as a nonentity, in asmuch as our uncontradicted experience testifies to its reality as the element where the hawk and other birds can fly.

And because of recognition (II. ii. 24).

Also because of recognition, momentariness cannot be established. "This is (the same as) that"; thus, by the relation of opposition between the two words, 'this' and 'that' we come to understand that one and the same thing can exist in the past as well as in the present. It is the contact of the objects with the senses of the man, who retains the impressions of a former experience, which has given rise to this recognition. Wherefore, as propounding such doctrines as that all things are momentary, the theory which maintains that the aggregates are the cause of the universe is quite incoherent.

Adhikarana 4.

Of those who hold that external objects have an independent existence, the theory of those Buddhists who hold that the cow and the pot and the like are perceived by the senses has been refuted. Now the sutrakara proceeds to refute the theory that the existence of external objects has only to be inferred from our cognitions thereof:

Not (an attribute) of the non-existent, because it is never seen. (II. ii. 25).

Here a doubt arises as to whether the contention of some of the Buddhists that the existence of an external world is to be inferred from our cognition is consistent with reason or not.

Pûrvapaksha:—From a variety found in the cognitions, the cogniser has only to infer a corresponding variety in the external world which impresses its form on the cognition and then disappears.

Siddhânta:—This does not hold good; for, an external object is admitted to exist but for a moment; and we have seen nowhere any attribute of a non-existent object which has vanished out of sight attaching itself to something else.

Then even the indifferent would attain the end (II. ii. 26).

It being admitted that everything is momentary, it would follow that one performs an act while another reaps the fruit thereof; so that even to those who make no effort at all everything will accrue. Thus this theory is very hard to explain.

---

* It being held that a pot as it existed at the previous moment and its idea are necessary causes for a pot and its idea to arise at a given moment.

Adhikarana 5.

(The external object cannot be) non-existent, because we perceive it. (II. ii. 27).

Here a doubt arises as to whether the pure Vijnânavâda is consistent with reason or not.

Pûrvapaksha:—It is reasonable. For Vijnana (cognition) in its various forms is alone real. External objects are not real, in asmuch as, in svapna, we find all experience brought about by the mind alone in the absence of external objects. Similarly, the Jagrat experience can be explained. Wherefore Vijnana alone is real.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows It is not possible to maintain that external objects do not exist; for the external object enters into consciousness as its object which the perceiver has to take note of as expressed in the words "I know it." When consciousness is spoken of as putting on the form of an object, it simply means that the person is thereby enabled to know the particular object as it is and act upon that knowledge.

As to the contention that, on the analogy of svapna, the jagrat experience is void, the Sutrakara says:

On account of a difference, it is not like Svapna etc. (II. ii. 28).

Unlike svapna and the like, the Jagrat consciousness is not illusory, in asmuch as the latter differs from the former in so far as there is no defect in the sense-organ and the jagrat consciousness is never falsified by subsequent experience. Wherefore it cannot be that vijnana alone is real.

The Sutrakara adduces another argument:

There can be (no cognition without an object,) as it has never been so found. (II. ii. 29).

No cognition can possibly exist without a corresponding object, since such a cognition is never met with in experience. It is quite possible that even the Svapnic cognition has an object corresponding to it. Hence the incongruity of the theory that cognitions alone are real.

Adhikarana 6

And because of its incongruity in every way (II. ii. 30).

The question raised in this adhikarana for settlement is whether the doctrine that everything is void is reasonable or not.

Pûrvapaksha:—It is reasonable. It may be explained as follows. The universe as a whole is not existent, because it is falsified by other experience. Neither is it non-existent, because we are conscious of it. Neither is it both existent and non-existent, as such a conception involves a contradiction. We cannot say it is neither existent nor non-existent, since such a conception is impossible. On the other hand all is a mere void, not coming under any one of the four alternatives. Its appearance as an object of sensuous perception is due to *samvriti*, avidya or illusion. Hence the soundness of the theory of Nihilism.

Siddhânta:—The doctrine that everything is void is untenable—Why?—For, as when we speak of the universe being existent, so when we speak of it as non-existent or something else, the subject spoken of cannot be a non-entity; and accordingly the words *sat* and *asat*, existent and non-existent, as well as the ideas corresponding to them, all refer to a really existing entity spoken of as subject to the mutually opposed conditions of existence and non-existence.

As to the contention that the fact of the universe becoming an object of sensuous perception is a creation of *samvriti* or illusion, it is ridiculous to advance any such statement. If all is void, who is subject to the illusion? To whom does the illusion present itself? Therefore the theory that all is void is opposed to all experience.

A. MAHADEVA SASTRI.

(To be continued.)

SRADDHA AND BHAKTI.

We quote the following texts from the Vedas and Upanishads from those collected by Dr. J. Muir in his valuable book "Metrical Translations from sanscirt writers."

1. "Whatever is done with Knowledge with *faith* with yoga, is more efficacious. II. 1-10 Chandog Up.

2. "They have no faith in that man's sacrifice who sacrifices without the exercise of faith" I. 6-8-1. Tait. Samhita.

3. "On what are largesses based? On faith; for when a man has faith, he bestows largesses. On what is faith based? On the heart; for it is through his heart that a man has faith." XIV 6,9. 22. Satapatha Brahmana III. 9. 21. Brihad Aranyaka.

In the Rig Veda, piety, faith in the gods, and devotion to their service, are represented as the necessary conditions of enjoying their favour and obtaining the blessings which they are able to confer. I cite the following texts:—

I. 55, 5. "Men have faith (sraddadhate) in the fiery Indra when he hurls again and again his destroying thunderbolt."

I. 102, 2. "Sun and moon move alternately, O Indra, for us to behold, that we may have faith (in thee ?)"

1. 103, 5. "Behold therefore this his great force; have faith in Indra's prowess."

I. 104, 6. "Do not, O Indra, destroy our valued enjoyment: we have put faith in thy great power. 7. I verily believe that faith has been reposed in thee; do thou, who art vigorous, advance us to great wealth.

I. 105, 6. "Since I said at first, when desiring you twain (Indra or Agni), this our soma is to be sought after by the dieties,—come now, regarding with favour this our true faith, and drink the poured-out soma."

VI. 26, 6. "Thou, O Indra, gladdened by acts of faith, and by soma draughts, didst, for the sake of Dabhiti, cast chumuri into a sleep." *

VII. 32, 14. "Who, O Indra, can overcome the man whose wealth thou art? By faith in thee in the critical day (of conflict) the hero gains spoil."

In the following texts the reality of Indra's existence and power is asserted in opposition to sceptical doubts:—

ii. 12, 5. "That dreadful deity, of whom they ask 'where is he,' of whom they say 'he is not,'—he carries off the riches of the foe, as (a gamester) the stakes; * put faith in him, he, O men, is Indra."

VI. 18, 3. "Hast thou prowess, O Indra, or not? tell us truly. Thy strength, O thou strongest of beings, who art great by nature, is really existent."

VIII. 89, 3. "Seeking after good, present a true hymn, to Indra, if he truly exists. 'Indra does not exist,' says some one; 'who has seen him? whom shall we praise?'

4. 'Here am I, O worshipper' (exclaims Indra); "behold me here; I surpass all creatures in greatness."

See also R. V. VIII. 1, 31; X. 39, 5; X. 147, I. The following texts also express the pious emotions of the worshippers:—

1. 61, 2. "They polished their praises for Indra, their ancient lord, with heart, mind and understanding."

VI. 28, 5. "These cows, O men, are Indra: I desire Indra with my heart and mind."

I. 93, 8. "Do ye, O Agni and Soma regard the acts of the man who worships you with an oblation, with a mind directed to the gods, (devadricha manasa), and with butter." (The same phrase occurs in I. 163, 12).

IV. 25, I. "What man, a longing lover of the gods, hath enjoyed Indra's friendship to-day?"

X. 42, 9. "The self-dependent god provides with opulence that man who loves the gods, and does not withhold his wealth." The same phrase, "lover of the gods," *devakama*, occurs also in ii. 3, 9, and iii. 4, 9, and also in the following verse:—

X. 180, 3. "Indra does abandon the cattle of the man who loves the gods, and with a longing mind, and with his whole heart, pours out to him libations of soma."

IV 24, 6. "He bestows deliverance on the man who, with mind directed to him and unreluctantly pours out soma to longing Indra: he makes him a companion in his fights."

VII. 100, 1. "That mortal never repents who, seeking (for good), offers gifts to the wide-striding Vishnu, who worships him with devoted mind, and seeks to gain so great a hero."

* The commentator explains this as meaning that Indra was gladdened by rites performed with faith, for as he says, "the rite which is accompanied by faith has real worth;" and he quotes the Chhandogya Upanishad, I, 1, 10, where it is said, "whatever is done with knowledge, with faith, and with esoteric science, is more efficacious."

* The words of the Original are *vijah iva aminati*. *Vijah* occurs in two passages, i. 92,10, and ii. 12,5, in each of which Sayana assigns to it a different sense, though it must have the same meaning in both. Roth in his Lexicon, S. V. only says that it appears to be a gaming expression. Benfey in his translation of i. 92, 10, gives it the signification of "dice," Orient and Occident, ii. P. 257 and note

VIII. 2, 37. "Worship, O Priyamedhas with devoted mind Indra, who is really exhilarated with soma."

IX. 77, 4. "This soma knowing (our affairs) and lauded by many with devoted minds, will over come our assailants."

V. 4, 10. "Give renown, O Jatavedas (Agni) to me, who, a mortal, constantly invoke thee, an immortal, with a laudatory heart (*hridâ kirinâ*): may I with (or through) my offspring attain immortality."

VIII. 50, 9. "The man, whether learned or unlearned, who, devoted to thee, dedicates to thee a word, will delight thee."

Prosperous men are said to disregard Indra, until alarmed by display of his might:—

VIII. 21, 14. "Thou never choosest a rich man to be thy friend Men intoxicated with wine are hostile to thee. When thou makest a sound, thou gatherest them together - then thou art called upon as a father."

In 5, 44 the following verses occur:—14. "The Rik verses love him who is awake, the Sâman verses proceed to him who is awake. This soma-libation says to him who is awake: "I am pleased with thy friendship." 15. Agni is awake; him do the Rik verses love Agni is awake; to him do the Saman verses proceed. Agni is awake; to him does this Soma say, 'I am pleased with thy friendship."

The 151st hymn of the 10th book of the R. V. is addressed to Sraddha, faith. It is as follows:—I. "Through faith the fire is kindled; through faith the oblation is offered,* with our words we proclaim faith (to be) upon the head of good fortune †. 2. O faith, make this which I utter acceptable to him who gives, and to him who desires to give, and to liberal worshippers. 3. As the gods caused faith in (the minds of) the fierce Asuras, so make what we utter (be an object of faith) to liberal worshippers.

4. The gods Sacrificing, protected by Vayu, reverence faith. A man acquires faith through an impulse of the heart; through faith he gains wealth. 5. We invoke faith in the morning, at noon, and at the setting of the sun: O Faith, inspire us with faith." The Taittiriya Brahmana ii. 8, 8, 8, adds another verse: "Faith dwells in (or among) the gods; faith is the entire universe; with an oblation we exhalt faith, the mother of what we desire." The same Brahmana has the following verses in ii. 12, 3, 1 ff:—

"Through faith a god attains godhead; faith is divine, the support of the world; favouring us, she has come to our sacrifice, having enjoyment for her offspring, and yielding nectar (or immortality). * Faith, the divine, is the first born of the ceremonial, the sustainer of the universe, the supporter of the world. Her we worship with an oblation. May she assign to us an imperishable world, she the ruler, the divine sovereign misstress of all that exists."

In several passages of the Atherva Veda also reference is made to faith. Thus, VI. 35, 7 "I cook this all-conquering Brahmaudana offering; may the gods hear me who have faith."

VI. 122, 3, (and XII 3, 7), "Those who have faith attain to this world."

IX. 5, 7, and 11, "The goat drives far away the darkness, being given (offered up) in this world by a man who has faith." XI. 2, 28, "Be merciful, O King Bhava, to the worshipper, for thou art the lord of cattle. Be gracious to the fourfooted and twofooted beings of him who believes that the gods exist." XIX. 64, 1, May he Jatavedas (Agni), give me faith and understanding."

The Vajasaneyi Sanhita has these verses about faith. XIX. 30: "By giving gifts faith is obtained, and by faith is gained truth." XIX. 77: "Beholding the forms of truth and falsehood, Prajapati distinguished them; to falsehood he attached disbelief, and to truth he attached belief (or faith)."

The following is from the Taittiriya Sanhita i. 6, 8, 1, He has no faith in what he offers who sacrifices without the exercise of faith. He brings water. Water is faith. He sacrifices exercising faith; and both gods and men have faith in his oblation." See also Aitareya Brahmana V. 2. 7, near the end of the section. The Bribad Aranyaka Upanishad iii. 9, 21 (= Satapatha Brahmana XIV. 6, 9. 22) thus refers to faith. "On what is sacrefice based; on largesses, on what is large based? on faith for when a man has faith, he gives gifts; so it is on faith that largess is based; on what is faith based? on the heart; for it has assurance through the heart it is on the heart that faith is based."

There are many verses about Sradha in M. Bh. XII. 2308, 2320. See also M. Bh. iii. 12732, and 12734.

* 3. That is, according to *Yaska* Nirukta IX. 31, "is well kindled," "is well offered."

† I. e., according to the commentary on the Taitteriya Brahmana, ii. 8, 8, 6 ff., where the hymn is quoted, "Faith is the cause of good fortune to men." "Sayana in his explanation of this hymn, however, defines *Sraddha* to be "a particular desire which a man has."

* 4. The commentator quotes here a Smriti verse to this effect: "sacrifices offered, gifts bestowed, or austerity practised, without faith, are called bad (or null), and have no existence either here or hereafter, O son of Pritha."

GLEANINGS FROM TAMIL POETS: No. 1.

The fragment quoted below, to which I have added a literal translation in English, is from தெம்பா மும் மணிக்கோவை (String of triple gems for Chidambaram), a short poem by Kumaraguruparn Swami. A poem of this kind, மும்மணிக்கோவை, generally contains thirty stanzas falling into ten groups, each group comprising three stanzas of different metrical types. With this extract, it may be interesting to compare the following from a poem of Archbishop Trench :—

"Some murmur, when their sky is clear
And wholly bright to view,
If one small speck of dark appear
In their great heaven of blue.
And some with thankful love are filled
If but one streak of light,
One ray of God's good mercy gild
The darkness of their night.

In palaces are hearts that ask,
In discontent and pride,
Why life is such a dreary task,
And all good things denied;
And hearts in poorest huts admire
How love has in their aid
(Love that not ever seems to tire)
Such rich provision made."

கொடியு முரசுங் கொற்றவெண் குடையும்
பிறர்கொளப் பொருஅன் றுனே கொண்டு
பொதிசிற்கு நிகரி னிசதிசை போக்கிச்
செலியிற் கண்டு கண்ணிற் கூறி
யிருநிலம் புரக்கு மொருபெரு வேந்தன்
மிக்கோ னொருவன் வெறுக்கை கோக்குழிச்
தொக்கதன் வெறுக்கை சுருங்கித் தோன்ற
விழப்புது விழுமமெய்தி யழுகுறத்து
மற்றது பெறுதற் குற்றன-தெரிஇ
யயிற்சுவை பெருஅன் றுயிற்சுவை யுருஅன்
மணிமழை மகளிர் தோணலங் கொளான்
தொகாற்று வழங்காப் பெருமூச் செறிந்த
வலியுற் றழிவனுக காண்டு மதாஅன்று
விறகெடுத் தூதொறுஞ் சுமந்த விற்றக் (கூலி கொண்டு)
புன்கையு மடகு மார்ந்தி மக்களொடு
மினியும் பிறவு நோக்கி யயன்மனை
முயற்சியின் மகனை விழித்தனள் சென்னி
யெனக்கினை யிலெனை வினையன் மற்றொருவன்
மனக்கவிப் புரீஇ யமிழ்வனுகம் காண்டும் (அதனால்)
செல்வ மென்பது நிச்சையி னிறைவே

வல்சா ளன்ற வலாவெனப்படுமே
யையுணர் வடக்கிய மெய்யுணர் வல்லதை
யுயர்ச்சடல் சிறை வுலகெலாம் விழுங்கு
மயர்ச்சடல் சுடத்தற் கரும்புனி னின்றே (அதனால்)
[இருபிறப்பமைந்த வொருபிறப் பெய்த
ஞான்மறை முனிவர் மூவாயிரவரு
மாருதி வழங்கும் யாக சாலையிற்
தூஉ தெமுபுகை வானுற வெழுவ
தெழுதாப் படைத்த முத்தீக் கடவுள்
கடலமிழ் தமிழ்ந்தாங் கினமிழ் தண்ண
வரும்பெருந் தேவரை வானவர் கோனெடும்
மிருந்தெதிர் கொள்சென விடுத்தது கடிக்கும்
வலையற்] சிறப்பிற் புலியூர்ச் சிழவனின்
னருன்பெற்றுய்த்தற் குரிய னியானெனிற்
பல்லுயிர்த் தொகுதியும் பவக்கடலுழந்த
வல்லல் செய்யு மவாவெனப் படுமவ்
வதனையினின்றும வாகுமி
யதிவின்செல்வ மனித்தரு ளெனக்கே.

(N. B. The bracketed portion I have not translated, as being merely descriptive of Puliyûr.)

Many lands a mighty king rules o'er,
With ears seeing, with eyes speaking,*
The tyrant wheel of conquest sending
In one direction, then another,
Not bearing other kings should own
The flag, the drum, the umbrella white
(Symbols all of victorious might)—
Such monarch to his surprise sees
The wealth of a greater king than he.
His own less wealth seems lesser still.
Him seizes ruinous envy foul.
Devising means† to glut his greed,
He eats no food and sleeps no sleep;
He tastes no joys of women's love;
With saddened heart he oft heaves forth
Long sighs of grief and discontent.
In misery groaning pines he thus.‡
On the contrary,
A cutter poor that carries wood

* This is the Oriental ideal of a potentate. The kingdom was so extensive, that the ruler could not see everything for himself but had to depend upon the reports of his ministers and viceroys. The orders he had to issue were so many that, in taciturn dignity, he signified his wishes by a nod of his head or a motion of his eye. Elsewhere we have :—

"கண்ணிற் சொலிச் செலிஞ்சேர்ந்து மிறைகாட்டி"

* c. f. Emerson :—"If you own land, the land owns you.

† c. f. Bacon :—

"Princes are like heavenly bodies, which have much veneration, but no rest."

From place to place, and crying vends.
And, with the little earne'd, lives
With children all on gruel and greens—
He, proud of hut and trifles few,
Despising mocks the next-door man,
Like him a son of labour too,
With brag: "He is no equal of me."
Thus lives right pleased and happy he.*
Therefore,
Wealth is but the heart's contentment †
Desire is ceaseless penury.‡
No bark so sure, as Intelligence§ pure,
The senses five that has subdued,‖
To cross Desire's e'er-wid'ning sea
That all the worlds enfolds within,
And tiny makes the surging main.¶
Therefore,
O Lord of famous Tiger-town,
Thy saving Grace if I may claim,
From grip of Desire-poverty
That drowns all souls in painful births**
In mercy me release,
And grant me wealth†† of knowledge, Lord.

N. B.

* *c. f.* Gray :—

"From toil he wins his spirits light.
From busy day the peaceful night;
Rich, from the very want of wealth,
In Heaven's best treasures, peace, and health."

† *c. f.* Miltou :—

"The mind is its own place, and in itself
Can make a Heaven of Hell, a Hell of Heaven."

‡ *c. f.* Ruskin :—

"We complain of the want of manythings—we want votes, we want liberty, we want amusement, we want money. Which of us feels, or knows, that he wants peace?"

§ Intelligence in which there is no relative consciousnes

‖ *c. f.* Sir Thomas Browne :—

"He who is his own monarch contentedly sways the sceptre of himself, not envying the glory tocrowned heads and Elohim of the earth."

¶ *i. e.* by comparison.

** *c. f.* the couplet from Kurral :—

"அவாவென்ப வெல்லா வுயிர்க்குமெஞ்ஞான்றுந்
தவாஅப் பிறப்பீனும் வித்து"

'To all souls ever is Desire the unfailing seed of birth'

†† *c. f.* Coleridge :—

"Three treasures—love and light
And calm thoughts, regular as infants' breath;
And three firm friends, more sure than day and night,
Himself, his Maker, and the Angel Death."

GLEANINGS FROM TAMIL POETS :—No. 2.

The stanza quoted below, to which a translation is added, is from the கோழிக் கன்மணிமாலை ("Necklace of Fourfold gems for the God of Chidambaram"). The poem கான்மணி மாலை contains 40 stanzas, falling into ten like groups, each group having four stanzas of different metrical forms. The author is the great ancient poet and sage, Pattinaththār, a hater of shams, a veritable Carlyle of the past. His poetry is in many places characterised by a coarse bluntness of expression and a scornful disregard for conventionality, delicacy or euphemism. Very often our taste rebels offended; but who shall blame the poet who flashes his electric searchlight on some of the filthiest corners of human life, if he does so only to warn us away in a kindly spirit from going perilously near them?

இணைக்குறளாசிரியப்பா.

பேசுவாழி பேசுவாழி
ஆசையொடு மயங்கி மாசுறு மனமே
பேசுவாழி பேசுவாழி
கண்டன மறையு மூண்டன மலமாம்
பூசின மாசம் புணர்ந்தன பிரியும்
நிறைந்தன குறையு முயர்ந்தன பணியும்
பிறந்தன விறக்கும் பெரியன சிறக்கும்
ஒன்றொன் றொருவழி நில்லா வன்றியும்
செல்வமொடு பிறந்தோர் தேசொடு திகழ்ந்தோர்
கல்வியிற் சிறந்தோர் கடிந்திறன் மிகுந்தோர்
கொடையிற் பொலிந்தோர் படையிற் பயின்றோர்
குலத்தி னுயர்ந்தோர் நலத்தினின் வந்தோர்
எனைய செங்குலத்தினிறந்தோரனையவர்
பேரு நின்றில போலுந் தேரின்
நீயுமஃதறிதி யன்றே மாயப்
பேய்த்தேர் போன்று நீப்பரு மூறக்கத்திக்
கனவே போன்று நனவுபெயர் பெற்ற
மாய வாழ்க்கையை மதித்துக் காயத்தைக்
கல்லினும் வலிதாக் கருதிப் பொல்லாத்
தன்மைய நிழிவு சார்ந்தனை யீயும்
நன்மையிற் றிரிந்த புன்மையை யாதலின்
அழுக்குடைப் புலன்வழி யிழுக்கத்தி னெழுதி
வலைவாய்த் தண்டலி னுள்ளிரை விழுங்கும்
பண்மீன் போலவும்
மின்னுறு விளக்கத்து விட்டில் போலவும்
ஆசையாஞ் பரிசத் நியானை போலவும்
ஓசையின் வினிந்த புள்ளுப் போலவும்
வீசிய மனத்தின் வண்டுபோலவும்
உறவு தனாச் செறவுழிச் சேர்ந்தனை
நண்ணா னூற்றுத் தன்னைப் படிக்கும்
அறிவில் டேத்து நாழிப் போல

ஆசைச் சன்னிப் பாசத் தொடர்பட
கடல்வெழு ஞானெனுமுயற்சை தறியாத
குடல்வெழு நிறையறைக் குறும்பு விடத்தி
கறவை நினைந்த கன்றென விரங்கி
மறவா மனத்து மாசற மடியார்க்
கருள்சுரந் தளிக்கு மற்புதக் கூத்தனே
மறையவர் திருவே மன்னுளாடும்
இறையவ னெனதிவ ணென்னினைந் தனையே.

Hail! Speak* Hail! Speak.
O Erring mind by desire bewildered,
Hail! Speak. Hail! Speak.
What things are seen but fade from sight,
And things we eat to fæces turn;
What things are rubbed† but change to dirt,
And things that meet in time yet part;
What things are full do still decrease,
And things rise high but low to fall
What things are born soon end in death,
And things once great to little wane.
Nought stands the same. And yet besides,
Men born to wealth, men known to fame,
Men great in lore, or grand in might,
Men free of gifts, men trained to arms,
Men high of birth or virtuous life,—
How many such of my tribe have died?
Not e'en their name endures; and this
Dost not thou, Mind, on thought perceive?
The false mirage‡ (the spectral car),
A dream in sleep§ this life‖ is like,
A waking life though it is called.
And, deeming this body¶ harder than rock,
With vicious ones,
Thou too hast infamously fallen.
Thou art a base thing, straying from
The righteous path. And errant drawn
By senses five,** as fish that takes
From angle bent the hooke'd bait,
As moth that seeks the glowing flame,
As elephant caught by lustful touch,†
As bird by music sweet allured,‡
As bee by fragrance blown beguiled,§
Thou hast unconscious neared destruction.
As the stupid worm that weaves fine web
And tangling itself therein dies,‖
In bondage caught by chains of Desire,
Unknowing how to act, heart sore.
Thou drowsest in this boweled prison.¶
The Lord that stintless grants his grace
In mercy sweet, to those that serve
And pine for Him unceasing, like
The calf that yearns to meet the cow,**
The Lord of Tillai's wondrous dance,††
Thou dost not praise, adore.
What thinkest thou, my simple mind?

N. B

---

* The meaning is:—"I wish health to thee, mind. Speak and answer me."

† *i. e.*, perfumes, powders etc

‡ The mirage was quaintly fancied to be the chariot on which ghosts ride. The mirage ceases to be seen when we go near; it is transitory; even so is this life. *cf.* Amiel "Man, under his mortal aspect, is but a species of ephemera.... I gazed into the great implacable abyss in which are swallowed up all those phantoms which call themselves living men. I saw that the living are but apparitions hovering for a moment over the earth, made out of the ashes of the dead, and swiftly re-absorbed by eternal night, as the will-o'-the wisp sinks into the marsh."

§ *cf*, Shakespeare

"We are such stuff
As dreams are made of, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep."

‖ *cf*, Amiel:—"To appear, to shine, to disappear; to be born, to suffer, and to die; is it not the whole sum of life, for a butterfly, for a nation, for a star?"

¶ *cf*, Amiel:—"A bubble of air in the blood, a drop of water in the brain, and a man is out of gear, his machine falls to pieces, his thought vanishes, the world disappears from him like a dream at morning. On what a spider thread is hung our individual existence? Fragility, appearance, nothingness."

* Note how the fish, the moth, the elephant, the *asuna* bird and the beetle are lured to their destruction by the five senses of taste, sight, touch, hearing and smell respectively.

† The allusion here is to the mode of catching male elephants with the help of trained females. Vide Sanderson's "Thirteen Years among the Wild Beasts of India," pp. 73 *et seq.*

"Four or five steady females, ridden by their mahouts, who partly conceal themselves with a dark-coloured blanket as they lie on their elephants' necks, are taken to the jungle where the single male is known to be, and are allowed to graze as though they were wild ones, and to gradually approach the male if he does not himself take the initiative.....When the male can be got to abandon himself without reserve to the society of the females, they keep in close attendance upon him.....The tame Delilahs, under the direction of their riders, close round their victim when he is really asleep, and two mahouts slip off with coils of rope and tie the slumbering Samson's hind-legs together very securely."

‡ The bird (real?) is the *Asuna* (also called *Kōkam*, but not the peacock). It is a conceit of the Tamil poets that this bird is lured and kept fascinated by sweet music, and that a jarring note makes it fall down senseless, when it is easily caught.

§ The bee or the beetle, drawn by fragrance, sips the fermented honey of the flowers, and falls to the ground intoxicated.

‖ The reference here is to the silk-worm which covers itself with threads of silk, or to the caterpillar of some such species as the Vanessa Urticæ. This caterpillar covers some spot with layers of silk-threads, and "a small hillock of silk is formed, the tissue of which is not at all compact." By alternately contracting and elongating its body, it pushes its hindermost legs against the hillock of silk, presses against it the hooks of its feet, so as to get them better entangled, and lets its body fall in a vertical position." The silk-gatherers perhaps kill it then and remove the cocoons of silk. Vide Figuier's "The Insect World," pp. 146 *et. Seq.*

¶ *i. e.* the body having bowels.

** The cry of the calf to its mother is very pathetic. It sounds like the Tamil word 'Ammá' (Mother).

†† 'Tillai' is Chidambaram. 'The wondrous Dance,' is the Dance symbolic of Creative Energising.

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika

MADRAS, APRIL 1899.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE GOD-HEAD.

"ஒண்ணுமையும் பெண்ணுமையாகி."

"Behold! He is the male, the female and the neuter."!

Tiruvachakam.

Very often it happens we have to write upon the same subject over and over again, and nobody need wonder why this should be so. We eat the same kind of rice and dish of vegetables over and over again, day after day; from the year's end to the year's end, and yet we never ask why this should be so. The answer is plain that this is the best and safest and most wholesome food we require every day of our life, for its sustenance and nurture and growth. What applies to the body applies to the mind as well. The mind requires also some wholesome and safe and healthy pabulum for it to feed upon, also, every day, nay, every hour; and you can starve the mind, as well as over-feed it; and you may feed it on unwholesome and unhealthy food; and these are irregularities which we should avoid as we should avoid irregularities in diet. Wholesome food, however often we may repeat, ought not to tire any body. And this is necessary for another reason also. Man is circumstanced more or less by his environment; all sorts of influences are brought to bear on him; and these create doubts and misgivings even in the most well-regulated minds and the mind vacillates from one extreme to the other. It is therefore good that the mind is made to face the same truth ever and anon. And then, indeed, our memory is so weak, we forget what we learnt only yesterday; and what fails to strike our imagination at one time may attract it another time. Besides, errors and fallacies are repeated day after day, and it becomes necessary to repeat what we regard as truths as often. As such, we make no further apology for going fully into a subject which we touched upon in our Review of "the Minor Upanishads," in our introduction to the Kaivalya Upanishad, and in our article on the Personality of God. Very often a controversy is carried on by means of names and words, and the whole fallacy lies in the different parties to the controversy understanding the word in as many different ways. We have seen how European writers differed in defining the word "*Personal*" and "Impersonal"; and we have accepted the word '*Personal*' free from all implication of limitation or anthropomorphism and in the manner defined by Emerson, Lotze, Dr. Merach &c. We have also noted the different ways of interpreting the word *Saguna* and *Nirguna*. One calls God *Saguna*, and interprets *Nirguna* in undoubted and authoritative passages as meaning merely "*devoid of bad qualities.*" And in this sense *Saguna* must mean *full of bad qualities*; and yet this one will only call his God *Saguna* and not *Nirguna*; and he exhibits a clear prejudice against the word "Nirguna," thus clearly making out that his interpretation is after all only a doubtful expedient at avoiding an inconvenient corner. We have however referred to its techinical and original and philosophic acceptation, in that *Guna* means the *Guna tatwa* which is the name and characteristic of *Mulaprakriti*; and this *Guna* comprises the three *Gunas*, *Satwa*, and *Rajas* and *Tamas*; and *Saguna* accordingly means clothed with *Satwa* and *Rajas* and *Tamas*, gross material qualities, and *Nirguna* means freedom from these three qualities or gross material veilings; and the definition of God as *Nirguna*, and not as *Saguna*, does not therefore conflict with the literal and consistent acceptation of the two words, or our idea of God's Supreme Nature. By the way, an additional proof that our interpretation is correct is furnished by the fact that the Saguna Philosopher actually clothes his God with Satwa-Guna. Comparisons are generally odious, but where principles are at stake they cannot be avoided altogether; and we merely invite our readers' attention to the two descriptions of God-head, given in the appendix to Dr. Muir's metrical translations from Sanskrit writers, which are respectively summarised from the Swetaswatara Upanishad and Uttara-Ramayana. You may omit the names, for they are accidents due to our ancient religious history, and you may give the bare descriptions to our artist; and we have no doubt he will draw two totally different pictures. No doubt we admit their Saguna conception of God, and as for that any *bavana* of God serves the purpose of the aspirant after a higher path

to a great extent, on the well-known principle laid down by St. Manikavasa, "*Choose the form which attracts your love most.*" But as we have pointed out already, we do not remember at times that this is only a form, a symbol and not the truth itself, that truth is beyond one's ordinary ken ("அவரவர் புலனுக்கு எட்டியவாறே.—உவமை இல்லா ஒருவனை யன்றே."), and that we can this vision is possible ("கண்ணுதல் மருவு கண்ணே", ("பாசம் நீங்கிய பரமனே") when leaving our feeling of 'I' and 'Mine' destroying and annihilating our *Pasu* and *Pasa* nature "யான் எனது என்னும் எனதே—ான் எனதே" and assisted by His Supreme Grace ("அவனருள்"), we reach the place of peace, Nirvana (Literally non-flowing-as air) (இவறற்ற நிறைபுற நிலை எனல் ஆம்).*

What we, therefore, here wish to lay down and impress upon our readers, is that, whatever names we may use, ("ஒருவனே ஒருவனை ஒன்றினாலும், ஒருவ னிருவனை பலவ னென்றும் ஒன்றிலொன்றை"—" Let us sing the thousand names of the One who has no name, no form, nothing"), and though we may accept this form and that symbol for worship and practice (Sadhana), yet we hold rigidly to the principle that God is not man, covered by ignorance and matter, and God cannot be born as a man and clothed with Prakriti qualities. The rigid acceptance of this one principle alone that *God is Aja*, (*cannot be born*) ought to distinguish and elevate the Siddhanta from all other forms of Religion. And the rigid acceptance of this one principle alone must prevent it from its degenerating into a superstition, and base idolatry, and man—and fetish-worship. One great obstacle to the due recognition of the excellence of the Siddhanta is the obstacle thrown by certain names. We use certain names as denoting God and as comprising the characteristic attributes which we clothe Him with. But now can we help it? We cannot forget our language, and its past traditions; we cannot forget our religious part, however we might try; and we cannot therefore coin new names, simply because some others want us to do so. And what need is there for doing so either? If we use certain names, they were so used by 90 per cent of the Indian population for the last 30 centuries, at least they were so used in the days of the Puranas and Itihasas, they were so used in the days of the Upanishad writers and they were so used in the days of the Vedic writers. And some of these Mantras and texts have been used in the daily prayer of everybody. The publishers of "The Theosophy of the Upanishads" recommend to us the following Mantra from the Taitriya Upanishad for our daily prayer.

"Satyam pranam Anantam Brahma Anandarupam Amritam *yad* vibhûti Shantam *Shivam*, Advaitam."

And what is there sectarian about the word "*Shivam*" herein? Even an Upanishad of the Type of Ramatapini has this text with the same word, (quoting as it does the above Mantra of course),

"*Shivam*, Shantam, Advaitam, *Chathurtam* manyante."

There is one thing about the word "*Shivam*" Sanscrit scholars say that the word in this form is not a neuter noun but simply an adjective, and accordingly translate it as *gracious*, *benignant* &c.; but it is remarkable that this word is always used in the Rig-Veda and other Vedas and Upanishads in conjunction with the word Rudra, Sankara, Bava, &c., and to denote the same personality and not any other. However this be, the word (சிவம்) is Shivam used in Tamil clearly as the neuter Form of Siva or Sivan (சிவன்), as Param (பரம்) of Para or Paran (பரன்), as Brahmam (பிரமம்) of Brahman (பிரமன்), with no change of meaning in either form. That this accounts for the frequent change from one gender to another in describing the Supreme Being, even in the same Mantra, as in the Swetasvatara, we have already pointed out That all these names are also declinable in the feminine gender without change of meaning, we have also pointed out elsewhere. Whether we say Siva, Sivam, or Sivah; Sankara, Sankaram, or Sankari; Paran, Param, or Parai; we denote the same Supreme Personality. We use these words and in these forms of gender, as these are all the forms or symbols we perceive in the material universe. To us, therefore, these names are mere names and nothing more; and we affix therefore no greater importance to one form in preference to another. Though Professor Max Muller would prefer to call God, in the neuter, "It" and think it a higher name, we are thoroughly indifferent as to calling the supreme, as *He*, *She* or *It*; and we accordingly with St. Manicka Vachaka praise God, as

* "Be still and know that I am God." Book of Psalms.

"பெண்ணன் ஆலியெனும் பெற்றியன் காண்க"*
"Behold! He is the male and the female and the neuter."

These lines will be found repeated often and often in the Thiruvachakam, Devaram and every other sacred writing in Tamil. Can lines be quoted from writers of any other school? We dare say not. But the older Upanishads contain similar thoughts and that only proves our contention that the Siddhanta school but barely represents to day the oldest traditions and are the inheritors of the most ancient Philosophy. Of all Indian Preachers, it was the late Madakkandana Venkatagiri Sastrigal that used to dwell on this universal aspect of the Siddhanta in respect of naming Him as 'He' 'She' and 'It' and he used to point out that all names of Siva are declinable in all the three genders without change of meaning, whereas other names do not admit of this change, and even if they do, the word is meaningless or means something else. We do not know why some people prefer the neuter form to the masculine or feminine, when in fact it stands to reason that the male and female represent in each the perfection of organized and organic form, much more so than the neuter forms. If by calling Him,† 'It' we mean to emphasize that God is sexless we must also insist that God is genderless and that he cannot be spoken of in the neuter gender. And the phrase, "அவனவளது" 'Sripunnabhnusam,' 'He, She, It,' has become a technical phrase with us (see first sutra of Sivagnanabotham) to mean the whole of the material manifested universe and its various froms; and when naming God with words and forms borrowed from matter, we cannot avoid using these words. But then, the difference between principle and symbol, truth and dogmatism, has to be perceived. We tried to make ourselves clear about this distinction about the "Soham or Tatvamasi" doctrine in our last; and in the subject we have been elucidating above a similar distiction has to be perceived. One says, 'address God always as He'; and if you call him, 'It,' he says you are addressing a cold abstraction. Another claims to have reached a higher Philosophy by refusing to call Him, 'Him' and by calling Him 'It.' Both seen to think that there is something degrading in calling Him as 'She.' But the feeling which induces the European to lift the female to almost divine honors, and the tenderest and most passionate of all our emotions which cling round the word 'mother' ought to enable one to realize our ideal of God as the 'Divine Sakti,'* One who, St Manicka Vachaka says, "is even more loving than my mother." ("தாயிற் பெரிதும் தயாவுடைய தம்பெருமான்"†)

Where of course, the truth is seen, there will be no more room for ignorant dogmatsim, and any and all these modes of address will equally be acceptable to Him, if instead of uttering those bare words, we put into them, such love as will "make our bones melt." and such as is described by our own Saint, in his "போற்றித்திருவகவல்" "Pilgrim's Progress" (p. 101, S D Vol. I.)

We began our article with the object of quoting from our Lord Manicka Vachaka some passages in which he addresses the supreme as "Sivam" in the Superlative Neuter of Prof. Max-Muller and the forgoing remarks will be sufficient to introduce these passages.

"சித்தாகாசமிவமே போற்றி."‡ p. 25.
"Praise be to "*Shivam*" beyond reach of thought."
"அன்பருள்ளம் சிவமே." p. 26,
O *shivam*! who dwells in the heart of those who love Him."

"அரிக்கும் பிரமற்குமல்லாத தேவர்கட்கும்
தெரிக்கும்படித்தன்றி நின்ற சிவம்." p. 12.
"*Shivam* which stood unperceived by Hari, and Brahma and other Gods."

* And yet consider the following lines from the same 'utterence,'
அரசன் ஆனபெண் ஆலிய காரமாகி
பரந்த யாதுமாய்ப் பயங்கி னாய்
செந்தழல் மேனிவெண் பெருமை யோனே
நின்னடி முன்னம் நினைப்பரி தாகுவே."

My Father! He became man, woman and hermaphrodite, the Akas, and Fire and this final Cause, and transcending all these forms, stands The Supreme Siva of the Body glowing like the Flame of the Forest. He is our Lord and the King of Gods.

"பெண்ணாகி யாணாய் லியாய்ப் பிறங்கொளிசேர்
விண்ணாய் மண்ணாகி யிதனிலியும் வேறாய்
கண்ணார் முதலாய் நின்றான்."

"He became, 'He' and 'She' and 'It' and the Earth and Heaven and is *different from all these* and stands as my dear Blessedness."

† The genius of the English Language, reflecting as it does the Christian Religion does not allow us to call God, except in the masculine, though of course we have heard that they do not name to say that God is a male like man.

* Mrs. Flora Annie steel speaks of Uma-Himavati as the emblem of perfect wife-hood, mother-hood and mystical virginity.

† Consider the following lines also.
"அன்னே யெம்பாய் எனக்குன் ஒப்பாரையாரும் பெருமே"
"தாயே புன்தன் முலைக்கே"

‡ We give the references from the well-printed and neat edition of Kanchi Nagaliuga Mudaliar, 45, Bairagimutt lane, Madras.

"சமைந்த சிவமான" Ibid.

"Losing one's 'I'ness, became *Shivam*"

"இத்திக்கும் சிவபதம்." p. 119.

"The sweet *shiva Padam*" (*The Mahat padam of the Upanishad.*")

"சிவன் செல்_நறுமை கமழும் திண்டேன்." p. 125.

"I will not touch those who love not *Shivam*."

"இத்தலை மறவித்துச் சிவமாக்கி யென்னையன்ட அத்தன்." p. 153.

"My Father who took me to His embrace by making me *Shivam*, after cleansing me of my sin."

These are only a few out of a vast number, and this description is found also in the Devara Hymns and other sacred writings. Probably, if this aspect of Siddhanta had been present to the mind of Prof. Max Muller when he wrote his introduction to the Swetaswatara Upanishad, in refuting the argument that the Upanishad was a sectarian one, need not have gone to the extreme of trying to establish an illusory identity between a Nirguna and a Saguna God. For we do not, at any rate, accept the Saguna God as God, the Supreme at all; for the Saguna God is only a god in name, but a Pasu or soul in reality. And we here come to a great fallacy which is the source of a very grievous error. The error consists in interpreting such words as Iswara, Maheswara, Parameshwara, Isa, Isana, Mahesa, Deva, Mahadeva, Hara, Rudra, Siva, Purusha, wherever they occur in the Upanishads, Gita &c. as meaning the lower or Saguna Brahman, and seemingly because these names are applied to a God who is one of the Trinity or Trimurtis, Brahma, Vishnu, and Rudra. But any ordinary student of the Saiva Siddhanta will perceive that the God they worship is not one of the Trinity though called by the same name and that their system, speaks of Him as the *Thuriyam* and *chaturtham*, both meaning fourth, and these thoughts can be piked up from the most ancient and the most recent books in Tamil and in Sanscrit. The typical passage in the Upanishads is the one in the Atharvasikha.

Dhyàyeethèsànam pradhyàyithavyam, Sarvam idam Brahma Vishnu Rudrèndràs thè sarvè samprasùyantè sarvàni chèndriyanicha saha bhutais, nakàranam Kàranànàm dhàtà dhyàtà Karanahtu dhyèyas, Sarvaiswarya Sampannas Sarvèswaras Sambhuràkasa madhyè ..... Siva éko dhyéya: Sivankara Sarvam annyat Parithyaja Samápta atharvasikhà.

The first cause, the possessor of all Prosperity, the Lord of all, Sambhu; He should be contemplated in the middle of the Akasa &c., &c.

"Adore the most adorable Isana. Brahma, Vishnu, Rudra, Indra and others have an origin. All the senses originate with the elements. The first cause and cause of causes has no origin. Taking another book at random, say the Mahimnastotra, which is reputed to be by a very ancient sage, in praise of Siva, we come upon the following passage also.

"The mystical and immutable One which being composed of the three letters, A. U. M. signify successively, the three Vedas, the three states of life (awaking, dreaming and sleeping), the three worlds (heaven, earth and hell), the three Gods (Brahma, Vishnu and Rudra), and by its nasal sound (ardhamatra) is indicative of thy fourth office as Supreme Lord of All, (Parameshwara) ever expresses and sets forth thy collective and single Forms."

And we to day only propose to quote similar passages from only one book and that the Tiruvachakam.

The first passage is the one occuring on p. 26, which we have already quoted in reviewing the minor Upanishads. Lest that the 'three' in this verse may be taken to mean Brahma, Vishnu and some other God than Rudra, our saint himself expressly sets forth his meaning more clearly in the following verse.

"தேவர்கோ அறியாத தேவ தேவன்
தெழும்பொழில்கள் பயந்தகாத்தழிக்கும் மற்றை
மூவர்கோ னுய்கின்ற முதல்வன் மூர்த்தி
மூதாதை மாதாளும் பாகத்தெந்தை." p. 32.

"Him the God of Gods not perceived by the king of Gods (Indra,* Him the supreme king of the other Triad, who create, sustain and destroy the worlds. The first Murti, (the manifest God)† the Great Ancestor, my Father who consorts with the divine maid. Consider the following passages also.

முன்னோ முவக்கு முறைமைய் முற்றுக்கும்
பின்னோப் பிஞ்சகனோப் பேணுபெருந் தகையின்
மன்னோ வானவனே மாதிலையும் பாதியனே."

"Aim, *The more ancient than the Triad*, The End (of all things), and yet one who lasts behind all things, the one with the braided hair.‡ the king of our loved.

* Like ghee in butter milk, after churning with knowledge and love.

† *cf.* the story in the Kenopanishad about Indra and other Gods being unable to know Brahman and being taught by Uma Himavati (God's grace) about the Supreme Brahmam.

‡ Kapaidin of the Rig-veda.

city Perundurai, The Heavenly God, and the consort of Uma."

பூவேறு கோனும் புரந்தரனும் பேற்பமைந்த
நாவேறு செல்வியுங்காரணனும் கான்மறையும்
மாவேறு சோதியும் வானவரும் தாமுதியாச்
சேவேறு சேவடிக்கே சென்றாய்சோத்தும்பி.

In the following passage, He is identified with the Triad, in the same way as He is often identified with all the works of His creation, Earth, Air, Water &c, though those very passages say at the same time that He is not to be identified with the creature and created things, a doctrine which clearly cannot be mistaken for Pantheism. As a Christian writer points out, the Doctrine of Immanency of God in all nature is quite consistent with our idea of the Transcendency of God.

" புருமூன்றுமாகி புணர்வரிதாமொருவன்." p. 79,

He became the *Triple Form* (of the Triad), and yet remained the one who could not be perceived by the mind."

" முந்தாவெவு முடிவுமாகிய முவறறியாச்
சித்தாச்சேவடியான்."

" Himself the Beginning, the middle and the end, Him whose beautiful " *Mahat Padam* " could not be perceived by the *Three*." Also the following passages.

யாருரன்
செம்பெருமான் வெண்மலரான் பரக்கடவான்,
செப்புவபோல் எம்பெருமான் தேவர்பிரானென்று, p. 91.

" He of Arûr, whom even Rudra, and Brahma and Vishnu, praised as ' Our king, the King of Gods."

முதியமுதல் நடுவிறியுமாகுய்
மூவரும்றிவிலர் யாவர்மற்றறிவார்." p. 95.

Thou becomest the Foremost, the Beginning, the Middle, and the End and were not understood by the Triad, and who else can know thee."

" முழுமுதலே, யைம்புலனுக்கும் மூவர்க்குமென்னைக்
வழிமுதலே." p 97. கும்,

The Impartite First, the First cause or source of the five senses, (the material universe), the *Three Gods* Triad, and myself (Soul)."

தேவதேவன் மெய்சேவகன் தென்பெருந்துறை நாயகன்
மூவராலு மறியொணு முதலாயவானந்த மூர்த்தியான்
யாவராயினு மன்பரன்றி யறியொணுமலர்ச் சோதியான்,
தூயமாமலர்ச்சேவடிக்கணுஞ் சென்னிமன்னிச்சுடருமே."

(" God of Gods. God of Truth. The Lord of South Perunturai
The Lord of Bliss, The first cause whom the Three cannot know,
The Glorious one whom none can know save those that love.
His pure bloom-like feet my head does seek and glorify.)

" மூவரு முப்பத்து மூவரு மற்றெழிந்த
தேவரும் காணாச் சிவபெருமான்—மாவேறி
வையகத்தே வந்திழிந்த வார் கழல்கள்
வந்திக்க மெய்யகத்தே யின்ப மிகும்.

(" The Lord Siva, unknown by Devas all,
The Three and Thirty-three—
He that rides the Bull—
His holy feet if here we seek and praise,
Our bliss will sure increase.")

Yes, nothing can be truer than the thought expressed in this verse.

The Highest conception that we can ever reach of God, describing as it does His inmost nature, and of course the only way we can know Him, is that god is Love and Blessedness, *Shivam*.*

And such a great scientist as the late Prof. Romanes has asked with truth:—" What has all the science or all the philosophy of the world done for the thought of mankind to be compared with one doctrine ' God is Love'."

" PURRAPORUL VENBAMALAI."

(*Continued from page* 229.)

§ 4. *Omens.*

This speaks of *omens* which are continually referred to here.

VERSE 4.

" In the little town encircled with barriers, at eventide, while our people stand around with clasped hands, she [the wise women of the village] speaks, and would say, ' Bring forth toddy from the jar in the stand'; but really says, ' Bring the large-eyed cow from the shed.' Therefore, O thou who bear'st the bent bow in thy mighty hand the victory is ours. "†

§ *They go forth*

The raiders armed with bows, and so styled in Tamil, Ploughmen of the Bow' (*cf. Kural*, 872), go forth through the stony wilderness to the hill fortress of those whose cattle they are bent on carrying off.

---

* The word *Nandi*, a favourite word with St' Tirumûlar and others means also literaly the Blissfull ; and our readers have to consider why we ..ow call the Great Bull (Pasu) in front of God by the same name Nandi.

† Here ... 'stand, ... cowshed' ... toddy from the jar, or "large-eyed ... and for they heard ... cow' ; so she seemed to say, Bring the large-eyed cow from the fold.' The sybil seemed involuntarily by the mistake of a letter (*r* for *l*), to urge them to the raid

VERSE 5.

"Like death's satellities, bearing the curved bow in their left hands,
followed by flocks of vultures they go forward!
Their minds fixed on the station where the herds of cattle are found,
they make for the hill whereon the long *bambús* wave."

§ 6 *The Scouts.*

The raiders send forward trusty spies to ascertain the precise position of the bell-bearing herds, and the number of the warriors to whom these belong.

VERSE 6.

"Our friends have gone forth in the deep darkness to ascertain,
the place of the herds, and their number, and the hosts of the bowmen who defend them, O eagle-eyed warrior king,
with honey-dripping wreath, and hero's jewelled anklet deckt!"

The raiders lie hidden in the dense jungle at the foot of the hill, while the scouts make their way through the darkness up the gorge, to spy out the dwelling-places of those against whom the foray is made.

§ 7. *The Fort Surrounded.*

The raiders surround their enemies fortified dwelling on the crest of the hill, and set guards to prevent egress on every side; and this is done in the silence of the night unknown to the unsuspecting objects of the attack.

VERSE 7.

"None from hence shall scape! Like fires of the day of doom the enemy came forth at dawn. Their power is spent.
The stealthy marauders have surrounded every part
none of the beleaguered ones shall issue forth."

After a short but fiery contest the attacked have retired within their stronghold, which is straitly besieged.

§ 8 *The Storming of the Hill-fort*

The raiders, urging on their swift-footed horses and bearing aloft their bent bows, storm the fort, which is soon enveloped in flames.

VERSE 8.

"Hate lends them help; while fierce fire rages they shout: they rush on regarding no obstacle! In the broad daylight those fall that living never knew defeat! With jewelled anklets' sound
and deadly bows the raiders storm the mountain fort.

§ 9. *The Seizure of the Cattle.*

Having overcome and taken the stronghold, the victorious heroes seize the whole herd—bulls and cows and calves.

VERSE 9.

"Like a congregation of spotted tigers, in the town
in midmost of the *bambú*-encircled upland plain
they take possession of the assembled herds, and round about
stand steadfast to repel all who would set them free.

§ 10 *The Fight around the Herds.*

Now muster on all sides the clansmen of the attacked people wearing wreaths of *Karanthai* (காந்தள், a species of *Basil*, bearing a dark purple flower). This wreath is worn by the bands that come forth to rescue the stolen cattle and repel the raiders. The whole subject is more fully treated in the second *Padalam*.

VERSE 10.

"Those, who came to retake the herds from the raiding host, have fallen;
the vultures have swooped down upon the corpses of the slain;
their dark clouds are like those of the arrows reeking with blood,
that the foeman, fearful as those of the cruel bowman death, have sent forth.

§ 11. *The Cattle driven over the Wolds.*

The raiders, to elude pursuit, drive off the herd quietly through wild unfrequented paths.

VERSE 11.

"'Let the cattle graze, and rest awhile in quiet companionship':
thus spake the bow-bearing, jewel-ankleted hero, though he saw
the rescuing host rushing after, like water from a lofty hill;
and so they paused under the shadow of the mighty crags."

§ 12. *The Raiders' Return.*

The relatives of the raiders rejoice at the return of their hero with the spoils.

VERSE 12.

"First come the cows with their hanging dewlaps:
then come the bulls with their black masses of hair.
The warlike drums sound out, and the wood land maids who feared for their loved ones hail the signs that show them safe."

§ 13. *The Spoil brought home.*

While the drums sound out, and the whole town is in a state of eager expectation, the raided herds enter the village enclosure.

VERSE 13.

The hero's spouse, with shining rows of teeth and rare beauty,
sees her hero crowned with wreaths midst which the beetles hum!
Her heart swells with gladness as she beholds the herds
with tinkling bells filling the open spaces of the village."

This is sung of in P.N.N., 262:—

"Bring out the buried *toddy*; slay the rams;
in *pandál* thatched with green leaves, with slender *(bambu)* posts,
lavishly strew fine sand from river-bed!
My Lord, who first led the charge against the foeman's van,
comes home in rear guarding the captured herds;
his faithfull comrades march, more wearied than himself."

This is a song of Madura. Did even the Pándi kings indulge in these sports? See also P.N.N., 297.

§ 14. *Division of the Spoils.*

The raided herds of cattle are distributed among the successful soldiers according to each one's deserts.

VERSE 14.

"To those who overcame with their glittering swords,—
to those who sought out as spies, and brought back the tale,—
to the skilful ones that interpreted the favouring omens,—
they divide the herds of cattle in the little town."

§ 15. *The Feast.*

The warriors with jewelled anklets, that tinkle as they walk, drink 'toddy,' and dance rejoicing.

VERSE 15.

"The aspect of the maidens, sweet of speech and fair as *Lakshmi*,
fills with pleasing pains the warrior's soul!
The gladness of the intoxicating draught departs, as does the anger against his foes from out his soul.
Love is lord of all."

§ 16. *Gifts.*

The spoils acquired in the raid are lavishly bestowed on all that ask.

VERSE 16.

"The wealth brought back from the battlefield by the warriors
that flinched not in the strife, but bent their bows,
has become the price paid for the fiery drink
by musicians, drummers, singers and singing women."

§ 17. *Extra Rewards.*

To those who as scouts explored beforehand the scene of the fierce strife they give more honour than they take unto themselves.

VERSE 17.

"To those who feared not death, but night and day
explored the battlefield, spied out, and brought us news,
some gifts beyond those given to others surely is due,
O warrior wielding the keen dart, that slays the fiery foe!"

§ 18. *The Favourable Prognosticators.*

Some reward is given to those who faithfully expounded the lucky signs.

"When we went forth with minds intent upon our foemens herds,
these made plain the favouring signs, and sounds that gave us heart;
think not of what is strictly due as their share; to each give
four cows, with udders large, distended with milk!"

§ 19. *The Drummer.*

"The virtues of the old man who beats the drum, according to ancestral custom, for the jewel-ankleted warriors, are celebrated.

VERSE 19.

"For my grandsire's grandsire his grandsire's grandsire beat the drum! For my father his father did the same; so he for me. From duties of his clan he has not swerved: Pour forth for him one other cup of palm-tree's purest sweetest wine!"

The following song (P. N. N., 290) illustrating the section is attributed to the ancient poetess Avvaiyâr:—

"O king, whose chariot drawn by angry elephants
is foremost in the fray, pour out for him the palm-wine.
His father's father, in fierce fight, when spears flew thick,
died tenacious as the workman's pincers,
defending the king, thy father's father!
He, too with valour filled, instinct with glory of his race,
shall, like palm-leaves that screen from sun's fierce rays,
hide thy head from the spear hurled at it."*

§ 20. *The Demoness* Kottavai.

Here they celebrate the never-failing grace of her who protects the warlike host, whose glory never grows dim.

VERSE 20.

"Her beauteous banner bears the lion's form. Her hand the golden parrot grasps and bounding stag.
A countless host of demons round her press—great Kottavai!
When we designed the attack on the foeman's fort,
she went before our host, and made foes flee!"

§ 21. *The Devil-Dance.*

The damsels, with flawless jewels decked, dance the mystic dance with Vélan,† now the deed is done. This is called the Vallai Dance.

VERSE 21.

"Did the black-throated One behold, he would rejoice;
it is the dance performed for the dart-hurling *Murugan*
by warrior, and by jewel-bearing lovely maid,
with fragrant garlands dight."

* "He will cover thy head in the day of battle,

† *Velan*=spearman

The following (P. N. N., 257) gives a portrait of the leader of the cattle-raid. It is somewhat confused, but belongs to the VEDCHI Padalam:—

"CALL THE MILK MAIDS!

"Softly he treads as though pebbles were in his sandals;
huge his paunch and broad his chest,
bright his eye, and bristly as the mountain-side,
his cheeks hang down like dewlaps!
Who is this that thus cometh with his bow? A fearful sight!
Look close, he doth not come from far;
he is not one whose fort is in the wilderness.
At early dawn he watched the course of the foeman's herds,
pointed them out with his hand, numbered them,
and with his bow drove off the would-be rescuers!
The herd is large, but what the gain
if those who milk with white large-mouthed vessels,
and who churn, are not at hand."

These twenty-one verses from the whole *Padalam* commemorating the incidents of the cattle-raid.

PADALAM II.

THE *Karanthai* WREATH, OR THE RESCUERS.

This is a wreath of *basil* or *tulaci*, a sacred plant of several species having dark purple flowers' contrasting with the bright crimson of the *Vedchi* of the former *Padalam*. This *Karanthai* wreath was worn by those who went forth to oppose the raiders and rescue the herds. In P. N. N. there are eleven lyrics referred to this *Tinai*.

§ 1. *The Karanthai.*

Here the owners of the herds with their chaplets of dark purple flowers rush forth to the rescue.

VERSE 22.

"The crowding warriors crown their heads with garlands of *karanthai*,
and go forth to rescue the herds the foeman drives away
as though one should bring back the souls of dwellers on earth
begirt by the sounding sea, after death has devoured them."

§ 2. *The Summons.*

The people whose herds are being driven away are bidden to relinquish their occupations and haste to the rescue.

Verse 23.

"The jewel-ankleted heroes, the fierce bowmen,
they who wield the spear, men terrible to sight, who fear not
death in their fierce anger,—all hear the sound of the drum,
and go to rescue the flocks which the vedchi-chapletted have carried off."

§ 3. *The Rescuers on the Track.*

Only those unfit for war remain in the town; the rest, boiling with fierce wrath, follow the track of the raiders.

Verse 24.

The conch-shell sounds, with the mighty horn, and instruments of music;
adorned with peacock feathers, and roused by the roll of the loud drum.
The *Rescuers* arise, and over the fiery desert make their way,
following the tracks of the cattle,—spears glistening like the sun."

§ 25. *The Doubtful Fight.*

They draw near the raiders, surround them, attack them with fearful energy, and a battle with many changeful fortunes is fought.

Verse 25.

"Like a multitude of tigers or lions or warior-elephants,
full of power and wrath and honourable shame and glorious resolve.
they shout, and hasten on, as they hear
the raiders' defiant cry;—and so the battle rages."

The following sections of this chapter speak of the glory of the individual heroes on either side. They fall fighting to the last full of enthusiasm. But we shall henceforth content ourselves with a few specimen verses.

§ 13. *Glory of the King,*

The praise is sung of the *Maravan* king, a valiant swordsman.

Verse 34.

* * * * *

"They *truly live* who yield their lives fighting against the foe in the fierce battle amid the flash of swords and the whirling of the spear!"

§ 14. *The Heroic Race.*

The praises of the heroes of tried valour and of ancient race.

Verse 35.

The men of ancient race that appear foremost in the fight
wielding their swords; who stand as, in the universal
deluge, some mountain-top rises firm amid the flood;—
what wonder if their glory lives when all falsehoods have passed away!
Thus ends the chapter of the *Rescue.*

We have seen that many of the lyrics in the *Purra-naanuru* seem to have been composed from the hints given in these verses: or it may be that from those lyrics this

more systematized work has arisen. Certain it is that they are closely connected, and must be studied together. Thus P.N.N., 259, evidently refers to an incident in the attempted rescue. The rescuers are in sight of the raided flocks, but the raiders themselves are not seen; the bard cries out to the angry pursuers:—

"See'st not the ambushed Maravars with well-strung bows,
hid in the jungle vast amid the leafy trees,
who while the raided cattle move, move not with them!
Stay, stay, all honour to thy glorious soul! O thou
whose foot the hero's jewelled anklet wears, by whose side
glistens the sword resplendent, whose steeds,
quivering with eagerness, shake like the priestess' frame
before the demon shrine, when *Murugan* inspires her soul!

Here we have an instructive glimpse of the current demon worship, with the agitated priestess dancing wildly before the image of the hill-god. This may be seen daily even yet in the South.

Cattle-lifting is a chief topic in all these poems. It was the beginning of warefare the *Raid* was followed by the *Rescue*, and these by the organized *Invasion* of the enemy's country (for which another wreath was assumed) This led to the systematic *defence*, and the defenders assumed a different wreath. The siege and protection of forts each demanded its appropriate garland. Then came *war in general* and for that another wreath was borne. And finally, the victors who had gained *supremacy* had another wreath, which they wore as the proud token of their victory. Thus our work relates to the expeditions in which these eight different chaplets were worn by the combatant. Some interesting chapters follow in which kings and their attributes, and miscellaneous matters connected with life of the people, are illustrated. It is from these as has been said, that the authors of the Kurral, the Naladiar, and other lesser poets drew much of their material. It must be evident, therefore, that in many respects the work we are now concerned with is an introduction to almost the whole of the genuine poetry of the Tamil language.

The thorough exposition of these chapters, which reveal to us the south Indian primitive tribes making war with one another from their ill fortresses, would require a volume. It must be remembered that in those days there were three great kingdoms of the south—the Pandian, with Madura as its capital; the Cera, with Karur as its centre; and the Chola dominion, with Urraiyur as its chief town. (See my Naladiar, p. 414; verses 240–3). But besides these, almost every little hill had its chieftain who sometimes considered himself subject to one or other of the great powers, but generally was independent, and sometimes even fought against them. These petty chieftains were for the most part of lower caste, if indeed caste distinctions was really recognized among them In the greater kingdoms Brahmanical influence was predominant, and was gradually leavening the whole South.

The chief tribe of what we may call the aborigines were the Maravar, or 'men of violence,' as the name signifies. They often fought as mercenaries in the armies of the greater kings. They still form a very great part of the population of the extreme South, and have no small share of the rude qualities of their ancestors.

The Demoness whom they worship was called *Kottavai*, 'the Victorious One' [in Malayälim, Kotti]. She was evidently the object of worship among the oldest peoples of the South, and she is the great Demoness whose worship is performed under many names in the Devil temples which are still found in every southern village. The Brähmans have transferred her attributes to UMA, the wife of *Siva*, and call her *Durgä*, with whom she is now quite confounded.* There was also a divinity, the Hill-god of all the South, who is represented as being the son of *Kottavai*. His name is *Murugan*, 'the Fragrant One.' And he has been received into the Hindu Pantheon and invested with the attributes of *Kärttikéyan*, the warrior son of *Siva*, and is so regarded by nearly all the rural tribes. Originally it seems quite certain that he had nothing to do with the Brähminical deities. The student who would form an independent opinion on these subjects must read these verses in the original, comparing them with the *Purra-nännüru*, and with the *Tol-Käppoyam* (*Porul*, 56–60), and with chapter 1 of the *Pattu-pättu* ('ten lyrics'). Good editions of all these have been issued by *Saminathaiyar* and *Tamotharam Pillai*, veteran scholars, whose learning and industry are worthy of all praise. Of these works it is hoped that some account may hereafter be given. The dances in honour of these divinities, and especially of *Murugan*, are many, and are still performed. The late lamented *Sundaram Pillai*, in an article published in the *Madras Christian College Magazine*, March 1891, has given an exceedingly interesting account of the *Pattu-pättu*, and he says "It seems not altogether impossible that *Murugan* was originally a Dravidian deity; and that in the course of time, when Aryan civilization found it expedient to adopt the cult of the independent nations over which it came to exercise its influence, a place in the Puränic mythology was found for the war god of the Tamils, as transformed and embellished by Aryan genius; just as in more recent times Buddhistic institutions and even Buddha himself, under the name of *Sasta*, came to be absorbed into Brähmanism."

Perhaps one of the most remarkable 'developments' that can be found anywhere is that of the idea of this Devil-dance as seen to this day in the South, into the really beautiful idea of Sivan's mystic dance giving life and blessing to the whole created universe. This, most undoubtedly, is the origin of the dance in Tillai. [See *Nal.*, 16.]

(To be continued.)

* The whole history of the myths connected with *Durga* and many kindred subjects should be studied in Muir's "Sanskrit Texts," vol. iv, with references to the very complete index.

VACCINATION BY ANCIENT HINDUS

[*By* LIEUTENANT-COLONEL W. G. KING, I.M.S.]

In response to Surgeon-General Sir Charles Gordon's invitation, conveyed in your issue of the 25th instant, I furnish the following note:—The quotation given by the *Madras Courier* was acknowledged by it as derived from the eighth volume of the *Asiatic Journal*, 1819. This has, at intervals, been circulated by the lay and medical Press. It was this quotation which first attracted my attention to the connection of the Hindu with vaccination, some years back. Since then I have never missed an opportunity of consulting Sanskrit scholars on the subject, and have had such copies of Dhanwantari's works as are available in this Presidency perused, on my behalf, by various Native gentlemen. The difficulty attending the task of finding such a quotation will be readily understood. The nearest approach to settling the origin of the quotation was obtained lately when in hunting for Sanskrit references for plague one of the Native gentlemen kindly helping me stumbled across the exact words quoted by the *Madras Courier*. These are contained in a Sanskrit work entitled "Ayurveda Vijnana" compiled and published by Kaviraj Binod Lal Sen. The compiler adds, after quoting the passage, (page 481), that he obtained it from Dhanwantari's "Sacleya Gvanlom." The following is the extract, as given in the *Madras Courier*:

Dhe'nu stanva ma' suchi va Naranan cha ma' siechica.
Taj jalam I ahumu at cha sastraa tena grihitavan.
Bahunnle cha sastrani ract 'otpatti carare cha,
Taj jalam racta militave spotoca jwara Samb havet.

Translation:—

"*Take the fluid of the pock on the udder of the cow*, or on the arm between the shoulder and elbow of a human subject, on the point of a lancet, and lance with it the arms between the shoulders and elbows until the blood appears; then mixing the fluid with the blood, the fever of the small-pox will be produced.

The date of publication of the work I have mentioned is 1750 of the Christian era. It may, therefore, have been the source of information of the writer in the *Asiatic Journal*; but if he got it direct, as suggested in the context of his communication, it gives additional testimony to the passage existing in the original works of Dhanwantari. Sir Charles Gordon draws attention to the distinction between vaccination and inoculation. It will be seen that true vaccination—involving the use of animal lymph—is referred to in the text, and, if the extract be genuine, it clearly proves that Jenner's discovery of vaccination had been forestalled by the Hindus. I would take this opportunity of asking Sanskrit scholars to aid me in establishing the fact, and should be glad to receive any communication on the subject. To be able to claim that an operation which has done so much to save from death and suffering was recognised in Ancient India, is a matter that should appeal to every Indian proud of his country's former progress and civilisation. As to inoculation proper I made enquiries a few years back with the object of comparing the duration of protection afforded by small-pox inoculation, vaccination, and natural small-pox, respectively. I gathered details of cases from members of Hill tribes confined in the Vizagapatam Jail, and from Shans and Burmese in the Mandalay Jail. The records of vaccination of the prisoners were carefully searched; results were verified in each case; and were vaccination had not been effected this was carried out by me, and the result recorded. Enquiries were made as to attacks from natural small-pox after inoculation. The statements received from uneducated men of the classes named were probably not exact but presumably contain some approach to the truth. At Bangalore, 56 sepoys, with well marked signs of small-pox, were also vaccinated by me. The following results were obtained:—Of the total number of 976 cases that were enquired into, 880 had been inoculated under 15 years of age; of these, 5·6 percent, admitted having been attacked with small-pox during adult life. 94 persons had beed inoculated when above 15 years of age: of these, 3·2 per cent, had been attacked during the subsequent years with natural small-pox. 313 persons who had been inoculated when below 15 years of age were vaccinated in adult life, with a success rate of 80·8 per cent. Of those who had been inoculated when above 15 years of age, the vaccination success rate was 81·8 per cent. The Sepoys above mentioned yielded a vaccination success rate of 75 per cent. About the same time (1891-92) I called for information respecting methods pursued for inoculation in the Vizagapatam District. One of the best replies I received was from Hospital Assistant V. S. Arunanunthum (No. 236) which I quote at length, as likely to meet Sir Charles Gordon's requirements:—

The inoculators are Orya Brahmins, inhabitants of Orissa; by profession they generally are physicians, tracers in silk cloths and coral, witchcraft, &c. No fixed rule is enforced amongst them as to the systematic working of the business: thus, the collection of lymph, its preservation, and the mode of operation differ from each other; but the theory of inoculation as a religious affair is unanimous. Hence the inoculators as a rule, begin the process of operation with religious ceremonies, and this they continue till they quit the habitation. The ceremony means the installation of the goddess called Khali, or Devi, or Sakti, in a secret place. Here they make poojah and offer her flowers, Dupam, fruits, sweets cakes kunkamum, rice coloured with saffron, and sacrifice of fowl sheep, pigs,

buffaloes. I never heard one saying that he used any medicine for any ailments that may be brought on by inoculation; but all that he does is the distribution to the patients of the sacred articles such as dholl, Bengal gram, saffron-coloured rice, etc., which were offered to the goddess, and at the same time advises, dholl and rice cooked and to rub their body with saffron, neem leaves. He also by pretension makes the people to believe that the goddess personally appears to him, and she is in his command and he can do whatever he wishes to do with the power of the deity Hence the Telugu proverb goes to say—the pronunciation of the goddess—" Vandina kundalonu vanduthanukani Oddyvadu potu nanu varalanu."; that is "I can rather cook in a vessel that was once used, but, I will not bear the lance of Orya." The literal sence of the proverb is this small-pox will never appear on a person inoculated though it may on a person who had once been attacked with small-pox. For the above reason, people, offer every comfort possible to the inoculator, and easily, yield to his commands and threats; thus he makes a good purse.

I now beg to attempt to answer the question how the inoculator procures lymph at the first start. I was told that he tries to get a supply directly from a natural small-pox eruption by feigned means, and uses this lymph on two or three cases only. This statement is supported by the(1) general belief that the first case he operates is sure to end fatally, as the people suppose that these cases are intended by the inoculator as a sacrifice to the goddess; (2)he starts this business where there are cases of natural small-pox (3) an eye witness who is a Orya man who saw him (the inoculator) actually taking lymph from a natural small-pox case. Subsequently the inoculator collects lymph from the inoculated eruption—this he continues from time to time till he retreats. This statement is supported by (1) two eye-witnesses and (2) the general belief that the operation gradually fades in its virulence, and thus the death rates also lessen. No one could mention the fixed day on which the lymph is taken and none can tell if they collect lymph from any selected cases only. Judging from the different statements heard from men who actually witnessed and also who heard what others have said, I formed an opinion that the lymph is taken from any case that can be easily obtained, and most commonly from the poorer clases, who have no voice in the matter, and it is taken at the pustular stage. Two eye-witnesses describe the lymph as semiconsistent, yellowish green, emits offensive odour. The inoculator is always supposed to have been using lymph. This is explained (1) while he is employed in one village he makes bargain with another and fixes a day which conveniently suits him for the preparation of lymph to be used, and as soon as he receives lymph supply he shifts his abode where he was previously engaged (2) all the children are inoculated at one time in each village. One-eye witness states that before the inoculator quits the village, he gathers lymph from the inoculated eruption which is full and large size of persons of the poorer classes. Lymph is collected by making small punctures over the eruption and the lymph is soaked with cotton and squeezed in a receiver, the lymph being preserved and carried about in no fixed utensils. Fish shells, thin bamboo tubes, tin cases, ect., are used. When the lymph gets any way dry I was told that they add a little cow's milk to moisten it. The modes of operation are (1) scarification by an instrument resembling exactly the nail cutter of a native barber; (2) puncture by needles. This may be explained (1) by five eye-witnesses, of whom three speak of scarification and two of puncture. The scarification is made for a length of about $\frac{1}{6}$th of an inch, skin deep and then the lymph is applied with the same instrument. The puncture is made in a circular spot about O size as if tattooed and afterwards the lymph is applied! (2) by the personal examination of the scars of inoculation as to the shape, shows that they differ, some being shaped circular and some oblong."

Other replies received showed that scrabs rubbed up with cow's milk were at times employed by Orissa Brahmins that lymph is selected "from mild cases; that lymph is taken after observing one or two eruptions subside on the face; that eruptions found on the smooth skin, but not on the joints, are pierced with the pointed head of a paddy corn, and the inoculator is said to carry the lymph in cotton." The general opinion was that death resulted in about 2 per cent. of the cases, and that about 5 per cent. of the inoculations had the disease in a severe form. I have only found one instance of a Chinaman. I do not remember whether he bore marks of inoculation. The description of the process, is recorded in my notes, would show rather that natural infection had been imitated than that inoculation had been attempt; yet the Chinse are understood to have used inoculation proper from very remote periods. The method described by this man was that small-pox scrabs were preserved dry in a vessel. When required for use they were mixed with a few drops of blood from the tips of the operator's fingers, and the mixed product has blown into the nose of the subject by means of a brass tupe. With the Burmese and Shans, lymph is used when available during prevalence of small-pox otherwise scrabs are employed. Mild cases are always elected as the source—although certain of the Burmese "doctors" incline to the belief that better protection is obtained by using scrabs derived from severe cases. The Shans inoculate with the thorns of the "monan" free. Punctures and not sacrifications are used. When scabs are employed they are rubbed up with human milk, in a shell or wooden vessel. I have never seen an inoculation mark at the site on the arm selected by Europeans for vaccination. The

ahterior spect of the forearm or wrist is always chosen. The marks are always single, and usually are a little larger than a shilling.—*The Mail.*

SEGREGATION FROM THE HINDU STAND POINT.

The following in connection with the segregation may be interesting to your readers, and I therefore request you to kindly find space for it in your journal.

Mr. Streenivasa Rao F. T. S. of Guntore in his lecture on ancient and modorn religion and science, delivered in Telugu at the Theological High school, said that segregation is not foreign to Hindus. If a death occurs in one's family he observes Suthakam (days of pollution) during which he and the members of his family are considered to be under pollution and are not allowed to mingle with others or visit public places like temples &c for 10 days (15 among some classes). After the expiry of this period he throws away the old and useless things like earthen vessels &c white-washes the house and performs punyavachanam, when the homum or holy fire is burnt, after which the house and people are considered to be removed from the said restrictions.

If a person sees a corpse he should take a bath without removing from his person the clothes he had on (sachala-snanam). If one attends a funeral he should take a bath and wash his clothing before entering the town; and once more, after entering the town, he should then visit, before returning home, a temple where camphor &c is burnt.

In some cases he should remain away from home for a night.

It was shown that the observances of Suthakam, white-washing, punyavachanam, bathing and visiting temples, were calculated to prevent the spread of the disease if the death be due to an infective disease.

The rule was made applicable to all cases of death to obviate the necessity of discriminating deaths due to infective diseases from deaths due to other causes and to avoid the panic which would rise if the rule applied to certain cases only

It was shown that the visit to the temple was a sort of fumigation as one perspires freely while there owing to the dense smoke raised by burning camphor &c

It will not be out of place to mention that the prohibition of giving alms from a house where there may happen to be a case of small-pox, was meant to prevent the spread of the disease through the grain doled out.

He has compared several such things and proved that so called superstitious observances among Hindus have a real scientific value.

J. V. RAMASWÁMI NAIDU, L. M. & S.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

"THE Theosophical Review is indeed getting dull, and we miss a great deal of Annie Besant's guiding hand. Mrs. Hooper continues her article on "Scattered Scraps of Ancient Atlantis." She in the main does nothing but catalogue all the symbols that refer or apparently refer to an Atlantean epoch. Her contention is that emblems resembling the Christian Cross were also the favourite of peoples of a pre-christian age. But a good deal might be urged on the opposite side too.

***

MR. MEAD affords us some interesting reading in his the Key of Hermes the Thrice-Greatest." He is at very great pains to bring out the sturdy realism of that excellent Greek book. Hermes' speech recalls to one's mind some scenes in the Upanishads. Mr. Mead has been all along devoting his attention to the study of Greek theosophy, mysticism and philosophy. And hence he is able to make his contribution all the more lively by his parallel allusions to the Greek Platonists, Alexandrian philosophers and early Christian mystics.

***

There are certain other articles which are of a very commonplace nature. But the books that are reviewed in the present number include some useful publications. Foremost we would place Mr. A. V. Williams Jackson's book on Zoroaster, the prophet of Ancient Iran. The author is the professor of Indo-Iranian languages in Columbia University. Mr. Mead, one might think, blinds himself largely by his theosophic predilections in reviewing that scholarly work. We do not profess to give the palm to Mr. A. V. Williams Jackson for having worked out reliably the date of Zarathushtra. The date must remain disputed till archæology comes to our aid with surer materials. It would seem Mr. Jackson constructs his date entirely on historical grounds, as far as it is feasible with the present lack of a *tertia firma*. But to appeal to occultism and telepathy in the absence of genuine historical or literary records is to subvert all scholarlike justice, is to twist right methods.

***

As might be expected here is a good harvest of books on spiritualism. Of these one deserves more prominent mention, viz. Mr. Wallace's. He well-known as one of the biologists who made bold in the fifties of this century to enunciate Evolution. He is also held in very great

reverence by "The Clergy for his opinions about "Human Evolution." To him Man as a mental, moral and spiritual creature with his manifold gifts of music and mathematics is "ultra-Natural" in make and "ultra-Evolutional" in progress and culture. So his book on "Miracles and Modern Spiritualism" which has reached a 3rd edition would be hailed by many "pious" friends. Mr. Leadbeater says referring to it, "It is written of course from the Spiritualistic rather than the Theosophical point of view, but nevertheless many a theosophical student would find it a useful book to read himself in the first place, and then lend to materialistic or agnostic friends." As the late Prof. Romanes used to say "Wallace is not a Spiritualist when talking about Evolution and not an Evolutionist when speaking about Spiritualism."

***

"ANANDA Lahari with Yantras and Commentaries; Translated into English by R. Anantakrishna Sastry" is a book we might profitably notice. Mr. Mead remarks, and we would well commend it to the attention of our Sastry friend and in fact of many theospohists, "It is a pity that our learned colleague should waste his time on this work; his scholarship is worthy of a better fate." We would ask "how 'learned'?" and "what 'fate'?"

***

IT is a gratifying thing to learn that the Tamil Pundit of the Board High School of Udumalpet is bringing out an Edition of the Aranyakandam of Kamba Ramayanam with a Tamil Commentary and other notes. We remember having seen an edition of Balakandam issued on a similar plan some years back by some other gentleman. We wish the attempt every success. The book is sold for subscribers at Rs. 3 a copy.

***

There are already two English Translations of the Satakas of Bhartrihari, one by Prof. Tawney, late Principal of the Presidency College Calcutta, and another by Mr. Wortham, M. R. A. S. But "*India*" lately reviews a third translation of Bhartrihari and says it has all the fragrance and grace of FitzGerald's well-known version of "Omar Kayyam." The two previously mentioned translations are the finest samples of how well the excellence and vigour of an oriental work could be spoiled by clothing it in an outlandish garb. The translators are not really blameworthy for such sorry caricatures, but the so-called "classical literalism" and want of will and effort to sympathise with oriental thinking become the bane of many translators.

***

"The Madras Mail" has to say of our Journal on the 28th March, "'*Siddhanta Deepika*, or the Light of truth,' of which also we have been furnished with a copy of the last number, is a monthly journal written in English which has, to a very large extent, for its object the spread of accurate ideas in regard to the religion, philosophy and literature of the Tamil people. It was commenced two years ago in commemoration of Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee and has ever since been conducted on excellent lines. The February number contains besides a number of original articles on religious and philosophical subjcets, a few translations of Sanskrit works. Mr. A. Mahadeva Sastri, Curator of the Oriental Manuscript Library of Mysore, continues his interesting and scholarly translation of the 'Kaivalyopanishad,' and his notes are elaborate and have been prepared as a result of critical study" while "the Hindu" dated May 4th remarks, "'The Light of Truth or Siddhanta Deepika' for March displays new features of interest. A beginning is made in the way of translating Thevaram and the almost untranslatable Thayumanavar. Among the original articles Mr. Ramanan's critique on the poetry of Stephen Phillips needs special mention."

***

The Marine Mullusca of Madras has of late received some attention at the hands of the authorities of the Manchester Museum. A few years ago Prof. J. R. Henderson of the Madras Christian College sent to Mr. Hoyle, of the Manchester Museum, a representative collection of shells dredged off the coasts of Madras and its Neighboarhood, for identification. We are glad to learn that quite recently in the Journal of the Conchological Society of Great Britain and Ireland, a paper has appeared from the pen of Messrs Melville and Standen describing the various species sent by Dr. Henderson among which nine are mentioned to be quite new to science.

***

Our readers must by this time have learnt of the death of Prof. Sir Monier Williams of England. His name will indissolubly stand associated with the Oxford Indian Institute. His death is a heavy loss to the Sanskrit world and especially so as he was engaged at a final revision of his classical "Sanskrit-English Dictionary" on a new basis altogether, to keep it abreast of the latest developments in the science of lexicography. And we do not know which competent scholar might come to complete the half-done work and make it ready for the press. There would be, we are sure, many men here in South India, who might remember his face and the genial way in which he induced others to co-operate with him in carrying out his mission to India. He was the orthodox champion of missionaries among oriental scholars, and we would recommend a reading of his "the Modern India and the Indians to our friends to be able to understand him aright.

V. V. R.

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA

A Monthly Journal, Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science &c

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, 1897

VOL. II | MADRAS, MAY 1899. | No. 12.

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page 146.*)

Adhikarana 7.

We have done with the Buddhists. The doctrine of the Jainas is refuted as follows :—

It cannot be because of its impossibility in one. (II. ii. 31).

The Jainas, indeed, explain contradictory states in one and the same thing by the logic called *Sapta-bhangi—naya*, or "the system of the seven paralogisms." The question is whether this doctrine of theirs is reasonable or not.

Their theory runs as follows : There are two *padarthas* or predicaments, *Jiva* and *Ajiva*, soul and non-soul. Jiva is sentient, of the size of the body, and composed of parts. *Ajiva* again is of six classes : the class comprises such things as trees, mountains, and the like ; the remaining five classes are *Asrava*, *Samvara*, *Nirjara*, *Bandha* and *Moksha*. *Asrava* is the aggregate of the senses, so called because it is by their means that jiva moves towards external objects. *Samvara* comprises *aviveka*, non-discrimination, etc., so called because *viveka* or discrimination is thereby concealed. *Nirjara* is the self-mortification, such as the plucking out of the hair and the getting on a hot stone, so called because desire, anger and the like is thereby completely brought to decay. *Bandha* or bondage is the series of births brought about by the eight forms of *Karman* or action,—the four sinful acts of injury and the four virtuous acts of non-injury. *Moksha* is the incessant upward march of the Jiva when liberated from those acts. These seven predicaments should be determined by the logic of *Sapta-bhangi-naya* which is stated as follows "May be, it is," "May be, it is not," "May be, it is and it is not," "May be, it is not explicable." "May be, it is and yet not explicable," "May be, it is not, and not explicable," "May be, it is and it is not, and not explicable." "May be" here means somewhat. Accordingly, the seven predicaments are established on the logic of *Sapta-bhangi-naya*. This is unreasonable; for it is impossible for one and the same thing both to be and not to be, to be both eternal and non-eternal, to be both different and not different. Such mutually

opposed conditions of being and non-being, of clay-lump, of pot, and pot-shreds, which come into being one after another, can never co-exist simultaneously in a substance. The Jain doctrine, therefore, is full of contradictions.

So also is the Non-universality of A'tman. (II. ii. 32).

So also, the non-universality of A'tman is incongruous. If A'tman be of the size of the body, it will follow that he will be wanting in some parts when passing from a big body to a smaller one. It is, therefore, quite unreasonable to maintain that A'tman is of the same size as the body.

Nor can the incongruity be averted by supposing a fresh condition, because of change etc. (II. ii. 33.)

The foregoing incongruity cannot be explained away by supposing that A'tman assumes a smaller form afresh; for, then, it would lead to the undesirable conclusion that A'tman is subject to change etc.

Both being eternal owing to the persistency of the final (size), there is no difference. (II. ii. 34.)

The final size, the size in the state of moksha, persisting the same, it is the natural size of A'tman. Thus A'tman as well as his size being alike eternal, the size must be the same in the preceding state also. When A'tman assumes the sizes of the different bodies, imperfectness is inevitable. Wherefore, by the theory that one and the same thing both is and is not and so on, and by the theory that A'tman is of the size of the body, the Jain system is quite full of contradictions.

Adhikarana 8.

The Lord (Pati) (cannot be a mere efficient cause), because of an incongruity. (II. ii. 35.)

The Tântrikas, the so called orthodox, those who profess to follow the Parames'vara's A'gamas, without knowing the real import of their teaching, hold that Pati, the Parames'vara, is a mere efficient cause, though, according to S'ruti, He is both the material and the efficient cause of the universe. Now, a doubt arises whether this theory is reasonable or not.

Now, the *Purvapaksha* may be stated as follows: The potter and others, who are, not of course, the material cause, become the agent as merely wielding the stick etc. So, too, the I's'vara, a by-stander, is the mere *Nimitta* or efficient cause. Mâyâ is the *Upâdâna* or material cause. S'aktis are the instruments. Otherwise, if I's'vara be the Upadâna or material cause like clay etc., it will follow that He is likewise subject to change. Wherefore, Parames'vara is merely an efficient cause.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: It is not reasonable to maintain even that I's'vara, the Lord (Pati), is a mere efficient cause, because the theory is incongruous as opposed to S'ruti and reasoning.

The Sûtrakâra proceeds to show how it is opposed to reasoning:

And because of the incongruity of rulership (II. ii. 36.)

It cannot be explained how the Parames'vara who has no body can act upon Mâyâ, the material cause. In ordinary experience it is found that an embodied being alone such as the potter can operate on a material cause such as clay-lump. The analogy therefore, of the potter does not hold good. When Maya is not operated upon, there can be no such Isvara as has been contended for, and thus we are led to the Sankhya theory, there being no use of supposing the existence of Isvara. Wherefore, it cannot be that the Paramesvara is a mere Efficient cause.

An objection is raised and answered as follows:

If you hold (that He is without a body) like the sense-organs, (we say) no, because He would be subject to enjoyment etc. (II. ii. 37).

(*Objection*):—No body is necessary for Him in operating upon the material cause. Just as a sense-organ, though having no body, yet operates upon the physical body, so does Isvara operate upon Pradhana.

(*Answer*):—No; for, He would be subject to enjoyment of pleasure and pain pertaining to Pradhâna. Just as A'tman, who has no body, becomes subject to pleasure and pain pertaining to the body, while operating upon the body, so, too, Parames'vara will become subject to pleasure and pain pertaining to Pradhana while operating upon Pradhâna. Wherefore, I's'vara is no mere efficient cause.

Finitude and limited knowledge, too. (II. ii. 38).

(*Objection*):—Like the potter, Parames'vara has a body; and as the potter operates upon a lump of clay standing a part, so does He operates upon the material cause, standing apart from it.

(*Answer*):—No. If so, like the sam-sârin, Is'vara, the Lord, would be a finite being and would not be an omniscient Being. As He would thus be subject to pleasure and pain, and so on, Is'vara cannot be one who operates on Pradhâna.

Objection:—Though operating upon Pradhâna, Parames'vara would not be subject to pleasure and

pain, inasmuch as the Sruti declares that "the other, not eating, merely witnesses".*

(*Answer*) :—If so, we should not rely on the strength of reasoning; we should, on the other hand, look to S'ruti alone. Accordingly it should be admitted that Parames'vara is also the upâdâna or material cause of the universe, as declared in the following passages: "that Atman made Himself (into the universe), of Himself."† "May I be born many."‡ "All is verily Rudra."§ Though Parames'vara is thus both the efficient and the material cause of the universe, yet He is not subject to change as we may understand from the s'ruti which declares that He is "without parts, without action."‖ In the Vayu Samhita, we are told that, in the universe comprising Mâyâ and so on, Siva Himself with His Saktis or potentialities forms the material cause in the following words:

"Sakti was the first-born, followed by the Santyati'-tapada. Thence came Maya; thence Avyakta. From the Lord Siva endued with Sakti, the Santyatitapada was born, and thence the Santipada, in succession."

Again it says:

"From Sakti to the Earth, all is born from the Siva-tattva. By him alone is all pervaded, just as a pot is pervaded by clay."

From this we understand that the universe is pervaded by Siva, the material cause, as the pot is pervaded by clay. And on the authority of the A'gamas it may be held without fear of contradiction that Parames'vara is both the efficient and the material cause of the universe, as declared in the following passage:

"It is the Divine Being Himself, the self-conscious A'tman, who, like a Yogin, by His will manifests externally all the things which existed within himself, without resorting to any material cause."

Former A'chârya (teachers) maintain that this Adhikarana is intended to set aside the theory, advanced in parts of S'iva-A'gama, that S'iva, the Parabrahman, is a mere efficient cause. On the contrary, we see no difference between the Veda and the S'ivâgama. Even the Vedas may properly be called S'ivâgama, S'iva being the author thereof. Accordingly S'ivâgama is twofold, one being intended for the three higher castes), the other being intended for all. The Vedas are intended for people of the three castes, and the other for all. S'iva alone is the author of both. That He is the author of the Veda is declared in the following passages of S'ruti and Smriti:

"He is the Lord of all Vidyâs."*

"(The Veda) is the breath of the Mighty Being."†

"Of these eighteen Vidyâs of various paths, the original author is the wise S'ûlapâni Himself. So says the S'ruti."

Elsewhere also the Parames'vara Himself is thus spoken of. Wherefore, the author being the same, both teach the same thing and are alike authoritative

Or, the question may be viewed thus:—The Vedas and the A'gamas are both authoritative inasmuch as we find, in both alike, Brahman, Pranava, the Panchâkshari, Prâsâda and other mantras; mention of Pasu, Pati, Pâs'a and other things; such lofty Dharmas as the smearing of ashes, the wearing of tripundra, worship of Linga, the wearing of rudrâksha, and all other such things. The author being the same, and both expounding the same thing, they are not opposed to one another. Wherefore we maintain that this adhikarana refers to the Yoga-Smriti of Hiranyagarbha which speaks of Is'vara as the mere efficient cause. Therefore this adhikarana is properly intended to overthrow the Hiranyagarbhâgama.

Or, as some one says, there is nothing objectionable (in this adhikarana being made to refer to Sivâgama) inasmuch as it is intended to remove an incidental doubt arising with reference to the teaching of the Si'vâgama itself, just as the doubt concerning the origin of âkâs'a will be removed (Vide. *II.* iii. 1.) Any how, our conclusion is that Is'vara is not a mere efficient cause.

Adhikarana. 9.

Because of the impossibility of birth. (II. ii. 39).

The Pancharatra system was revealed by Vasudeva. It speaks of Jîva as being born, and so on. A doubt arises as to whether such a thing is possible or not.

Pûrvapaksha:—It is possible. For, what has been revealed by the Blessed Lord, Vasudeva, must be an authority. The theory therein expounded may be stated as follows: The Blessed Lord, Vasudeva, is one alone, and is Paramatman, the Supreme Spirit. From

* Mund Up. 3-1.
† Tait Up. 2-7
‡ Chha. Up. 6-2.
§ Mahana. Up. 16.
‖ Svc. Up. 6-19.

* Mahâna Up. 44.
† Bri. Up. 6-5-11

him is born Jiva, known by the name of Sankarshana. From Jiva comes Manas, called Pradyumna, and from Manas comes Ahankara or Egoism called Aniruddha. These four groups form the essence of everything. Wherefore, Vasudeva being superior to Hiranyagarbha and all the rest, his revelation must be authoritative, and all that is thus taught therein must be true.

(*Siddhânta*) :—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: This Sâstra, which speaks of Jiva being born and so on, is not authoritative ; for, the birth of Jiva is an impossibility, since then it would follow that deeds go for nothing and that something accrues from what is not done. When some one who has done acts of virtue and sin dies away at the time of *pralaya*, then, (at the time of creation), some other jiva reaps the fruit. Thus something accrues to a jiva from what he has not done; and what the other has done is lost to him. Wherefore the sastra which speaks of the birth of jivas is no authority.

The Sûtrakara proceeds to point out another incongruity :

Neither can the sense-organ come out of the agent. (II. ii. 40).

It is said that from jiva called Sankarshana, manas called Pradyumna was born. It is impossible that a sense-organ should be born from Jiva, the agent, inasmuch as the sense-organ, which is evolved out of Prakriti or matter, cannot have been evolved out of consciousness.

(Suppose the opponent explains as follows :)

Or, no denial thereof, as they become consciousness etc. (II. ii. 41).

'Cônsciousness' means jiva Here jivas etc., are not spoken of as having birth. On the other hand, sankarshana etc., are said to become jivas etc. To become jîvas etc., to govern them from within. Accordingly the authority of the sâstra should not be denied. Thus explains the opponent.

(This objection is answered as follows :)

And because of its rejection (II. ii. 42.)

Though the mention of the birth of Jîvas is thus explained away, the system of Pâncharâtra cannot be accepted, because it is rejected as teaching that the doctrine of Is'vara which is opposed to the teaching of Sruti conduces to moksha, and as inculcating the duty of having certain symbols branded on the body. Wherefore, the system of Pâncharatra is inconsistent. And it is specially prohibited in passages such as the following :

"In Pâncharâtra or in Buddhism, or in Kâlâmukha, be Ye initiated with faith, O dregs of the Brâhmanas."

Being thus rejected, the system of Pâncharâtra is no authority.

(*Objection*) :—In such passages as "Purusha is verily Rudra," Parames'vara Himself is spoken of as Purusha, as Vâsudeva; and by knowing and worshipping Him, one will gradually attain to the goal, to Parames'vara, as the S'ruti says. If the Pâncharâtra, which treats of His worship, be no authority, then it would follow that He should not be worshipped.

(*Answer*) :—Though, as contradicting the S'ruti, the Pancharatra is no authority, how does it affect Him? For, it is possible to worship Him in the way pointed out by the S'ruti. Hence no inconsistency whatever.

End of the second *Pâda*.

THIRD PA'DA.

Adhikarana I.

All the course of reasoning which has been adopted by the rival systems of thought has been set aside. Again, in the remaining part of the adhyâya, the Sûtrakâra proceeds to explain apparent contradictions in the Siddhânta itself :

A'kâs'a is not (born), there being no s'ruti. (II iii. 1.)

As having no parts, âkâs'a may seem to be unborn; and therefore a doubt arises as to whether the birth of âkâs'a is reasonable or not.

(*Pûrvapaksha*): It seems that âkâs'a is not born. For, it is not so declared in the S'ruti. To explain : In the Chhândogya-Upanishad, creation of elements commencing with light is declared in the words. "Existent alone. My dear, this at first was It created light." There no mention is made of the birth of àkàs'a.

As to the passage "from A'tman, âkâs'a was born," occurring in the Taittiriya, it must be understood only in a figurative sense for it is difficult to trace the material cause etc., which could give rise to akasa. Wherefore, akasa is not born any more than Jiva.

As against the foregoing, we hold as follows

But there is (II. iii. 2).

A'kâs'a has a birth, because the Sruti says "Thence, from the Atman, is akasa born;" and so on. But Atman has no birth, because it is denied in the words. "The knower is not born, He does not die." There is

no Sruti which denies the birth of akasa. Wherefore akasa is born.

As to the assertion that the passage speaking of the birth of akasa should be understood in a figurative sense, the Sûtrakâra explains the opponent's position as follows:

It is figurative, because of the impossibility and the Sruti. (II. iii. 3).

Because the Sruti declares that light was first created in the words, "It created light,"* the passage "Akasa was born"† should be understood in a figurative sense, in as much as it is impossible that the akasa which has no parts can ever be born, and that the sruti declares it to be eternal in the words, "the air and the ether, both these are imperishable."‡

And like word 'Brahma' it is possible for one word to be used both ways.

It is possible for one word 'born' to be used in a figurative sense when predicated of âkâsa, and in its primary meaning when predicated of others, though used in one and the same context, as it is possible when a word is repeated in two different passages in the sruti. The word 'Brahman', for instance is used in a figurative sense when spoken of as Prakriti or the material cause, in the following passage:

"Thence, this Brahman (the Prakriti) is born as name, form and food."§

And the same word is used in its primary sense when repeated in the following passage.

"By meditation Brahman grows."§

So also here. Wherefore it does not stand to reason to hold that âkâsa is born.

Now follows the refutation of the opponent's position:

The original proposition can be upheld by non-distinctness (II. iii. 5).

"Whereby what is not heard becomes heard." (‖) This proposition that from a knowledge of the one comes a knowledge of the whole can be maintained only when the akasa etc. are not distinct from Brahman as being produced out of Brahman. Therefore it cannot be that the word "born" is used in a figurative sense, since it would lead to the giving up of the original proposition. The passage should be so construed as not to militate against the original proposition.

From texts (II. iii. 6).

Light is regarded as the first object of creation simply because àkâs'a is not mentioned in the S'ruti "It created light." This cannot prevent one from holding that àkàs'a has a birth as declared in the passage, "from A'tman ákàs'a was born."

The division, however, is meant for the whole creation, as in ordinary speech. (II iii. 7.)

"All this is made up of this A'tman." From these words, we may understand that even àkás'a etc., are to be regarded as created; and therefore we are to conclude that the mention of objects of creation from light onwards points to the whole created existence. In ordinary speech, for example, a man says that he has ten children and then speaks of the birth of a few only of them. So, too, here. Wherefore it is quite reasonable to maintain that àkàs'a had a birth.

Adhikarana 2

Thereby the air has been explained. (II. iii. 9).

In the Sutra II. iii. 10, the Sûtrakara is going to speak of light; and accordingly, the air is separately considered here.

A doubt arises as to whether, like akasa, the air has a birth or not.

(*Púrvapaksha*):—The air has no birth; for, in the Chhandogya-upanishad, creation commences with light, and no creation of the air is spoken of; and in the Brihadaranyaka-upanishad it is said to have no birth in the words. "The air is a being which never disappears."* On all accounts, the air is not born.

Siddhânta:—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: Though, in the Chhandogya-upanishad, the air is not said to have been born, yet on the principle that we may understand in one place what has been declared in another place on the same subject, the birth of the air which has been spoken of in the Taittiriya-upanishad may be taken to have been declared in the Chhandogya-upanishad as well. The words that "this being never disappears" used with reference to the air are meant as a mere praise, as it occurs in a section treating of the contemplation (upâsana) of the air. Wherefore the air, too, has a birth.

---

* Chha. Up. 6-2.
† Taitt Up. 2-1.
‡ Bri Up. 4-3.
§ Mundaka Up. 1-1.
‖ Mund. Up. 1.1.

* Br. Up 3-8-22.

Adhikarana 3.

The existent has no birth indeed, because it cannot be explained.
(II. iii. 9).

It has been shown that from Brahman, the Existent, akasa etc. have been born, as the sruti says: "The Existent alone, my dear, this at first was."* Now a doubt arises as to whether Brahman, the Existent, the cause of all, Himself takes His birth from some cause, or not.

(*Purvapaksha*):—Now, it is maintained that Brahman, too, has a birth, just as the akasa, which is a cause, has a birth. Only it being declared that "the Existent at first was," it had its birth before all objects of creation. If you ask what its cause is, we say it is the non-existent, because the sruti says "Non-existent this at first was; thence verily was born the Existent."* Therefore, Brahman, too, the Existent is born.

Siddhânta:—Brahman is not born; for it is emphatically declared that Siva, Brahman, alone was in the following passages:

"The Existent alone, my dear, this at first was, one alone without a second."*

"When there was no darkness, no day nor night, no existence and non-existence, Siva alone was, isolated from all."§

He has therefore no birth, as the existence of all else is thus denied. All else has a birth, since the contrary is impossible.

(*Objection*):—Just as Brahman is declared to be the cause of all, so the sruti speaks of something else as the cause of Brahman in the following words:

"Non-existent alone this at first was; thence verily the existent was born."†

Thus the non-existent is the cause of the existent.

(*Answer*):—It is wrong to say so, because it is denied in the words "How can the existent be born from the non existent."‡ If the existent should be born out of the existent, it would involve the fallacious view that a thing is based in itself. Wherefore Brahman alone the Existent has no birth; while all else has a birth, because, otherwise, the proposition that all becomes known when the One has been known becomes untenable.

A. MAHADEVA SASTRI.

(*To be continued.*)

Chha. 6-2.
(§) Sveta. Up. 4-18.
† Tai. Up. 2-7.
‡ Chha. Up. 6-2.

SERMONS IN STONES.

From the Gorakpur copper plate Inscription.

I. "Salutation to the God, who is manifested in various forms, from earth to the performer of a sacrifice,* who is an universal soul, to be apprehended only by contemplation of saints and who pervades all.

2. "Salutation to the unborn God.† († Brahma, the creator himself not created, and therefore termed unborn) who makes the worlds production, its continuance, and ultimate destruction, and the recolection of whom serves as a vessel of transport across the ocean of mundane ills.

3. Salutation be to the husband of Lacshmi; to him who reposes on Sésha as on a couch, to him who is Vishnu extracting the thorns of the three worlds; to him who appears in every shape‡ (‡Vishnu, who reposes on the serpent Ananta or Sésha, and who has been incarnate in various shapes, to relieve the world from oppressors.

4. "Salutation be to the blessed foot of Parvati§ (§ Bhavani or Durga slew Mahistasura. The legend is well known) which destroyed the demon mahisha, by whom all had been overcome; and which gives felicity to the world.

श्रीगणेशस्तवनम्:.

स्थित्यादिकजगत्कर्त्रे मूर्तयेविश्वयोनये।
मुनिनांध्यानगम्याय सच्चिदव्यक्तरूपिणे:।
अनायघगदुत्पत्ति स्थितिप्रलयकारिणे।
संसारसागरोत्तार पोतसंस्तूतयेनमः॥

From the Chitradrug Brass plate Inscription. A. D. 1395.

I. "Salutation to Ganesa. I bow to sambhu graced with the beautiful moon crowning his lofty head; himself the pillar, which upholds.

2. The origion of the three worlds* (*Siva or Mahadeva is figured with the moon as a crest. According to mythology, he upholds the creator. This, and the two following stanzas, seem to be the same which are found, but in a different order, at the beginning of the inscriptions on the plates preserved at the temple of Conjeeveram with some difference, however, in the reading and interpretation). May he, whose head is like an elephant's, the son of Hara the cause of uninterrupted supremacy, the giver.

3. Of boons, and the luminary which dispels darkness preserve us. May the auspicious primeval boar (the incarnation of Vishnu as a boar etc. is well known by whom closely embraced, the earth exults, grant us vast prosperity.

---

* Siva, manifested in eight material forms: viz. Earth, water, Fire, air, Ether, the sun, the moon, and the person who performs a sacrifice.

THA'YUMA'NAVAR'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page* 177.)

பிறியாத தண்ணருட் செஞ்ஞாலீ யய்யுந்து
பேசரிய வாரியாசே
பேரின்ப வல்லடையை யளித்தனையென் மனதறிவ
பேரம் பலக்கடவுளாய்
அறிவா யிருந்திடம் காதலொலி காட்டியே
யமிர்தப்பே ரூகெளித்தி
அருளினை யலாதகிரு வம்பலமு மாடியெனை
யாண்டனைபி னெய்யிலெதிரியாட்கக்
குறிதா னளித்தனைகன் மாவுரித்தோ னத்தனைச்
சோலமா யசபாலம்
கூறினின் மௌனியாய்ச் சூட்டா விருக்கேசந்
கூட்டினையெலாமிருக்கச்
சிறியேன் மயங்கிமிக வறிவின்மை யாலுனை
தேடரிய சத்தாகியென்
சித்தமிசை குடிகொண்ட வறிவான தெய்வமே
தேசோ மயானந்தமே. (சகக)

116. O Bliss of teeming Splendour, O The Supreme Intelligence, being the indiscernible Sat that has filled my heart!

Like an all-gracious Siva-gnani Thou taughtest me to feel the Heavenly Bliss by means of restraint of prana in a state of abstraction. Thou, as the Supreme Lord of *Chitsabha*,* hast plunged me in the ambrosial joy, having killed my *mind* and brought me in contact with the inner *natham* or sound of intelligence. Besides, hast Thou been to me a Divine Gnana and as such made me Thy slave.

Thou didst shew Thyself and direct me in Divine law to the ultimate Goal of *Siva-sayujya*.* And neatly dressed in barks of trees Thou camest like a brahmin Guru and didst influence me in the mental recital of Thy Glory. Lastly Thou camest as *Mauni* and didst reveal to me the blissful state of *mona*.†

In spite of these spiritual influences brought to bear upon me by Thee, can I be still left a victim to Ignorance?‡

* *i.e.*, Hall of wisdom. Our Siva-Lord dances the dance of Joy in the wisdom of souls who have become His devotees.

† Vide notes to 2nd verse.

‡ Here the reference is to the power of *anava mala*. It is quite appropriately called '*sahaja*'—*mala* that it is almost the '*nature*' of the soul it attaches to. To subdue it is so difficult that Siva-Lord has out of pure benevolence subjected the devotees sometimes to the hardest trial as in the case of the Saint Siruttondar, whose only dear son was ordered to be cooked as food for the Supreme who appeared as his guest.

(*Notes to verse 115 Continued.*)

"The Yogi is superior to the ascetic, he is superior even to the wise, he is superior to the man of action; therefore, become thou a Yogi, O Arjuna. Among all the Yogis, he who with the inner self abideth in me, who *full of reverence loveth* me, is considered to be the most harmonised.—Gita.

2. "Then therefore the enquiry into Love".—First Sandilya sutra.

3. 'Sandilya refutes, as follows, the objection of Patanjal to Love which is *extreme attachment* towards God. The objection is in the sutra of Patanjal running thus:—'*Ignorance, the Sense of Being Desire Aversion and Attachment are distractions.*'

"Sandilya, however, says that Love is not to be condemned, simply because it is an attachment. Things are not good or bad in themselves but the uses that are made of them. Companionship is not undesirable per se, companionship with bad men is no doubt undesirable, but that with good men is to be eagerly sought. Even the deadly poison of cobera acts like nectar, while milk like poison, under various circumstances. Similarly, *attachment* is not to be condemned per se. What the Yoga sutras condemn is attachment towards worldly objects which bring on distraction of the mind, but *not attachment towards God*. Hence as is laid down in the sutra (21) Love is not to be condemned, simply because it is an attachment; for the Love which Sandilya is speaking of is *the Love towards the Fountain Source of all that is pure and holy*."—J. Magoomdar's commentary on Sandilya Sutra 21.*

4. That Supreme love is the extremely reliant state is clear from the recognition of the purport of the Gita."—Sandilya Sutra 83.

5. "Every one obtains emancipation from supreme love."—Do. 84.

6. "Every one will surely receive me, by shewing supreme love towards me"—Gita.

7. "*Identification* with Him proceeds from the extreme dissolution of the mind in Him, by undivided devotion" Sandilya sutra 96.

(This sort of Identification or identifiableness, a Siva Siddhanti would rightly and aptly call '*Sivôhambhâvana*.')

8. "He, the Highest Purusha, O Partha, may be reached by *devotion to Him only*, in whom all beings abide, and by whom all *this* is spread out"—Gita.

(Note here that Sri Krishna teaches to Arjuna the existence of Turiya Murti. This supports Mr. Suba How's correct observation that our Krishna Bhagavan was a Perfectest Jivan Mukta sent down to procure relief to this world.)

9. Love is superior to others, as they are in need of it" Sandilya Sutra 10.

"There are various paths," says J. Magoomdar, "leading to release or emancipation, such as the paths of Love, Knowledge, Action, Yoga and so on; but *that* of Love is superior to all. Wisdom can achieve nothing without the help of Love. The wise man without Love is invariably a victim to the *snare of his intellect*, and so is the Yogi devoid of Love to that of self-mortification. It is love that imparts its divine warmth and lustre to wisdom or Yoga. The man of action must also be full of love for humanity or he will be wanting in the main spring of his action"—commentary on the above sutra 10 *cfr*, 86th verse of Saint Thayumanavar above with notes.

10. "He who seeth the *Atma* thus, thinketh It thus, Knoweth It thus, becometh one whose entire love is to the Atma &c"—Chandogya Upanishad. Mr. J. Magoomdar says "In this passage are given the *various stages* through which a man has to pass in order to reach the *Final Goal* and *knowledge* here is mentioned as a lower stage than *love*, which is mentioned after the former." *A Saiva Siddhanti goes further and says that all the four stages, Sariya—Kiriya—Yoga—Gnana), are successively indispensable and, (unavoidable and each inseparable with pure Love.* In other words in order to reach the Final Goal a soul pliant with Love should have and could not but have gone through the four stages successively either in final birth or in the birth previous thereto. For instance our Saint *Kannappar* got through these stages in his previous birth as Arjuna under Sri Krishna, his divine teacher, with the effect that he (*Kannappar*) was only to be born again amongst the warlike race and, by the emotional prayer with Extreme Love to Siva attained Siva-Sayujya (the Highest Goal for a perfectest soul) in the Sri Kalathi Siva Temple. So, from a Saiva Siddhantis stand-point all the four stages (Sariya etc.,) of action, Yoga and Gnana are all necessary; and a soul ascending through *these steps* in the ladder should throughout bear in mind the need of the hold or anxiety of *pure and holy Love to Supreme Siva*. Hence I think that I was, according to our Sruti 'அடை சடேயன்ரு வாசை' (adoring His Feet by the aid of His Grace), inspired by Sikalathi nadhar to sing before Him in the Holy place called Srikalathi.

"அன்பே சிவமய போன்ப சிவய மத்தன்பதுவே
முன்ப மிபோக முந்ர் சிவருட முந்தசன்பம்
என்பே புருகி யிடையா யதுமேற்ற வாபரல்
அன்பே புருவரு சிவாசந்தி ஞாக மாதலினே."

(Love is Siva-Sariya, Love is Siva-Kiriya, and Love is the much regarded Siva-Yoga and Love extreme is the *Supreme Sivadvaita-Gnana of Bliss eternal.* Such a love is to be acquired by the complete dissolution of our lower manas in the Sikalathinather (Siva-Lord) and by the melting of our bones &c. And it is Love that enables us to become or assimilate ourselves with Sikalathinather who is *The Love Supreme.*)

12. Thus, we have seen that action, Yoga and Gnana are but necessary auxiliaries to *Love* being stimulated in the aspirer of Siva-Sayuja till he attains purity and becomes identified with Siva (God of Love) in the Supreme Advaita Union posited by this school.

13. So, Sandilya says in his 27th Sutra "Love requires constant stimulation, till purity is attained, as rice is to be struck *over and over again*, till it is free from impurities." 'Similarly, in order to deepen and purify your Love, you are to *constantly fix your mind on the Lord.*'—J. Magoomdar *c. f.* notes to 'ashtaanga Yoga' under verse 61 supra.

14. "Similarly, though nothing can be done without love, still you must not neglect the practice of virtues (sariya, kiriya &c) which will strengthen the hands of Love." *Love and the four stages or steps Suriya—Kiriya—Yoga—Gnana are so connected with one another that one of them cannot render real benefit without the other combined with it.* To instance an analogy—

"பத்திசே ரன்பைப் பலன்ன மன்றேப் படிபடியாஞ்
சித்தி சரித்திருஞ்சிவ முன்னுன்றுத் தெவிட்டாதரை
வித்த நிரம்பிச் சக வெனாத மறைவையும்
முத்தியளந்த முடிவே சொல்லிரன் மோடுப்பனே."

(considering my *Love to Siva*; my *practising the Siva—sariya, Siva-Kiriya and Siva-Yoga*, and my *Siva—Gnana of Bliss* to be as necessary for my attaining the *Siva-Sayujya Mukti as rice, water, and six tastes* are for our physical health, respectively, I shall sincerely aspire for the said Siva-Sayujya.)

15. It will not be out of place to state the marks of Love and definition of Love:—

(*a*). "The marks which characterise the Love towards the Lord are:—*Veneration, delight in objects resembling Him, joy in His presence, pain in His absence, in diference towards other objects, feeling of Glory in Him, living for His sake, feeling that every thing is His, feeling all is One, absence of Hostile feeling towards Him*, and other marks not mentioned for the sake of brevity"—Sandilya Sutra 44.

(*b*). "*Bhakti* is the love of the lover towards the beloved, divested of its sensual nature."

(*c*) "*Prayer* is the spontaneous outburst of deep *emotions* that agitate the heart."

(*d*) "True worship consists in *being* and *doing as well in order to being*, like unto the Father who is in Heaven, and *not merely saying something.* The worshipper sets *an ideal* before his mental vision and tries to fashion his life after that ideal. Sometimes his heart may overflow with the love and reverance he feels for his ideal and sincere prayer is nothing but the spontaneous outburst of his enraptured heart. Set forms of prayer are intended for reminding the worshipper of the ideals of his life. When a christian "looks towards the Heavens" and says "Father, Thou art merciful", he, according to his idea, is worshipping God although he has no image of mercy before his physical eyes; and, if he is worshipping sincerely he has the ideal of mercy in God before his mental eyes and longs in the heart of his heart to become as merciful as God Himself. If he however rests satisfied with simply uttering the words, "Father, thou art merciful," without trying to become as merciful as God Himself, his worship is of no use; for, in that case, he does not advance an inch towards his ideal.'—J. Magoomdar (Note how our Esteemed brother hits at the hidden truth of Christianity being a good Religion of Love i. e. of idol worship or Ideal-worship)

(*e*) Idol-worship, *which is a mark of Love*, is not a thing to be neglected even in the advanced stage of Siva—Gnanis. "*As the very best among us are not without frailties, and would not fulfil our ideals, sages, says Srimat Bagavat, "introduced idol-worship."* J. Magoomdar. *c.f.* the notes under verses 92 and 93 above. *c.f.* also what Dr. C. T. Stockwell observes in his paper read before a club in spring-field (vide p. 7 Awakened India Vol iv of January 1899. "In this connection let me call attention to the fact that Prof. Wundt of Leipsic, in his "Facts of the moral life" has shown, as stated by a recent writer, "by psychological analysis that the moral evolution has been wrought by the interplay of two factors—the *feeling of reverence and the feeling of sympathy*, neither of which is adequate to carry it on *alone.*" If this be true, and it would seem to be capable of proof from a historical point of view,—then do we not need, for the realization of the highest moral progress, a union of the *deepest reverance of the theist* with *the tender and more innate sympathy of the* pantheist?—sympathy which comes of that love of universal nature, of universal life in all its forms? Only thus it would seem, shall we arrive at the truest and most effective conception of the *fatherhood of God and the real brotherhood of man.* When historic theism and historic pantheism shall have advanced to *a point where full coalescence is possible*, then will the present movement in the world of thought have reached, apparently *a destined goal.*"

R. SHUNMUGA MUDALIAR.

"PURRA-PORUL VENBA-MALAL."

(*Continued from page* 260.)

PADALAM III.

THE *Vanji*-WREATH, OR INVASION OF THE ENEMY'S TERRITORIES.

Raids such as have been described naturally lead to systematic invasions of the territories of those who have proved themselves such troublesome and treacherous neighbours. The injured king now declares war, or makes war without declaring it; while he and his warriors, binding the *Vanji* wreaths upon their brows, go forth with their fourfold full array of elephants, chariots, horses, and infantry. The *Vanji* is the general name for any creeping plant, such as is found on all the mountain slopes. This particular wreath is represented as composed of flowers of a yellow colour, and the plant is one whose leaves are green all the year round. It is the symbol of a race the fire of whose valour is never extinguished. It is curious that *Vanji* has become the poetical name of *Karur*, the Cera capital, and it would seem that the Cera kings, of whom twelve are celebrated in the P.N.N., were remarkable for the frequency of their invasions of neighbouring territories. Being for the most part mountaineers, their energy was resistless, and we may add that their wrath was implacable. Thus in P.N.N., 4, the great poet *Paranar* sings of one of these expeditions, and his song is a specimen of very many in the same work. He celebrates the sword, the jewelled anklet, the capacious shield, the fiery charger, the resistless elephant, and the towering banner-crowned chariot of a king; and thus concludes:—

"Like the ruddy sun arising over the dark sea,
art thou in thy beauty, O king!
And therefore, the land of them that provoked thy wrath
shall ceaseless mourn, foodless, and helpless,
like the tender infant forsaken by its mother!"

§ 1. *The Invasion.*

The king puts on the unfading *Vanji* wreath, and contemplates the subjugation of the enemy's land.

[The invasion and complete subjugation of the whole southern seaboard by the famous Pandyan *Nedum Ceriyan* is related in P. Pattu, vi, 149, etc.]

VERSE 36.

"Like young bulls red-eyed
the youthful warriors bend their bows,
with glistening eyes, longing for the battle-feast; and so
put on the *Vanji* wreath, to subdue the unsubdued."

§ 2. *The Invading Hosts.*

The heroes arise in their wrath, brandishing their bright swords, amid the trumpeting of the elephant-hosts.

VERSE 37.

"The drums sound out like the roaring of the angry sea!
Wreathed with the *Vanji* the valiant bands rush on.
In the midst of the glittering bands, like the eternal fires,
the elephants madly rush on like black clouds in the rainy sky."

The following verses speak of the uplifting of the banner, and the unsheathing of the sword. *Kottavai* is again introduced as putting to flight the enemy's forces.

§ 6. *The Model Hero.*

VERSE 41.

"You ask how the hero distinguishes himself: he is foremost mid his kinsmen's hosts. He emulates the prowess of the bravest. Like fire he penetrates the foeman's rank: these are the deeds of the jewel-ankleted hero."

§ 8 *Woe to the Conquered.*

The soldiers commiserate the sufferings of the land they overrun.

VERSE 43.

"The lotus-like eyes of the warrior, whose breast bears the warlike wreath, are wet with tears, as
he exclaims: 'They perish, a fearful spectacle to all beholders,
they who erewhile rode forth with garlands gay,
with glistening eyes, and sound of warriors' cars.'"

§ 9. *The Rewards.*

As they come to distribute the spoil, the question arises, who of the foe shall be spared?

VERSE 44.

"Touch not the temples, where sacrifices are offered;
spare the dwellings of the holy ascetics;
enter not the houses of the sacred Vedic Brahmans.
Let all the rest be abandoned to our warriors as their guerdon."

[So P.N.N., 9.]

The vanquished enemy now submits and pays tribute. The prowess of the heroes is again celebrated.

§ 14. *The Wasted Land.*

The devastation of the ravaged land, and the deserted homes, described. [Cf. P.N.N., 6.]

VERSE 50.

Spoils.

"Gather the slaves, the heaped-up jewels, pearls,
red gold, the plunder from the stately homes,
and give them to the warriors; while subjects
of the hostile king make loud laments!"

The inhabitants of the invaded land flee on every side; the country is ravaged with fire; and the invaders build their fortresses.

§ 22. *The Warriors' Feast.*

VERSE 58.

"The instruments of music sound out. The heroes like tigers rush upon the field and reap the crops and feast, while they explore the resources of the vanquished lands."

§ 23. *Glory to the Conquering Invaders.*

Triumph and pity mingle in the final song.

VERSE 60.

" Where palaces like mountains reared their heads, the roar
of the consuming fire is heard. Wild jungle plants grow among the ruins. The conqueror rides glorious on his lofty car,
round which triumphing hosts flow like a mighty sea!

These desolating wars account for the multitudes of deserted strongholds whose ruins are yet to be seen, and for the comparative sparseness of the population at the period when authentic history begins. In P. N. N. twelve lyrics refer to this chapter. In all the poems there is a note of an oft-times savage ferocity. These old Dravidians were great and most implacable warriors!

Whatever faults may be found with the government under the *Pax Britannica* by peevish and restless partisans, we see that the idea of a *Pax Tamuliensis* is a myth.

PADALAM IV.

THE KA'NJI PADALAM, OR THE DEFENCE OF THE

The Kânji is the *Ulmus integrifolia*, or elm-tree, and its foliage was dark. Its flowers and leaves formed the wreaths worn by the defenders of an invaded country, and were supposed to be indicative of a stubborn resolve to conquer or die. This most generally ended in the death of the king and the overthrow of his kingdom, and hence the same word (Kânji) is used for the wreath of a minstrel who inculcates moral precepts, and more especially dwells on the instability of worldly things. The word Kânji has thus become a synonym for 'sober counsel,' and some of the verses under this heading have nothing particular to do with war. The great example of this is the Madura-Kânji, an account of which will be given in the life of the Pândiyan, Talai-Alangaṉatta Cenuvendra Nedum Ceriyan.

§ 1. *The Kanji Wreath.*

The inhabitants of the invaded country put on wreaths of the *Kânji*, and retire to make a last stand in their mountain fortresses.

VERSE 61.

" 'Since there is no longer any band to withstand the foe upon the plain,
at least we can die on the heights of our native hills!'
So saying, intent upon the defence of their little mountain homes,
the warriors assume the *Kânji* wreath."

The following verses in the chapter illustrate the fierceness of the final struggle. Marvels of bravery are related. The heroes fall; their wives perish with them the warrior rips open his wounds and dies on the plain; demons and demonesses brood over the gory battlefields, sometimes helping and sometimes destroying the dying men; much toddy is consumed, libations to the great demoness are poured out, and a universal wail is heard.

§ 19. *The Elegy.*

Praise and pity mingle in the song as the heroes ascend to the paradise of the valiant.

VERSE 80.

" He was the raft on which his people sailed over the sea of battle! He was a pillar amongst the mighty! He was the life of his town, and of the world! The door
of charitable deeds has been closed by the spear
that tore open our leader's breast!"

In P. N. N. there are forty-one lyrics, of which this gives the keynote.

Other topics are introduced, but the chapter ends with the 'crushing defeat' and it would seem, the extermination of the conquered people.

PADALAM V

THE DEFENCE OF THE FORT

THE *Nochi* WREATH.

The next chapter speaks of the defence of hill-forts. When hostile kings besieged a fort its defenders were accustomed to assume a wreath of the leaves and flowers of a wild creeper called the *Nochi*, or 'Vitex Nirgundi.' There are many species of the *Vitex*, which is often called the 'five-leaved chaste tree' (see Ainslie's "Materia Medica," vol. ii, p. 252). The flowers are of a pure, pale-bluish colour, and have a pleasant fragrance. This flower is very celebrated in Tamil songs. The poet Moci-câttanar has sung of it very sweetly (P. N. N., 271, 272)

" Like linked gems are *Nochi's* curling ringlets blue,
Mid all the flowering trees is none whose tender hue
So fills the soul with love as thine, whose blooming wreath
Men see the youthful maiden's slender form ensheathe,
In the wide guarded city,—sight beloved of all;
And when fierce enemies attack the moated wall,
The warriors on their brows thy flowers defiant show,
As sign they shield their virgin fort from every foe."

It was the symbol of chastity, and those that wore these wreaths were pledged to keep their fort inviolate. The virgin fortress guarded by warriors so adorned,

laughed at its foes. Much of romance mingled with the ferocity of those ancient days!

§ 1. *The* Nochi.

The heroes go forth to guard their turret-crowned battlements, whence archers shoot forth their deadly arrows.

VERSE 86

"Like the host of the *Aruvar*, whose triple fort
the god with serpent crowned, and fiery form would take,
these warriors crowned with *Nochi* wreaths
guard their strongholds, wielding the sharp-pointed dart."

This is one of the common places of Hindu verse, here borrowed from the *Mahâ Bhârata*. The story of the destruction of the three forts of the *Asurar* (or *Aruvar*) is most celebrated (see Muir's Sanskrit Texts, vol. iv, pp. 203, 225).

There were in the sky three cities of the valorous Asuras, one of iron, another of silver, and a third of gold which Maghavan (Indra) could not demolish, with all his weapons. Then all the great gods, distressed, went to the great Rudra (afterwards known as Siva) as their refuge, and said to him, after they were assembled: "Rudra, there shall be victims devoted to thee in all the sacrifices. Bestower of honour, destroy the Daityas with their cities and deliver the worlds." He, being thus addressed, said. "So be it"; and making Vishnu his arrow, Agni its barb, Yama, the son of Vivasvat, its feather, all the Vêdas his bow, and the excellent Savitri (the Gâyatri) his bowstring, and having appointed Brahmâ his charioteer, he in due time pierced through these cities with a three-jointed three-barbed arrow, of the colour of the sun, and in fierceness like the fire which burns up the world. These Asuras with their cities were there burnt up by Rudra. [Cf. Tiruvasagam, xiv.]*

One of the most famous historic (?) defences of a fort is referred to in P. N. N., 21. The fort was called Gana-per-eyil, and its king bore the epithet of *Vêngai-marbaṉ* (he whose breast wore a *Kino* garland). It was besieged by the famous king of Madura, *Ukkira-peru-Varuthi*, of whom something will be said in the Analysis of the P. N. N. The poet *Mûlam-kirar* of *Aiyar* enumerates the parts of the fortification "There was first of all, a moat so deep that it reached down to the abodes of the demons next there was a wall that rose up to the heavens: this was crowned with turrets from which the archers shot forth their arrows; there was an impervious wood that surrounded all and there were numerous small forts at every angle."

The chapter contains the usual phrases of the king and his warriors, relates how they fell fighting to the last "they desired not, these lions in the fight, to guard their bodies or their lives." There is also a hint that these sieges were often the result of a refusal on the part of the king to give his daughter in marriage to the leader of the besieging army.

* Now printing at the Oxford University Press.

PADALAM VI.

THE BESIEGERS: ATTACKING ENEMIES' STRONGHOLDS.

THE *Urriñai* WREATH. [Venbâ, 95-126.]

When an army marched to besiege a fort they wore a wreath of the Urriñai (*Oerua lanatar*), a species of cotton-plant, which is mentioned in P.N.N., 50, where it is said to have 'golden shoots,' and to belong to the 'Western Country. This seems to have been worn by our heroes in derision, implying the worthlessness and weakness of the fort they went to seize. There is little remarkable in this chapter. We are told in it that sheep were offered in sacrifice by the combatants; the exploits of Vishnu, who stormed a fort called *Viraco*, are celebrated; as also those of Sivan (as above). The encircling wood is cut down; the besiegers make rafts on which they pass the moat; scaling ladders are applied to the wall; the besiegers leap down into the area; tremendous fights take place: and the fort is taken.

§ 23. *Utterly waste.*

This relates how the conquerors, yoking asses, plough up the foundations of the fort, and sow worthless jungle plants upon the spot.

VERSE 120.

"The beautiful homes with pictured walls are levelled with the dust;
asses are yoked to plough up the soil with spears;
while worthless plants are sown on the foundations.
Thus rages the conquering king!"

Other verses tell how there is a solemn washing of their blood-stained swords in sacred waters, and their presentation as offerings. The conqueror is solemnly wedded to the newly-acquired country neighbouring kings bring tribute: and the chapter ends with universal submission "They make a desert and they call it peace."

This subject is formally discussed in *Tol-Kâppiyam*, Poruḷ, 66-68, pp. 135-146. An admirable illustration of it is found in P. Pâṭṭu, vi. 149, etc.

PADALAM VII.

WAR IN GENERAL.

THE *Tumbai* WREATH.

When a king contemplated an offensive war he wore a wreath of the special war-flower, the *tumbai* (*Pedalium Murex*). This is celebrated in Sanskrit as *Kuruṇṭa*,

§ 1. *The Wreath.*

VERSE 127.

"The king, whose war-drum sounds like unceasing thunder from the stormy clouds,
contemplates war that shall bedew the battlefields with blood.
He has put on the warlike *tumbai* wreath, and leads forth his hosts eager for the glorious strife."

To these old kings the excitement of war was a necessity of life: it was only thus that the monotony of existence could be relieved. Yet the horrors of war are much dwelt upon in these verses, and the king is represented as hesitating, and only deciding upon battle when its necessity was apparent. The twenty-five verses of the chapter present, without any attempt at arrangement, many of the striking incidents of ancient war.

§ 2. *Presents to the Troops.*

The king heaps upon his chosen warriors gifts so that they go forth joyously under his banner.

VERSE 128.

"Badges of victory, lands, precious treasure, farms,
murderous elephants, and horses,—the king distributes.
His enemies, tho' strong in horses and chariots, tremble when
they hear of the movements of the jewel-bearing king."

§ 3. *Can the fight not be prevented?*

Both armies are brave: might it not be well to avoid a struggle?

VERSE 129.

"Should these warriors meet on the demon-haunted battle-ground
and with their polished spears begin the fight,
't will prove the saying false, that 'glory of the king
is guardianship of human lives.'"

Praises are now sung of the elephants, the horses, the gallant heroes, and the war chariots.

§ 9. *The Bard's Eulogy.*

The battle has been fought, and the bards on the battle-field burn or bury the dead with appropriate songs of praise.

VERSE 137.

"The tender spouse, the mother, the children know not this!
Upon the battle plain the fiery piles are lit, the death songs sung!
Heroes who fell beneath the elephants they slew
have gone to banquet with the heroes' gods!"

While demon shapes like fantastic shadows dance before, behind, and around, the bodies of some of the slain heroes are carried home.

§ 23. *Joy mingled with wailing.*

The wife, seeing the body of her husband covered with glorious wounds, and still grasping the sword, weeps with proud joy.

VERSE 151.

"Even death is abashed, for here is valour greater than his own!
The wife takes the sword from the hand of her dead warrior;
and, watching his calm triumphant repose, is glad as she bedews his breast with tears."

This ends up with her voluntary death.

§ 25. *All died gloriously.*

They perish not; their renown is established for ever, though they lie strewn over the battlefield.

VERSE 154.

"They urged a stubborn fight alone; the two kings fell,
grasping still their spears; the earth is desolate!
Swiftly their wives uprose, and threw themselves into the flames.
Behold, even fierce death himself is satisfied."

This last verse seems to be a reminiscence of the history referred to in P.N.N., 62, 63. There the kings were the Ceran prince Kudakko-Neḍum-Ce'rala'than, and his rival the Coran Peruvirral Killi, who fell on the same battle-field. Their deaths were sung by the poets *Karattalar* and *Paraṇar*.

There is power and pathos in the following dirge, by the former of these:—

P.N.N., 62.

"What has become of the defiant valour of these rival kings?
Demon-Furies probe deep the wounds of the fallen heroes.
While with bloody hands they besmear their dishevelled locks,
hovering round they display their blood-stained forms.
With sullen sound the death-drums moan, while demons dance.
The kings themselves raging with heroic wrath are fallen and lie amid the vultures that devour the slain.
The victory-vaunting kingly canopies are low, the drums that erewhile announced the leaders' glory and their sway, lie broken there.
Over the field, where myriads fought, a fearsome stillness broods.
The heroe's wives on dainties feast no more, nor bathe in perfumed waters, but lie dead on the bosoms of their lords
They have gone to feast in the world of the gods,
who wear unfading wreaths from the tree of Immortality,—whose eyes slumber not,—who eat ambrosial food.
Let the glory of the heroes live for aye!"

The site of this famous battle is unknown, but it is often referred to in old Tamil verse.

(To be continued.)

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, MAY 1899.

PROPHETS AND THEIR MISSION

"Let not Moses speak unto me, nor any of the prophets. but rather do Thou speak, O Lord God, the Inspirer and Enlightener of all the prophets."

THOMAS A KE.

It has been the fortunate feature of every religion that counted among its adherents a large number of men, that brought spritual solace to the minds of sin-cankered individuals, to undergo what might be called periodic ecdysis. One set of doctrines and observances please and stimulate its votaries at one phase of its existence, to be only succeeded at the next generation by another body of creed and a different liturgy, which may in fundamentals resemble their predecessor, and whose disagreement, minute though it be, would be patent to a conscientious student of any religion. Such are the steps by which religion progresses, and such is the almost imperceptible course of its motion, that to none but a trained student, its rapid changes and stable fundamentals would be apparent. Even in that immobile miscellanea which are sometimes conglomerated together as Fetichism it is possible for a comparative religionist, to find within its inmost depths, an evolving life pulsating, and an innate tendency that aims at a distant perfection. What Prof. Max Müller's admirable lectures on "The Anthropological Relgion" have done in unravelling even to the minds of determined sceptics like Spencer, and rabid Christians like Sayce who could not imagine anything like organic unity or orderly growth in any religion but their own, leaves us not in any necessity to touch on that subject much. He has shown us by lucid argumentation and by a study of their languages, how useless it is for us to believe even in the traveller's accounts of native tribes of remote countries, which record only eye-witnessings, unless coupled with a competency in him to move socially with the aborigines, to induce in them a confidence with regard to his well-minded curiosity, to study their sacred writings and understand their genuine spirit, and to be able to speak freely with, and convey his ideas to, them. He shows by unmistakable examples, how also the versions of well-minded globe-trotters, liberal-viewed missionaries, are in most cases untrustworthy and contradicting each other, in the light of the further labours of recent men who have studied the tribes and their creed for the sole sake of learning their religion. Totemism, Fetichism and many other allied forms of worship prevalent among the so-called semi-civilized races of America, the Andamans, Africa and the rest, are shown by him to have an organic growth and to hide within them all the salient points of a soul-satisfying religion. With the evolving tendency and progressive growth of Hinduism, Prof. Max Müller has excellently dealt in his Hibbert lectures. And Rhys Davis has done the same for the religion of the Buddhists. Zoroastrianism and Confucianism are religions for a continued history of which we might direct the attention of the enthusiast to the clear manuals of Haug and Legge. Alongside of the natural tendency of the Human Mind to hanker after innovation, and to be the subject of steady though sometimes convulsive progression, it is scarcely possible to shut our eyes to the inscrutable trait of every religion, that it should be invariably influenced from time to time by the thorough-going speculations of some religious leaders who variously called themselves as saints, apostles, prophets, saviours and the like. Every step in the onward progress of religion, each excellent point that tended to clarify its doctrines, has always been associated with the reform of one man of strong intellect, with the well-directed labours of a pious enthusiast. In bigger religions, by virtue of their sacred scriptures being handed down as written documents, from generation to generation, the teachings of these venerable men have been embalmed and preserved in writings, and along with their canonical books and their persisting influence, the remembrance of the names of these individuals in the mouths of their votaries had become a desideratum. While in smaller religions, the zealots of which had more truth and faith in them than vain rhetoric and word-spinning metaphysics, the names of the epoch-making leaders and reformers could not be remembered beyond a certain number of generations, since in the absence of writing as a vehicle of religious thought, there was no means to preserve their teachings and to remind their names to the fervent minds of their untutored adherents. This would explain why the names of a Pythogoras and a Sankaracharya should be remembered, why

the moral confessions of a St. Augustine or a St. Bernard should be recorded, why Laotze and Buddha should be idolised. For a keen student of religion, the subtle intricacies which Sankara has introduced in the region of Hindu Philosophy must be evident, and Hinduism should lose much of its all-embracing catholicity and depth of metaphysical reasoning for the absence of a such a glittering roll of names, as those of Ramanuja and Madhava, Vidyaranya and Vijnanabhikshu and the like. In Christianity the rapid march of new ideas and the steady influence which the ever-progressing Science has exerted on the ethics and philosophy of that religion, have introduced more of orderly evolution and virile progress than in the annals of any other religion. Christianity has been, ever from its dawn, a literary religion, a religion that boasted of an ever-incessing number of adherents who had a cultured language of their own, and thus a history of its progress, minute to the very nature and temperament of its adherents, has been preserved to us in books. And here therefore our expectations receive more than a real gratification. These prophets have been looked upon in various lights by sundry men of each religion. Some have been thought to be superhuman in origin, to have been attended with extra-ordinary wonders in Nature at their birth, to have worked Miracles to attest to their Divine commission, and to have ended their lives in the most marvellous of ways. It is not our purpose to dwell on the peculiar tendencies of the Human Mind to look upon things of the past with a reverential awe, to enlarge on the irrepressible aim of Human Nature to invest everything antique in a superhuman halo and to lay it in a Divine setting. This fact receives its best example in the true and represented nature of Mahomad, and in the wonderment and notoriety that attend even the most modern of Indian religious reformers, such as Rajah RamMohan Roy and Keshab ChunderSen, Swami Ramakrishna Paramahamsa and Kabir Doss. Such prophets have in every instance been intimately connected with the expurgation of some corruptions that cropped up in a religion at a particular age, and they have left the religion richer in religious lore than what they found it in. The same craze that led the votaries of a religion to look upon the religious leaders, with a superhuman awe and an almost Divine worship, the same fancy that leads an archæologist to regard old ruins in a blinding sense of soul lifting respect and unearthly regard, the same reverence which a man of literature feels for an old copy of a forgotten poet, has led the people at large to set the prophets at a Diviner level and to transfer even to them, in a degree, the functions of that Limitless One, of which they were the earthly tongued exponents. We have therefore been taught to look upon a prophet as a saviour of the world, another one as being able to intercede with God and set right our blemishes, a third man as the Inexhaustible Deity itself in human form. In every scripture that has been written in the name of God, and in every votary that directs his eyes to Heaven with a yearning heart after the Infinite, the same infinite fountain of Grace is surging up, the same virile step towards the infinite Goal is made. Nobody need presume to take up into his hands the benovalence which is His alone, or the mercy of which He is an infinite ocean. His presence is shadowed forth in the towering hills, in the many-coloured flower and in the awe-inspiring ocean. No man need be taught the truth of this so long as he has eyes to see and ears to hear. What the prophets themselves evidently meant to do was to shout about the Infinite when the people's ears were getting waxed, and to point to the Infinite Lustre and blaze their torches of preaching when the moral eyes of men were getting dim. To search for that Infinite, to be feeling after the Divine Vivifier we need go to no man for direction, for, in Him we live and move and have our being. When the perception of the Infinite becomes an accomplished fact for the mind, what could be done in the way of pure worship before that Limitless Splendour, so long as we are trammelled by the shackles of flesh and blood, so long as we could not but anthropomorphise the Infinite Attributes, becomes a realised vision. And herein lies the truth and essence of religious perfection of every Human Soul. It is the height of mental worship that leaves us on the lowest bolder of the Spiritual Mountain, and what one must be able to do, despite the orthodox fanaticism of rank religionists, and the pathological mental abnormalities which the modern *yogins* are able to induce in their own bodies, and which are usually mistaken for the signs and wonders of the Higher Path, is to approach as best as one might the Throne of Sanctity, to reach the highest pinnacle of godly meditation, and to surround one's notions with the best ethical exactitude which his heart dictates. And there the yearning Pilgrim should stand at the lowest step of the Golden Stairs and when the life-immuring bonds snap, the wheel of karma rotates, landing him for a time in a happier realm of blissful beatitude, than it was his lot to live, when striving on this world below.

V. V. RAMANAN.

LECTURE ON CREATION.

Opinions as to the origin of the world.

The problem of the origin of the world was the first to engage man's speculative activity. The question. "How did the world arise?" is found in the mythologies of all peoples, and it is general by answered in a wrong way. Some cosmogonies in tracing out the origin of the universe resort to the theory of an unformed, eternal, self-existent matter, of which the world was made at the bidding of a Supreme Power; and this theory was done away with in our last lecture But most of the ancient cosmogonies describe the world as originating from God by emanation, so that in no way it is distinct from God, but is evolved out of God's substance, and in consequence God is at the same time the efficient and the material cause of the world, the clay, the potter and the pot, the spider and the web, the creator and the creature, the architect and the building. The theory of emanation, therefore, is one of the oldest in philosophy, and it reperesents the effort of the human mind, eager to solve the mystery of the origin of the world, and yet not able to transcend the power of the imagination.

The theory of emanation in Hindu Philosophy

Now, in no cosmogony is this effort more apparent than in the cosmogony of the ancient Aryans. In the Book of Manu, son of Brahma, creation is thus described:—

"This universe existed only in the first divine idea yet unexpanded, as if involved in darkness, imperceptible, undefinable, undiscoverable by reason, and undiscovered by revelation, as if it were wholly immersed in sleep."

"Then the sole self-existing power, himself undiscerned, but making this world, with five elements and other principles of nature, appeared with undiminished glory, expanding his idea, or dispelling the gloom."

"He, whom the mind alone can perceive, whose essence eludes the external organs, who has no visible parts, who exists from eternity, even He, the soul of all beings, whom no being can comprehend, shone forth in person."

"He, having willed to produce various beings from his own divine substance, *first with a thought created waters*, and placed in them a productive seed."

"The seed became an egg bright as gold, blazing like the luminary with a thousand beams, and in that egg he was born himself, in the form of Brahma, the great fore father of all spirits." (The Laws of Manu, ch. I. vers, 5-10.

In this account of creation it is first said that "the sole self-existing power, having willed to produce various beings, *first with a thought created the waters*;" and so far the theory is acceptable, because it is creation, not emanation; but the following words are added: "and placed in them (the waters) a productive seed; the seed became an egg bright as gold, and in that egg he (the sole self-existing power) was born himself in the form of Brahma, the great fore father of all spirits:" so that all various "beings are from his own divine substance" which is sheer emanation.

Later on theory of emanation was received by the Hindu philosophers in all its crudity, as it appears from the following celebrated verses of the Purusha Hymn: Rig-veda, Mandala x. 90—Translated by Monier Williams in "Indian Wisdom."

"The embodied spirit has a thousand heads,
A thousand eyes, a thousand feet, around
On every side envoloping the earth,
Yet filling space no larger than a span.
He is himself this very universe;
He is whatever is, has been, and shall be;
He is the lord of immortality.
All creatures are one fourth of him, three-fourths
Are that which is immortal in the sky."

Finally we find the theory of emanation polished and refind by later philosophers in all the Puranas, and especially in the Gita, where the "Great One" declares to Arjuna some of his endless emanations, which cause him to be the "self in the heart of every being, the beginning, the middle, and the end of every thing." (Gita Chap. X. 19, 39, Ch. VII. 3 and elsewhere.)

And this is likewise the view of most of the Hindu Philosophers of our time. They conceive the world as having been originated from the material side of Brahama, the self-existent eternal being, who in consequence is in no way distinct from the world.

But is it really so? Is the theory of emanation defensible on philosophical grounds? Can we explain the origin of the world by saying that everything came from God by emanation?—The theory of emanation is utterly absurd, and this can be proved from the consideration of the divine nature as follows:—

The theory of emanation not defensible.

You can divide a block of wood, stone iron into particles, because their nature allows of it, because they are substances earthly, material, consisting of parts, and in consequence divisible. But it is not the same thing with Almighty God. God's Being is physically and metaphysically simple, namely, not only does He exclude division, but with him all composition is incompatible. If therefore God's substance has no parts, if God's substance excludes composition and is substantially and accidentally simple, how can He emit parts out of his substance? How can this Universe have emanated from His substance?

Moreover, God is immutable or unchangeable in his Divine Being. But this world could not have evolved or emanated from Him, without his substance being changed as often as He assumed a shape or form which He had

not before: because all emanation is essentially a change and to make the unchangeable God changeable is t destroy the very primary idea of the Deity.

Furthermore, God is an infinitely perfect Being. No perfection can be added to Him, as in His simple unity He contains all conceivable and possible perfection. and what is infinitely perfect can receive no addition of perfection. But every emanation would be an addition of perfection to God. Every man newly born, every tree newly blossomed, every stone newly formed, every house newly built, would be a new manifestation, a new emanation of God's substance, which emanation was wanting to God before, and it was added to him only in course of time. To this the right idea of God? No. such a God would be no God at all, but a monster, a chimera, a madman's dream, a perpetual blasphemy against the true, living God.

The theory of emanation leads to pantheism.

And such is the direct consequence of the theory of emanation. For, as we stated in our first lecture, if the universe had emanated from God, the pantheistic theory in regard to the origin of the world would be the right one. In this supposition everything would be God. part and parcel of God, a portion of the Deity, a fragment of the divine substance. According to this theory, creatures would be but particles emitted from the Divine essence, and God would be at the same time the material and the efficient cause of the universe, the agent its material cause and the effect, the clay the potter and the pot, the spider and its web, the creator and the creature, the architect and the building, heaven, earth, trees, animals, men; in short, everything visible and invisible, would be but a different shape, form or clothing of the same universal God. Now the absurdity of all these notions is apparent; nor do they need refutation.

Neither is the absurdity less. if we say that the world originated from God by emanation inasmuch as all forms of being, although diverse from, and opposed to, one another, are so many several determinations under which the First Being manifests itself, and yet at the same time all are one and the same, in as much as it is the same First Being that manifests itself under all these diverse determinations. For, besides the reasons given above, no one can conceive this universal Being that is everything, and yet He himself is nothing: turning into everything, and yet preserving nothing for himself, assuming at the same time every shape, every form, every nature, fire and water light and darkness, intelligence and imbecility, purity and foulness, life and death, entity and nonentity.

The theory of emanation the out come of mental weakness.

We must therefore conclued that the theory of emanation is due to the weakness of the human mind, "eager to solve the mystery of the origin of the world, and yet not able to transcend the power of imagination." For, creation is indeed conceivable, but not imaginable, as we live in a world of phenomena, in a world of effects and emanations; and all phenomena, all effects that fall under our senses are mere changes of substances already created, something emanating from the same substance. In order, therefore, to solve the mystery of the origin of the universe we must discard altogether the old theory of emanation and rising higher, we must conceive the self-existent Being, not, as animals do, generating everything out of its own substance, but producing all things by the force of his will out of nothing,in which the theory of creation properly consists.

What creation properly is.

But here at the outset it is good to bring to mind the definition of creation which runs as follows "creation is the production out of nothing of a thing according to its whole substance, nothing being presupposed, whether created or increate." (St. Thomas, summa Theol. I, p. q. 65. a. 3.) The world was therefore created out of nothing, not in the sense that *nothing* was to God the *meterial cause*, the *plastic matter* out of which the world was made, just as clay is the matter of the potter, wood or marble the matter of the sculptor, building-meterials the matter out of which the architect rears a house. "Nothing" means nonentity; and nonentity cannot be the plastic matter of anything, because the plastic matter of anything is entity, not non-entity. What therefore is meant by the proposition, "The world was made out of nothing," is that the creator caused it to come into existance; with the implication that nothing of the same kind previously existed. Therefore creation is not the change of nothing into the world, but the starting of the whole world into existance at the command of the Almighty God, nothing whatever existing before. Therefore, nothing is not the subject of creation, but the mere point of departure whence everything that now is, sprang into existence by the creative power of God.

But how can God produce things out of nothing? First I answer: because God is the self-existent Being, and has an infinite Intellect, an Infinite Will, an infinite Power an infinite Goodness. As it is however, I say that in so far we ban form any idea of the action of the Creator, he produces all things from nothing by the force of his will. God wills and the universe springs up out of nothing! "The self-existing power, says Manu having willed to produce various beings, first *with a thought* created the water." (Institutes. Chap. I.) We must not forget however that creation is indeed conceivable, but not imaginable, and that we have no direct evidance of what creation is (Cfr. Lecture I.) Nevertheless to him that asks how creation can be understood I say you are a small, weak and in-

complete but true image of the Creator; you are an intelligent being which wills. Now you will, and your arm rises, you will, and your whole body is in motion. This motion, this activity, before the act of your will, was nothing. It sprang up by the force of your will. Between the act of your will and the ensuing motion, there is a certian connection: But how can you account for it? If, therefore, you cannot explain to us, the connection between the act of the wills and the fact that appears, in so far as concerns finite beings, how can you ask us to explained, it with regard to the infinte Being? And yet to some extent and by analogy it can be explained, and the finding of similar things in themselves greatly strengthens the direct arguments which in my next lecture I shall bring forward in favour of creation out of nothing. (Cfr. Prof. Balmes' Fundamental Philosophy Vol. II. Ch. XII.) For this time I shall content myself with showing to you an image of creation in many things of art as well as of nature which fall constantly under our eyes.

An instance analogous to creation.

It has been repeatedly said that we have no direct evidence of what creation is, as our imagination cannot picture to itself the producing of a whole substance out of nothing; and because all the phenomena or effects of nature we see, are but emanations of a substance or quality from another, or the various modifications which under the agency of an active force are produced in a pre-existing subject or substance. Nevertheless I am able to point out to you not only in God's but in man's work also, an image, though faint, though analogous only, of what creation properly is. Indeed, works of nature and art plainly show us, that no phenomenon, no effect, nothing of any sort in fact comes into existence but with the implication that nothing of the same kind previously existed. Namely, in the production of every change or effect, something is originated which did not exist before; because if nothing at all resulted but what there was already, there would be no change. Thus an artist chooses a block of marble to make a statue, so to say, out of nothing: for, in a previous time there existed indeed that block of marble but not the statue. The statue has been got out of non-statue. The statue appeared in the marble at the command, and by the skilful hand of the sculptor. Where had those human features their abode before being fixed for ever in that mass of marble? In the intellect and imagination of the artist, who sees the statue in the block; there they lived in an idle state, cherished, nursed, loved by the warm genius of the man of art, say the same thing of the painter, of the architect, of any artificer whomsoever. Nor is the thing different in the works of nature. Water is the result of the combination of hydrogen and oxygen; but these two elements are not water; water has been obtained out of non-water. Flowers and fruits are the product of trees, but they appear where before there were neither flowers nor fruits; they simply come out of non-flower and non fruit. Namely, in the production of any effect whatever, the starting point is the non-existence of the same effect, else there would be no production at all. In the generation of man the starting point is non-man; in the building of a house, the starting point is non-house; in the attainment of science the starting point is ignorance; finally, in the acquisition of any perfection, the non-existence of the same perfection is necessarily required, and presupposed.

An image of creation.

This, as I said, is but a faint a pale image of what creation is: because although in this case the non-existence of the effect of the form or perfection is absolutely required; on the other hand, the subject or substratum of the change is as absolutely required or presupposed whereas in creation nothing is presupposed, nothing is required; but the starting-point of creation is the absolute non-existence of anything whatever. A sculptor makes a statue out of non-statue, but not also out of nothing; because wood or stone is presupposed as the material subject of his work. An architect builds a house out of non-house, but building materials are presupposed to his work. Not so with God. He makes entity out of non-entity. He creates every thing out of nothing. "In the beginning there was neither nought nor aught: then there was neither sky nor atmosphere above. Then was there neither day nor night, nor light nor darkness, only the existent one breathed calmly self-contained." (Rigveda Hymn, Mandala X. 129.) And Moses attests that "In the beginning God created heaven and earth." (Gen. ch. I.) "For the Lord spoke, and all was made, He commanded, and all was created." (Ps. 32. 9.) And the pous valiant mother of the Machabees, encouraging her youngest son to martyrdom, says: I beseech thee, my son, look upon heaven and earth, and all that is in them: and consider that God made them out of nothing, and mankind also." (2. Mach. 7. 28.) Manu therefore and the writers of the Rigveda agree, at least in part, with Moses in acknowledging the great and fundamental truth of the creation of heaven and earth. And in the simple yet sublime words of the Bible there is a tacit reference to all the forms of error respecting the origin of the universe. The world has created by God It was not therefore originated by chance, neither by self-generation, nor by impersonal powers of nature, and much less by evolution from the divine substance. In the beginning God created heaven

The Christian and Hindu Scriptures on creation.

and earth, that is, heaven and earth had a beginning, and they did not exist, therefore, from eternity: nor are we permitted to trace them backwards from age to age, till we lose all idea of their having had a beginning, Scripture does not tell us how remote the beginning is from any age of the world, known to science or to history, but it insists on the reality of a beginning for the Universe by creation, as well shall demonstrate it in our next and last Lecture on Creation.

G. BARTOLI, S. J.

(To be continued.)

REVIEW.

MEIKANDA SASTRA.*

[*Edited by* C. NAGALINGA MUDALIAR.]

The attention of the Tamil public must have been drawn long before this to the excellent and scholarly edition of Meikanda Sastra (மெய்கண்டசாத்திரம்) by C. Nagalinga Mudaliar a Tamil poet of some reputation who loves to spread a knowledge of Tamil Literature and Saivite Philosophy. Unlike the usual type of the Tamil pandit who lives intellectually a dull, listless life, surfeited on the memory of the Sutras and verses he can glibly quote, sometimes oppositely but oftener not, Mr. Nagalingam has always been an active worker in the field of Tamil letters and thus proved himself a worthy disciple of the worthy teacher, Pandit. Ashtavathanam P. Kalyanasundara Mudaliar. This edition seems, from the title-page, to have been undertaken, on a wish expressed by His Holiness Srila Sri Ambalavâna Swamigal of Thiruvavaduthurai Mutt a scholar of keen Critical insight and wide yet profound learning both in Sanskrit and Tamil, well known for his enlightened views and liberal sympathies. This edition has also had the good fortune of securing another friend in the Rajah of Ramnad, Sri Bhaskara Setupathi, a Scholar among Rajahs and a Rajah among scholars. The Rajah is a zealous patron of Tamil letters and Siddhantha Philosophy reminding you of the Cholas and Pandiyas of old in whose courts Tamil poetry blossomed and Tamil learning flourished, besides, his own scholarship, in the literatures both of the West and the East is said to be very profound. He gives of his own quite ungrudgingly and unstintingly wherever the interests of Tamil and Saivism are concerned; and many are those to whom, but for the Rajah's liberal and timely help, their Tamil learning would be a regret and Saivite devotion a trial.

And this Edition deserves all the help lent to it by such patrons of saivite learning. It is the only edition that brings all the 14 Siddhanta Sastras together and is thus eminently fitted for study or reference. There have been separate editions of *திருவாசகம், சித்தியார், சிவப்பிரகாசம்,* etc; but for the first time in this edition all are brought together and presented in a form which strikes you by its completeness and unity In the choice of commentaries, also, where more than one are extant, the Editor judges carefully and puts in only that which is lucid, luminous and instructive, instead of by giving all the commentaries as have been done in other editions, burying a simple truth under a heap of heavy commentary.

The fourteen Siddhanta Sastras, contained in what is Collectively known as Meikanda Sattiram மெய்கண்ட சத்திரம், are:—

உந்தி களிறு உயர் போதஞ் சித்தியார்
பிந்திருபா உண்மை பிரகாசம்—வந்தீரூட்
பண்பு வினை போற்றிகொடி பாசமிவை நெஞ்சிற்
உண்மைநெறி சங்கற்ப முற்று.

Thiruvunthiya'r	by Wiyyavantha The'var of Thiruviyalúr.
Thirukkalitruppadiya'r	by Wiyyavantha The'var of Thirukkadavur.
Sivagna'na Bodham	by Meikanda The'var of Vennainallu'r.
Sivagna'na Siddhiya'r Irupa'virupathu	by Arunanthi The'var of Thiruthuraiyu'r.
Unmaivilakkam	by Manava'sakamkadantha Thêvar.
Sivapraka'sam Thiruvarutpayan Vina'venba' Po'tripahrodai Kodikkavi Nenjuviduthu'thu Unmainerivilakkam Sankalpanira'haranam	by Uma'pathi Sivan of Kotravankudi.

of these, Thiruvunthiyar has 45 triplets of verse, each of which gives a truth of Saiva Siddhantam in a terse form; but it cannot lay claim to being a systematic treatise. The only commentary on this work, which is the one published in this edition, is by Chitrambala Thambira'n.

Thirukkalitrupadiyar contains 100 Venba quatrains, remarkable for beauty of thought and expression The commentary published is that of Sivaprakàsa Thambiran and I do not think any other exists

Sivagnánabodham is the greatest in importance of all the Siddhanta sastras. It is based on the Rowraya Agama, and contains but 12 sutras, each of which is a gem of condensed, systematised thought. This great philosophical work is by Meikanda Deva who lived about 1200 A.D. The oldest commentary on this work is that of Parañ Perumal, but this has been superseded by the commentaries

* Can be had at the Siddhanta Deepika Office, Price per copy 6-0-0.

of Sivagnana Swamigal, a scholar without an equal in the later history of Tamil literature. A giant in intellect, reminding you of Dr. Thomas Aquinas, the angelic doctor, Sivagnanaswami adorned everything he touched. He was a great Poet an acute Logician, a profound Philosopher, a brilliant controversialist and a master of Tamil and Sanskrit learning. He is the author of two commentaries on Sivagnana Botham, one short and the other long. The short commentary (சிற்றுரை) is the one now generally used; but the long commentary Dravida Maha Bashyam திராவிடமாபாஷ்யம், has not seen the light of publication, being jealously guarded by the Thiruvávaduthurai Mutt, and only a few have read even portions of it. In the edition under review, Mr. Nagalingam gives us the short commentary of Sivagnana swami, and has as a new feature peculiar to this edition, added about 200 foot-notes, quoting passages from the rare Dravida Bashyam, which going to Thiruvavaduthurai, he must have specially consulted for the purpose, these foot-notes are very helpful, and students of Sivagnana Bodham ought to feel thankful to the Editor for them.

Next to Sivagnana Bodham in importance, is Sivagnána Siddhiar by Arunandhi Thèvar, a disciple of Meikanda Deva. This work claims to be merely Sivagnana Bodham expanded, amplified, and illustrated; but must be treated almost as an original treatise, so marked is the genius of the author. It is in two parts, the critical section (பரபக்கம்) and the expository section (சுபக்கம்). On the critical part we have the commentary of Thathuva Prakasar; on the more important expository part, we have six commentaries. In the present edition, of the six, Mr. Nagalingam has given us two, the thoughtful commentary of Sivagnana Swamigal, supplemented for facility of study and clearness by the word-for-word rendering of Sri Subramanya Desikar. That this is a wise selection all students of Sivagnana Siddhiar will testify.

Irupavirupathu is a short work of 20 stanzas, elucidating the nature of *Pasa* (Bondage). The commentary is that of Namasivaya Thambiran, given in the edition under review. Unmaivilakkam is another short work of 54 quatrains. The commentary published in Mr. Nagalingam's Edition is the one generally in use, but who the author of the commentary is not known.

Sivaprakasam is an important work among the Siddhanta sastras, containing 101 quartrains. It is by Umapathy Sivan, one of the greatest names in Saiva philosophy and Literature. The Commentary is that of Conjeveram Chidambaranathar who a son of Mani Kanda Mudaliar at whose instance சஞ்சிபுராணம் was composed by Sivagnana Swamiyal. Thiruvarutpayan, of 101 Couplets, is a sort of supplement to the Kural திருக்குறள். It deals with Moksha or வீடு, while the Kural treats of Dharma (அறம்), Artha (பொருள்) and Kama (இன்பம்). The commentary is that of Nirambia Alagiya Desikar (நிரம்பவழகியதேசிகர்), the author of Sethu Puranam (The Legends of Rameswaram). Vinàvenba, of 13 quatrains, is a short work treating especially of the nature of Maya and has a clear and helpful commentary by Namasivaya Thambiran.

Potripahrodai and Kodikkavi are both short works, each with a commentary; but the names of the Commentators are unknown.

Nenjuvidutthûthu has 258 lines; and this work is published in the present edition with a word-for word rendering by the distinguished Pandit now livin P Kalyanasundara Mudaliar.

Unmainerivilakkam is a very short work of 6 quatrains with a commentary whose author is unknown.

Sankalpaniràharanam, of Umapathi Sivan, the author also of seven works immediately preceding, was composed in the year 1235 of the Salivahana Era i. e. in 1313 A. D The preface to the work mentions this date :— ஏழஞ்ஞிரு நூறெடுத்த வாயிரம் வாழுஞ் சீனமருவாதிப்ப The commentary on this work is by an unknown author, but it is a clear and useful guide.

From what has been stated above, it will be seen that Mr. Nagalingam's மெய்கண்டசாத்திரம் is a complete edition of the 14 Siddhanta sastras with the best of the commentaries on them. Dr. G. U. Pope, a fair and impartial critic, says :—The *Saiva Siddhanta* system itself is the choicest (pure south Indian) product of Dravidian intellect, and ought to be studied by all who seek to influence the Tamil mind." And those who desire to study the Saiva Siddhanta philsophy in the Original Tamil Sastras themselves cannot do better than buying and using a copy of Mr. Nagalinga Mudaliar's Edition of மெய்கண்டசாத்திரம்.

N. B.

"மகளிரமேற்றோழி" or "The Tamil Zenana Magazine," published by C. S. Ramaswamy Iyer, Triplicane, Madras. Vol. I, Numbers 1 and 2. March and April 1899.

The Indian Social platform has not been lacking the well-minded shibboleths of the want of liberal culture among our women. But really very little has been done to awaken in the Hindu women-kind the irony of its present situation and how little it is adapting itself to the changing environments. Among the many Tamil journals existing at present, few are directly addressed to women, and fewer take into consideration the difficulties attending an attempt to bring them face to face with the interesting general and scientific problems of the hour. In order to

remedy this defect, and to disseminate easy ideas about all topics engaging the attention of the Western nations of the present day, and about the crying social questions which need be brought home to the minds of the Tamil girls and women, a journal named "Janavinodini" was projected some two decades ago. It, as has largely been the lot of the South Indian Journalism, was short-lived and died a natural death through want of popular enthusiasm and sympathy. Ever since that time, if we might exclude "the Swadesa Mitran" which is perhaps addressed to a larger circle of readers including men, and is a Tri-weekly Newspaper, and "the Vivekachintamani" which is conducted by the excellent efforts of Mr. C. V. Swaminatha Iyer and looks to the diffusion of general knowledge to all the Tamil-knowing peoples, we have had no journal having for its sole object the advancement of the cause of female-education. The journal under review, as such, has long been a decided want and our Tamil women ought to congratulate themselves now that it appears. The education of the Hindu women are primarily in the hands of the Hindu men, and unless the latter come forward with cheer and zeal to encourage journals of this stamp, and employ them as necessary media for the instruction and intellectual advancement of women, it is nothing short of bare-faced folly to accuse, after a time, that they are not properly conducted and they have failed to fulfil their ends. In every venture, however enthusiastic and energetic one might be to make it a success, without the support of subscribers and earnest patrons, one's zeal must go to decay and inanition. Material financial support is the mainstay of a successful journal and the want of it will throw the most zealous of propagandists into dismay and confusion. And the present journal, if it should see the light of day and be made a strong social organ for our women, should be accorded with *something more than mere* lip-praises. The heads of families and English-educated men, to whom the present lamentable neglect of a liberal course of education for our women without alarming any of the socio-religious prejudices of the Hindu homes must seem a harrowing defect, ought to co-operate in encouraging this magazine and introducing it as largely as they could into their homes, and thus keep up a fine supply. In this way a long life for the journal would be ensured.

As regards the contents of the journal they are as interesting, various, and amusing as we might expect. In the March number there are some interesting anecdotes of the childhood of Queen Victoria, the first instalment of an excellent, well-written story of Savitri of the *Itihâsas* the well-known type of a Hindu wife, a lesson on the general principles of Hygiene from the pen of a Hindu medical gentleman, a natural history subject on "The Sagacity of the Elephant," an imaginary conversation between two Hindu ladies reflecting their true attitude towards topics of the day, and some riddles proposed by a Hindu woman. There are some jottings on cookery which is an all important subject for women and some "news and notes" keeping the readers in touch with the most useful items of general information. Hygiene, a very useful subject for our women is a good deal lost sight of even by our educated men as a guiding principle of their life. Mr. C. V. Swaminatha Iyer had to take a large share of trouble before he was able to fairly convince our modern graduates of the utility of extending their eyes to sanitation So that the import nce of this subject to our young women can not be over-rated. In the April number a zoological subject opens the journal, and it is a summary in Tamil of a lecture delivered by Dr. J. R. Henderson of the Madras Christian College on some Poisonous creatures, the second instalment of anecdotes of Queen Victoria's childhood, the life of Savitri continued from the first number, a lesson on Valcano, a geological subject, a lecture on Air from the hygienic standpoint from the pen of the same medical gentleman who contributes to the first number, the opening chapters of a novel entitled "The Two Daughters" and the usual "riddles," notes on "cookery" and "news and notes." The geological subject must be instructive as well as the amusing stories that appear in the second issue. Putting the two numbers together we have articles bearing on hygiene, zoology, geology, and natural history, along with a few anecdotes and some amusing moral-conveying stories. The aim evidently is to popularise Science, and to make the journal also a medium of correspondence between women thereby ensuring them of intellectual improvement and moral education. We hope that in future numbers more scientific subjects would be brought in, and more variety and width would from the feature of other topics. We commend the journal to the earnest attention of our young graduates and to that of the heads of families, and must exhort them to take it up and promise for it a long and successful career. In the sympathy and encouragement which men evidence, the salvation of women lies.

V. V. R.

EXTRACT.

CO-OPERATION. THE LAW OF LIFE.

AN EXAMPLE FROM RUSKIN.

A PURE or holy state of anything is that in which all its parts are helpful or consistent. The highest and first Law of the Universe, and the other name of Life is, therefore, "help." The other name of death is "separation." Government and cooperation are in all things, and eternally, the laws of life. Anarchy and competition, eternally, and in all things, the laws of death. Perhaps the best, though the most familiar, example we can take of

the nature and power of consistence, will be that of the possible changes in the dust we tread on.

Exclusive of animal decay, we can hardly arrive at a more absolute type of impurity than the mud or slime of a damp, over-trodden path in the outskirts of a manufacturing town. I do not say mud of the road, because that is mixed with animal refuse; but take merely an ounce or two of the blackest slime of a beaten footpath, on a rainy day, near a manufacturing town. That slime we shall find in most cases composed of clay (or brick dust, which is burnt clay) mixed with soot, a little sand and water. All those elements are at helpless war with each other, and destroy reciprocally each others' nature and power; competing and fighting for place at every tread of your foot: sand squeezing out clay, and clay squeezing out water and soot meddling everywhere and defiling the whole. Let us suppose that this ounce of mud is left in perfect rest, and that its elements gather together, like to like, so that their atoms may get into the closest relations possible.

Let the clay begin. Ridding itself of all foreign substance, it gradually becomes a white earth, already very beautiful, and fit with help of congealing fire to be made into finest porcelain, and painted on, and be kept in kings' palaces. But such artificial consistence is not its best. Leave it still quiet to follow its own instinct of unity and it becomes, not only white, but clear; not only clear, but hard; not only clear and hard but so set that it can deal with light in a wonderful way and gather out of it the loveliest blue rays only, refusing the rest. We call it then a sapphire,

Such being the consummation of the clay, we give similar permission of quiet to the sand. It also becomes, first, a white earth; then proceeds to grow clear and hard, and at last arranges itself in mysterious, infinitely fine parallel lines, which have the power of reflecting not merely the blue rays, but the blue, green, purple and red rays. in the greatest beauty in which they can be seen through any hard material whatsoever. We call it then an opal.

In next order the soot sets to work. It cannot make itself white at first, but instead of being discouraged, tries harder and harder; and comes out clear at last; and the hardest thing in the world; and for the blackness that it had obtains in exchange the power of reflecting all the rays of the sun at once in the vividest blaze that any solid thing can shoot. We call it then a diamond.

Last of all, the water purifies or unites itself; contented enough if it only reach the form of a dewdrop; but if we insist on its proceeding to a more perfect consistence, it crystalizes into the shape of a star. And for the ounce of slime which we had by political economy of competition we have by poitilcal economy of cooperation, a sapphire, an opal, and a diamond set in the midst of a star of snow.

—RUSKIN in *Ethics of the Dust.*

(Extracted from "*The new Century*")

72

THE PAIRS OF OPPOSITIES.

BY EDWARD C. FARNSWORTH.

THEN I looked on all the works that my hands had wrought, and on the labor that I had labored to do; and, behold all was vanity and vexation of spirit, and there was no profit under the sun."

The discontent of the Hebrew preacher, here so strikingly expressed, contains nothing unique, for thousands in all ages have had like experience. Indeed, any student of human nature finds discontent manifesting on every side, in all stations of life. He sees man a bundle of contradictions, alternately hoping, despond ing; now moved by love, now indifferent, even hating; bound by some evil to-day, repentant to-morrow, ever in an unstable condition, finding no rest in either extreme of his personal being. The question as to the cause of all this naturally arises.

A great law known as the "attraction of opposites" operates in the Universe. But for this law evolutionary progress would be impossible. Man, ancient wisdom declares, is the Microcosm of the Microcosm therefore we can deal directly with him as illustrating the nature and action of this law. We may, despite our limited power of cognition, conceive of Divinity as a Trinity of Will, Desire and Thought in stable equilibrium, a Unity reflecting itself in the inmost heart of man and revealed in all its perfection only to beings capable of comprehending its entirety. As yet man catches, here and there, but imperfect glimpses of what he feels is a pure and divine reality and, mistaking illusion for that reality, strives to make it his own. Grasping and fleeting shadow, he finds it "vanity and vexation of spirit." Still the divine inner urge is upon him. Buffeted and defeated, he will try again. Surely that bow of promise e'en though faintly pictured on his mental sky, must hold for him, within its sevenfold beauty, one ray whose glory he never yet has known on earth, in air, or sea. So in his feverish quest for happiness, he flies to the other extreme, to be again disappointed, foiled, driven back. Now in order to rise superior to the clash and clamor of the pairs of opposites, to really free himself from these many adversities, man should strive to cultivate habits of introspection, of looking to that calm reflected in the depths of his being, of all being, for Being is One. When he looks upon his brother, he ought to remember that the pure, eternal flame which consumeth not, lies beneath the outward seeming, and by sympathetic words and actions he should strive to remove any obstruction. Then that beneficent, uninterrupted light shall ray forth upon himself and others. Man with eye fixed on the guiding star at the positive pole of his being, shall finally reach the restful haven where erter not the troubled waters,

Theosophy teaches that the eternal spirit of man sits enthroned above delusion, and by the power, the majesty of its presence, draws man to itself, thus gradually narrowing the area of his oscillations, slowly but surely overcoming the resistance of his beligerent personal will, to finally bring him into that calm and peace from which spring true knowledge self-conscious union with the Divine.

Man's mental, astral and physical constitution is such that he cannot proceed independently along any one line of development.

He loses interest, satiety ensues and with it comes a vague sense of unrest, precursor of change; so he is forced from round to round, up the ladder of experience. His petty personal will is made to bow to the Divine Universal Will acting through his spiritual will, for the balance of parts must be preserved in the

universal whole, each will must be rounded out to focus that universal whole. The law of opposites which affects the individual, also acts on men in the aggregate; therefore every man represents in his earthly life the rise, culmingtion, decay and final death of nations. Every nation, like very man, is the living expression of some particular virtue or vice, some excellence or defect, because its main energy, like his, is directed to the accomplishment of certain ends, thus rendering the Nation incapable of realizing in itself the varied excellences of other nations and so endangering and delaying the harmonious perfection of the final whole. Therefore in national life the great law of opposites becomes active; for instance, military power and virility give gradual place to weakness and impotence, then suddenly the Goths and Vandals of fate—blind instruments in the hands of unseen powers—are thundering at the very gates of the stronghold. The end must come, as it came to many nations; some of them unremembered in the pages of the world's historians.

What civilizations lie buried beneath the calm surface of the great ocean! Pacific it seems, yet those mighty waters hide the remains of the old Lemurian land. The Atlantic spreads an almost unbroken plain where once stood the great islands of fair Atlantis, whose splendid, though material civilization, contained within itself, like Lemuria, the germ of that which should cause its final overthrow. When the strength of the storm is upon us, the restless Atlantic, with its turbulent waves lashed into fury by "the powers of the air," well illustrates the final condition of that ancient people, whose lack of spirituality rendered them an easy prey to pride, selfishness and every vice springing therefrom.

The chief defects of our own civilization are selfishness, unbrotherliness, striving for power and preferment, exalting the one at the expense of many. Is this not a one-sided development? Shall not the great equilibrating law be called into action? Sure, unless we discover and utilize something that can counteract these evils.

The chief object of the Universal Brotherhood Organization is to demonstrate from a philsophical, ethical, and—most important of all—from a practical standpoint, the existence and nature of such a counteracting power and its application to these urgent times. Practical Universal Brotherhood is that counteracting power. This alone can ameliorate conditions; reduce to a minimum pain and misery resulting from violated law and thus prove a most important factor in the bringing about of the infinite purpose of Divine Will, balance of parts in the perfected whole.

Man vibrating between the opposites of his being, is but a single, though notable example of the instability of all below the equipoised and immovable Supreme. All else, whether low or high, are more or less under the influence of the positive and negative poles of being.

Olympian Zeus, the allegorical ruler of the Grecian Pantheon, is shown as realizing the impermanence of his throne, for he in reality represented a certain stage of Cosmic and human development, as did his predecessor, the dethroned Titan.

Now all these gods and heroes, results or symbolizing Grecian thought and thrilling us in its Epic and Drama—clothed, it is true, to the uninitiated with man's imperfections and vices—were to Pythagoras, Plato and other mystics and illuminati, in reality great powers and hierarchies who have their correspondents in the cosmogonies of every nation from Odin and the gods of the North, to Issis and Osiris of Egypt, and the triune Brahma Vishnu and Siva of India. All of them, covering vast cycles of time, are sympolical representations of Nature's truths, and though apparently yielding and being replaced, yet ever reappearing under new forms. Time itself must ultimately yield to, must become one with, its container, Infinite Duration. It was the sublime conception of the Hindu sages that at the sympolical inbreathing of Brahm—the mystical unknown Deity—Suns and Systems disappear; their light is lost in Absolute Light, the light of Orcus, the unknown Darkness.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE full name of the English translation of *Bhartrihari*'s Satakas we commended to the notice of our readers in our last issue is "A century of Indian Epigrams, chiefly from the Sanskrit of Bhartrihari by Paul Elmer More. (London and New York: Harper and Brothers.)" Three cardinal qualities characterise *Bhartrihari's* poetry which usally absent themselves from the productions of many Sanskrit poets and they are variety, love of nature, and depth of moral feeling. The English poet whom Bhartrihari, who is essentially a man of refined ethics and philosophy, most nearly resembles in creed and temper is Matthew Arnold.

***

MESSERS MACMILLAN have done the reading world immense benefit in bringing out a cheap edition of Rubaiyát of Omar Khayyám in "the Golden Treasury Series." Omar was the astronomer poet of Persia, a Sufi by creed, and a philosopher by insight and ability. To the opinion of some, the Wine which Omar celebrates is simply the juice of the grape, while there are others who would say that the poem, as consistent with the usual method of Sufi Philosophic poetry, celebrates the mysticism of Háfiz under the sensuous symbols of Wine and Grape. Wine and Beauty are, with these, images to illustrate, not to mask to hide, the Divinity the poem celebrates. Some might urge that perhaps some allegory less lible to mistake or abuse had been better among so inflammable a people as Persians, and much more so, as many think with Háfiz and Omar, the noumenal is not only compared to but actually identified with the phenomenal sensual symbol, hazardous if not to the devotee himself, at least to his weaker brethern who might see behind ruby wine and angelic maidens food to nurture their baser nature, and worse for the laity in proportion as the fanaticism and devotion of the initiated grew warmer and more demonstrative. And all for what? To quote Edward FitzGerald "To be tantalised with images of sensual enjoyment which must be renounced if one would approximate a God who according to the Doctrine, *is* sensual matter as well as spirit, and into whose Universe one expects unconsciously to merge after Death without hope of any posthumous Beatitude in another world to compensate for all one's

self-denial in this." Yet there is no harm in siding with the cool notion of some who have given years of patient study to Omar Khyyám that while the poet bragged more of the juice of the grape than he drank of it he meant to do nothing but jeer at the Spiritual Wine, which with all the loud ejaculations and pious penances of its votaries had been, for all human intents and purposes, leaving them in destitution, hypocricy and dreamy golden visions never pointing to any realisation

***

In the library of useful stories published by George Newnes of London, one of the later volumes is "The Story of Religions by the Rev. E. D. Price. F. G. S." The aim of the writer has been to indicate the leading principles which underlie the great religions of the world and to show the influence each particular form of faith has exercised upon the national and private life of its adherents. Almost all the important religious cults of the world are taken notice of, and Christianity among them, receives very elaborate treatment. The history of every Christian Church, and the causes of the ever-widening rift in some ecclesiastical sects of the present day are excellently sketched, while Hinduism along with its sister oriental religions receives very flimsy treatment. In dealing with Hinduism much emphasis is laid on the *puranic* aspect of it and no mention is made of the *Siddhantis* when speaking of the numerous sects among the Hindus. The author remarks referring to the people of the Vedic age "a woman was permitted to marry again on the decease of her husband" and "animal food including that of the cow, now, sacred to the Hindu, was eaten by the early Aryans. The sacred thread, it is said "is a coil of three threads. Yajnopavita, worn over the left shoulder and hanging down across the body to the right hip. A Brahmin wears a cord of cotton, a Kshatriya one of hemp and a Vaisya one of wool." For the assailable nature of these observations we would refer the inquisitive critic to Prof. Max Mullers History of ancient Sanskrit Literature, the *Paraskara Grihya Sutras* and also to the *Apastumbha Dharma Sutras*. By a curious mistake the Sanskrit equivalent of Marriage is given to be Viraha (?) on page 17

***

"The Calcutta University magazine of April publishes a life of Dr. Cowell, late Principal of the Sanskrit College in Calcutta and now professor of Sanskrit in the Cambridge University. The sketch is taken with a few alterations from M. M. Nilmani Mukherjea's report of the Sanskrit college for 1898. Prof. Cowell was the pupil of the celebrated Horace Hayman Wilson with whom he learned Sanskrit. He served as Librarian at Oxford before he came out to India in 1856, as professor of History at the Calcutta Presidency College. In the words of the article "such was the versatility of his attainments and such the affectionate regard he felt for his pupils that he used to take a delight in lecturing on other subjects also, such as Moral Philosophy or English" On the resignation of Pundit Iswara Chandra Vidyasagar in 1858 he succeeded to the principalship of the Sanskrit College. In those days classes were not so large as now, and hence opportunities were ample to enable students to move closely with the professor. His students, on one occasion, wanted a week's holiday and applied to him with an extemporised stanza in Sanskrit and got what they wanted. At another time, the professor welcomed the students on their return to the college-building after the mutiny during which time it had been used as a hospital for invalid soldiers in a sanskrit stanza composed by him which meant "*This college coming back to it old habitation will have the fragrance of its fame diffused in the world, as the goodly sandal tree grows and thrives only in Malaya Mountain, and no where else.*

***

Though long far away from this country Prof. Cowell takes a delight in writing letters to his old pupils and evinces a lively interest in the cause of Sanskrit learning "That was a very happy time" he wrote to one of his friends in India though it now seems a long while ago. I was young and strong then, I am now nearly 70 years of age and the days spent in Calcutta look like a *Janmantaram* (another birth) to me now! What a sympathy it is that sympathy can leap over the intervening years and seas, and unite the hearts of friends in a moment. I am always interested in hearing about the Tols. The Sanskrit College will always be dear to me, though all its professors are probably now unknown to me personally. I do yet hope to see the Sanskrit College again, but the prospect seems uncertain, as life runs on. Anyhow my affection for it and my interest in my old friends there will never cease. Let me hear from you sometimes how the College prospers. It is a goodly tree now, and many pupils have sheltered under its shadow". To him we can apply the remarks which Michael Madhusudan used in regard to the great Vidyasagar, Prof. Cowell's predecessor, or we may truly say he has the genius and wisdom of an Indian Sage, the Energy of an Englishman, and the heart of a Bengali mother.

***

William George Jordon, Editor, *Saturday Evening Post* makes some ethical and philosophical observations in "the New Century" from which we excerpt the following.

When Death comes into the little circle of loved ones who make up our world, all life becomes dark to us. We seem to have no reason for existing, no object, no incentive, no hope.

***

"Then in the divine mystery of Nature's processes, under the tender, soothing touch of Time, as days melt

into weeks, we begin to open our eyes gently to the world around us, and the noise and tumult of life jars less and less upon us. We have become emotionally convalescent. As the days go on, in our deep love, in the fullness of our loyalty, we protest often, with tears' in our eyes, against our gradual return to the spirt and atmosphere of the days of the past. We feel in a subtle way a new pain, as if we were disloyal to the dear one, as if we were faithless to our love.

***

"If life has not gone well with us, if fortune has left us disconsolate, if love has grown cold, and we sit alone by the embers; if life has become to us a vally of desolation, through which weary limbs must drag an unwilling body till the End shall come,—let us not radiate such an atmosphere to those round us; let us not take strangers through the catacombs of our life, and show the bones of our dead past; let us not pass our cup of sorrow to others, but, if we must drink it, let us take it as Socrates did his poison hemlock,—grandly, heroically and uncomplainingly"

***

In "the Universal Brotherhood" of May 1899 an innovation is introduced in the matter of the variety of contents. In additon to purely theosophical subjects, there are a great many contributions bearing on lay and secular themes which at the same time seek to point out the usefulness of studying them from the standpoint of the philosopher. A series of articles on "Egypt and the Egyptian dynasties" is begun by Dr. Alexandar wilder. An introduction to these is written by Katherine A. Tingley, the well-known Editor of "the New Century," in which she exhorts the students to take up the study of prehistoric times and their documents and suggests the importance of continuing it in a reverent and truth-finding spirit. Basil Crump's article on Richard Wagner's Prose Works" will, we are sure, not fail to delight men taking an interest in musical literature. An excellent contribution on "Nineteenth Century Butterflies" by Herbert Coryn shows the characteristic feverishness and mental restlessness of the age by directing our attention to the diametrically opposite and sudden-changing views of different sectarians. The next remarkable trait of this number is the Young Folk's Department. "The king of the doves An old Hindu tale by H. de N., is sure to amuse our Hindu friends.

***

We see no good in "The Light of the East" continuing its translation of Bhagavat Gita with Sankar Bhashya unless it be better than Mr. A. Mahadeva Sastry's translation of the same published a year or two ago in Madras. We have tested the former one here and there, and find it running very far short of Sankara's slashing style, and sharp ratiocination. We should have been much more pleased to find "the Introduction of the Mahabharata" doing better justice to the ethical and philosophical aspects of its teachings. A good deal is spoken about the style of the epic and its litarary characteristics, and even here we are sorry we perceive more tall talk and noisy bombast than a true aim to study its language and diction from a rhetorician's point of view. The article "Spiritual Perception" is a gem.

***

We are in receipt of the letter from Mr. S. W. Coomarasawmy of Trincomalee, Ceylon, asking us to induce some of our esteemed Sanskrit scholars here, to deal satisfactorily with the derivation of the Sanskrit word *Karpur* Eng.—Camphor. We ourselves are willing to take up this question as it interests us most, and we hope to be able to deal with ti in a forthcoming number. Whenever an etymology is brought in for one's acceptance one ought to make sure if the roots suggested are exact and uncorrupted in form, and if the derivation satisfies the operation of phonetic laws, philological methods and sound linguistic reasoning. Even the best philologist's surmises need thorough thrashing out on this score.

***

The Humanitarian League (Prisons Department) which has for its objects the amendment of the Criminal Law and the abolition of cruel punishments, has forwarded a resolution to the Home Secretary, protesting "most earnestly against the practice of hand-cuffing together on a chain, remand prisoners, women as well as men and taking them into crowded public places, such as railway stations, on their way to trial. To have their disgrace thus forcibly brought under the notice of the public would be bad enough in the case of convicted prisoners, whose guilt is yet to be proved, whose innocence may yet be established must be revolting to the feelings of all humane people."

***

We are glad to note that Mr. Govinda Charlu has reduced the prices of his edition of Bhagavat Gita with Ramanuja's commentary to Rs. 10-0-0, 9-0-0 and Rs. 8-0-0 respectively and we are sure that they would place the buyers at a decided advantage more than before.

V. V. R.