

PAPERS ON INDIAN REFORM.

RELIGIOUS REFORM.

PART II.

PHILOSOPHIC HINDUISM.

Yatha deva, tatha bhaktah,
 "As is the god, so is the worshipper."

"Thou thoughtest that I (God) was altogether such an one as thyself."
The Bible.

"What is not true cannot be patriotic."
Raja Sir Mudhava Row, K. C. S. I.

MADRAS:

THE CHRISTIAN VERNACULAR EDUCATION SOCIETY.

S. P. C. E. PRESS, VEPEERY.

1ST. ED.]

1887.

[2,000.

PREFATORY NOTE.

Part I. of the *Papers on Religious Reform* treats of POPULAR HINDUISM, the religion of the Hindus in general, as represented in the Epic Poems, Puranas, Tantras, and aboriginal cults.

Part II. discusses PHILOSOPHIC HINDUISM, as unfolded in the Upanishads and Darsanas. In the following compilation the under-mentioned works have chiefly been used :—

Ballantyne, *Christianity contrasted with Hindu Philosophy*.
Madden. 1859.

Banerjea, Rev. Dr. Krishna Mohun, *Dialogues on the Hindu Philosophy*. Williams and Norgate, 1861.

Barth, *Religions of India*, Trübner. 16s.

Bose, A. M. Ram Chandra, *Hindu Philosophy*, Punjab Religious Book Society, Lahore, Rs. 2.

Do. *Hindu Heterodoxy*, Methodist Publishing House, Calcutta, Rs. 3.

Caldwell, Bishop, *Remarks on the Bhagavad Gita*.* C. V. E. S.
Chentsal Rao, Hon. P. *The Hindu Religion*, *Christian College Magazine*, Vol. III., pp. 915—932.

Colebrooke, *Essays on the Religion and Philosophy of the Hindus*.
Williams and Norgate.

Day, Rev. Lal Behari, *Tract on Pantheism*. Included in *Select Tracts*, C. V. E. S.

Duff, Rev. Dr., *India and India Missions*.*

Flint, Rev. Dr., *Antitheistic Theories*. W. Blackwood, 10s. 6d.

Gough, A. E. *Philosophy of the Upanishads*: Trübner, 9s.

Do. *Vaiseshaka Aphorisms of Kanada*. Dr. Lazarus, Benares, Rs. 4.

Goreh, Rev. Nehemiah, *Rational Refutation of the Hindu Philosophy*. Translated by Hall. Calcutta Tract Society, Rs. 3.

Do. *Theism and Christianity*. Oxford Mission Press, Calcutta.

Hoisington, *Translations from Tamil Metaphysical and Theological Treatises*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

Jacob, *Translation of the Vendantasara, with copious notes*.
Trübner. 6s.

Kellogg, *Hinduism and Christianity*. *Princeton Review*. Reprinted in the *Indian Evangelical Review*, April, 1835.

- Mitchell, Rev. Dr. Murray, *Hinduism Past and Present*. Religious Tract Society. 4s.
- Mullens, Rev. Dr. J. *Religious Aspects of Hindu Philosophy*,* Smith, Elder, & Co.
- Müller, Max, *Sacred Books of the East, Vol. I. The Upanishads, Part. I.* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 10s. 6d.
- Roer, Dr. L., *Translation of the Brihad Aranyaka Upanishad.* Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta.
- Robson, Rev. Dr. J., *Hinduism and its Relations to Christianity*, Hamilton, Adams, & Co. 7s. 6d.
- Sarva Darsana Sangraha*, translated by Cowell and Gough, Trübner, 10s. 6d.
- Telang, Hon. R. T. *Translation of the Bhagavad Gita.* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 10s. 6d.
- Williams, Sir Monier. *Hinduism.* S. P. C. K. 2s. 6d.
- Do. *Religious Life and Thought in India.* Murray, 14s.

Works known to be now out of print are marked by an asterisk. Perhaps it should be added to one or two others.

The quotations show which treatises have specially been used by the compiler. It should, however, be mentioned that there are many short extracts, generally abridged or slightly altered to suit the context, which are not acknowledged.

The reader is urged to examine the subject for himself. Religion is not a matter of mere speculation, but of the deepest personal interest, and may the Source of all true knowledge guide him in his inquiries.

J. MURDOCH.

MADRAS, December, 1887.

RELIGIOUS REFORM.

PART II.

PHILOSOPHIC HINDUISM.

INTRODUCTION.

Intellectual Growth.—"The life of a nation," says Morell, "bears an obvious analogy to that of the individual."

The child gives life to every object around it. Whatever strikes the imagination affords delight; the most extravagant tales are accepted as true.

"The severing of imagination on the one hand from abstract principles on the other, marks the rise of another era in a nation's development,—that, namely, which corresponds with the sphere of THOUGHT, properly so called. The separation is effected by the understanding, and is marked by a decided tendency to metaphysical speculations.

"When these periods have run their rounds, then the age of positive science commences,—that in which the reason gathers up all the results of the other faculties, and employs them for the direct investigation of truth."*

The Hindus, in general, represent the childhood of humanity. Every thing around them is instinct with life. "The idlest legend," says Professor Cowell, "passes current as readily as the most authentic fact, nay, more readily, because it is more likely to charm the imagination; and in this phase of mind, imagination and feeling supply the only proof which is needed to win the belief of the audience."

Part I. of this Series, POPULAR HINDUISM, seeks to describe the religion of the masses. It is that of the Epic Poems, the Puranas, and Tantras, including aboriginal superstitions.

The tendency to metaphysical thought, the speculative stage of the human intellect, may be called the "childhood of philosophy." In Hinduism, this may be described as the religion of the Upani-

* Morell's *Elements of Psychology*, pp. 263, 264.

shads, the Darsanas, and Bhagavad Gita. Its investigation forms the Second Part of the Series, PHILOSOPHIC HINDUISM.

There is no sharp line of demarcation between Popular and Philosophic Hinduism. They blend into each other. Some combine the two. Even the common people are leavened, more or less, with some of the notions of Philosophic Hinduism.

Course of Hindu Thought.—India was first occupied by non-Aryan races, generally like the wild tribes still found in various parts of the country, although some had attained an elementary civilisation. Their religion apparently consisted in propitiating the demons and tutelary gods which, to the present day, forms the actual cult of the masses.

The Aryans poured in from Central Asia through the western passes, and spread over the great river basins of the Indus and Ganges, where they gradually became mingled with the pre-existing population, the two races mutually acting upon each other.

In later Vedic times the Indian tribes were gathered together in farms, in huts of sun-dried mud, in houses of stone, in hamlets and in fenced towns, under village chiefs and Rajas. The outward aspects of their life were not unlike those of rural India of to-day. The Indians of the Vedic age tilled their rice and barley, irrigated their fields with water-courses, watched the increase of their flocks and herds, and made a hard or easy livelihood as blacksmiths, wheelwrights, boat-builders, weavers, doctors, soldiers, poets, priests. They lived upon the produce of their cattle and their fields, drank wine and soma juice, and exercised their leisure in sacrificial feasts, in games, and spectacles.

The powers of nature present themselves to them as so many personal objects. The child personifies the stone that hurts him; the child of superstition personifies the laws of nature as gods. Sky and Earth are the father and mother of gods and men. Mitra, presiding over the day, wakes men, and bids them bestir themselves betimes, and stands watching all things with unwinking eye. Varuna, ruling the night, prepares a cool place of rest for all that move, fashions a pathway for the sun, knows every wink of men's eyes, cherishes truth, seizes the evil-doer with his noose, and is prayed to have mercy on the sinful. Agni, the fire-god, bears the oblation aloft to the gods. Indra, ruling the firmament, overthrows Vritra; Soma invigorates the gods, and cheers mankind.

The gods require to be flattered with hymns, to be fed with butter, to be refreshed with soma juice, that they may send rain, food, cattle, children, and length of days to their worshippers. Life is as yet no burden; there is nothing of the blank despair that came in later with the tenet of transmigration, and the misery of every form of sentient life. Pleasures are looked for in this world; their harvests are enough for the wants of all; their flocks and herds are many;

and pleasures are looked for again in the after-life in the body in the kingdom of Yama.

This worship of the personified powers of nature with a view to material benefits gradually hardened into a series of rites to be performed by the priesthood. In course of time it came to be held that the sacrifices performed without knowledge of their import produced their desired effect,—some material good, the birth of children, long life, or future happiness. This later form of Vedic religion received the name of the *Karmakanda*, or ritual department of the Vedas.

But in the midst of this life of the primitive Hindu, there are discernible the first stirrings of reflection. Questions began to be raised in the hymns of the Rishis in regard to the origin of earth and sky. One of them asks, "Which of them was first and which was later? You wise, which of you knows?" Another asks, "What was the fruit, what the tree, they cut the sky and earth out of?" In one hymn earth and sky are the work of Visvakarman. In another it is Hiranyagarbha, the Golden Germ, that arose in the beginning; in another it is Varuna. Agni is sometimes the son of Earth and Sky; at other times he is said to have stretched out the earth and sky. In a few of the later hymns there are touching confessions of ignorance; such as, "Who truly knows or who has told what path leads to the gods?"

"This creation, whether any made it, or any made it not? He that is the overseer in the highest heaven, he indeed knows, or haply he knows not."

The period of the hymns was followed by that of the ritual and legendary compilations known as the Brahmanas. Of these Brahmanas, particular portions, to be repeated only by the hermits of the forests, were styled Aranyakas, and to the Aranyakas were attached the treatises setting forth as a hidden wisdom the fictitious nature of the religion of rites, and the sole reality of the all-pervading and all-animating self, or Brahman. This hidden wisdom, the philosophy of the Upanishads, in contradistinction from the *Karmakanda*, or ritual portion, received the name of *Jnanakanda*, or knowledge portion of the Sruti, or everlasting salvation. There were now virtually two religions, the *Karmamarga* or path of rites, for the people of the villages, living as if life with its pleasures were real, and the *Jnanamarga*, or path of knowledge, for the sages that had quitted the world, and sought the quiet of the jungle, renouncing the false ends and empty fictions of common life, and intent upon reunion with the sole reality, the Self that is one in all things living."*

* Abridged from Gough's *Philosophy of the Upanishads*, pp. 7-17.

THE UPANISHADS.

Meaning of Title.—Sankara Acharya explains Upanishad as meaning the “setting to rest” (or destruction) of ignorance. “The term,” says Gough, “imports mystic teaching, and the synonymous term Vedanta means a final instalment of the Veda. The Upanishads are also called Vedantas, and the philosophy of the Upanishads, in its developed form is known as the Vedantic system.”

According to Professor Max Müller :

“All we can say for the present is that Upanishad, besides being the recognised title of certain philosophical treatises, occurs also in the sense of doctrine and of secret doctrine, and that it seems to have assumed this meaning from having been used originally in the sense of session or assembly in which one or more pupils receive instruction from a teacher.”*

Place among Hindu Sacred Books.—There are two great classes, *Sruti* and *Smriti*. The *Sruti*, the higher, means heard. It is equivalent to direct revelation, and is believed to have no human author. *Smriti*, ‘that which is remembered,’ though believed to be founded on direct revelation, is thought to have been delivered by human authors.

Sruti includes the three portions of the Vedas, viz. the *Mantras* or Hymns, the *Brahmanas*, directions about sacrifices, &c., and the *Upanishads*.

Smriti may be held to include all the other sacred books, the *Darsanas*, *Dharma Sastras*, *Itihasas*, *Puranas*, *Tantras*, &c.

The Upanishads, as stated above, belong to the *Sruti* class. The *Chhandogya Upanishad* gives the following account of its own origin: “Brahma told this to Prajapati, Prajapati to Manu (his son), and Manu to mankind.”

Number.—Weber, some years ago, reckoned the number of the Upanishads as 235; but some of them seem to have been quoted twice under different names. A later estimate makes them 170. New names, however, are being added to the list.

Max Müller says in his *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* :

“During the latter ages of Indian history, when none of the ancient Upanishads could be found to suit the purpose, the founders of new sects had no scruple and no difficulty in composing new Upanishads of their own. This accounts for the large and evergrowing number of these treatises. Every new collection of MSS., every new list of Upanishads given by native writers, adds to the number of those which were known before; and the most modern compilations seem now to enjoy the same authority as the really genuine treatises.” p. 317.

* Introduction to Translation, p. lxxxii.

Most of the Upanishads are small and unimportant. The two longest are the *Chhandogya*, attached to the Sama-Veda and the *Brihad-aranyaka* attached to the Satapatha-brahmana. Among others may be mentioned the *Isa*, attached to the White Yajur-Veda; the *Kena*, of the Sama-Veda, the *Katha*, *Prasna*, *Mundaka*, *Mandukya*, of the Atharva-Veda, and the *Taittiriya*, of the Black Yajur-Veda. The *Svetasvatara*, attached to the Black Yajur-Veda, is considered one of the most modern of the Upanishads.

Date.—Max Müller says :

“Though it is easy to see that these Upanishads belong to very different periods of Indian thought, any attempt to fix their relative age seems to me for the present almost hopeless. No one can doubt that the Upanishads which have had a place assigned to them in the Samhitas, Brahmanas, and Aranyakas are the oldest. Next to these we can draw a line to include the Upanishads clearly referred to in the Vedanta-Sutras, or explained and quoted by Sankara, by Sayana, and other more modern commentators. We can distinguish Upanishads in prose from Upanishads in mixed prose and verse, and again Upanishads in archaic verse from Upanishads in regular and continuous anushtubh Slokas. We can also class them according to their subjects, and, at last, according to the sects to which they belong. But beyond this it is hardly safe to venture at present.”*

Sir Monier Williams considers some of the more ancient probably as old as the sixth century B. C.

Orthodox Hindus believe the Upanishads to be part of the Vedas ; but their quotations from the Rig-Veda Sanhita, as well as their language, prove them to belong to a much later age than that of the Rig-Veda.

Text, &c.—Several of the Upanishads, in the original Sanskrit, have been published by the Bengal Asiatic Society. Sankar Acharya, the great Hindu controversialist, who flourished about the eighth century of the Christian era, wrote commentaries on eleven of the Upanishads. There are also commentaries by other Hindu writers. About fifty of the Upanishads were translated into Persian for Prince Dara, brother of Aurungzeb. Rammohun Roy translated four of them into English. Drs. Rajendralal Mitra and Roer have translated others. The most recent English translation is by Max Müller, forming part of the *Sacred Books of the East*. But only a few of them have yet been translated or even printed. *The Philosophy of the Upanishads*, by Mr. Gough, Principal of the Muir College, Allahabad, gives an admirable review, with copious extracts, of some of the most important of them.

“Liberation” the Aim of the Upanishads.—As already mentioned, in Vedic times a cheerful view was taken of life; but with the Upanishads, says Dr. Mitchell, “commences that great wail of

* Introduction to Translation, p. lxix.

sorrow which, for countless ages, has in India been rising up to heaven, and which, as time goes on, will deepen into the darkness of despair. In modern Europe the evils that still afflict both the individual and society have suggested the question—'Is life worth living?' If this be the case we cannot wonder that those ancient hermits were overwhelmed by the deep mysteries of existence and the manifold trials of life."*

The doctrine of transmigration, probably developed about the time of the Upanishads, had doubtless a great influence in producing this tone of sadness. Solomon, the richest and wisest king in ancient times, after trying every sensual pleasure, characterised all as "vanity and vexation of spirit." Buddha, the son of an Indian Raja, with similar experience, came to the same conclusion. His first "noble truth" is that "existence is suffering." As a devout Buddhist counts his beads, he mutters *Anitya, Dukka, Anatta*, "Transience, Sorrow, Unreality." Life is a curse, and the great aim ought to be to get rid of it.

Hinduism has been powerfully affected by Buddhism. "Transmigration is the great bugbear, the terrible nightmare and daymare of Indian philosophers and metaphysicians. All their efforts are directed to getting rid of this oppressive scare. The question is not, What is truth? Nor as it the soul's desire to be released from the burden of sin. The one engrossing problem is, How is a man to break this iron chain of repeated existences? How is he to shake off all personality?"† . . .

"Ask a Hindu," says Dr. Robson, what is the chief end of man's existence? and he will answer, Liberation (*mukti*). This is the answer which will be given alike by the peasant and the philosopher of any of the Schools. Ask him what he means by Liberation? and he will say that it is "to cut short the eighty-four."‡

"The Upanishads express the desire of the personal soul or spirit (*jiva* or *jivatman*) for deliverance from a long series of separate existences and from liability to pass through an infinite variety of bodies—gods, men, animals, plants, stones—and its longing for final union with the supreme soul or spirit of the Universe (*Atman* afterwards called Brahman)."

Max Müller, in his *Hilbert Lectures*, thus points out the object the Upanishads:

"To show the utter uselessness, nay, the mischievousness of all ritual performances, to condemn every sacrificial act which has for its motive a desire or hope of reward; to deny, if not the existence, at least the exceptional and exalted character of the Devas, and to teach that there

* Abridged from *Hinduism Past and Present*, pp. 49, 50.

† Sir Monier Williams.

‡ The 84 lakhs of births through which a person may pass.

§ *Religious Thought and Life in India*.

is no hope of salvation and deliverance except by the individual Self recognizing the true and universal Self, and finding rest there, where alone rest can be found." p. 340, 341.

Way of Liberation.—How is liberation to be obtained? how are the 84 lakhs of births to be cut short? It is not to be gained by a virtuous life or by works of any kind. The following illustration is used, and with the Hindus an illustration has all the force of an argument:—

"We are bound to our existence by two chains, the one a golden chain and the other an iron chain. The golden chain is virtue, and the iron chain is vice. We perform virtuous actions and we must exist in order to receive their reward; we perform vicious actions, and we must exist in order to receive their punishment. The golden chain is pleasanter than the iron one, but both are fetters, and from both should we seek to free our spirit."

"We must seek a higher end—deliverance from pain and pleasure alike—and look for it by nobler means, by being free from works altogether. Knowledge is the instrument, meditation the means by which our spirit is to be freed. To avoid all contact with the world, to avoid distraction, to avoid works, and to meditate on the identity of the internal with the external spirit till their oneness be realised, is the 'way of salvation' prescribed by the higher Hinduism. Sankaracharya, one of the principal authorities, says: 'The recluse, pondering the teacher's words, "Thou art the Supreme Being," and receiving the text of the Vedas, "I am God," having thus in three several ways—by the teacher's precepts, by the Word of God, by his own contemplation—persuaded himself "I am God," obtains liberation. 'This is the Hindu philosophical answer to the question, 'What must I do to be saved?' It is called the 'way of knowledge,' and is said to be the highest and only infallible way; the other ways being supposed to conduce to it.'"

Character of the Upanishads.—The larger Upanishads contain dialogues and mythical stories; the shorter are more abstract and observe more order. "The images pressed into service are of the simplest order. The fire produced from the attrition of two pieces of wood, the spokes issuing from the nave of a wheel, the athlete running a race, cows suckling their calves, leaves attached to the branches and the stocks, a bowstring, an arrow let fly, a flaming fire, a rolling car, a bellowing ox, a drop of water on a lotus-leaf—such are the images which flit across our mind as we turn page after page of these ancient books. A favourite storehouse of figures is the beehive and the honey squeezed from it, which is now the best of gods, then the best of sacred writings, and anon the best of ceremonial observances."†

The gods of the Upanishads are those of the Vedas. Their number varies from three and three thousand to one, but as in the Rig-

* Robson's *Hinduism*, pp. 104, 109, 110.

† *Hindu Philosophy*, by Ram Chandra Bose, A. M.

Veda a partiality is shown to "thirty-three" or thrice eleven." These gods are invoked in the Upanishads. The Taittiriya begins: "May Mitra be auspicious to us, may Varuna be auspicious, may Indra, . . . may the wide-striding Vishnu be auspicious to us."

The ceremonies referred to are Vedic. The Aswamedha, or horse sacrifice, is graphically described and referred to again and again. The Brihad Aranyaka thus sets forth its greatness:

"The dawn is verily the head of the sacrificial horse; the sun is the eye; the wind the breath; the fire, under the name Visranara, the open mouth; the year, the body of the sacrificial horse; the heaven is the back; the atmosphere, the belly; the earth the footstool (hoof); the quarters, the sides; the seasons, the members; the months, the half months, the joints; day and night, the feet; the constellations, the bones; the sky, the muscles; the half-digested food, the sand; the rivers, arteries and veins; the liver and spleen, the mountains; the herbs and trees, the various kinds of hair. The sun as long as he rises, the forepart of the body; the sun as long as he descends, the hind part of the body. The lightning is like yawning; the shaking of the members is like the rolling of the thunder."

Mr. Bose adds: "Decency leads us to throw the veil over the concluding portion of this series of grotesque metaphors and similies."

The Soma-yajna, the Pasu-medha, or inferior animal sacrifices, and the great sacrifices, called Purusha-medha, or the sacrifice of the Lord of creatures, have also references.

"The most essential teaching of the Upanishads, is, and has been so understood by the great exponents of them from ancient times, that every thing is Brahma. That our *atma*, or soul, is itself Brahma and the highest worship according to them is self-worship, and that consists in meditating that my own self is Brahma, that it is every thing."*

The Manduka Upanishad says: "As from well-kindled fire thousands of sparks of the same nature are produced, so O meek one, from the Imperishable the creatures of various sorts spring forth, (and) into the same again they are resolved."

To give a better idea of an Upanishad, one of the principal of the shorter ones is quoted in full. It is the Isa, attached to the 40th chapter of the Vajasaneya-samhita of the White Yajur Veda. Monier William says, "I was told by a great Pandit that this was the only Upanishad entitled to be called *apaurusheya*, i. e., not written by men."

The translation is by Max Müller in the first volume of the *Sacred Books of the East*. The passages within brackets are inserted explanations:

1. All this, whatsoever moves on earth, is to be hidden in the Lord (the Self). When thus hast surrounded all this, then thou mayest enjoy. Do not covet the wealth of any man!

* *Theism and Christianity*, by Rev. Nehemiah Goreh.

2. Though a man may wish to live a hundred years, performing works, it will be thus with him; but not in any other way: work will thus not cling to a man.

3. There are the worlds of the Asuras covered with blind darkness. Those who have destroyed their self (who perform works, without having arrived at a knowledge of the true Self), go after death to those worlds.

4. That one (the Self), though never stirring, is swifter than thought. The Devas (senses) never reached it, it walked before them. Though standing still, it overtakes the others who are running. Mâtarisvan (the wind, the moving spirit) bestows powers on it.

5. It stirs and it stirs not; it is far, and likewise near. It is inside of all this, and it is outside of all this.

6. And he who beholds all beings in the Self, and the Self in all beings, he never turns away from it.

7. When to a man who understands, the Self has become all things, what sorrow, what trouble can there be to him who once beheld that unity?

8. He, (the Self) encircled all, bright, incorporeal, scatheless, without muscles, pure, untouched by evil; a seer, wise, omnipresent, self-existent, he disposed all things rightly for eternal years.

9. All who worship what is not real knowledge (good works), enter into blind darkness: those who delight in real knowledge, enter, as it were, into greater darkness.

10. One thing, they say, is obtained from real knowledge; another, they say, from what is not knowledge. Thus we have heard from the wise who taught us this.

11. He who knows at the same time both knowledge and not-knowledge, overcomes death through not-knowledge, and obtains immortality through knowledge.

12. All who worship what is not the true cause, enter into blind darkness: those who delight in the true cause, enter, as it were, into greater darkness.

13. One thing, they say, is obtained from (knowledge of) the cause; another, they say, from (knowledge of) what is not the cause. Thus we have heard from the wise who taught us this.

14. He who knows at the same time both the cause and the destruction (the perishable body), overcomes death by destruction (the perishable body), and obtains immortality through (knowledge of) the true cause.

15. The door of the True is covered with a golden disk. Open that, O Pushan, that we may see the nature of the True.

16. O Pushan, only seer, Yama (judge), Surya (Sun), Son of Prajapati, spread thy rays and gather them! The light which is thy fairest form, I see it. I am what He is (viz. the person in the Sun).

17. Breath to air, and to the immortal! Then this my body ends in ashes. Om! Mind, remember! Remember thy deeds! Mind, remember! Remember thy deeds!

18. Agni, lead us on to wealth (beatitudo) by a good path, thou, O God, who knowest all things! Keep far from us crooked evil, and we shall offer thee the fullest praise! (Rv. I. 189, 1.)

Dr. Murray Mitchell says of the Upanishads :

"These are by no means either systematic or homogeneous. They have well been called 'guesses at truth; for they present no formal solution of great problems. They contradict one another; the same writer sometimes contradicts himself. They are often exceedingly obscure, and to Western minds repellent—vague, mystical, incomprehensible. A few rise to sublimity; others are nonsensical—'wild and whirling words,' and nothing more. Yet there is frequently earnestness—a groping after something felt to be needful; there is the yearning of hearts dissatisfied and empty. In this lies the value of the Upanishads."*

The Cambridge Professor of Sanskrit thus describes them :

"The Upanishads are usually in the form of dialogue; they are generally written in prose with occasional snatches of verse, but sometimes they are in verse altogether. They have no system or method; the authors are poets, who throw out their unconnected and often contradictory rhapsodies on the impulse of the moment, and have no thought of harmonizing to-day's feeling with those of yesterday or to-morrow. Through them all runs an unmistakeable spirit of Pantheism, often in its most offensive form, as avowedly overriding all moral considerations; and it is this which has produced the general impression that the religion of the Veda is monotheistic."†

The Rev. Dr. K. M. Banerjea says that some of the Upanishads contain "rather a large sprinkling of obscenities." Dr. Roer was obliged to translate nearly the whole of the concluding chapter of the Brihadaranyaka into Latin because of its gross indecencies. "It could not bear an English rendering."‡

THE SIX SCHOOLS OF HINDU PHILOSOPHY.

"The Upanishads contain the first attempts to comprehend the mysteries of existence; and their teachings cannot be gathered up into an harmonious system. But as time went on, a desire was felt to expand, classify, and arrange these earlier utterances—to make them more definite and more consistent. Hence gradually arose what we may call the official philosophy of India, which is comprised in a number of methodical treatises. These are generally called the six *Darsanas*, or 'exhibitions.'§ No doubt it was only by

* *Hinduism Past and Present*, p. 49.

† Quoted by Major Jacob, *Vedanta S ra*, p. 15.

‡ *Dialogues on Hindu Philosophy*, p. 321.

§ Or "Demonstrations of Truth." Sir Monier Williams.

degrees that they assumed their present elaborated shape, which cannot be much older than the Christian era.* They consist of the following:—

1. The *Nyaya*, founded by Gotama.
2. The *Vaiseshika*, by Kanáda.
3. The *Sankhya*, by Kapila.
4. The *Yoga*, by Patanjali.
5. The *Mimansa*, by Jaimini.
6. The *Vedánta* by Badarayana or Vyása.

The original text-books of the various systems consist of *Sutras*, which are held to be the basis of all subsequent teaching. The word properly signifies 'a string.' We may understand it to denote a string of rules, or rather aphorisms. "They are expressed with extreme conciseness—doubtless for the purpose of being committed to memory; and without a commentary they are exceedingly obscure."

The date of the composition of these aphorisms cannot be settled with certainty. Nor is it possible to decide when the six schools were finally systematised, nor which of the six preceded the others.

The Darsanas belong to the division of Hindu books, called *Smriti*. They are therefore authoritative; but not to the same extent as the Vedas and Upanishads.

"It is usual to classify these systems in pairs, making three pairs in the order given above; but this arrangement is not satisfactory. The *Nyaya* and *Vaiseshika* may indeed go well enough together; and the *Sankhya* and *Yoga* may with some difficulty do the same; but the *Mimansa* and *Vedánta* have very little in common. Their conjunction has arisen from the circumstance that the *Mimansa* (otherwise called the *Purva* or earlier *Mimansa*) deals with the ritual portion of the Vedas as explained in the *Brahmanas*; while the *Vedánta* or *Uttara* (later) *Mimansa* seeks to unfold and apply the principles of the *Upanishads*; and thus, as each expounds a portion of what had come to be called the *Veda*, the two systems came to be bracketed together."

"None of the six systems professedly attack, or deny, the authority of the Vedas: on the contrary, they all profess the profoundest reverence for the sacred books. It is difficult to see how the authors of some of the systems could do this with sincerity. Yet the Hindu mind has long surpassed all other minds in the ability to hold, or believe itself to hold, at the same time, two or more opinions which appear to be wholly irreconcilable: indeed an acknowledged note of the Hindu mind is 'eclecticism issuing in confusion;' it has been said to be 'the very method of Hindu thought.' But the contradictions among the philosophical systems were too glaring to escape the notice of men capable of reflection; and accordingly the author of one *Darsana* and his followers frequently attack the supporters of the others. Thus the great controversialist

* *Hinduism Past and Present*, by Dr. Murray Mitchell.

Sankara denounces a follower of the Nyaya philosophy as a bullock minus the horns and tail—implying, we suppose, that he had all a bullock's stupidity without his power of fighting. The author of the Sankhya charges the followers of the Vedanta with 'babbling like children or madmen.' The Mimansa accuses the Vedanta of being disguised Buddhism. The Padma Purana maintains that four of the six systems are simply atheism.

"But while thus radically opposed to each other, the six official systems of philosophy are all held to be orthodox."*

1. THE NYAYA.

Gotama, the founder of this system, is claimed to have been a Rishi, married to Ahalya, the daughter of Brahma. She was seduced by Indra, who had to suffer in a way too indecent to be mentioned.

The word Nyaya signifies "going into a subject," taking it, as it were, to pieces. The system was intended to furnish a correct method of philosophical inquiry into *all the objects and subjects* of human knowledge, including, *amongst others*, the process of reasoning and laws of thought.

The different processes by which the mind arrives at true and accurate knowledge are four; viz.—*a. Pratyaksha*, 'perception by the senses'; *b. Anumana*, 'inference'; *c. Upamana*, 'comparison'; *d. Sabda*, 'verbal authority,' a 'trustworthy testimony,' including Vedic revelation.

'Inference' is divided into five *Avayavas*, or 'members.' 1. The *pratijna*, or proposition. 2. The *hetu*, or reason. 3. The *udaharana*, or example. 4. The *upanaya*, or application of the reason. 5. The *nigamana*, or conclusion. The following is an example: 1. The hill is fiery; 2. for it smokes; 3. whatever smokes is fiery, as a kitchen-hearth; 4. this hill smokes; 5. therefore this hill is fiery.

The second topic of the Nyaya proper is *Prameya*, *i. e.*, the subjects of *Prama*, or the subjects about which right knowledge is to be obtained. These are twelve: viz. 1. Soul (*atman*). 2. Body (*sarira*). 3. Senses (*indriya*). 4. Objects of sense (*artha*). 5. Understanding or intellection (*buddhi*). 6. Mind (*manas*). 7. Activity (*pravritti*). 8. Faults (*dosha*). 9. Transmigration (*pretya-bhava*). 10. Consequences or fruits (*phala*). 11. Pain (*dukha*), 12. Emancipation (*apavarga*).

With regard to the fourteen other topics, they seem to be not so much philosophical categories as an enumeration of the regular stages through which a controversy is likely to pass.

There is first the state of *Samsaya*, or 'doubt about the point to be discussed.' Next, the *Prayojana*, or 'motive for discussing it.'

* Dr. Murray Mitchell, *Hinduism Past and Present*.

Next follows a *Drishtanta*, or, 'example' leading to the *Siddhanta*, or 'established conclusion.' Then comes an objector with his *Arayava*, or 'argument split up,' as we have seen, into five members. Next follows the *Tarka* or 'refutation,' (*reductio ad absurdum*) of his 'objection,' and the *Nirnaya*, or 'ascertainment of the true state of the case.' But this is not enough to satisfy a Hindu's passion for disputation. Every side of a question must be examined—every possible objection stated—and so a further *Vada*, or 'controversy' takes place, which of course leads to *Jalpa*, 'mere wrangling,' followed by *Vitanda*, 'cavilling;' *Hetv-abhasa*, 'fallacious reasoning'; *Ohhala*, 'quibbling artifices'; *Jati*, 'futile replies'; and *Nigraha-sthana*, 'the putting an end to all discussion,' by a demonstration of the objector's incapacity for argument.

After enumerating these sixteen topics, Gotama proceeds to show how false notions are at the root of all misery. For from false notions comes the fault of liking or disliking, or being indifferent to anything; from that fault proceeds activity; from this mistaken activity proceed actions, involving either merit or demerit, which merit or demerit forces a man to pass through repeated births for the sake of its rewards or punishment. From these births proceeds misery, and it is the aim of philosophy to correct the false notions at the root of this misery.*

The name *Iswara* occurs once in the *Sutras* of Gotama, the founder of the *Nyaya*, but they say nothing of moral attributes as belonging to God, nor is His government of the world recognized. Nor can the system be said to believe in creation, inasmuch as it holds matter to be composed of eternal atoms. Confluent atoms, in themselves uncreated, composed the world. Soul, or rather spirit, is represented as multitudinous, and (like atoms) eternal. It is distinct from mind.†

2. THE VAISESHIKA.

The *Vaiseshika* may be called a supplement of the *Nyaya*. It is attributed to a sage, nicknamed *Kanada* (atom-eater). *Colebrooke* explains *Vaiseshika* as meaning "particular," as dealing with "particulars" or sensible objects. It begins by arranging its inquiries under seven *Padarthas*, or certain general properties or attributes that may be predicated of existing things.

The *Vaiseshika* *Sutras* do not mention God. They go very fully into the doctrine of atoms—which, like the *Nyaya*, they declare to be uncaused and eternal. An atom is thus defined by *Kanada*: "Something existing, without a cause, without beginning and end. It is contrary to what has a measure." Atoms are so exceedingly

* Monier Williams.

† Dr. Murray Mitchell, *Hinduism Past and Present*.

small that it requires three of them to be perceptible like a mote in a sunbeam.

It is held that the living individual souls of men (*jivatman*) are eternal, manifold, and *diffused everywhere throughout space*; so that a man's soul is as much in England as in Calcutta, though it can only apprehend and feel and act where the body happens to be.

The Vaiseshika is dualistic in the sense of assuming the existence of *eternal atoms*, side by side either with *eternal souls*, or with the Supreme Soul of the universe.

The Vaiseshika Aphorisms of Kanada, with comments, have been translated by Mr. Gough, formerly Anglo-Sanskrit Professor in the 'Government College, Benares.*'

3. THE SANKHYA.

The founder of this school is said to have been Kapila. In Gaudapada's commentary he is claimed to have been one of the seven Rishis, the "mind-born" sons of Brahma. Unlike the Nyaya, this is a *synthetic* system, as it were, placing things together. It is essentially dualistic. It holds that there are two primary eternal agencies. There is an eternally existing essence, called *Prakriti*, "that which produces or brings forth every thing else." This is sometimes, not very accurately, rendered by "*Nature*." "From the absence of a root in the root, the root of all things is rootless."

Prakriti is supposed to be made up of three principles, called *Gunas*, or cords, supposed to bind the soul. They are *Sattva*, *Rajas*, *Tamas*; or Truth, Passion, and Darkness. These principles enter into all things; and on the relative quantity of each in any object depends the quality of the object.

Souls (*Purush*) are countless in number; individual, sensitive, eternal, unchangeable. All that is done by *Prakriti* is done on behalf of soul. In its own nature soul is without qualities, until united with *Prakriti*. The union of the two is compared to a lame man mounted on a blind man's shoulders; the pair are then both (as it were) capable of perception and movement.

Beginning from the original rootless germ *Prakriti*, the Sankhya counts up (*san-khyati*) synthetically (whence its name of 'synthetic enumeration') twenty-three other Tattwas or entities—all productions of the first, and evolving themselves spontaneously out of it, as cream out of milk, or milk out of a cow,—while it carefully distinguishes them all from a twenty-fifth, *Purusha*, the soul, which is wholly in its own nature destitute of *Gunas*, though liable to be bound by the *Gunas* of *Prakriti*.

* Published by Dr. J. Lazarus, Benares, Price Rs. 4.

The process is thus stated in the Sankhya-karika: "The root and substance of all things (except soul) is Prakriti. It is no production. Seven things produced by it are also producers. Thence come sixteen productions (*vikara*). Soul, the twenty-fifth essence, is neither a production nor producer."

According to the Sankhya system, the five grosser elements (*mahabhuta*) with their distinguishing properties and corresponding organs of sense are the following :

	Distinguishing Property.	Organ of Sense.
1. <i>Akasa</i> , ether	Sound.	The Ear
2. <i>Vayu</i> , air,	Tangibility	The Skin
3. <i>Tejas</i> , fire, light,	Colour,	The Eye
4. <i>Apas</i> , water	Taste	The Tongue
5. <i>Prithivi</i> , earth	Smell	The Nose.

In the Sankhya there is no place for God ; and accordingly it is known among Hindus by the name of Niriswara Sankhya, or the *Sankhya without the Lord*. Yet all the original text asserts is that this existence is "not proved." Kapila, then, was an agnostic rather than atheist.*

Notwithstanding these atheistical tendencies, the charge of unorthodoxy is evaded by a confession of faith in the Veda.

"It is remarkable that this singular Sankhya theory of the relationship between spirit and matter, involving as it does a strange jumble of physical and metaphysical subtleties, has always had peculiar charms for the Hindu mind. Not that the uneducated masses could make anything of the mysticism of a primordial eternal germ evolving out of itself twenty-three substances to form a visible world for the soul, described as apathetic, inactive, devoid of all qualities, and a mere indifferent spectator ; but that ordinary men are only too prone to accept any theory of the origin of the universe which makes the acts of the Creator harmonize with their own operations and the phenomena which surround them. Even the most illiterate Hindu, therefore, was well able to understand and adopt the idea of a universe proceeding from Prakriti and Purusha as from father and mother. Indeed the idea of a union between the female principle, regarded as an energy or capacity (*Sakti*), and the male principle, regarded as a generator, is of great antiquity in the Hindu system.

"In the Puranas and Tantras, Prakriti becomes the real mother of the universe, taking the form of female personifications, who are regarded as the wives or female energies and capacities (*Sakti*) of the principal male deities, to whom, on the other hand, the name

* An agnostic professes not to know whether there is a God ; an atheist denies his existence.

Purusha, in the sense of the Supreme Soul, or primeval male, is sometimes applied.”*

The Sankhya Aphorisms of Kapila, with illustrative extracts from the commentaries, were translated by the late Dr. Ballantyne. (Trübner, 16s.)

4. THE YOGA.

The Yoga, founded by Patanjali, is often styled the Theistic Sankhya. It agrees in its general principles with the Sankhya proper, but claims greater orthodoxy by directly acknowledging the existence of God. The Supreme Being of the Yoga is a soul distinct from other souls, unaffected by the ills with which they are beset; unconcerned with good or bad deeds and their consequences, “a spirit unaffected by works, having for one of his appellations the mystical monosyllable Om.” Practically he is a nonentity, introduced to satisfy popular feeling, prejudiced against the Sankhya as atheistic.

Indian philosophy makes salvation dependent upon right knowledge—that is the knowledge of the essential distinction between soul and non-soul. This right knowledge is generally supposed to be attainable only by the ascetic exercises prescribed in the Yoga Shastra.

The word *Yoga* means union. The great end of the Yoga is to obtain union with the Supreme Being. Patanjali defines Yoga as “the suppression of the functions of the thinking principle.” The following are the exercises to be employed:—

1. *Yama*, restraint. 2. *Niyama*, religious observances. 3. *Asana*, postures. 4. *Pranayama*, regulation of the breath. 5. *Pratyahara*, restraint of the senses. 6. *Dharana*, fixed attention. 7. *Dhyana*, contemplation. 8. *Samadhi*, profound meditation.

All wandering thoughts are to be called on, and attention fixed on some one object. Any object will answer if it is thought of alone; other thoughts must be suppressed. At last there is profound meditation without any object.

Great importance is attached to *asana*, or postures. At an early period they were fixed as 84, but of this number ten are specially recommended. The following directions are given regarding some of them:

The Lotus Posture.—The right foot should be placed on the left thigh, and the left foot on the right thigh; the hands should be crossed, and the two great toes should be firmly held thereby; the chin should be bent down to the chest; and in this posture the eyes should be directed to the tip of the nose.

* Sir Monier Williams.

Gomukha, or Cow's Mouth Posture.—Put the right ankle on the left side of the chest, and similarly the left ankle on the right side.

Fowl Posture.—Having established the lotus posture, if the hand be passed between the thigh and the knees and placed on the earth so as to lift the body aloft, it will produce the fowl seat.

Bow Posture.—Hold the great toes with the hands and draw them to the ears as in drawing a bowstring.

The regulation of the breath, *pranayama*, is likewise of great importance. "The usual mode is after assuming the posture prescribed, to place the ring finger of the right hand on the left nostril, pressing it so as to close it, and to expire with the right, then to press the right nostril with the thumb, and to inspire through the left nostril, and then to close the two nostrils with the ring finger and the thumb, and to stop all breathing. The order is reversed in the next operation, and in the third act the first form is required."*

Marvellous powers are attributed to the man fully initiated in the Yoga. The past and present are unveiled to his gaze. He sees things invisible to others. He hears the sounds that are in distant worlds. He becomes stronger than the elephant, bolder than the lion, swifter than the wind. He mounts at pleasure into the air or dives into the depths of the earth and the ocean. He acquires mastery over all things, whether animated or inanimate.

To find Yogis possessed of such powers seems to have been one of the objects of Colonel Olcott in coming to India. He says in his addresses :

"I have met those who had seen the marvellous phenomena performed by ascetics, and amply corroborated all the stories we had heard and circulated through the Western press." (p. 13). He was not, however, successful in his search to find any of them. He thus describes some whom he saw: "A crowd of painted impostors who masquerade as *Sadhus* to cheat the charitable, and secretly give loose rein to their beastly nature." (p. 184.)

Two gentlemen in South India each offered to give Rs. 500 to any Yogi who would raise himself in the air in an open space ; but no one has fulfilled the conditions.

The whole belief is a delusion. The brain is the organ of the mind. To enable it to act properly, it must have a good supply of pure blood. The blood is purified by fresh air entering into the lungs by breathing. From want of sufficient food and suppression of the breath, the blood of the Yogi is small in quantity and impure. The brain does not act properly. He may be in a dreamy condition or almost unconscious. Barth, a French writer, a distinguished

*Quoted by Mr. R. C. Bose from the translation of the Yoga Shastra by Dr. Rajendralala Mitra.

Sanskrit scholar, says of the Yoga exercises: "Conscientiously observed, they can only issue in folly and idiocy."

5. MIMANSA.

This is sometimes called Purva-Mimansa, because founded on the Vedas. It is not a branch of any philosophical system; but rather one of Vedic interpretation, thrown into a kind of scientific form.

Jaimini, its founder, did not deny the existence of God, but practically he makes the Veda the only god. The Veda, he says, is itself authority, and has no need of an authorizer. *Dharma* consists in the performance of the rites and sacrifices prescribed in the Veda, because they are so prescribed, without reference to the will or approval of any personal god, for *Dharma* is itself the bestower of reward.

Jaimini asserts the absolute eternity of the Veda, and he declares that only eternally pre-existing objects are mentioned in it. Another doctrine maintained by him is that sound is eternal, or rather, that an eternal sound underlies all temporary sound.*

6. THE VEDANTA.

This system, though described last, has long been the chief philosophy of India. It is the truest exponent of the habits of thought of thoughtful Hindus. The outline of its pantheistic creed is traceable in the Rig-Veda, and it conforms more closely than any other system to the doctrines propounded in the Upanishads, on which treatises, indeed, as forming the end of the Veda, it professes to be founded.

Vyasa, or Badarayana, is said to be the founder of the Vedanta. He is commonly supposed also to have arranged the Vedas, to have compiled the Mahabharata, as well as to have written some of the Puranas. One theory is that there were several persons of the same name. The most probable explanation is that the writer, according to a common practice among the Hindus, claimed the celebrated name of Vyasa to gain more respect for his work. In South India, several books, quite modern, are attributed to the Rishi Agastya.

Vyasa is said to have composed the Sariraka Sutras, containing 555 aphorisms. They are very obscure, and numerous commentaries have been written upon them. The most celebrated is that of Sankar Acharya.

The first aphorism states the object of the whole system in one word, viz., *Brahma-jijnasa*, "The desire of knowing Brahm." In the second aphorism this Brahm is defined to mean "that from which the production of this universe results."

* Abridged from Monier Williams.

The *Vedanta Sar*, of much later date than the Sariraka Sutras, is a good compendium of Vedantic principles. There is a translation of it, with some valuable notes, by Major Jacob.

A Vedantist's creed is comprised in the well-known formula of three words from the Chhandogya Upanishad (*ekam evadvitiam*, one only without a second). This does not mean that there is no second God, but that there is no second anything. Rammohun Roy and Keshab Chunder Sen understood it to mean monotheism, but it is pantheism.

The following are other statements: "Brahm* exists truly, the world falsely, the soul is only Brahm, and no other."† "All this universe indeed is Brahma; from him does it proceed; into him is it dissolved; in him it breathes. So let every one adore him calmly."

Nothing really exists but the one impersonal spirit, called Atma, or Brahm (Purusha). Hence the doctrine of the Vedanta is called *Advaita*, non-dualism. The Sankhya has two—Prakriti and Purusha, and is therefore called *Dwaita*, dualism.

This eternal impersonal spirit is itself Existence, Knowledge, Joy (*sac-cid-ananda*). But this existence is without consciousness; a kind of dreamless sleep, the joy is only freedom from the miseries of transmigration. This pure Being is almost identical with pure Nothing.

When this impersonal unconscious Spirit assumes consciousness and personality—that is, when it begins to exist in any object, to think about any thing or be joyful about anything—it does so by associating itself with *Maya*, the power of Illusion. It thus becomes the supreme personal God, Paramesvara. It is this personal God who, when he engages in the creation, preservation, and dissolution of the universe, is held to be dominated by one or other of the three *gunas*, *rajas*, *sattva*, *tamas*.

According to Vedantism, there are three kinds of existence. 1. True existence (*paramarthika*). Of this Brahm is the sole representative. 2. Practical (*vyavaharika*). This includes Iswara, souls, heaven, hell, the world. Such objects are to be dealt with practically as if they were really what they appear to be. A man is practically a man; a beast, a beast. 3. Apparent existence (*pratibhasika*). Among this class are things seen in dreams, a bright shell mistaken for silver, &c.

The Supreme Spirit is represented as ignoring himself by a sort of self-imposed ignorance, in order to draw out from himself, for his own amusement, the separate individual souls and various appearances, which, although really parts of his own essence, constitute the apparent phenomena of the universe. Hence the external world,

* Brahm is used instead of Brahma, neuter, to distinguish it from Brahmá, masculine.

† Brahma satyam Jagan mithya jiva Brahmaiva naapara.

individual souls, and even Isvara, the personal God, are all described as created by a power which the Vedantist is obliged for want of a better solution of his difficulty to call *Avidya*, generally translated 'Ignorance,' but perhaps better rendered by 'False knowledge,' or 'False notion.'

Avidya is possessed of two powers—*avarana*, envelopment (or concealing), which hides from the soul its identity with God, and *vikshepa*, projection, which causes the appearance of an external world.

Avidya is held to have an eternal existence equally with Brahm. It is the same as *Maya*, illusion.

By reason of *Avidya*, then, the *Jivatman*, or living soul of every individual, mistakes the world as well as its own body and mind for realities, just as a rope in a dark night might be mistaken for a snake. The moment the personal soul is set free from this self-imposed ignorance by a proper understanding of the truth through the Vedanta philosophy, all the illusion vanishes, and the identity of the *Jivatman* and of the whole phenomenal universe with the *Paramatman*, or Supreme Soul, is re-established. The "great sentence" is *Tat twam asi*, "That (Brahm) art Thou," or *Aham Brahma*, "I am God." A man persuaded of this obtains *mukti*, or liberation.

The following illustration is used. The world is just like a dream. We fall asleep; we imagine things to be about us which are only the creations of the brain, but which have for us all the value of realities. We wake up, and find that they are all a delusion. So shall we one day wake up and find that all the external universe has been but the play of our spirit.*

It is believed by many good authorities that there are two schools of Vedantists—an earlier and later. Major Jacob says, "The writers of the Upanishads, *i. e.*, the Vedantists of the old school, were undoubtedly *parinamavadins*, or believers in the *reality* of the world of perception; and, with them, Brahma was not its substitute or illusory-material cause, but the material from which it was evolved or developed." The *Munduka Upanishad* says, "As a spider throws out and retracts (its web), as herbs spring up in the ground, and as hair is produced on the living person, so is the universe derived from the undecaying One." Professor Cowell says: "There can hardly be a question as to the fact that the original Vedanta of the earlier *Upanishads* and of the *Sutras* did not recognise the doctrine of *Maya*. The earliest school seems to have held Brahma to be the material cause of the world in a grosser sense."†

The idea of *Maya* was not fully developed till after the time of Buddha, about the sixth century B. C. Those who held it were

* Dr. Robson, *Modern Hinduism*.

† Quoted by Major Jacob, p. 8.

called *Mayaradins*, or Illusionists. Vedantism, in its maturity, is found in the *Vedanta Sar* and in a still later work, called *Vedanta Paribhasa*. Both are comparatively modern.

BHAGAVAD GITA.

The Bhagavad Gita, the Divine Song, is considered to represent the loftiest flights of Hindu philosophy and morality; for beauty of style it is deemed incomparable. The sentiments expressed in it have undoubtedly exerted a powerful influence throughout India, for the last 1600 years.

At present only a general description will be given of the work. In a subsequent section its leading doctrines will be examined more in detail.

The real author of the Bhagavad Gita is unknown. It was inserted in the middle of the Mahabharata to give it more authority. The date of its composition is also uncertain; but it is generally supposed to have been written in the second or third century of the Christian era. It is later than the six Darśanas, and Krishna, who elsewhere in the Mahabharata is little more than a human hero, is exalted as the Supreme Lord. There are several English translations in prose. The latest is by the Hon. K. T. Telang, in the *Sacred Book of the East*. There is also a poetical version by Edwin Arnold.

The book "consists of a dialogue between the warrior Arjuna, and the deity Krishna. The armies of the Pandavas and Kauravas were drawn up in battle array; the war-shell had sounded; and the deadly strife was about to commence when the tender-hearted Arjuna was overwhelmed with grief at the thought of imbruing his hands in the blood of men who, while opponents, were yet near relatives. His bow drops from his hand; he weeps; he cannot fight. The god Krishna, who has been acting as Arjuna's charioteer and giving him advice, here interposes with a rebuke of this faintheartedness, and denounces his reluctance to slay the foe as disgraceful, despicable weakness. And then, to prove his point, the deity plunges into the depths of metaphysical speculation, and at length reaches the conclusion,—'And therefore up; on to battle, son of Bharata.'"^{*}

The great aim of the book is to harmonize the doctrines of the Yoga, the Sankhya, and the Vedanta, combining with them the doctrine of faith (*bhakti*) in Krishna, and of stern devotion to caste duties (*dharma*).

The poem is divided into three sections, each containing six chapters, the philosophical teaching in each being somewhat distinct.

^{*} Dr. Murray Mitchell, *Hinduism Past and Present*.

The first section dwells chiefly on the benefits of the Yoga system, pointing out, however, that the asceticism and self-mortification of Yoga ought to be joined with action, and the performance of caste duties, and winding up with a declaration that the grand aim of all self-suppression is to attain that state which enables a man to annihilate his own individuality and see God in everything and everything in God.

In the second division the pantheistic doctrines of the Vedanta are more directly inculcated than in the other sections. Krishna here, in the plainest language, claims adoration as one with the great universal spirit, pervading and constituting the universe. He reveals himself to Arjuna as possessed of countless faces, countless mouths, countless eyes, and blazing like a thousand suns.

The third division aims particularly at interweaving Sankhya Doctrines with Vedanta, though this is done, more or less throughout the whole work. It accepts the doctrine of a supreme presiding spirit as the first source of the universe, and asserts that both Prakriti and Purusha—that is the original eternal element and soul—both emanate from this Supreme Being. Moreover, it maintains the individuality of souls.

As a necessary result of its composite character, the work is, of course, full of contradictions.*

MINOR SCHOOLS.

The foregoing are the Six Darsanas, or recognised great systems of philosophy. Besides these, there are several minor schools. Both are described by Madhava Acharya in his *Sarva Darsana-Sangraha*, of which there is an English translation by Professors Cowell and Gough. The *Madras Christian College Magazine* (Vol. III. pp. 915-932) contains an account, by Mr. P. Chentsal Rao, of several systems, chiefly taken from the preceding work. It has also been used by Mr. R. C. Bose in his *Heterodox Philosophy*. Sir Monier Williams, in his *Religious Thought and Life in India*, gives some additional information. The following brief sketch of some of the Minor Schools is mainly compiled from the foregoing sources.

The Charvakas.

This sect is an ancient one which exercised no slight influence on Hindu philosophy, but it has now hardly any adherents. Nothing is known about Charvaka, the founder. The creed of the Charvakas is pure materialism. They reject all the *Pramanas* or sources of true knowledge except *Pratyaksha*, 'perception by the senses'; they admit only four *Tattvas*, or 'eternal principles,' viz. earth, air,

* Abridged from Monier Williams.

fire and water; and from them intelligence (*caitaniya*) is alleged to be produced; they affirm that the soul is not different from the body; and lastly they assert that all the phenomena of the world are spontaneously produced without even the help of *adrishṭa*.*

"The system seems," says Dr. Murray Mitchell, "to have been marked by a light, sneering infidelity; and it was probably in derision that the school was said to have been founded by Brihaspati, the *Guru* of the gods. 'The authors of the three Vedas were buffoons, knaves and demons'—such was the sweeping dictum of the Charvakas. Their morality seems to have amounted to this: 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.'"

The Ramanuja, or Visishtadvaita School.

Ramanuja was born about the twelfth century at a town 26 miles west of Madras. He studied and taught at Conjeveram, and resided towards the end of his life in the great temple of Vishnu, at Srirangam, near Trichinopoly.

The distinctive point of his teaching was the assertion of the existence of three principles. 1. The Supreme Being. 2. Soul, and 3. Non-soul. Vishnu is the Supreme Being; individual spirits are souls; the visible world (*drisyam*) is non-soul. All three principles have an eternal existence from each other.

The soul is neither born nor dies, nor having been shall it again cease to be. It is atomic. "If the hundredth part of a hair be imagined to be divided a hundred times, the soul may be supposed a part of that, and yet it is capable of infinity." The Deity is the internal controller, who, abiding in the soul, rules the soul within.

At great periodical dissolutions of the Universe, human souls and the world are re-absorbed into God, but without losing their own separate identity.

Ramanuja's system is so indeterminate that it is charged with admitting the three ideas of unity, duality, and plurality. Unity was admitted by him in saying that all individual spirits and visible forms constitute the body of the one Supreme Spirit. This is called *Visishtadvaita*, 'qualified non-duality.' Duality was admitted in saying that the spirit of God and man are distinct. Plurality was admitted in saying that the Spirit of God, the spirit of man, which is multitudinous, and the visible world are distinct.

The Ramanujas, about 100 years ago, were divided into two parties, called the *Vadagalai* or Northern School, and the *Tengalai*, or Southern School. They are more opposed to each other than both parties are to Saivas. The northern school accept the Sanskrit

* Mouier Williams.

Veda. The southern have compiled a Veda of their own called The Four Thousand Verses (*Nalayira*), written in Tamil.

An important difference of doctrine, caused by different views of the nature of the soul's dependence on Vishnu, separates the two parties. The view taken by the Vadagalais is called the 'monkey theory.' The soul, say they, lays hold of the Supreme Being by its own free will, act, and effort, just as the young monkey clings to its mother. The Tengalais hold what is called the 'cat-hold theory.' The human soul remains helpless until acted on by the Supreme Being, just as the kitten remains helpless until transported by the mother cat.

The two sects are distinguished by different marks on the forehead, to which they attach great importance. Both are noted for the strict privacy with which they eat and even prepare their meals.

The Madhava or Purna-pragna Sect.

Madhava, also called Ananda-tirtha, was a Canarese Brahman, born about the beginning of the 13th century. Wilson supposes him to have been the brother of Sayana, the great commentator on the Veda; but Burnell considers that the two names represent the same person.

His doctrine is commonly called *Dvaita*, Duality, and is well known for the intensity of its opposition to the Advaita doctrines. The system is much the same as that of Ramanuja. Sir Monier Williams says: "I repeatedly questioned some of the more intelligent followers of Madhava I met in the South of India as to the exact distinction between his views and those of Ramanuja, but no one was able to give me any very satisfactory reply."

Vishnu is held to be the one eternal supreme Being, all other gods being subject to the law of universal periodical dissolution. "Brahma, Siva, and the greatest of the gods decay with the decay of their bodies; greater than these is the undecaying Hari."

Great efficacy is attached to branding the body with the circular discus and shell of Vishnu. It is considered almost a passport to heaven.

The sectarial mark, representing the foot of Vishnu, has a strip of black in the middle.

The Saiva Darsana.

"With regard to Saiva philosophical doctrines it should be observed that, like those of the Vaishnava sect, they deviate more or less from the orthodox Vedanta doctrine of the identity of the Supreme and human spirit, the amount of deviation depending of course on the intensity of the personality attributed to Siva.

"A particular system, which may be called the Saiva-darsana *par excellence*, came into vogue in India about the tenth or eleventh century. It was handed down in 28 books, called *Agamas*, almost all of which are lost. This philosophy is followed by a sect in the South of India, and is wholly opposed to the non-duality of the Vedanta. Its founder, like Ramanuja, taught that three entities have a separate existence. 1. The Lord (Siva) called Pasupati. 'lord of the Soul' (Pasu). 2. The Soul called Pasu, 'an animal.' 3. Matter called Pasa. 'a fetter.' The soul which belongs to the Lord as to a master, is bound by matter as a beast (pasu) is by a fetter; and of course the great aim of the Saiva philosophy is to set it free and restore it to its rightful owner. These doctrines have evidently much in common with the theistic Sankhya."*

The soul is non-atomic, all pervading, and eternal, unlimited in its nature by space or time. Souls transmigrate according to their actions.

Matter is eternal, although its connection with any particular soul is temporary.

The "four feet" by which the liberation of the soul is obtained are 1. *Jnana*, knowledge. 2. *Kriya*, ceremonial action. 3. *Yoga*, meditation. 4. *Charya*, practical duty.

In Tamil, these are called *Ganam*, *Yogam*, *Kirikei*, *Sarithei*. *Sarithei* results in the heaven called *Salokami. s.*, the state of being with God; *Kirikei* ends in *Samipam*, nearness to God; *Yogam* conducts to *Sarupam*, the state of being in the image of God; *Gnamam* leads to *Sayuchchiam*, the state of union with God.

The Pasupata Sect.

The founder of this system was Nakulisa. Instead of affirming the separate existence of three entities, it is content to distinguish between two—Pati and Pasu. The former (Pati) is the Lord (Isvara), the cause and creator (*Karta*) of all things; the latter is the effect (*Karya*) or that which is created, and is wholly dependent on the cause.

This system has strange religious rites. Some of them are the following: Bathing with sand, lying upon sand; ejaculating *hum* like the bellowing of a bull, snoring as if asleep when awake, trembling as if from an attack of rheumatism, limping as if the legs were disabled, dancing, talking nonsensically, &c.

The Raseswara or Mercurial System.

This is also a branch of the Saiva system. It contends that we should make our bodies strong and permanent, as liberation results

* *Religious Thought and Life in India*, pp. 88, 89.

from knowledge, knowledge from study, and study is only possible in a healthy body. This healthy body can be secured by the aid of mercury, which must be first applied to the blood and then to the body. After the acquisition of a divine body by means of mercury, the light of pure intelligence shines forth, and the aspirant obtains liberation from the enveloping illusion, and attains the absolute.

The Panini Darsana.

Panini was the great Hindu grammarian. To retain the reciting of the Vedic hymns to themselves, the Brahmans taught that the mispronunciation of a single word brought down the anger of the gods. Prosperity is held to arise from the employment of a correct word. The wise have called Grammar the first *anga* of the Veda. Exposition of words is the means to final bliss.

The Vallabhacharis and Saktis were noticed under "Popular Hinduism."

FUNDAMENTAL ERROR OF HINDUISM.

This may be best expressed in the words from the Bible on the title page: "THOU THOUGHTEST THAT I (GOD) WAS ALTOGETHER SUCH AN ONE AS THYSELF."

For the present, only the general statement is made; it will hereafter be considered in detail. The meaning is that Hindus suppose that what man cannot do, God cannot do; what man likes, God likes.

It may be said that the whole of Hinduism, both popular and philosophic, rests on this foundation. It is a basis of sand, involving the overthrow of what is reared on it.

The reader is now invited to a calm consideration of the principal tenets of the systems which have been briefly described.

DOCTRINES OF PHILOSOPHIC HINDUISM.

God.

There are three leading opinions about God: 1. *Monotheism*, Belief in the existence of one God only, the Creator of all things. This is held by Christians and Muhammadans. 2. *Polytheism*, Belief in the existence of many gods. This prevails generally throughout the uncivilized nations of the world. 3. *Pantheism*, Belief that all that exists is God. This is held by so-called learned Hindus. The people generally combine it with polytheism.

Disbelievers are of two classes. An *atheist* is one who denies the existence of any god. An *agnostic* professes not to know whether there is a God or not, and, as a rule, does not care.

It has been mentioned that Kapila's system is known among Hindus as *Niriswara Sankhya*, the Sankhya without the Lord. Some others, although they acknowledge God, are virtually atheistic.

There are many passages in Hindu writings which seem to teach monotheism. The unity of God is the key-note of the faith of the modern Hindu. Not only the learned, but the most ignorant among the people are agreed in this. One may go into any village, where on every side he will see the grossest idolatry, and ask the first man that he meets, how many gods there are, and he will have but one answer: 'There is only one God.' The Vedantic formula is ever on the lips of those who know no other Sanskrit, *Ekam brahmanam dvitiyanasti*, 'Brahma is one; there is no second.' This formula, however, expresses *pantheism*—not *monotheism*. Brahma is one because he is all, and all that really is, is Brahma.* This is clear from the Chhandogya Upanishad: *Sarvam khalvidam Brahma*, All this (universe) is Brahma. The objections to pantheism will be noticed hereafter.

God's Attributes.—The Supreme Being, in his ordinary condition, is represented as *nirguna*, unfettered by action. He is said to be *sat, cit, ananda*. Brahm is pure unconscious existence (*sat*); he is pure Thought (*cit*) with nothing to think about; he is pure joy (*ananda*) with nothing to be joyful about, and only in the sense of being free from the miseries of transmigration.

Hindu books contain some sublime descriptions of the natural attributes of God—that He is infinite, eternal, unchangeable, &c.; but these qualities are often understood in an imperfect sense. Though God is represented as *sarvasakti*, almighty, as it will hereafter be shown, He cannot *create* anything, that is, call it into existence out of nothing. God is often called *dayalu*, merciful, but the Rev. N. Goreh thus proves that, according to Hinduism, it cannot be applied to God:—

"What do you understand by *daya*, mercy? Is it not doing good to some one without his meriting it? But it is a fundamental principle of all schools of religion among the Hindus that every thing that God does to souls He does with reference to their good and evil deeds only, in order that they may receive reward for good deeds, and punishment for their evil deeds, and He never does anything irrespectively of the good and evil deeds of the soul. The familiar expression '*Kritahanakritabhayagamaprasangat*' is used to express this very fundamental principle of the Hindu religion. It means that if a soul should not obtain what he has merited, and should get what he has not merited, 'there, would

* Dr. Kellogg.

ensure the effacement of what is done, and the accession of what is not done.'"*

Brahm, in his *nirguna* condition, is supposed to be like a Hindu Raja who spends his life or sloth within his palace, heedless of what is going on throughout his dominions, and leaving everything to his ministers.

"Unencumbered by the cares of empire," says Dr. Duff, "or the functions of a superintending providence, he effectuates no good, inflicts no evil, suffers no pain. He exists in a state of undisturbed repose—a sleep so deep as never to be disturbed by a dream—even without any consciousness of his own existence." A celebrated German philosopher says that "Pure being equals nothing." Brahm, as *nirguna*, is a nonentity.

But Brahm does not always continue in this state of dreamless repose. After the lapse of unnumbered ages, he awakes. Becoming conscious of his own existence, and dissatisfied with his own solitariness, a desire for duality arises in his mind. Though himself devoid of form, he, in sport, imagines a form. How desire arises in this unconscious being is a question which never has been answered.

It is asserted that Brahm is *nirvikara*, incapable of change. How is this statement consistent with the other statement that he exists alternately in a *saguna* and a *nirguna* state? How can he who is essentially immutable become sometimes void of qualities and sometimes endued with qualities? The Vedantic writings say that the quality of *rajas* (passion) produces a longing for worldly pleasure, and the quality of *tamas* (darkness) is the effect of ignorance. How can he who is beyond the region of the senses and who is incapable of sensual pleasures, assume the quality of *rajas*? And how can he, who is eternal light itself, become endued with the quality of *tamas*, that is, darkness? And if Brahm becomes possessed of *tamas*, then does He become sinful, yea the author of sin itself—an idea contrary to right reason.†

The *nirguna* Brahm is a being without mercy or love. He neither sees, nor hears, nor knows, nor cares about any of his creatures; he has neither the power nor the will to do good or evil—to reward the righteous or punish the wicked. It is useless to present a petition which is not read; it is as vain to worship a being represented as in a state of unconscious slumber. Hence, throughout the whole of India, there is not a single temple dedicated to Brahm.

The God of the Bible is, in many respects, a perfect contrast to Brahm. He has, indeed, existed from all eternity. "From everlasting to everlasting Thou art God." But He is never

* *Theism and Christianity*, pp. 13-15. † Rev. Lal Behari Day on Vedantism.

unconscious; He never slumbers nor sleeps. The care of the universe which He called into existence is no burden to Him. "The Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not neither is weary." He knows every thing that takes place throughout His vast dominions. Not a hair of our head can fall to the ground without His knowledge; every thought of our heart is known to Him. His ear is ever open to the cry of His children. With regard to His attributes, He thus makes Himself known: "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty."

His most glorious attribute is His spotless holiness. Sin is that abominable thing which He hates. "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God of hosts." Instead of exhibiting, like Brahm, an example of selfishness, He is continually doing good to His creatures: His character is expressed in one word—God is LOVE. Still, it is not the feeling which looks upon good and evil with equal eye. If a king allowed crime to be unpunished, his kingdom would become like a hell. But God's own declaration is, "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his evil way and live."

The Bible emphatically teaches monotheism. There is one God, and there is none other but He. The supposed 33 crores of gods and goddesses have no existence.

CREATION.

According to Hinduism, there is no creation in the strict sense of the word. This is the result of that fixed dogma of a Hindu philosopher's belief—*navastuno vastusiddhih*, nothing can be produced out of nothing.

The Rev. Nehemiah Goreh thus states the case:—

"By the word, Creator, Christians as well as Theists mean one who gave being to things which had no being before, or according to the phrase used in Christian Theology, created things out of nothing. In this sense no sect of religion or school of philosophy among the Hindus believes God to have created anything.

"And here I wish to say that such of our countrymen as have been educated in English schools and colleges, and are not familiar with the true tenets of Hinduism are apt to be misled by certain words and phrases used in the religious books of our country. They are apt to think that those words and phrases were used by the authors of those books and are understood by Orthodox Hindus, in the same sense which they themselves attach to them, having acquired more enlightened notions of religious truths by coming in contact with Christianity, and then to

think that those very notions are taught in those books. For instance it is stated in those books that God is *Sarva-karta*, that is, maker of all. Yet it would be a great mistake to think that they teach that God is the *Creator* of all things. It is a fixed principle with the teachers of all the schools of philosophy in our country (and remember that with the Hindus philosophy is religion and religion is philosophy) that every *Karya*, that is, effect, must have a *Samavayi* or *Upadana Karana*, that is a cause out of which an effect is produced or formed, such as clay is to an earthen pot. It may be translated by the English word 'material cause' in some cases, though not in all. Therefore the world could not be created out of nothing. According to the Hindus' belief the world has an *Upadana Karana*, or a material cause, and that material cause is uncreated, self-existing, and eternal like God Himself. According to the Nyaya School, the *paramanus*, or atoms of earth, water, fire, and air, which are infinite in number, are the material cause of the visible and tangible parts of this universe, and are themselves self-existent and eternal. Moreover *Akasa*, time, space, souls, not only of men, but also of gods, animals, and plants and *manas*, the internal organs which together with souls are infinite in number, are all uncreated, self-existent, and eternal. Very little indeed have they left for God to do. He only frames, with these self-existent substances the world. According to the Sankhya system *prakriti* is the material cause of the universe, and it is of course self-existent and eternal.

"Even the false god of the Vedantists, the maker of the false world, is only a framer of it like the God of the Nyaya, and not a *Creator*, *Maya* being the *Upadana Karana*, or material cause of it. From this *Maya*, though false yet eternal, the whole universe is evolved, as according to the Sankhya it is evolved from their eternal *prakriti*."*

It has been stated that the fundamental error of Hinduism is to judge God by our own standard. A carpenter cannot work without materials; in like manner it is supposed that God must have formed all things from eternally existing matter. The fallacy of this is thus shown by the late Rev. Dr. K. M. Banerjea :

"That no man can work without materials is denied by none, simply because man is not omnipotent, and has not creative power. But when one looks at an exquisite production of art, he is so lost in admiration at the skill of the artist, that he almost forgets the minor question of the material. And yet so banefully has the theory of material causality worked among us that the mental energy of our philosophers has found most active exercise NOT in the exclamation, How wonderful is the arrangement of the universe! BUT in the interrogation, Of what pre-existing substance is all this made? Nay they have been so lost in that question, as to forget that a Creator of infinite power and perfection needs not, like weak and imperfect man, to stop for materials, but can make materials by the mere *fiat* of His will. If the natural instincts of the human soul lead us to believe in the existence of an all-powerful and perfect Being, if the irresistible arguments of the Vedanta itself drive us to the conclu-

* *Theism and Christianity*, Part I. pp. 5-7.

sion that the universe was created by a God, infinite in wisdom and contrivance; then there can be no possible necessity for speculating on the *material* of the world: then the most philosophical course is to consider the object originally created by such a God as at once the *matter and form* of the world. To assume the eternity of some gross material, existing side by side with an intelligent and all-perfect God, is not only unnecessary (and therefore unphilosophical,) inasmuch as it assumes two principles, where one is amply sufficient to account for all we see; but it is inconsistent with the idea of perfection which we must attribute to the Deity. If he had some material to work upon, previously existing independent of Him, then there was nothing peculiar in His agency; then it was of the same species as that of a human architect; then he was our creator in no higher sense than that in which a potter is the maker of a jar. The Vedantist, on the other hand, placed himself in a false position, by seeking in a spiritual essence, the substance of such a world consisting of pure and impure, intelligent and unintelligent, rational and irrational, animated and inanimated creatures.”*

“Ye do err, not knowing the power of God,” applies to Hindus as well as those to whom the words were addressed by the Great Teacher.

Whether is it more rational to suppose the eternal existence of one Being, infinite in power and wisdom, or to imagine that innumerable unintelligent atoms and spirits existed from all eternity? Besides the latter, an eternal, intelligent Arranger is also required.

ADRIKTA, OR KARMA.

As Hindus deny the *creation* of the world in the strict sense of the word, so they deny its *government* by God. All things are supposed to be determined by “an irresistible power, very significantly called *Adrishta*, because felt and not seen. Hence the soul has to bear the consequences of its own actions only, being tossed hither and thither by a force set in motion by itself, but which can never be guarded against, because its operation depends on deeds committed in former lives quite beyond control, and even unremembered.” “It stands for fate, merit or demerit founded on works of a previous state of existence; destiny, necessity; disposition which depends on or is derived from one’s own acts in a previous life.”†

Karma comes from *kri*, to do; it means ‘deeds’ or ‘actions.’ According to *Karma*, every action must bring forth its legitimate result. As Sankaracharya says, even God cannot alter it any more than He can produce rice out of wheat seed.

Dr. Kellogg thus explains the doctrine:—

“All Hindu thinkers agree that the whole universe, material and spiritual, and all that takes place in it, is the effect of actions done by

* *Dialogues on Hindu Philosophy*, pp. 134, 135. † *Dialogues on Hindu Philosophy*.

souls as its meritorious cause. That is to say, for example, I myself in a former state of existence, whether as man, demigod, demon or beast, performed certain actions, good or bad; and of whatsoever sort they were, they made it necessary for me to be born just when and where and as I have been, and live just the life that I have, in order to reap the fruit of those actions in reward or retribution. Thus this life, with all that is in it, all my perceptions, feelings and actions, my joys and my sorrows, wealth and poverty, sickness and health, my right deeds and my crimes alike, like a given fruit from a given seed, are the necessary and inevitable result of actions performed in a former state of being of which it is not pretended that ordinary men have or can have the slightest recollection. And herein we have the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, together with its philosophical justification.

“ This seems to the Hindu the one adequate explanation of the universe, and above all, of the so unequal distribution of happiness and misery. For, inconsistent though it may be with his pantheism, the Hindu still has a conscience, and feels that sin and suffering, and especially the suffering of the innocent, must be accounted for. If an infant agonize in pain the Hindu considers it arises from some great sin committed in a former life. So, on the other hand, if that reprobate prosper in the world, this is thought to be just as plainly the reward of meritorious deeds performed in a former state of being. Thus the inequality of life, and, above all, the sufferings of the innocent, seem to the Hindu to demand the doctrine of *karm* as their only adequate explanation.”*

There is no doubt that the unequal distribution of happiness in this world is a great problem which has exercised the minds of thinking men from the dawn of philosophy. The theory of *Karma* has been accepted both by Hindus and Buddhists as the only explanation. On inquiry, however, it will be seen that it is attended with insuperable difficulties.

Adrishta, or *karma*, is supposed to be endowed with most wonderful influence and qualities. As a judge, its decisions are marked by unerring wisdom, and its awards are inevitably carried out to the letter. They may be stated more in detail as follows:—

1. *It is most wise.*—A judge of the High Court, able to sentence a man to death, needs great wisdom; how much more is this necessary when the award may be heaven or hell for unnumbered ages?

2. *It is inflexibly just.*—A judge may be wise, but he may be partial. Not so with *karma*. It renders to every one exactly according to his deserts.

3. *Its power extends to all worlds.*—Through it a person is born in one of 84 lakhs of births in this world, in the world of the gods, or in one of the hells.

4. *It extends to all time.*—Its memory never fails. A man may be in the enjoyment of happiness for millions of years on account of

* Quoted in *Indian Evangelical Review*, April, 1885.

some supposed merit, but at the end of that period he may be born in the lowest hell for some crime in a former birth.

5. *It is unalterable.*—The highest gods have no power to avert its effects; they are themselves subject to *adrishta*.

6. *Its object is good.*—To punish vice and reward virtue, is an aim of the noblest kind.

What is it that Hindus suppose to possess these high attributes? A mere name, something that has no existence. What power is there in an action itself to reward or punish millions of years after it was performed?

As a rule, there must be some one to give the rewards or punishments due to men's actions. Thus a man is engaged to do a certain work for which he is to receive wages. The work done is the man's *karma*: the wages to be received is the *phala* or fruit. But how is he to receive this *phala*? Is it to be received from the *karma*? No. It must be given by some one able and willing to bestow it. Suppose a thief steals many thousand rupees, will he be punished without the intervention of other persons? Were any person to say that for the purpose of punishing the criminal no judge is necessary, that by demerit of the crime the man would be flogged without any one flogging him, would any person of common sense believe him? And if such an assertion cannot be received as true respecting the affairs of this world, can similar assertions be received as true respecting the other world?

If, instead of *karma*, we read God, all becomes plain. He is eternal, His sway extends over all worlds. He possesses all power, omniscience, justice and goodness. But to ascribe such attributes to a mere word is folly. A living intelligent Being is required.

The Rev. Dr. K. M. Banerjea states other objections to the doctrine of *karma*, of which an abstract is given below:—

Inequalities of Happiness less than is supposed.—Inequalities of birth do not necessarily imply a disproportion of happiness or misery. How often do we find the high-born man in greater misery than the low born! A Persian poet has well said, 'While a poor man has only to seek a morsel for himself, and when he has got that, sleeps as soundly as if he were an emperor, a prince is troubled with the concerns of the whole world.'

Happiness or Misery is often traceable to conduct in this life.—Our success in business is much dependent on ourselves. You will frequently find that the man whom the world calls fortunate has made a better use of his time, his talents, and his abilities than he who has proved unfortunate. The fortunate man has perhaps been industrious, attentive, honest, courteous; the unfortunate, on the contrary, may have been inactive, lazy, imprudent, dishonest, ill-mannered, or rash.

The facts brought forward to prove a prior existence may be, in a

great measure, accounted for by differences observable in the world itself, in the actions of men.

It is not necessary for any to blame destiny, after the fashion of the ignorant, for what his *own* acts bring on himself; neither is it philosophical to seek an *unseen* cause in *adrishṭa*, where there are visible causes before you to explain the mystery.

We may look forward as well as backward.—It is granted that all the inequalities in life cannot be explained in the preceding way. This only shows that we cannot consider this as our *only* stage of life. It forces us to look forward to another. It does not however necessarily force our eyes *backward* to a previous state. There is another theory more satisfactory, that this is a state of probation and trial preparatory to another and a better world. Probation itself demands difficulties. Gold cannot be tried without being placed in the heated crucible. A child is not trained for the purposes of life without passing through the ordeal of a school.

Karma does not explain the origin of things.—Inequalities in life are said to be the results of peculiar habits and works in a previous state of existence. This only removes the difficulty one single step, for the question will recur, *Whence those peculiar habits and works,*—and, whence the inequalities *in that life*? Thus Hindus were compelled to fly from stage to stage, until they were forced to declare that the world was never created—that it is without beginning, that it is eternal. And that which is eternal is, in their conception, not dependent on a cause. How can such men consistently find fault with the Charvakas, who deny the necessity of an intelligent First Cause, when they themselves pronounce the world to be without a beginning? The theory involves difficulties far greater than those it is intended to remove.

Before there could be merit or demerit, beings must have existed and acted. The first in order could no more have been produced by *karma* than a hen could be born from her own egg.

Evil Effects of a belief in karma.—Suppose a child should be taught that he cannot possibly behave otherwise than he does, that he is not a subject of blame or commendation, nor can deserve to be rewarded or punished. The child would doubtless be highly delighted to find himself freed from the restraints of fear and shame, with which his play-fellows were fettered; and highly conceited in his superior knowledge so far beyond his years. But conceit and vanity would be the least bad part of the influence which these principles must have, when thus reasoned and acted upon, during the course of his education. He must either be allowed to go on and be the plague of all about him, and himself too, even to his own destruction: or else correction must be continually made use of, to supply the want of those natural perceptions of blame and commendation which we have supposed to

be removed; and to give him a practical impression of what he had reasoned himself out of the belief of, that he was in fact an accountable child, and to be punished for doing what he was forbid.*

The pernicious effects of a belief in *Karma* are thus further shown by Dr. Kellogg:—

“Even when, over-constrained by the testimony of conscience, the Hindu will speak as if moral good and evil were to be rewarded and punished by a personal God, still that doctrine of *Karm* remains, and is no less fatal to the idea of responsibility. For if I am not free, if all my actions are determined by a law of physical necessity entirely beyond my control, then assuredly I am not responsible for them. Let it be observed again that these are not merely logical consequences attached to the system by an antagonist which the people will refuse to admit. The Hindus themselves, both in their authoritative books and in their common talk, argue that very conclusion. In the Puranas again and again those guilty of the most flagitious crimes are comforted by Krishna, for example, on this express ground, that whereas all was fixed by their *Karm*, and man therefore has no power over that which is to be, therefore in the crime they were guilty of no fault. And so among the people, one wearies of hearing this constant excuse for almost every thing which ought not to be, ‘What can we do? It was our *Karm*.’”†

Thus even condemned murderers often view their crimes with stolid indifference.

God, the Ruler of the Universe.—It has been shown how absurd it is to suppose that a mere word can act the part of the wisest judge in millions of cases every day as is alleged to be done by *Karma*. On the other hand, all is agreeable to reason if, instead of *Karma*, we take God. He is eternal, the Creator of all things, having all power, inflexibly just, wise, and merciful. It is most fitting that He, the Lord of all, should be the Judge. This is what Christianity declares. His “dominion is an everlasting dominion and His kingdom is from generation to generation;” “He is Governor among the nations.” He knows every thing. A holy man of old said: “Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising, Thou understandest my thoughts afar off. Thou compassest my path and lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo, O Lord, Thou knowest it altogether.” “Every one of us shall give an account of himself to God.” “God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil.” God “will render to every man according to his works.”

Besides a judge to decide, an agency is necessary to carry out the sentence. While *Karma* has no power to do this, God is

* *Dialogues on Hindu Philosophy.* † *Indian Evangelical Review*, April, 1855.

omnipotent; His power extends through all time and to every portion of the universe.

Hinduism denies free agency either on the part of God or man; Christianity affirms it in both. If we sin, it is our own fault.

MAN.

The Body.—The ancient Hindus thought that a man was rendered impure by touching a dead body. Hence they did not dissect and examine it minutely as is done in modern Medical Colleges. The writers of the Upanishads simply framed an imaginary body out of their own heads, and, to impose upon the ignorant, said that it had been revealed by Brahma.

The following assertion is made in the Chhandogya Upanishad:—

“There are a hundred and one arteries of the heart, one of these penetrates the crown of the head; moving upwards by it a man reaches the immortals; the others serve for departing in different directions, yea, in different directions.”

In the Taittiriya Upanishad there is the further account: “There arise the hundred and one principal arteries; each of them is a hundred times divided; 72,000 are the branches of every branch artery; within them moves the circulating air.” According to this calculation, the number of arteries in the human body is 727,200,000!

When the soul proceeds to Brahma, it ascends by the coronal artery, *sushumna*, which springs from the upper part of the heart and goes to the top of the head. This is called the door of rejoicing. When the soul goes out to some other body it proceeds by the other arteries.

Hindu philosophers agree that mind (*manas*) is distinct from spirit or soul. Mind is not eternal in the same way. The spirit cannot exercise perception, consciousness, thought or will, unless joined to mind and invested with a bodily covering or vehicle. The spirit while impersonal is unconscious. When it assumes consciousness and personality—that is, when it begins to exist in any object, to think about anything, or to be joyful about anything—it does so, according to Vedantism, by associating itself with the power of Illusion (*Maya*), and investing itself with three corporeal envelopes.

First the causal body (*Karana sarira*), identified with *Ajnana* or Ignorance. It is also identified with *Maya*. It is therefore no real body. The second is the subtle body (*Linga sarira*) which encloses a portion of the universal spirit in a kind of thin envelope, constituting it a living individual personal soul (*Jivatman*), and carrying it through all its bodily migrations till its final reunion with its source. Third, the gross body (*Sthula sarira*) which surround the spirit's subtle vehicle and is of various forms in the

various stages and conditions of existence through animate or inanimate life.*

The Soul.—Hindu speculations regarding the soul differ in several respects. On one point, however, they are nearly unanimous, that the soul is not created by God but eternal, *śrayambhu*, self-existent.

The Kathavalli says: "The wise one (that is the soul) is not born nor does he die; he has not come into existence from any cause, nor has any one (as something distinct from him) come into existence from him. He is unborn, eternal, permanent, the ancient; he is not killed when the body is killed."† In like manner the Bhagavad Gita says that the soul is "neither born at any time nor does it die."

On other points there are differences.

The Vaiseshika school maintains that the soul is diffused everywhere through space. "Ether, in consequence of its universal pervasion, is infinitely great; and so likewise is soul." VII. 22.

On the contrary, the Svetasvatara Upanishad declares that the soul is almost infinitesimally small: "If the point of a hair be divided into one hundred parts, and each part again divided into one hundred parts—that is the length of the *atma*."

In the Katha Upanishad it is said that "Brahma, of the size of the thumb, dwells in the *atma*."

The Vedantic idea is that the soul is part of Brahm, and that to him it returns. A particle of him for a time is associated with a particle of Ignorance or Maya.

Remarks on Hindu ideas of the Body and Soul.—It is again and again asserted in the Upanishads that the heart has 101 arteries, by one of which the soul escapes at death. The slightest examination of the heart shows that all this is purely imaginary. There are just two arteries from the heart leading to the lungs, and one great artery, which, afterwards, subdivided, conveys blood to the whole body. In like manner, there is one great vein carrying the blood to the heart from the whole body, and two veins leading to the lungs.

The Taittiriya Upanishad says that "within the arteries moves the circulating air." *Arteries* mean air-pipes. They were thought to contain only air, because after death they are empty. When a person is alive, blood flows through them. This is proved by the fact that if one of them is cut, blood gushes out. When a person dies, the heart loses its power to send out blood, and the arteries are found empty.

It is plain that God who made the body cannot have inspired the Upanishads, for He cannot give a false account of the human body.

* *Religious Thought and Life in India*, pp. 27, 24.

† *Theism and Christianity*, I. p. 44.

Hindu speculations about the soul are equally baseless.

One argument for the eternity of the soul is the supposed axiom "Whatever exists must always have existed." As already shown this denies God's omnipotence. By His will He can create things or call them out of nothing into existence.

Another argument is that "Whatever had a beginning must have an end." This is also a denial of God's power. He can give a future eternal existence to any creature He has called into being. According to Hinduism, souls may pass into gods, demons, beasts, birds, reptiles, fishes, insects, into plants, and even into inanimate objects. Who can estimate the number of these eternal *svayambhu* essences! Is it not perfectly unphilosophical, because absolutely unnecessary and egregiously extravagant, to assume such an indefinite numbers of eternal essences, when one Supreme Essence is sufficient to account for all things, visible or invisible, material or spiritual?*

If a man denied the existence of his earthly parents, it would be a great sin; but it is a much greater sin to deny that God is our Maker and Heavenly Father.

If our souls are eternal and self-existent, we are a sort of miniature gods. Our relation to God is changed. It is only that of king and subjects. His right over us is only that of might. It is only because He is mightier than we and of His possessing power to benefit and to harm us that we should be anxious to pay homage to Him. There is not the love which a child should cherish towards a father. True religion is thus destroyed.

To any man endowed with a grain of common sense, the opinion maintained by some of the schools that the soul is infinite, like *akasa*, must seem the height of absurdity. Other views held are scarcely less extravagant, that it is eternal, *svayambhu*, self-existent, or a part of God. The body is said to be the "City of Brahma," but who has the slightest recollection of passing through any former cities? To account for this it is asserted that at each new birth something takes place by which the remembrance of former things is destroyed. In this case the person on whom it is wrought is virtually no longer the same person. According to this doctrine one man is really punished for the faults of another of which he is quite ignorant. Would it be right to hang a man because his grandfather committed murder? Just as one falsehood is sought to be supported by another, so one fiction of Hindu philosophy requires a second equally without foundation.

The Christian doctrine is briefly as follows:—

God alone is self-existent, without beginning or end. He is omnipotent, able to call beings or things into existence out of

* Dr. K. M. Banerjee, *Dialogues*, p. 164.

nothing. He gave us a body and a soul. The soul never existed before our present birth. The body is mortal; the soul returns to God who gave it. At the great day of judgment, all must appear before God, to answer for the deeds done in the body, whether good or evil.

As already mentioned, it is unphilosophic to maintain that there are innumerable self-existent beings, when one possessed of almighty power is sufficient. The explanation given by Christianity is beautifully simple, and meets all the requirements of the case.

“The common people,” says Dr. Kellogg, “speak of the soul as being ‘a part of God.’ It is a portion of the Supreme ruler as a spark is of fire. Yet in the same breath they will affirm that God is *akhand*, ‘indivisible,’ whence it follows that each soul is the total Divine Essence, and that is precisely the strict Vedantic doctrine! So one may go into any Hindu village and ask the first peasant that he meets who God is, and he will to a certainty, receive the answer, *Jo bolta hai, wahi hai*; ‘That which speaks, that same is He.’” On the other hand, if the soul is a portion of God, our relation to Him is that of whole and part. It is not necessary for God to worship Himself. If I am either God or a part of God, why should I worship Him?

MAYA.

There are three words used in the same sense found in Vedantic writings; viz., *Ajnana*, Ignorance, *Avidya*, Nescience, and *Maya*, Illusion. Their meaning has already been explained. The object at present is to examine the truth of the theory.

The following are some of the arguments against *Maya* :

1. *The Testimony of our Senses*.—Every one of our five senses—sight, hearing, taste, smell, and touch—bears witness to the reality of the objects around us.

The reply to this is as follows: A man sees a rope and by misapprehension takes it for a snake: in like manner the ignorant see the world, and suppose it to be real.

A man may, indeed, by misapprehension take a rope for a snake, but only so long as he keeps at a distance from it. Let him come near it, and he will at once see his error.

Another illustration is that the eye is deceived in mirage, fancying water to exist where there is none.

It is true that one sense may mislead us for a time, but the wrong idea is soon corrected by the other senses. The illusion of the mirage is detected by the touch. Kanada has well said, that it is only when the senses are unsound or defective or when some bad habit is contracted, that a person may be deceived.

According to Gotama: “If all evidence is to be rejected, then the

refutation itself is inadmissible." The fact concerning the mirage is communicated to us through the senses. If the senses are never to be trusted, then how do we know about the mirage?

2. *The doctrine of Maya is incapable of proof.*—If all human beings are under the influence of the "eternal *Maya*," who is to find out that they are all deluded? How did the Vedantic philosophers discover it? Are they conscious of such an influence? But, on the supposition of the reign of universal and eternal delusion, is not that consciousness itself delusive? If it be said that the fact has been discovered by divine revelation; must not the perception of that revelation, as well as the comprehension of its import, on the supposition of a universal and eternal delusion, be also delusive?

3. *If the whole world is Unreal, the Vedas are also Unreal.*—The same applies to the Upanishads and all Vedantic writings.

4. *The doctrine gives a most dishonouring idea of God.*—"According to Vedantism, it is Brahma who has put the whole human race under the universal influence of the eternal *Maya*." He has projected a distorted reflection of himself with a view to delude his rational creatures. In consequence of this act he is termed *Mayavi Brahma*! How unworthy is such an opinion of the spotless and infinitely pure God! Can it be concerned for a moment that He delights in deceiving mankind? Can the idea be entertained in the mind that the holy God, is, like a potent juggler, perpetually deceiving the whole human race as a "divine amusement?"

Religious errors are the most serious of all errors, and of all religious errors, the greatest must be that which consists in a false notion of the Divine attributes.*

The doctrine of *Maya* is a mere figment of the imagination, utterly opposed to common sense.

HUMAN DUTY.

Hinduism, like Buddhism, makes life a curse instead of a blessing. The body is regarded as the mean lodging-place for vile worms and many diseases; men suffer from their fellowmen, from famines, from the malignant influence of evil stars or from the cruelty of demons and hobgoblins. The great object is to be delivered from an endless succession of births, exposed to such calamities. "The aim of the Hindu philosopher is essentially selfish; his own deliverance from pain in its varieties of ghastly forms. An aim so selfish cannot but lead a man to concentrate his attention upon his own self, to be self-centred and self-absorbed. Under its influence he makes self the centre of his thoughts, feelings, and desires, and all

* Abridged from Dr. K. M. Banerjea and the Rev. L. B. Day.

his schemes and projects revolve around it as their pivot or pole. Is it possible for a person to be thus absorbed in self without being degraded and debased, enfeebled in mind, and vitiated in soul?"

Christianity, on the other hand, teaches us to make *God*—not *self*—the centre of our thoughts, the end of our existence. He gave us life, He preserves us in life; every blessing we enjoy is His gift. So long as we have being, it is our duty to worship, honour, and love Him. A holy man of old says, "Praise the Lord, O my soul. While I live I will praise the Lord. I will sing praises unto my God while I have any being." According to Hindu philosophy, worship of God is only a means of obtaining *jnana*. When it has been reached, the worship of God ceases for ever. On the contrary, the longer we exist, the more should we love and honour God, the more should we desire to become pure and holy like Himself.

While the first command of Christianity is to love God with all our heart and soul, the second is to love our neighbour as ourselves. We are to try to do as much good as we can to all around us. The surest way to be happy ourselves is to try to make others happy.

According to Hindu philosophy, the chief end of man is to crush out all feeling and thought. Men are to abstain from action of every kind, good or bad; as much from liking as disliking, as much from loving as from hating, and even from indifference.

"Self-deliverance, self-improvement, or self-glorification is not to be made the aim of life, though these blessings are sure to crown man's efforts to serve God with a singleness of eye to His glory. He is delivered from sorrow, exalted and glorified, not because he seeks with all his heart his own beatification, but because his life is unreservedly devoted to the adoration and service of Him by whom he has been redeemed. Nay, in proportion as his mind is withdrawn from selfish aims and purposes 'and set on things above,' his sorrow of heart disappears, his thought becomes exalted, his feelings purified, and his soul made instinct with an abiding sense of peace, triumph, and gladness. The true philosophy of happiness is with him and him alone. Happiness flies the more it is (directly) sought. The Christian, by following the principle, 'not enjoyment and not sorrow,' succeeds in a pre-eminent degree in securing the one and fleeing from the other."*

THE CAUSE OF MAN'S DEGRADATION.

It is generally allowed that man is a fallen being. His inclination to wrong-doing is such that all means employed to counteract it often prove fruitless. Bolts and bars are needed to protect

* The greater part of this section is from *Hindu Philosophy*, by Mr. R. C. Bose.

property; bonds and deeds to check frauds; prisons, the lash, and the scaffold, to deter criminals. In a world of virtue such would have no place. Man, also, is born to trouble as the sparks fly upwards.

According to Hindu philosophy, what is the cause of man's debasement? The cause is *ajnana*, ignorance. By *ajnana* is not meant ignorance of God, but ignorance of the identity between the soul and Brahm.

Christianity traces man's degradation to sin. He has broken God's laws which are holy, just, and good, and he is suffering the consequences. All are guilty before God: "There is none righteous, no, not one."

"Sin makes us miserable in two different ways. It, in the first place, separates us from God, the source of life, light, and joy; from that dependence without which liberty is license; from that cheerful submission without which our will becomes stubborn and intractable; that communion without which the soul is bereft of its genuine enjoyment, and that grace without which true progress is an impossibility. It then darkens our understandings, vitiates our affections and passions, and proves thereby a source of ineffable restlessness and torment to our ourselves and to all around us. For, though its seat is the heart, it is perpetually issuing out in putrid streams of corruption in our life and conversation. The springs and fountains of life within are vitiated, and its outgoings cannot but partake of the corruption. The history of the world is the history of sin incarnated in words and deeds."*

MEANS OF ARRIVING AT MUKTI.

The *Karma-marga* leads only to temporary happiness; the *Jnana-marga*, according to Hinduism, is the only path to *Mukti*.

The means prescribed by the *Yoga* have already been mentioned. The repetition of the mystical monosyllable *om* is considered of great importance. So also are *asana*, postures; as the lotus posture, the fowl posture, the bow posture, &c. Other means prescribed are the *pranayama*, suppression of the breath, fixing the eyes on the point of the nose, intense meditation at last without any object. In this way a person who thoroughly observes the directions, his blood not being properly purified and a mesmeric state being induced, he becomes dazed and half idiotic. He may then believe the monstrous fiction that he is God.

Christianity teaches that "bodily exercise profiteth little." A man who wishes to lead a holy, active life will be temperate in food and in every other respect; but he will try to preserve in

* Mr. B. C. Bose. *Hindu Philosophy*, pp. 383, 384.

health and strength the body which God has given him that it may be used in doing good.

According to Christianity, sin is the cause of man's degradation. Holiness is what is needed to make him happy here and hereafter.

The means of growth in holiness are prayer for Divine help, reflection, self-examination, sorrow for sin, confession of sin, acceptance of God's offered mercy, the study of good books, public worship, the company of the pious, meditation, &c.

MUKTI OR LIBERATION.

All women and the great majority of male Hindus can look forward only to the temporary happiness secured by *Karma-kanda*. The supposed higher bliss obtainable by the *Jnana-kanda* is the heritage of very few.

The means to be employed have already been mentioned. The two stages of happiness will now be described.

The first is called *jivan mukta*, "liberated but still living." The devotee in this state is in a manner petrified though alive. He moves not, he sees not, hears not, thinks not, breathes not as ordinary mortals do. He is not affected by heat or cold, light or darkness, storm or calm. Like the gods, he is above all responsibility and can do no wrong. All distinctions, even those between virtue and vice, purity and impurity, vanish before him. Anandagiri says that "as long as he lives he may do good and evil as he chooses and incur no stain." The Gita says, "Actions defile me not." "He who has no feeling of egoism, and whose mind is not tainted, even though he kill (all) these people, kills not, is not fettered (by the action)." As water passes over the leaf of the lotus without wetting it, so these acts no larger affect the soul.

The Folk Songs of Southern India (page 166) thus express the doctrine:—

"To them that fully know the heavenly truth,
There is no good or ill; nor anything
To be desired, unclean, or purely clean.

Where God is seen, there can be nought but God.
His heart can have no place for fear or shame;
For caste, uncleanness, hate, or wandering thought,
Impure or pure, are all alike to Him."

Living representations of this stage are given in naked, filthy Sanyasis, indulging in every kind of vice.

"Such," says Mr. Bose, "is the goal of the system. The *Paramhansa*, or the Knower of Brahma, feeding as swine upon filth and living as swine without self-consciousness, thought, perception of physical and moral beauty, recognition of distinction

between good and bad; without taste, refinement, sublimity of thought, elevation of feeling, holiness of purpose, and grandeur of aspiration."

The second stage is absorption at death into Brahm. "Just as rivers falling into the sea lose their names and forms, so wise men knowing their names and forms attain the *Paratpara Purusha*."

The Rev. Lal Behari Day has the following remarks on this stage:—

"With regard to the doctrine of the absorption of the human soul into the Divine Essence; such a doctrine, to say the least, is highly improbable: for it is only homogeneous substances that mix. But God is unique in the universe; there is none like Him? How then can any other being be absorbed in him? Besides, if it be true, as the Vedas say, that Brahm is *nitya*, that is incapable of increase or decrease; how is such an idea in keeping with the absorption of numberless beings into his essence? The absorption of so many beings in so many ages and kalpas must be adding materially to his dimensions. Again, it is doubtful whether absorption into the Divine essence is a source of happiness to a creature. For absorption into the Divine Essence implies a loss of the sense of personal identity, that is, annihilation. And how can a creature that is annihilated be happy? When I swallow sugar, I get a sensation of pleasure; but if I myself become sugar, who will get that sensation? It is better to *eat* sugar than to *become* sugar. Hence absorption into the ocean of Brahm's essence, that is to say, a loss of personal identity, cannot make man happy."

Brahm is supposed to be in a dreamless sleep, without any more thought than a stone. Hindu absorption is practically the same as the Buddhist *nirvana*, or annihilation. "Not to be," says Professor Wilson, "is the melancholy result of the religion and philosophy of the Hindus."

Mr. R. C. Bose thus shows the moral influence of the doctrine:—

"This system has proved a refuge of lies to many a hardened sinner. What a balm to the seared but not deadened conscience is a system which assures them that all their fears arising from their recognition of moral distinctions are groundless, and that perfect beatitude will be their reward if they can only bring themselves to the conclusion that there is no difference between God and man, virtue and vice, cleanliness and filth, heaven and hell!"

While Hinduism denies, Christianity affirms, the reality of an eternal and necessary distinction between sin and righteousness. The Rev. Dr. K. M. Bauerjea shows that the great aim of Christianity is to make us holy and happy like God. This does not refer to our bodies, for God is without form; but to our souls. He thus contrasts the two systems:

"The likeness has been disfigured by the introduction of sin. The reflection partakes of the mirror's impurity, but the chief end of human

existence is so to cleanse and polish the mirror of the soul by personal holiness that it may present an unspotted likeness of its God and Saviour, and be fully restored to the image in which it was originally made. The restoration of that image implies perfect release from all those corruptions which the Brahmanical philosopher dreaded most, but it does not involve destitution of sentient existence or loss of individual consciousness. Christianity animates us with the hope of positive happiness and glory. Far from involving a destitution of sentient existence or loss of individual consciousness, the ineffable bliss we look for, signifies the full sanctification of our senses, and the increasing contemplation of the divine perfections without the least abatement of individual consciousness. We do not seek to fall into a state of irreparable insensibility, but we seek for an eternal life of perfect sentiency, that we may live for ever, intelligently and consciously to laud and magnify the goodness and mercy of God. We wish our passions and affections not to be destroyed, but to be brought in subjection to God, and to continue as immortal trophies of His omnipotent grace.*

DOCTRINES OF THE BHAGAVAD GITA.

As this work is held in the highest estimation by most Hindus, an examination of its teaching is desirable.

1. *Krishna's reasoning with Arjuna when he expressed unwillingness to slay his kindred.* Arjuna says: "Preceptors, fathers, sons as well as grandfathers, maternal uncles, fathers-in-law, grandsons, brothers-in-law, as also (other) relatives. These I do not wish to kill, though they kill (me) O destroyer of Madhu! even for the sovereignty over the three worlds, how much less then for this earth (alone)?"

To these noble and humane sentiments "The Deity" replies :

"Be not effeminate, O Son of Pritha! it is not worthy of you. Cast off this base weakness of heart, and arise O terror of (your) foes!

"You have grieved for those who deserve no grief. He who thinks to be the killed and he who thinks it to be killed, both know nothing. It kills not, is not killed. Unborn, everlasting, unchangeable and primeval, it is not killed when the body is killed. As a man, casting off old clothes puts on others and new ones, so the embodied (self) casting off old bodies, goes to others and new ones. It is everlasting, all pervading, stable, firm, and eternal." "Looking alike on pleasure and pain, on gain and loss, on victory and defeat, then prepare for battle, and thus you will not incur sin."

Bishop Caldwell thus shows the fallacy of Krishna's reasoning by supposing it acted upon in the concerns of daily life :

"A man accused of murder neither denies his guilt nor pleads that he committed the act in self-defence; but addresses the Court

* *Dialogues on Hindu Philosophy*, pp. 525, 526.

in the language of Krishna: 'It is needless,' he says, 'to trouble yourself about the inquiry any further, for it is impossible that any murder can have taken place. The soul can neither kill, nor be killed. It is eternal and indestructible. When driven from one body it passes into another. Death is inevitable, and another birth is equally inevitable. It is not the part therefore of wise men, like the judges of the Court, to trouble themselves about such things.' Would the judges regard this defence as conclusive? certainly not. Nor would it be regarded as a conclusive defence by the friends of the murdered person, or by the world at large. The criminal might borrow from the *Gita* as many sounding nothings as he liked, but the moral sense of the community would continue to regard his murder as a crime.

"Krishna's arguments, based upon transcendental doctrines respecting the immortality and impassibility of the soul, if they proved his point, would equally prove the most unjust war that was ever waged to be innocent."

2. *Caste.*

This system receives divine sanction in the *Gita*, and Arjuna is told that a man has no higher duty than to follow his caste.

"The Deity said: 'The fourfold division of castes was created by me according to the apportionment of qualities and duties.' In Chapter XVIII., after describing the qualities and duties of the different castes, it is added: "One's duty, though defective, is better than another's duty well performed. Performing the duty prescribed by nature, one does not incur sin."

Intelligent Hindus admit that caste is one of the chief causes of India's degradation. Its evils are shown in the "Paper on Caste."* "The system of caste," says Principal Caird, "involves the worst of all wrongs to humanity—that of hallowing evil by the authority and sanction of religion." "Instead of breaking down artificial barriers, waging war with false separations, softening divisions and undermining class hatreds and antipathies, religion becomes itself the very consecration of them." "Of all forgeries," says Dr. K. M. Banerjea, "the most flagitious and profane is that which connects the name of the Almighty with an untruth." Yet this is what is done in the *Gita*.

Bishop Caldwell has the following remarks on the duty of every one to follow the work of his caste:—

"A soldier of the Kshatriya caste has no duty superior to fighting. If fighting and slaying are lawful simply because they are caste employments, the immutability of moral obligations is ignored. What shall we say then of the Kallars, the thief caste of the South, the ancient (but now generally abandoned) employment of whose caste was to steal, and whose

* See last page of wrapper.

caste name means simply 'thieves?' Krishna's teaching on this head elevates the conventional duties of the institutions of a dark age above the essential distinctions between right and wrong."

3. *The Doctrine concerning God.*

This is the chief characteristic of the poem, occupying the greater part of it. It is thus summarised by Bishop Caldwell :

"According to the Gita, God is the soul of the world ; its material cause as well as its efficient cause. The world is his body, framed by himself out of himself. A consequence of this doctrine, a consequence which is distinctly taught again and again, is that God is all things, as containing all things. Every thing that exists is a portion of God, and every action that is performed is an action of God. The doctrine knows no limitations, and is incapable of being exaggerated. The basest animals that creep on the face of the earth, have not merely been created by God for some good purpose, but are divine, inasmuch as they are portions of God's material form ; and the most wicked actions which men, vainly fancying themselves free agents, are ever tempted to perform, are not only permitted by God, but are actually perpetrated by him, inasmuch as they are performed by his power and will, working out their ends through the human constitution, which is a part of himself.

"This doctrine differs, it is true, from the Adwaita doctrine, to which alone the name of Vedantism is popularly given, that the Supreme Spirit alone really exists and that the world is unreal ; but it may be regarded as questionable whether the unreality of phenomena be not preferable to the doctrine that their reality consists in their inclusion in God as parts of his totality."

4. *The Self or Soul.*

A passage already quoted asserts that this is "everlasting, all-pervading, stable, firm, eternal." We are thus, as has been said, "miniature gods." This assertion has already been discussed.

5. *Mukti or Liberation.*

The poem is partly an attempt to reconcile the *karma-marga* and the *jnana-marga*. The need of action is admitted, otherwise the human race would soon come to an end. On the whole, however, there is a leaning to the Yoga. Repeated directions are given about restraining the breath, looking at the tip of the nose, &c. He "is esteemed highest to whom a god, a stone, and gold are alike, who thinks alike about well-wishers, friends, and enemies, as well as about the good and the sinful."

The doctrine of Mukti was considered in the previous chapter.

6. *Bhakti or Faith.*

One great design of the poem is to exalt the doctrine of devotion to Krishna. "Even if a very ill-conducted man worships me, not worshipping any one else, he must certainly be deemed to be good,

for he has well resolved." The following assurance is given towards the end of the poem: "The man, also, who with faith and without carping will listen (to this) will be freed (from sin) and attain to the holy regions of those who perform pious acts."

The value of faith depends upon its object. Faith in a being who was confessedly a thief, adulterer, and murderer, must be worthless, and can only destroy him by whom it is exercised.

7 *Object of Krishna's Incarnations.*

"The Deity said: Whosoever, O descendant of Bharata! piety languishes, and impiety is in the ascendant, I create myself. I am born age after age, for the protection of the good, for the destruction of evil doers, and establishment of piety."

The Bhagavata Purana professes to give a record of "The Deity's" life in his incarnation as Krishna. Instead of according with the above objects, it has been well characterised as the incarnation of Lust. The Krishna of the Bhagavad Gita should have appeared for the destruction of the Krishna of the Bhagavat Purana.

The 'Gita, like most Hindu writings, sometimes mingles the ridiculous with the sublime. The following is an example. The "bands of kings and principal warriors" are represented as rapidly entering Krishna's "mouths, fearful and horrific by (reason of his) jaws. And some with their heads smashed are seen (to be) stuck in the spaces between the teeth!"

It has been shown that the Gita inculcates principles whose falsity is seen by applying them to ordinary life; that it upholds the divine institution of caste; that it teaches pantheism and other errors.

Some of its deficiencies are thus pointed out by Bishop Caldwell:—

"It nowhere exhibits any sense of the evil of sin considered as a violation of law, as defiling the conscience, and as counteracting the ends for which man was created. It makes no provision for the re-establishment of the authority of the Divine Lawgiver by the expiation of sin in such a manner as to render forgiveness compatible with justice. It teaches nothing and knows nothing respecting the forgiveness of sin. It makes no provision for the healing of the wounds of the sin-sick soul by the communication of sanctifying grace and instruction in sanctifying truth. The salvation it teaches is not a salvation from sin by means of a new birth to righteousness, commencing in the present life and perfected hereafter, but merely a salvation from the necessity of being born again in repeated births, by means of the final emancipation of spirit from matter. The moral system of the Gita fails therefore in the most essential points—the vindication of the justice of the moral Governor of the Universe, and the restoration of harmony between man's moral nature and the constitution of things under which he is placed."

HINDU PHILOSOPHY TRIED BY ITS FRUITS.

This is an excellent test, easily applied. The following remarks are from Bishop Caldwell:—

“The soundness or unsoundness of this philosophy and the probability or otherwise of its divine origin and authority, may be estimated, like the characteristics of a tree, by its fruits. What are the visible, tangible fruits of this philosophy? What has it done for India the land of its birth?

“Has it promoted popular education, civilization, and good government? Has it educated the people in generous emotions? Has it abolished caste or even mitigated its evils? Has it obtained for widows the liberty of remarriage? Has it driven away dancing girls from the temples? Has it abolished polygamy? Has it repressed vice and encouraged virtue? Was it this philosophy which abolished female infanticide, the meriah sacrifice and the burning of widows? Is it this which is covering the country with a network of railways and telegraphs? Is it this which has kindled amongst the native inhabitants of India the spirit of improvement and enterprise which is now apparent? Need I ask the question? All this time the philosophy of quietism has been sound asleep or ‘with its eyes fixed on the point of its nose,’ according to the directions of the Gita, it has been thinking itself out of its wits. This philosophy has substantially been the creed of the majority of the people for upwards of two thousand years; and if it had emanated from God, the proofs of its divine origin ought long ere this to have been apparent; but it has all this time been too much absorbed in ‘contemplating self by means of self’ to have had any time or thought left for endeavouring to improve the world. What could be expected of the philosophy of apathy, but that it should leave things to take their course? There is much real work now being done in India in the way of teaching truth, putting down evil, and promoting the public welfare; but that work is being done, not by Vedantists or quietists of any school, but by Christians from Europe, whose highest philosophy is to do good, and by those Natives of India who have been stimulated by the teaching and example of Europeans to choose a similar philosophy.”

“The remarks of Lord Macaulay in his Essay on Lord Bacon on the Stoical philosophy of the ancients as contrasted with the modern Baconian philosophy, which is developed from and leavened by the practical teaching of the Christian Scriptures, will illustrate the unprofitableness of the Vedantic philosophy better than can be done by any words of mine. I commend the study of that brilliant Essay to the youthful Hindu. If Sanskrit words be substituted for the Greek technical terms quoted by Macaulay, every word that he says respecting the philosophy of Zeno may be said with equal truth of the philosophy of the Gita.”

A few extracts are given below from Macaulay’s Essay:—

“The chief peculiarity of Bacon’s philosophy seems to us to have been this, that it aimed at things altogether different from those which his predecessors had proposed to themselves.

“What then was the end which Bacon proposed to himself? It was, to use his own emphatic expression, ‘fruit.’ It was the multiplying of human enjoyments and the mitigating of human sufferings. It was ‘the relief of man’s estate.’”

“Two words form the key of the Baconian doctrines, Utility and Progress. The ancient philosophy disdained to be useful and was content to be stationary. It dealt largely in theories of moral perfection, which were so sublime that they never could be more than theories; in attempts to solve insoluble enigmas; in exhortations to the attachment of unattainable frames of mind. It could not condescend to the humble office of ministering to the comfort of human beings.

“The ancient philosophy was a treadmill, not a path. It was made up of revolving questions, of controversies which were always beginning again. It was a contrivance for having much exertion and no progress. It might indeed sharpen and invigorate the brains of those who devoted themselves to it; but such disputes could add nothing to the stock of knowledge. There was no accumulation of truth, no heritage of truth acquired by the labour of one generation and bequeathed to another, to be again transmitted with large additions to a third.

“The same sects were still battling with the same unsatisfactory arguments, about the same interminable questions. There had been plenty of ploughing, harrowing, reaping, threshing. But the garner contained only smut and stubble.

“Words and more words, and nothing but words, had been all the fruit of all the toil of all the most renowned sages of sixty generations. The ancient philosophers promised what was impracticable; they despised what was practicable; they filled the world with long words and long beards; and they left it as wicked and ignorant as they found it.

“We have sometimes thought that an amusing fiction might be written, in which a disciple of Epictetus and a disciple of Bacon should be introduced as fellow-travellers. They come to a village where the small-pox has just begun to rage, and find houses shut up, intercourse suspended, the sick abandoned, mothers weeping in terror over their children. The Stoic assures the dismayed population that there is nothing bad in the small-pox, and that to a wise man disease, deformity, death, the loss of friends, are not evils. The Baconian takes out a lancet and begins to vaccinate. They find a shipwrecked merchant wringing his hands on the shore. His vessel, with an inestimable cargo, has just gone down, and he is reduced in a moment from opulence to beggary. The Stoic exhorts him not to seek happiness in things which lie without himself. The Baconian constructs a diving-bell, goes down in it, and returns with the most precious effects from the wreck. It would be easy to multiply illustrations of the difference between the philosophy of thorns and the philosophy of fruit, the philosophy of words and the philosophy of works.”

Much more do the foregoing remarks apply to Hindu philosophy. It is notorious that the men most steeped in it, the paudits are,

of all classes, the most narrow-minded, bigoted, and the greatest enemies of social progress. Judged by its fruits, Hindu philosophy, when tested, is found wanting.

REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM OF HINDU PHILOSOPHY.

The students of Euclid are well aware that one method of proving the falsity of an assertion is to show that it leads to an absurd conclusion. The same mode of argument may be adopted with Hindu philosophy. Vedantism is the school by which it is most nearly represented. There are, it is true, some who dissent from it, but they are a comparative minority.

What is the ultimate aim, the goal of Hindu philosophy, of the *jnana marga*? It is expressed in the great sentences:

Tat tvam asi, That art Thou.

Brahmīsmi, or *Aham Brahma*, I am Brahma.

With reference to the *maha-vakya*, "I am Brahma," Gaudapurnananda says:—

"Thou art verily rified, O thou animal soul, of thy understanding, by this dark theory of Maya, because like a maniac, thou constantly ravest, 'I am Brahma.' Where is thy divinity, thy sovereignty, thy omniscience? O thou animal soul! thou art as different from Brahma as is a mustard seed from Mount Meru. Thou art a finite soul, He is infinite. Thou canst occupy but one space at a time, He is always everywhere. Thou art momentarily happy or miserable, He is happy, at all times. How canst thou say 'I am He?' Hast thou no shame?"*

Ramanuja, another celebrated Hindu writer, argues against it similarly:—

"The word *tat* (it) stands for the ocean of immortality, full of supreme felicity. The word *tvam* (thou) stands for a miserable person, distracted through fear of the world. The two cannot therefore be one. They are substantially different. He is to be worshipped by the whole world. Thou art but His slave. How could there be an image or reflection of the infinite and spotless One? There may be a reflection of a finite substance; how could there be such a thing of the Infinite? How canst thou, oh slow of thought! say, I am He, who has set up this immense sphere of the universe in its fulness? Consider thine own capacities with a pure mind. Can a collection of infuriated elephants enter into the stomach of a musquito? By the mercy of the Most High a little understanding has been committed to thee: it is not for thee, oh perverse one, to say, therefore I am God. Some sophists, sunk in a sea of false logic, addicted to evil ways, labouring to bring about the destruction of the world by false statements, themselves deceived and deceiving the world, say I am God, and all this universe is God. Their wicked device is now abundantly exposed."*

* *Banerjā's Dialogues*, pp. 379, 408.

The folly and sin of Vedantic teaching are thus shown by the Rev. Lal Behari Day :—

“Who in this life has become or can become *jivanmukta*? What man, putting his right hand on his bosom, can say—‘I am free from sin and sorrow; there is no sin in me; sin never enters my soul; I am as pure as God is pure?’ The fact is, that no man in this life can become absolutely sinless; *jivanmukta* therefore is a mere sound; such a person has no existence.

“If you say that in this present Kali Yuga no *jivanmukta* persons can be found, but there were plenty of them in the Satya, Treta, and Dvapara; then I ask, what proof is there that these persons you speak of were sinless? Besides, if in the present Kali Yuga no persons can become *jivanmukta*, then, by your own showing, it appears that the Vedantika religion is not suitable to the present age.

“And what shall we say of ‘*Tat tvam asi*, ‘Thou art That!’ and *Aham Brahmasmi*, ‘I am Brahma?’ What blasphemy! The Vedanta calls such a person a wise man, but every reasonable person will call such a man the greatest fool and most wicked man that ever lived in the world, for the sin of a man that calls himself God can never be forgiven. An atheist is better than a *jivanmukta*, for an atheist says there is no proof of the existence of a God, whereas a *jivanmukta* by calling himself God actually reproaches Him. If a boy calls himself his own father, what can we say of him but that he is mad? But the *jivanmukta* is worse than mad. Filled with intolerable pride, he blasphemes his Maker.”

It has thus been shown that the climax of Hindu philosophy is a blasphemous falsehood, too horrible almost to think of—for a puny, ignorant, proud, sinful mortal to say I am God! Yet, according to Hindu philosophy, he is the only wise man! How true are the words, “Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.”

FAILURE OF HINDU PHILOSOPHY.

For nearly three thousand years Hindu thought has been speculating about God, man, and human destiny. Its highest product is a miserable failure. This is briefly shown as follows :—

1. *Its Doctrines are contradictory.*—

“An English philosopher said that while man has the exclusive privilege of forming general theorems, he has also a monopoly of the *privilege of absurdity*, to which no other living creature is subject. And of men, he added, *those are of all the most subject to it that profess philosophy*. In India this monopoly is in the hands of those who profess to adhere to the Darsanas. All these systems are right in their eyes, notwithstanding their mutual inconsistencies. Whichever system they happen to take up for the time is supreme.”*

* *Dialogues on Hindu Philosophy*, p. 14.

It has been shown (see page 12) how the advocates of one system attack the others. But they also often contradict themselves. Sankaracharya, after ridiculing the idea of an eternal succession of works and creations, as a troop of blind leaders of the blind, virtually adopts it himself.

The differences between Hindu schools of philosophy are, in several cases, fundamental. If one is true, the other must be false, or, what is more likely, all may be based on error.

2. *Its aims are purely selfish.*

The personal happiness of the individual is the only consideration. His aim is neither to see, hear, nor care about what goes on in the world around him. The people of his nation may be sunk in ignorance, he is not to instruct them; they may be starving from famine, he is not to provide them with food; they may be dying from pestilence, he is not to give them medicine. With his eyes fixed on the tip of his nose, he is to try to meditate without any object. He is to refrain from all actions, good or bad.

This point has been considered at length under "Hindu Philosophy tried by its Fruits."

3. *It has no Moral Influence.*

Gough has the following remarks under this head :

"The Indian sages seek for participation in the divine life, not by pure feeling, high thought, and strenuous endeavour,—not by an unceasing effort to learn the true and do the right,—but by the crushing out of every feeling and every thought, by vacuity, apathy, inertion, and ecstasy. They do not for a moment mean that the purely individual feelings and volitions are to be suppressed in order that the philosopher may live in free obedience to the monitions of a higher common nature. Their highest Self is little more than an empty name, *caput mortuum* (dead head, worthless remains) of the abstract understanding. Their pursuit is not a pursuit of perfect character, but of perfect characterlessness. It is no aspiration and energy towards the true and the good, but only a yearning for repose from the miseries of life."*

4. *It denies the eternal Distinction between Right and Wrong.*—It has been shown that Hindu philosophy has no moral influence, but, worse than that, its teaching is most immoral. The *jivanmukta* is to look with equal eye upon virtue and vice, purity and impurity. According to Vedantism, "The sole existence being Brahma, or Self, sin is non-existent and impossible. It appears to exist; but that appearance is as illusive as the mirage of the desert. 'He whose intellect is not confused, even though he should kill, kills not.'"

5. *It strikes at the root of all Religious Feeling.*—The essence of

* *The Philosophy of the Upanishads*, pp. 266, 267.

religion is to love, honour, and obey God, to pray to Him, to worship Him. If I am God, why should I worship myself ?

The following remarks on this subject are from Professor Flint :—

“ The mystical piety of India, when strictly pantheistic, knows nothing of the gratitude for Divine mercy and the trust in Divine righteousness which characterise evangelical piety. Instead of love and communion in love, it can only commend to us the contemplation of an object which is incomprehensible, devoid of all affections, and indifferent to all actions. When feelings like love, gratitude, and trust are expressed in the hymns and prayers of Hindu worship, it is in consequence of a virtual denial of the principles of pantheism, it is because the mind has consented to regard as real what it had previously pronounced illusory, and to personify what it had declared to be impersonal. Hinduism holds it to be a fundamental truth that the absolute Being can have no personal attributes, and yet it has not only to allow but to encourage its adherents to invest that Being with these attributes, in order that by thus temporarily deluding themselves they may evoke in their hearts at least a feeble and transient glow of devotion. It has even been forced, by its inability to elicit and sustain a religious life by what is strictly pantheistic in its doctrine, to crave the help of polytheism, and to treat the foulest orgies and cruellest rites of idolatry as acts of reasonable worship paid indirectly to the sole and supreme Being. It finds polytheism to be the indispensable supplement of its pantheism. It is the personal gods of Hindu polytheism, and not the impersonal principle of Hindu pantheism, that the Hindu people worship. No people can worship what they believe to be entirely impersonal. Even in the so-called religions of nature the deified natural powers are always personified. It is only as persons that they are offered prayers and sacrifices.”*

6. *Its end is virtual Extinction of Being.*—*Mukti* is the happiness of a stone. “ It is thought always the same and ever objectless, thought without a thinker or things to think of. It is a bliss in which there is no soul to be glad, and no sense of gladness.” “ Hindu philosophy,” says Mr. Bose, “ begins with a recognition of human sorrow, goes out in vain in quest of a proper remedy, and ultimately arrives at annihilation as the goal where human misery terminates only in the extinction of life.”

6. *It culminates in a blasphemous Falsehood, most abhorrent to every right-thinking person.*—As already mentioned, the great sentence is *Aham Brahma, I am God*. This is the *reductio ad absurdum* of Hindu philosophy.

The pernicious effects of pantheism on Indian polytheism are thus shown by Professor Flint :

“ I have said that the ability of pantheism to ally itself with polytheism accounts for its prevalence in certain lands ; but I must add that, although a power, this ability is not a merit. It is a power for evil—a

* *Antitheistic Theories*, pp. 348, 389.

power which sustains superstition, corrupts the system which possesses it, deludes and degrades the human mind and heart, and arrests social progress. Educated Hindus are often found to represent it as an excellence of Brahminism, that it not only tolerates but embraces and incorporates the lower phases of religion. They contend that it thereby elevates and purifies polytheism, and helps the mind of men to pass from the lowest stage of religious development gradually up to the highest. The opinion may seem plausible, but neither reason nor experience confirms it. Pantheism can give support to polytheism and receive support from it, but only at the cost of sacrificing all its claims to be a rational system, and of losing such moral virtue as it possesses. If it look upon the popular deities as mere fictions of the popular mind, its association with polytheism can only mean a conscious alliance with falsehood, the deliberate propagation of lies, a persistent career of hypocrisy . . . India alone is surely sufficient proof that the union of pantheism with polytheism does not correct but stimulate the extravagances of the latter. Pantheism, instead of elevating and purifying Hindu polytheism, has contributed to increase the number, the absurdity, and the foulness of its superstitions."*

CAUSES OF THE FAILURE OF HINDU PHILOSOPHY.

Some of these are the following:—

1. *Starting with False Premises.*—Two of the principal have already been mentioned:

1. That God is a being somewhat like ourselves, and that as we cannot create, God cannot create.

2. That the soul is eternal. Hence the weary round of transmigration.

Mr. Bose says of Hindu philosophers: "They had an intellect keen and argumentative, and their writings are fitted to raise the puzzling question, so well put by Lord Macaulay, viz., how men, who reason so closely and so consecutively from assumed premises fail so miserably to see the utter groundlessness of the assumptions on which their ably conducted arguments are based."

2. *A proneness to dwell on subtle distinctions instead of grasping a subject as a whole.*—The Hindu mind resembles that of Hudibras:

"He could distinguish and divide
A hair 'twixt south and south-west side."

One great difference between a good and a bad lawyer is that the latter takes up some subordinate point, while he fails to see the main issue on which the case turns. Sir Monier Williams says that a Hindu disputant has captious propensities, leading him to be quick in repartee, and ready with specious objections to the most

* *Antitheistic Theories*, pp. 390, 391.

conclusive argument. Mr. R. C. Bose says, even of the Hindu masterminds, that they were defective in the following respects:—

“A view broad and comprehensive, an investigation calm and persevering, a thorough sifting of evidence, and a cautious building up of generalisations, in a word for all those processes of research and reasoning which are the basis of reliable science.”*

3. *A tendency to Speculate instead of Investigate.*—This is a radical defect of the Hindu mind. Mr. Bose gives the following illustrations:—

“The Hindu geographer does not travel, does not explore, does not survey; he simply sits down and dreams of a central mountain of a height greater than that of the sun, moon, and stars, and circular oceans of curd and clarified butter. The Hindu historian does not examine documents, coins, and monuments, does not investigate historical facts, weigh evidence, balance probabilities, scatter the chaff to the winds and gather the wheat in his garner: he simply sits down and dreams of a monster monkey who flies through the atmosphere with huge mountains resting on the hairs of his body, and constructs thereby a durable bridge across an arm of an interminable ocean. The Hindu biographer ignores the separating line between history and fable, invents prodigious and fantastic stories, and converts even historical personages into mythical or fabulous heroes. The Hindu anatomist does not dissect, does not anatomize, does not examine the contents of the human body; he simply dreams of component parts which have no existence, multiplies almost indefinitely the number of arteries and veins, and speaks coolly of a passage through which the atomic soul effects its ingress and egress.”

“The Hindu metaphysician does not analyze the facts of consciousness or enquire into the laws of thought, does not classify sensations, perceptions, conceptions and judgments and cautiously proceed to an investigation of the principles which regulate the elaboration of thought and processes of reasoning;—he simply speaks of the mind as an accidental and mischievous adjunct of the soul, and shows how its complete extinction may be brought about by austerity and meditation.”†

“The country has had enough of poetic and speculative intellect, and what it needs now to enable it to march alongside of the foremost nations of the world is a little of that cast of mind which may be called *scientific*.”

4. *A want of Common Sense.*—There are men who are well styled “learned fools.” They possess a great amount of knowledge, but seem incapable of making any wise use of it.

Hindu philosophers framed certain theories, and then proceeded to draw from them a long train of conclusions. They did not think of testing their reasoning, where practicable, by the evidence of the senses, nor by its application to the affairs of ordinary life. Indeed, as Sir Monier Williams says, “the more evidently physical and metaphysical speculations are opposed to common sense, the

* *Ecce Homo Philosophy*, p. 7.

† *Hindu Heterodoxy*, pp. 8-10.

more favour do they find with some Hindu thinkers. Common sense tells an Englishman that he really exists himself and that everything he sees around him really exists also. He cannot abandon these two primary convictions. Not so the Hindu Vedantist."

5. *Accepting Illustration for Argument.*—One illustration may appear to prove one thing, but another may be adduced leading to an opposite conclusion. It is sometimes said, "As there is only one sun in the sky, so there is only one God." This is a great truth, but the reasoning is no better than the following, "As there are innumerable stars in the sky, so the number of gods is countless."

The main proof adduced for the doctrine of *Maya* is that a rope may be mistaken for a snake, or that in a dream things appear to be real. This has been considered under "*Maya*." See pages 39, 40. Dr. Robson says:

"I once asked a pundit to state logically his argument that man's spirit was sinless which he did as follows:—

Man's spirit is sinless,
 Because it is distinct from the sin which man commits;
 For all things are distinct from that which they contain, as the
 water of a muddy stream is distinct from the mud which
 it contains;
 But so is the spirit of man distinct from the sin which it may
 be said to contain:
 Therefore it is sinless.

"This was an attempt to put into a logical form the stock argument used by the Hindus—Spirit is free from sin as water is distinct from all the dirt which may be mingled with it."*

2. *Its proud Dogmatism.*

Dr. Murray Mitchell notices

"the hard dogmatism and the unbounded self-assertion of all the schools. It would be an immense relief if one word betokening distrust of their own wisdom were uttered by those teachers—such as we have heard occasionally proceeding from the Vedic poets; but there is no such word. Each theorist moves with head erect, possessed of absolute faith in his own omniscience. It never occurs to him either that there are matters with which the human mind has no faculties to deal, or that Truth unveils her treasures only to the humble."

Their vagaries are even asserted to have a divine origin.

"The Hindu philosopher," says Mr. Bose, "claims prophetic functions, pretends to either miraculous insight or preternatural intercourse with superior beings, and brings out his excogitation as revelation to be implicitly believed in; not as results of philosophic inquiry to be tested by the ordinary appliances of the logical

* *Hinduism*, pp. 324, 325.

science. He is the guru, heaven-appointed or self-raised teacher, and his utterances must be accepted as divine revelations ; while all sorts of woes are pronounced upon those impious wretches who have the audacity to call in question a jot or tittle of his sayings."

Pope calls pride the "never-failing vice of fools," and asserts that it is one of the chief causes of wrong judgments :

"Of all the causes which conspire to blind
Man's erring judgment, and misguide the mind,
What the weak head with strongest bias rules,
Is pride, the never-failing vice of fools."

7. *It failed, like all other attempts, to solve the insoluble by merely human reason.*

The claims of the learned Rev. Nehemiah Goreh on behalf of his countrymen are readily allowed :—

"This great country of ours is a world in itself, and our forefathers were not inferior to any nation in the world, in learning, cleverness and power of reasoning. And in one respect, namely, in possessing a religious and pious disposition, they appear to me far superior in all other people, except those in whom the influence of divine revelation has produced such a disposition. And such a disposition made our forefathers and countrymen peculiarly fitted to show whether man can ever acquire correct knowledge of religious truth by his own reason without the light of revelation. I say then that since men endowed with such qualifications have failed to acquire it, and indeed the more they tried to attain to it wandered the farther away from it, and have fallen into such strange and grievous errors about it, we ought to be pretty sure that it is unattainable by human reason. And when we see that the same has been the case with all men, in all countries, and in all ages, whether civilised or uncivilised, learned or unlearned, we ought to become quite sure of it. And that such has been the case with all men everywhere is clear to all who know anything of the past history or of the present state of the nations of the world."*

Europe has had its succession of philosophers from the days of Pythagoras downwards, who have indulged in speculations like those of Kanada and Kapila. Lewis, in his *Biographical History of Philosophy*, makes the following confession : "Centuries of thought had not advanced the mind one step nearer to the solution of the problems with which, child-like it began. It began with a child-like question ; it ended with an aged doubt. Not only did it doubt the solution of the great problem which others had attempted ; it even doubted the possibility of any solution. It was not the doubt which begins, but the doubt which ends inquiry ; it had no illusions." It is also admitted "as a saddening contemplation," that the "failures of the philosophy of the ancient world were only repeated with parallel experience by the modern."

* *Theism and Christianity*, Part II. pp. 17, 18.

It may, however, be said that of all attempts to solve the riddle of the universe, that of Hindu philosophy is the maddest and most blasphemous.

The Bible well says, "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? It is high as heaven; what canst thou do? it is deeper than hell; what canst thou know?"

A revelation from God Himself is needed.

ESTIMATE OF HINDU PHILOSOPHY.

As a rule, the ignorant are always the most conceited. The highest estimates are formed of Hindu philosophy by men who know nothing else or are acquainted with it only by hearsay. Before referring to Hinduism, a parallel case may be taken from Islam. Sir W. W. Hunter, in his *Indian Musalmans*, thus describes the attainments of the students in the Calcutta Muhammadan College:—

"At the end of seven years the students know certain books by heart, text and interpretation; but if they get a simple manuscript beyond their narrow curriculum, they are in a moment beyond their depth. Such a teaching, it may well be supposed, produces an intolerant contempt for anything which they have not learned. The very nothingness of their acquirements makes them the more conceited. They know as an absolute truth that the Arabic grammar, law, rhetoric, and logic, comprise all that is worth knowing upon earth. They have learned that the most extensive kingdoms in the world are, first Arabia, then England, France, and Russia, and the largest town, next to Mecca, Medina, and Cairo, is London. *Au reste*, the English are Infidels, and will find themselves in a very hot place in the next world." pp. 204—207. 2nd Ed. 1872.

Shastris are much of the same stamp as the Maulavis. Professor Monier Williams admits

"the utter narrowmindedness of Indian Pandits. They have believed the whole circle of human knowledge to be contained in Sanskrit writings. To this very day the most bigoted are fully persuaded that to learn anything beyond the Sāstras is quite useless."*

Their learning generally is merely by rote. Sir Madhava Rao says: "A Pundit versed in logic very often repeats the maxim, 'where there is smoke there must be fire;' ask him to give illustrations, and he is at a standstill."

Claims of as high a nature are also made by Indians acquainted with English. Babu Surendranath Mookerjea, in the *National Magazine*, says of his countrymen:—

"Mentally and spiritually the average Bengalee is any day equal to a dozen John Bull. Centuries of worship with the unusual amount of

* *Modern India*, p. 287.

spirituality has resulted in making him more and more mentally and spiritually powerful than physically."

The *Pioneer*, with reference to the above, makes the sarcastic remark that "mental and spiritual power may co-exist with grammatical weakness."

But such pretensions are not confined to half-educated men. Mr. Krishna Behari Sen is an M. A. of the Calcutta University, and Rector of the Albert College. In a lecture which he delivered, he said that India "has given to the world a philosophy before which European philosophy hangs her head for shame."*

Hindu philosophy was the "perennial theme of the world's wonder" so long as it was shrouded in Sanskrit. Translations, by the ablest oriental scholars of the present day, have dispelled the illusion. Max Müller himself, the Editor of *The Sacred Books of the East*, says in the Preface:—

"It is but natural that those who write on ancient religions, and who have studied them from translations only, not from original documents, should have had eyes for their bright rather than dark sides. . . . Scholars, also, who have devoted their life either to the editing of the original texts or to the careful interpretation of some of the sacred books, are more inclined, after they have disinterred from a heap of rubbish some solitary fragments of pure gold, to exhibit these treasures only, than to display all the refuse from which they had to extract them. I do not blame them for this; perhaps I should feel that I was open to the same blame myself."

"No one who collects and publishes such extracts can resist, no one, at all events so far as I know, has ever resisted, the temptation of giving what is beautiful, or it may be what is strange and startling, and leaving out what is commonplace, tedious, or it may be repulsive. . . . We must face the problem in its completeness, and I confess it has been for many years a problem to me, aye, to a great extent, is so still, how the sacred books of the East should, by the side of so much that is fresh, natural, simple, beautiful, and true, contain so much that is not only unmeaning, artificial, and silly, but even hideous and repellent. This is a fact, and must be accounted for in some way or other."

The Principal of the Muir College, Allahabad, while Anglo-Sanskrit Professor at the Benares College published the Sanskrit text of the *Vaiseshika Aphorisms of Kanada*, with an English translation and comments from different works. He says in the preface:—

"The following pages will, it is trusted, facilitate to Sanskrit students the perusal of the original text, and to general readers an estimate of one of the Schools of Indian thought. Such interest as they may claim, will be historical, as a picture of a low stage of metaphysical culture."

* Quoted in *The Epiphany*, Nov. 26, 1887.

Mr. Gough afterwards published a learned work on *The Philosophy of the Upanishads and Ancient Indian Metaphysics*. It concludes as follows:—

“Such as they are, and have been shown to be, the Upanishads are the loftiest utterances of Indian intelligence. They are the work of a rude age, a deteriorated race, and a barbarous and unprogressive community. Whatever value the reader may assign to the ideas they present, they are the highest produce of the ancient Indian mind, and almost the only elements of interest in Indian literature, which is at every stage replete with them to saturation.” p. 268.

Mr. Ram Chandra Bose, A. M., has written two of the most complete accounts in the English language of the Hindu Philosophical Systems, both Orthodox and Heterodox. As a Bengali, he is “mentally and spiritually” qualified to form an accurate judgment. He expresses the following opinion of Oriental Literature:

“The growing tendency among educated natives to look back to the past history of our country with exaggerated veneration, or to speak of our past achievements in the region of literature and philosophy in terms of fulsome eulogy, would be a good sign if it were accompanied with a corresponding desire to secure an insight therein by careful study and patient research. Our decided conviction is that if they were simply to sit down and read the books on which they lavish what Dr. Chalmers, calls the ‘idolatry of their praise,’ their retrospective veneration would give place to sheer disgust; and their Quixotic schemes of reformation brought about by an indigenous or Oriental *renaissance* would be scattered to the winds.... That there are some good things, some flights of thought which may justly be called sublime, in it (Oriental literature) no man, woman, or child has ever or will ever deny; but these are buried under heaps of rubbish which it needs a world of trouble to clear away; and such things, moreover, may be found amid such surroundings in the literatures of nations or peoples whom we are apt to regard with supercilious contempt. Let our educated countrymen only study what they were never tired of speaking of in glowing terms of panegyric; and the conclusion will be irresistibly forced on their minds that their only chance of rise in the scale of civilization hinges on the wide diffusion of that literature by which their own minds are being trained, and especially of that religion to which all that is grand and elevating therein is to be traced.” *

The learned pandit of Benares, now the Rev. Nehemiah Goreh, is the author of a work on Hindu Philosophy so excellent, that it was translated into English by a distinguished American Sanskritist. Referring to the remark of Mr. Krishna Behari Sen, he says, “Had he really known the so-called philosophies of the Hindus he would never have said this. But such is the case with our educated young men in these days. They are utter strangers to the real teaching of the Hindu books, and they say whatever they like.” †

* *Heterodox Philosophy*, pp. 28, 29.

† *The Epiphany*, Nov. 26, 1867.

The late Rev. Krishna Mohun Banerjea, Examiner in Sanskrit to Calcutta University, was one of ablest Indian scholars of modern times. He translated into English part of the Brahma Sutras with the commentary of Sankaracharya, and his *Dialogues on the Hindu Philosophy* shows deep research. What is his estimate?

"Sciences, distinct in themselves, were blended together. Objects which surpassed the limits of the human understanding, were pursued with the same confidence and eagerness with which the easiest questions were investigated. The philosophers professed to have solved problems really out of the range of our knowledge, while they threw doubts on matters which every body believed, and which none could deny without belying his nature."

"The authors began to dogmatize in the very infancy of philosophical speculation. They drew general conclusions before they had collected facts. They worked up their own ideas without sufficient attention to external phenomena. They delivered obscure sutras to exercise the ingenuity of their followers."*

Dr. Mohendralal Sircar, one of the most eminent citizens of Calcutta, said at a recent public meeting :—

"You must have observed a retrograde movement going on in our midst which I fear is calculated to retard the progress of the Hindoo race, I mean a return towards superstitions and idolatries which lie as the blackest blot upon this part of the world. The crude words and hazy conceptions of the sages are looked upon as absolute truth. No man is allowed to differ from them however much they may have differed from one another, or however much they may differ from modern science. Indeed, if we are to believe these reactionaries, it is so much the worse for modern science if she will not conform her doctrines to the transcendental nonsense of the sages."†

Every educated man can easily form his own opinion. Let him read two of the longest Upanishads, the Chhandogya and Brihad Aranyaka in the English translations by Max Müller, Roer and Rajendralal Mitra, and he will, with Dr. Mohendralal Sircar, characterise much of them as simply "transcendental nonsense."

The welfare of India is to be secured, not by a Sanskrit revival, not by touching false morality, false history, false philosophy, and false physics, but by truth.

The remark of Sir Madhava Rao should be pondered : "What is not true, cannot be patriotic."

DUTY WITH REGARD TO HINDU PHILOSOPHY.

Europe has had its philosophers who speculated from the dawn of civilization to the present time. They wrangled with each other and taught the most outrageous doctrines, just like their brethren

* *Dialogues on Hindu Philosophy*, p. 72. † *The Epiphany*, Nov. 5, 1887.

in India. Cicero, the greatest Roman orator, had studied philosophy at Athens, and was well acquainted with the different schools. He said there is no opinion, however absurd, which has not been held by some philosopher. Sidgwick, in his *History of Ethics* (p. 17), says that Socrates considered some of the doctrines of Greek philosophers so extravagant and so materially contradictory, that they were "like madmen disputing."

Dr. Mullens thus describes the Hindu pandit class, and shows the resemblance, in several respects, of the present state of things in India to that in ancient Greece :

"The Hindu mind is moulded in a peculiar form. In arguing with Hindus, whether learned or rude, we deal with men, not brought up from their youth, like the English and Americans, under the philosophy of common sense, and hence possessing a reason, trained by experience and sound principles to judge fitly and simply of facts before them : but we deal with men of perverted principles, of judgments warped by absurd dogmas, men who have received the Vedas as true, and are perfectly willing to forswear the evidence of their own senses, wherever the Vedas contradict them ; men who know little of the physical world, who have read little even of the world within them, and have received concerning things in general the theories which they have been taught. In Indian philosophy, therefore, we leave the sphere and age of Baconian inquiry, and are transported back to the age and schools of the philosophers of Greece. The Platonists and Epicureans, the Atomists and Stoics, are living and studying before our eyes. We behold the same select circle of students, the same system of verbal instruction, the same deference to authority. The same antique principles, the same deficiency of physical research exists among them, as amongst the sages of ancient Greece. The groves of Academus, and the many schools of young philosophers, still exist at Nuddea and Benares. Gorgias still displays his subtle rhetoric in paradox and sophistry, Platos and Aristotles still lecture to their disciples on the origin of the universe, the *summum bonum*, and the future of the soul. The defenders of pantheism still sit in conclave, discussing the illusions of Maya and the real nature of existing entities ; and when they have proved to their satisfaction that everything is *Brahma*, they break up their lecture, and proceeding to the Ganges, spend two hours, sitting on its muddy bank, repeating mantras, reciting prayers, throwing in flowers, sprinkling the appointed water, and bathing in proper rule, in honour of those very gods, whose separate existence as real beings they had just before disproved ! Such examples of contradiction between belief and practice are witnessed every day. Thousands upon thousands of men believe that both sides of a contradictory argument are true. In thousands upon thousands the divorce between principle and practice is all but complete."*

Enlightened men in India should follow the same course which has been taken in Europe. It is considered part of a liberal educa-

* *Religious Aspects of Hindu Philosophy*, pp. 237, 238.

tion to have some acquaintance with the schools of Greek philosophy ; but only those opinions are retained which longer experience has shown to be well founded. In like manner, educated men should have a general view of the different systems of Indian philosophy. They are interesting as showing the workings of Hindu thought. There is much acute reasoning ; but, starting with false premises, the conclusions are often erroneous or absurd. The Nyaya is especially worthy of attention. Still, the Germans have an illustration that the study of philosophy is like sowing and reaping in the air—the harvest is *nil*.

DOCTRINES TO BE ACCEPTED INSTEAD OF HINDU PHILOSOPHY.

It must be admitted that Hindu Philosophy is, on many points, diametrically opposed to the views held at present by the enlightened nations of the world. No compromise between the two is possible.

In opposition to the leading tenets of Hindu philosophy the following should be adopted :

1. **God.**—There is only one God, but not in the pantheistic sense *ekam evadvityam*. Unlike the supposed Brahm, He is never unconscious ; He knows every thing that transpires throughout His vast dominions. His most distinguishing attribute is His spotless holiness. To represent Him either as *nirguna* or endued with *tamas* is most derogatory to His honour.

2. **Creation.**—God alone is without beginning or end. All things were called into existence out of nothing by His omnipotent power. We, it is true, cannot create ; but, with God, all things are possible.

3. **Man.**—We did not exist before our present birth. Our souls are immortal, or not subject to death ; but they are not eternal as God is eternal in not having a beginning. Our souls were created by God, but they are not parts of Him.

It follows from the above that there is no truth in the Hindu dogmas of transmigration and *adrishṭa* or *karma*. Man is a free agent.

4. **Human Duty.**—A child should love, honour, and obey his earthly father ; a subject should respect his rightful king, render to him his just service, and obey his laws. God stands to us in both relations. To Him we are indebted for existence ; our parents were, as it were, only the instruments in His hand. He is our Father in heaven. One of the oldest names of God used by the Aryans before they entered India was *Dyaus Pitar*, Heaven-Father. From our birth to the present moment we have been dependent upon Him for every breath we draw ; every blessing we enjoy is His gift. We should regard Him as an affectionate child looks

upon his father: But God is also our sovereign. He is the rightful Lord of the universe which He created. His laws are holy, just and good. To worship any other than Himself is rebellion. To ascribe to Him human vices is to be guilty of blasphemy.

Again, a child should love his brothers and sisters, and always treat them with justice and kindness. All men are children of the same Heavenly Father, and they should behave towards each other as brethren. We should do all the good we can to our fellow-men.

Our duty may be summed up in *love to God* and *love to man*.

Hindu philosophy, on the contrary, teaches a man blasphemously to think that he is God, and selfishly to seek only his own happiness by refraining from all action.

5. **Cause of Man's Degradation.**—Hinduism ascribes this to *avidya*, ignorance of the supposed truth that he is God. Christianity attributes it to sin. We are all guilty before God. We have broken His laws times without number. Instead of loving our neighbour, we have selfishly sought our own happiness.

6. **Pardon.**—According to *karma*, every sin must be punished: there is no forgiveness under any circumstances. This, like some other things, is a limitation of God's power. A king is able to pardon a criminal, and so, much more, is God. Pardon, however, requires to be exercised with great judgment or the effects would be most disastrous. Krishna says in the Bhagavad Gita, that at crises in the world's history, he becomes incarnate. This dimly shadows forth the Son of God becoming incarnate and suffering death on the cross for man's redemption. God's justice is satisfied, and forgiveness is now freely offered to all who trust in Jesus as their Saviour. It is accompanied by genuine sorrow for sin, and a turning from every evil way.

7. **Salvation by Grace.**—In the so-called sacred books of the Hindus, Buddhists, and Muhammdaus, says Sir Monier Williams:—

“The one key-note running through them all is salvation by works. They all declare that salvation must be purchased, must be bought with a price, and that the sole price, the sole purchase money, must be our own works and deservings.

“Here, then we make our grand contrast, and draw our broad line of separation. Our own Holy Bible, our own sacred Book of the East, is from beginning to end a protest against this doctrine. Good works are indeed enjoined upon us in our own sacred Book of the East far more strongly than in any other sacred book of the East; but they are only the outcome of a grateful heart—they are only the thankoffering of the fruits of our faith. They are never the ransom money of the true disciples of Christ. ‘Put off the pride of self-righteousness,’ says our Holy Bible; ‘it is filthy garment, utterly unfit to cover the nakedness of your soul at that awful moment when death brings you face to face with a

holy God.' 'Put on the garment of self-righteousness' says every other sacred book of the East. 'Cling closely to it. Fold it closely to your heart of hearts. Multiply your prayers, your penances, your pilgrimages, your ceremonies, your external rites of all kinds; for nothing else but your own meritorious acts, accumulated like capital at a bank, can save you from eternal ruin.' We can understand, then, the hold which these so-called sacred books of the East continue to exert on the natives of India; for the pride of self-righteousness is very dear to the human heart. It is like a tight-fitting inner garment, the first to be put on, the last to be put off."

8. **The Chief End of Man.**—This, according to Hindu philosophy, is deliverance from future births and unconscious absorption into the Deity. Kapila's first aphorism is: "The complete cessation of pain, of three kinds, is the complete end of man." "Such a *summum bonum*, implying nothing more than a state of nonentity and unconnected with any kind of moral action," says Dr. Bullantyne, "might satisfy tortoises, but not men."

A Christian catechism says, "Man's chief end is to glorify God, and enjoy Him for ever." By glorifying God is meant acknowledging His perfections, and behaving suitably to them, by trusting, loving, and obeying Him. To enjoy Him for ever, is to have an eternal conscious happy existence in His presence.

9. **Strength for Duty.**—It is not enough to know what we ought to do. Men often

" See the right; approve it too;
Condemn the wrong, and yet the wrong pursue."

A Hindu writer says, "This powerful devil of a deceitful heart is fiercer than fire, more impassable than the mountains, and harder than adamant: sooner might the ocean be emptied than the mind be restrained." In the contest with evil which every man must wage, if he would be saved, Hindu philosophy leaves him to his own resources; Christianity offers him the help of God's Holy Spirit.

For further details on the above important points, the reader is referred to some of the little books mentioned on the last page of the wrapper, but especially to the New Testament. Earnest religious inquiry, with prayer for divine guidance, is the duty of every human being.

RELIGION OF VITAL, PERSONAL IMPORTANCE.

The Hindus are prone to speculate about religion, but often they do not realize that it is far more than an abstract theory, that it is a matter which intimately concerns their own well-being both in this life and in the eternal unseen world which they must enter at death.

The following remarks of Bishop Caldwell apply to most Hindus, educated or uneducated :

“ Practically it matters very little in general what theosophy or philosophy a Hindu professes, what his ideas may be about the most ancient form of his religion, or even what his ideas may be about the religious reforms that the age is said to require. As a matter of fact, and in so far as his actual course in life is concerned, he is content, except in a small number of exceptional cases, to adhere with scrupulous care to the traditional usages of his caste and sect. His ideas may have received a tincture from his English education, but ordinarily his actions differ, in no particular of any importance, from those of his progenitors.”

Most men are absorbed by pursuit of the present. The insufficiency of this is well illustrated by the following anecdote :

About three hundred years ago, a young man came into a distinguished University in Europe to study law. His long cherished desire was at last gratified. He possessed considerable talents, and commenced his studies with bright hopes.

Soon afterwards, the student called on a good old man, who devoted his life to the benefit of the people among whom he lived. The young man told him that he had come to the University on account of its great fame, and that he intended to spare no pains or labour to get through his studies as quickly as possible.

The good old man listened with great patience and then said :—

“ Well, and when you have got through your course of studies, what do you mean to do ?”

“ Then I shall take my degree,” answered the young man.

“ And then ?” asked his venerable friend.

“ And then,” continued the youth, “ I shall have a number of difficult questions to manage, shall catch people’s notice by my eloquence, my zeal, my learning, my acuteness, and gain a great reputation.”

“ And then ?” repeated the good man.

“ And then,” replied the young student, “ why there cannot be a question I shall be promoted to some high office. Besides, I shall make money and grow rich.”

“ And then ?” continued the old man.

“ And then,” added the young lawyer, “ then I shall be comfortably and honourably settled in wealth and dignity.”

“ And then ?” asked his friend.

“ And then,” said the youth, “ and then—and then—then I shall die.”

Here the good old man raised his voice : “ AND WHAT THEN ?” Whereupon the young man made no answer, but cast down his head and went away. The last, “ And then” had, like lightning, pierced his soul, and he could not get rid of it. The student, instead of devoting his life to the pursuit of the pleasures and honours of

this world, sought to promote the glory of God and the good of his country.

Man needs a religion. In youth, in the time of prosperity, the thoughts of God, of death and a future state, may be distasteful, and the world may be considered sufficient to satisfy the desires. But a change will take place in all. The dark clouds of affliction will overcast the sky; wealth may take to itself wings and fly away; the coveted office may not be gained; health, the absence of which embitters every earthly pleasure, may be broken; loved ones may be removed by death, and, sooner or later the inexorable summons will reach ourselves.

Fairbairn thus strikingly shows of the wants of the soul:—

“Man has noble instincts and impulses that impel him to seek the true, to admire the lovely, to worship the good, to feel after and find the Infinite Perfection in which the true, and right, and beautiful, blend into a divine and personal Unity. Man has deep moral convictions of rights that are his due, of duties that he owes, of an eternal law he is bound to discover and obey. Man has sad and remorseful experiences, the sense of unfulfilled duties, of wasted hours, of sorrows that have turned the anticipated joys of his life into utter miseries, of mean and unmanly sins against conscience and heart, against man and God, of losses unredeemed by gain, of the lonely anguish that comes in the hour of bereavement and throws across the life a shadow that no sunshine can pierce. And out of these mingling instincts and impulses, convictions and experiences, rise man's manifold needs, those cravings after rest, those gropings after a strong hand to hold and trust, those cries for pardon, those unutterable groanings after light shed from a Divine face upon his gloom, in which lie at once the greatness and misery of man.”

The only way in which you can be safe and happy for time and for eternity, is to become reconciled to God, your heavenly Father, and to make the doing of His will the grand object of your life. You may strive to be rich and yet die a poor man; you may set your heart on some honour which always eludes your grasp. Even should you attain riches and rank, the loss of health, or some other affliction, may damp your joys; while, even at the best, the want of permanence must cast a shadow over all. Not so if you live for God. You may do His will in the lowest sphere as well as in the highest; when prostrated by sickness, as much as when most actively engaged. Milton says,

“They also serve who only stand and wait.”

“*Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come.*”