fruit of past deeds?[1] If God is the agent, he ought himself to be the sufferer for an evil deed. If man is the sole spring of all action, there is then no Supreme Being to impose any consequences at all. Necessity has no moral quality, but experience and revelation show that no one can escape what is ordained. There, in the Scriptures, men can learn the right, and how acts good and bad are, as it were, perpetually revolving on a wheel, and men must reap the fruits of what they do. One sinful act begets another; but this progeny can be arrested, the way of choice is always open. "Avoid all evil," says the sage, "follow the duties of your own order; for sinful deeds there are expiations; perform them, and you will not have to repent in the next world."

The most dramatic protest against the helplessness of man under the divine decrees falls from the lips of the injured lady Draupadī when she has been forced into exile with Yudhishthira and his brothers after the fatal game at dice, in which she had been herself the final stake.[2] Her anger is not for herself, but for the husband whose piety, sacrifices, and charities have not availed to save him from the hardships of the forest, deer-skins and bark clothes for silken robes, and coarse food in place of dainties on gold plates. Why is he not angry when he contemplates the misery of his brothers? Why does he not show the energy[3] which is the duty of the warrior's order, and destroy his enemies instead of forgiving them? Anger, replies the prince, leads to all sorts of crimes, brings weak men to ruin, and true energy is shown by renouncing it. The man who, when reviled, reviles again; who repays injuries by injuries, spoils the world's peace, for the birth of new generations depends upon forgiveness? Did not Kāçyapa say in his hymn that forgiveness was virtue, sacrifice, the Vedas, Brahman (*i.e.* holiness) truth, the power that upholds the world? Whoever forgives all, attains to Brahman. The indignant wife is unconvinced. "Reverence to the Creator and Disposer who have confused thy mind!"[4] Again she urges action, with its certain conse-

[1] xii. 32, 12 ff. [2] iii. 27–32. Cp. *ante*, Lect. II., p. 50.

[3] 27, 38, *tejas*.

[4] Perhaps ironical: Hopkins, *Religions of India*, p. 385. The pronoun is not expressed; Dutt, "my."

quences; it is only ignorance which makes men seek emancipation[1] from it. But the note suddenly changes. He had to his credit a long list of royal virtues and religious duties faithfully fulfilled, but they had not served to avert calamity. It was an old story that the worlds stand under God's will,[2] not under men's own control. They are like wooden dolls whose limbs are moved by wires; God penetrates all creatures like space, and ordains their happiness or misery. Man is but a bird on a string, a jewel on a cord, a bull with a rope through its nose. He follows the Creator's orders, for in bold phrases Draupadī declares that he is identical with him, inserted in him,[3] with no free-will of his own.[4] Author alike of noble deeds and wicked, God moves unobserved, pervading all creatures, and none says "This is he." The body is but the Creator's means[5] by which the Mighty One works works with fruits of good and evil. The Blessed God,[6] the Self-Created, the Great-Grandsire, with secret action destroys creatures by creatures, playing with them as a boy with toys. Not like father or mother does the Creator behave to his creatures; like an ordinary man he acts in anger. Nay, concludes the outraged princess, "if in truth the deed follows the doer, and reaches no one else, it is God who is stained by this base act. But if the deed overtakes not the doer, force is the only agency, and I grieve for those who have none!"

The prince admits that her words are clear, but her argument is sceptical.[7] True piety seeks no fruit: that is only trading in virtue. The sages of old became pure by virtue; to doubt or blame the ways of the Creator is folly; to abandon religion and vilify the Scriptures is the way to hell. Duty is the only ship across the sea of life, and if the pieties of the virtuous had been without result, men would have lived like beasts. The sages, the gods, and even the Asuras and Rākshasas,

[1] 30, 2; on *moksha*, see below, p. 179.
[2] 30, 20.
[3] 30, 27, *tan-mayo* (literally, "made of him") *tad-arpanaḥ*.
[4] *Nâtmâdhîno*.
[5] His *kshetra*, or appointed field of action.
[6] 30, 35, *Bhagavân devaḥ*.
[7] 31, 1, *nâstikya*, cp. above, p. 139.

lords of themselves, were diligent in practising virtue; but even to them the fruits are veiled in mystery, they are the secrets of that righteousness which is eternal. Let scepticism give place to faith.[1] "Learn to know God, by whose grace[2] mortals become immortal." Draupadī is but half-convinced by the appeal to the testimony of the past. She is apologetic; her mood wavers; her thought is unsteady.[3] Her religious experience is inadequate to so great a trial: she still pleads that the body is God's instrument for action, and deeds good or bad are the issue of divine arrangements proceeding from the past. She cannot free herself from the fatalism of Karma, or rely on its justice; yet the urgency of her appeal for a fresh effort to regain what has been lost points to the deep-seated belief that man may still be master of his fate. She sees that action counts; time and circumstance may be coessentials for success, but personal initiative is its first condition.[4] And it is by this faith that the Five Brothers, with Krishna's aid from the divine side, at length vanquish their foes, and Yudhishthira is solemnly installed as king.[5]

The whole of life, then, with its interminable successions, was placed under Brahman's rule. The Law of the Deed was thus incorporated in religion.[6] On the one side its operation was stern and unbending; as a calf could recognise its mother among a thousand kine, so the deeds of the past would not fail to find out the doer.[6] On the other, its operation might be qualified on rare occasions by divine grace (*prasāda*): the prayers of the faithful might secure boons for the unfortunate who were at last deserving; there are even strange hints of the extension of merit or guilt from one person to another. In days of old Yayāti had fallen from heaven to earth, but the good deeds of

[1] Faith in Brahman is the daughter of the Sun, xii. 264, 8.

[2] *Prasāda*, 31, 42, cp. below, p. 253.

[3] Hopkins, *op. cit.*, p. 186, thinks 32 is evidently a later addition. But Draupadī does not really "take back what she has said." Much of her previous argument is repeated, cp. 23 with 30, 31, though in different phraseology.

[4] 32, 49, 58. In iv. 20, 14, she admits that a girlish offence had brought on her the displeasure of the Ordainer (*Dhātri*).

[5] Cp. xiii. 40.

[6] A favourite image; cp. xii. 181, 16; 323, 16; xiii. 7, 22.

his pious grandsons restored him to the skies;[1] King Janamejaya, a wanderer under the burden of carelessly causing a Brāhman's death, is told to his horror that all his ancestors have fallen into hell for his deeds.[2] Such instances, however, are in the highest degree exceptional. No one must expect deliverance from the consequences of an evil past, though by new virtue he can secure a happier future. The Moral Order is at length formally ensphered in God, and in one of the latest sections of the poem, when Çiva is presented as the Self-Existent, the Unmanifest, the Eternal, among his thousand names he is called Karma.[3]

VI

Three great aims animated all human conduct, *Dharma*, *Artha*, and *Kāma*; Duty, Morality, or Religion; Utility, Profit, or Advantage; and Desire, Pleasure, or Love. They formed a three-fold mystery;[4] they were expounded in various treatises; —had not the Grandsire himself condescended to explain them in a work of a hundred thousand lectures?[5]—they supplied the constant theme of counsel from comrade or sage.[6] *Dharma*, however, at once fell apart into two great divisions. Twofold was the command of the Vedas, "Do acts," and "Renounce them."[7] Life might be ordered along one of two courses, action and practice, or knowledge and contemplation. When Vishnu in his turn filled the dignity of the Supreme Being,[8] he appeared before Brahman with the triple staff of a mendicant, reciting the Vedas; bade him as Lord of the universe think out the lines of fitting conduct for all creatures; and himself adopted the Religion of Renunciation (*nirvritti*) with its eternal fruits, ordaining for others the Religion of Action (*pravritti*).[9] Such

[1] xiii. 6, 30. In iii. 200, 14, the Brāhmans so control the gods that at their command men are admitted to heaven.

[2] xii. 150, 15.

[3] xiii. 17, 61. Cp. Hopkins, "Modifications of the Karma Doctrine," *JRAS* (1905), p. 581.

[4] i. 1, 48.

[5] xii. 59, 29.

[6] iii. 33, 2 ff.; xii. 103, 6 (where the sage Brihaspati instructs Indra); 123, 1; 167, 2 ff., etc.

[7] xii. 241, 1.

[8] Cp. Lect. V., p. 241.

[9] xii. 341, 93.

artistry rose above the boyish conception of creation as a divine sport. It was a protest against an obligatory monotony of virtue, a plea for variety in the world.[1]

The life of Action demanded continuous endeavour. Without individual exertion (*purusha-kāra*) the divine appointment could not be fulfilled.[2] "Work must be done" is the sages' constant exhortation;[3] man's body may be God's instrument, but his spirit must be God's fellow-worker. The duties of the Four Castes are laid down at great length in the counsels of Bhīshma and in the Law-book of Manu.[4] Over their details rise two main demands: how should man worship the Powers above him, and how should he treat his fellow-men? To the gods he must offer sacrifice, to his fellow-men goodwill. The householder's daily duty included a simple five-fold ritual. He must make his offering to Brahman by teaching or studying the Veda; to the departed fathers by simple gifts of water and food; to the gods by the burnt oblation; to the Bhūtas ("beings," spirits of various kinds) by portions of the morning or evening meal of grain or rice and ghee; to men by hospitality to guests, especially by charities to Brāhmans.[5] Many more were the rites in the annual round, and large was the expenditure imposed upon the rich. Wealth, said the ascetic Devasthana to Yudhishthira, was provided by the Creator for sacrifice, and man was appointed to guard it and perform sacrifice. By such energy and lavishness did Indra exceed all the gods; and Çiva, clad in the deer-skin of a devotee, poured out his own self as a libation in a universal sacrifice,[6] and thus became the first of gods, reigning supreme over all creation.[7] By sacrifice

[1] *Lokasya chitratām.*

[2] *Daivaṃ na sidhyati*, xiii. 6, 7.

[3] *Karma kartavyam*, xii. 10, 28.

[4] *Mbh.*, xii–xiii. On the correspondences between them, and the implications of literary connection, see Buhler's Introd., p. lxxv ff., *SBE*, xxv.; Jolly, *Recht und Sitte*, p. 15.

[5] *Manu*, iii. 70.

[6] *Sarva-yajñe*, perhaps a sacrifice of all the animals (as Dr Morison kindly suggests to me, or perhaps of all belongings, cp. *Kaṭha Up.*, i. 1: *SBE*, xv. p. 1); or can there be an application to Çiva in his capacity as Creator of the ancient hymn which described the making of the world under the figure of the sacrifice of the primeval Purusha, Rig *Veda*, x. 90?

[7] xii. 20, 10–12; 26, 25.

Yudhishthira expiates his sins. When the unhappy king Janamejaya entreats the sage Shaunaka to tell him how to make his repentance effective, the sage enumerates five purifying agencies, sacrifice, charity, compassion, the Vedas, and truth.[1]

For the Four Castes nine duties are of universal obligation, the control of anger, truthfulness of speech, readiness to share, forgiveness, marital fidelity, purity of conduct, avoidance of malice, sincerity, and maintenance of dependants.[2] Specific caste duties are reduced by a curious fractional scale, passing by successive fourths from the Brāhman to the Çūdra.[3] But there is an inclusive morality which transcends them all. Very significant is the tale of the Brāhman forest-recluse Jājali.[4] He had practised the severest austerities. During the rainy season he slept under the open sky; in the summer he exposed himself to sun and wind; in the autumn he sat in water. Plunged in meditation and living upon air alone, standing erect in the woods, he allowed two birds to build their nest in the tangle of his unshorn hair. No thought of merit entered his heart as they laid their eggs and hatched their young and reared the brood, and he was still motionless. Then, as the young birds began to learn to fly, the parent birds disappeared; and at last the young birds who had made their first ventures in the air and returned to the nest, were absent for lengthening intervals and finally came back no more. Then pride entered the ascetic's heart. He bathed in a river and offered worship to the sun; and in his joy he cried aloud, "I have attained righteousness."[5] But a voice was heard from the sky, "Thou art not equal in righteousness to Tulādhāra of Benares!" Angered at the thought of a superior, he made his way to the city, and found Tulādhāra[6] selling herbs and fruits in a little shop. He rose and greeted the Brāhman with respect, and to his visitor's astonishment told him exactly what had brought him there. How had he gained such knowledge? asked Jājali. "I know the Eternal Righteousness," said the shopkeeper, "full of mysteries. It is the Ancient Righteousness which everyone

[1] xii. 152, 7.
[2] xii. 60, 7.
[3] xii. 36, 32.
[4] xii. 261 ff.
[5] xii. 261, 40.
[6] The "scale-holder."

knows, the welfare of all creatures, goodwill;[1] it is to be ever kindly to all, devoted to their well-being in thought, word, and deed. I do not beg, or quarrel, or hate anyone. To all alike I am the same. To all my scales are even." It is a sceptical doctrine,[2] objects Jājali, for it involves the abandonment of animal sacrifices. There is another way, replies Tulādhāra, the way of Renunciation.[3] For the essence of sin is covetousness, whence come anger, lust, and pride, and a terrible progeny of vices.[4] From it springs ignorance, in truth identical with it, for each can issue from the other with the same fruits and the same faults.[5] Within man's heart is a strange tree called Desire. Its root is Ignorance; Anger and Pride are its trunk; Envy its foliage, and Thirst the creepers that twine round its sides.[6] How shall these perils be overcome but by that persistent self-control, that steadfast surrender of all personal cravings and satisfactions of sense which will lead a man to see in his own self the Eternal and Supreme Self, to recognise his own nature in all creatures both without and within (in body and soul), and thus to be ready to give his all for others?[7]

The higher disciplines of Renunciation involved retirement into the forest, the practice of various forms of austerity, and finally the adoption of the life of a wandering mendicant. One of the fundamental tests of self-control was the principle of *ahiṃsā*, "non-injury," which forbade the taking of life, and required the patient endurance of every insect pest.[8] It led directly to the suspension of animal sacrifice. When the young Brāhman Medhavin instructed his father in the truths of the higher life, "How can one like me," he asked, "worship with animal sacrifices involving cruelty?"[9] The venerable Bhīshma cited the saying of King Vicharakhu, disgusted at the

[1] *Maitrā*, from *Mitra*, "friend." The Pāli *mettā*.

[2] *Nāstikya*, xii. 263, 3, cp. *ante*, p. 139.

[3] xii. 263, 33, *tyāga*.

[4] xii. 158, 1–20. Cp. *Bhag. Gītā*, i. 38; xiv. 12; xvi. 21.

[5] xii. 159, 9–12.

[6] xii. 254, 1–3. Cp. *trishṇā*, 276, 2, and the Buddhist *Dhammapada*, xxiv. 1, tr. Max Muller, *SBE*, x. p. 80.

[7] Cp. xii. 13, 11; 17, 23; 250, 6; 158, 22–25.

[8] This was already the practice of early Buddhism.

[9] xii. 175, 33. Cp. the story of Dharma as a deer, 272, *ante*, p. 138[6].

sight of a slaughtered bull and the sound of the groans of the kine, invoking a blessing on all the kine in the world, and quoted Manu on behalf of "non-injury."[1] The ideal of the recluse appealed strongly to Yudhishthira after the great battle, as he sorrowed for the dead. He thought of the hermit's serenity, his forbearance and self-control, his purity, humility, truthfulness, his renunciation and *ahiṃsā*,[2] and he longed to follow the same path. He would enjoy the fragrance of the flowers, and with pious hymns would offer fruits and spring water to the Fathers and the Gods.[3] But the relinquishment of royal state would also mean the abandonment of kingly duty. The sovereign was the great fount of prosperity for his people; for the king makes the age, and if his reign realises the excellence of one of the first three *yugas*, he attains proportionate bliss in heaven; but if he brings on the evils of the Kali age, he suffers innumerable years in hell.[4] And Yudhishthira yields, warned that the mendicant often failed to conquer his passions, and only assumed the brown robe and triple-headed staff to gain an easier livelihood; while the king's duties included every sort of renunciation, and renunciation had been declared eternal righteousness, the chief of all.[5]

Nevertheless for ordinary persons, even including the despised outcast, the wanderer's life with its demands for mastery over the senses, indifference to cold or hunger, and its appeal for inward concentration, gentleness and calm, remained the highest earthly attainment of religion. Here was the breach with the world and its lusts; here was freedom from the bonds of attachment to the fleeting and impermanent. By untiring austerity the secret of the universe could be won at last. Mighty was the power of *tapas*, the hidden glow which rose at the heart of external mortifications and lifted the devotee above the limits of common humanity. Knowledge revealed it as the source of all, the instrument of the Creator in the production of the world, the method by which the ancient sages won the Vedas.[6] Again and again it is identified with Truth or Reality.

[1] xii. 265, 1-5; cp. 268, 7 ff. *Manu*, iv. 148; vi. 52, 68, 69, 75.
[2] xii. 7, 6.
[3] xii. 9, 10.
[4] xii. 69, 70, 99 ff.
[5] xii. 63, 27.
[6] xii. 161, 1, 2.

It is the discipline of the higher morality; it leads to purity of soul, to self-control, and the conquest of hatred and desire.[1] It secures access to heaven even for the humblest, beneath the lowest of the four castes;[2] it is "the greatest good for living creatures";[3] it is the path by which the soul may cross the river of life and time, and on the eternal shore may win deliverance and enter Brahman. For the true penances are not rigidity of limb, or suppression of the breath, or protracted fasts; they are not acts done for the sake of "fruit"; they are moral victories over self, abstention from injuring others, truthfulness of speech, goodwill, compassion.[4] Cutting off the root of Desire, forgiving those who would speak ill of him, Manki made his way to the city of Brahman.[5]

VII

To the two spheres of Action and Renunciation very different destinies are attached. The older teaching had already distinguished between those who would come back to earth for further births, and those who would enjoy the bliss of Brahman and return no more.[6] In the elaboration of the doctrine of "fruit" it was necessary to provide some agency to conduct the reckoning of good and evil, and adjust the fitting consequences of happiness and pain. This process was placed under the old Vedic deity Yama, first of men to enter the heavenly world, where he shared the sovereignty of the lofty Varuna over the Fathers who were borne by the agency of Fire to the skies.[7] Already in the days of early Buddhism Yama has acquired the august function of judge of the dead, and as such he is the *Dharma-Rājā*, the King of Law or Righteousness. In this character he plays in the Epic a double part,[8] severe and awful to the guilty, beneficent and helpful to the just. He is

[1] xii. 190, 1; 196, 17.
[2] xii. 296, 14.
[3] xii. 232, 22.
[4] xii. 79, 18.
[5] xii. 177, 42, 50.
[6] Cp., for example, *Muṇḍaka Upanishad*, i. 2, 5–10: *SBE*, xv. p. 31, and ii. 2, p. 36. *Kaush. Up.*, i. 3 ff.: *SBE*, i. p. 275 ff.
[7] Cp. *Kaṭha-Up.*, i. 5 ff.: *SBE*, xv. p. 5.
[8] For example, i. 9, 13 f.; 55, 11; v. 42, 6.

Dharmendra,[1] "Dharma-in-chief," and no man can escape his dooms. The path to his realm lies to the south;[2] it must be traversed alone, without relative or friend; the voyager has no companions but his own good and evil deeds; Fire, Sun, and Wind may have lived in his body and been spectators of his conduct, but the soul is its own best witness of what it has done and what it has left undone.[3] The messengers of Yama act as guides, and they that have given food to the hungry and clothes to the naked pass along without want or weariness, but there is no water or shade of trees or resting-place, and the suffering of evildoers begins at once.[4] In Yama's hall are the officers of the Dharma-Rājā who have been appointed to count the allotted days and measure out the span of destiny;[5] and there, it would seem, the condemned are sentenced and dismissed to chastisement.[6] Threefold is the gate of Hell, Desire, Wrath, and Greed, working ruin to the soul; and threefold are the paths of Darkness.[7] There all kinds of offences against the rules of caste and ritual as well as against ordinary morality find their penalties. To give the leavings of a meal for the dead to a Çūdra, or to explain to him the sacred Law; to offer sacrifices without due title to their performance; for a Brāhman to speak ill of others even truly, or to act like a heron or display the characteristics of a cat—all lead to hell.[8] Sceptics, of course, go thither.[9] The acceptance of presents from an avaricious king who disobeys the sacred Law involves the long passage through twenty-one different hells in succession.[10] Of these a terrible list is given in the *Vishṇu-Smriti*;[11] they include hells of howling and darkness, the iron-spiked, the flaming river, and the forest whose leaves were swords.[12] The liar, the cheat, the hypocrite, are forced

[1] *Dharma* and *Indra*, vii. 6, 6.
[2] So already in *Brihad.-Ār. Up.*, iii. 9, 21: *SBE*, xv. p. 146.
[3] xii. 322, 50 ff. [4] xii. 199, 47 ff. [5] ii. 8, 32.
[6] Yama is, of course, absolutely impartial, treating all alike: ix. 50, 3.
[7] *Bhagavad Gītā*, xvi. 21.
[8] *Manu*, iii. 249; iv. 81; xi. 37. *Mbh.*, v. 45, 8. *Manu*, iv. 197.
[9] *Mbh.*, xiv. 50, 4.
[10] *Manu*, iv. 87–90.
[11] On the relation of this work to Manu, see Jolly, *SBE*, vii. p. xxii ff.
[12] Chap. xliii. p. 140.

to bathe in this dreadful stream, and then with limbs torn by the sword-leaved trees to lie down on a bed of axes.[1] When the last test is imposed upon Yudhishthira, and he reaches heaven, but does not find there his great-hearted brothers, he declares that heaven without them is no heaven for him, and obtains permission to join them. A celestial messenger guides him along the hideous path to hell, through darkness made horrible by rotting corpses, stinging gadflies, and the smell of sinners, to the awful river and the terrible forest. His companion has reached the limit of his mission, and invites the king to turn back. But piteous cries are heard from all sides as he does so. At first he does not recognise his brothers' voices, but as they identify themselves his decision is taken instantly; he bids the messenger return, and stays himself. And lo! the Dharma-Rājā, with a vast company of heavenly powers headed by Indra, suddenly appears; the darkness and the stench and the whole horrible scenes of torture vanish. Instead of the flaming river there flows the heavenly Ganges, hallowing the three worlds, sky, atmosphere, and earth, in which the king may bathe and change his human for a celestial body. His last trial is over; he has been shown hell, and has been willing in love to share its pain; and as he is escorted by Dharma to the world above, he finds his brothers already glorified in the land of light.[2]

[1] *Mbh.*, xii. 322, 31 f.

[2] xviii. 2–5. It may be noted that there is a tendency to modify the stringency of the doctrine of "fruit," and to make the condition of the departed dependent, at any rate in part, on the conduct of survivors. The whole ritual of the dead, which had for its object the provision of a suitable form for the deceased, rests on this idea, derived from cultus of great antiquity. The extinction of families brings dire results, for when the ancestral rites remain unperformed the Fathers fall into hell (*Bhag. Gītā*, i. 42). *Manu*, ix. 138, quotes a punning etymology of *puttra*, "son," because he delivers (*trayate*) his father from a hell called *Put*! The hermit Agastya had a vision of his ancestors hanging head downwards in hell, and on asking the reason he was told that it was through want of offspring (*Mbh.*, iii. 96, 14–17). He takes steps to produce a suitable wife, and finally a son is born, and his ancestors obtain the region they desire (99, 30). Prayer by holy men may be equally efficacious. The royal sage Pururavas attained heaven through the intercession of Brāhmans (xiii. 6, 31). The future even may be thus secured. Whoever bathes at the famous *tīrtha*

The hells were naturally beneath the earth, an imaginative development of the ancient pit of punishment for sinners of the Vedic age. But Yama's hall, though located in the South, does not seem to have been underground.[1] It is only one of a series of mansions or palaces belonging to the greater gods. They rise into the sky like clouds,[2] and far above it are many worlds beyond even Indra's vision.[3] Yama's hall had been built after long *tapas* by the great architect, Viçvakarman ("Maker of all"); and as Yama was the son of the Sun, it was resplendent like his sire's, though not so large.[4] There was the home of the Fathers over whom he reigned,[5] and they were often identified (as in the Vedic hymns) with the stars.[6] Neither grief nor old age is there; there royal sages and spotless Brāhmans, and multitudes who had performed great sacrifices or severe austerities, and even trees and plants in holy forms,[7] ministered to the king.

(or sacred bathing-place), at the meeting of the rivers Sarasvatī and Aruṇā, saves seven generations, both past and to come (iii. 83, 151–153). On the other hand, King Janamejaya, who has killed a Brāhman by carelessness, is told that all his ancestors have fallen into hell through his deed (xii. 150, 15). Worse still, the ancestors of anyone who hates Nārâyaṇa (see Lect. V., p. 265), "sink into hell *for ever*." What happens to the hater himself is left untold (xii. 347, 6). But the case is impossible, for the next verse declares that as Vishnu (= Nārâyana) is the soul of all beings, he cannot be hated, for in hating him one would hate his own self.—Buddhism had been compelled to admit the doctrine of the transference of merit for the benefit of others, *e.g.* by gifts of charity (cp. Childers, *Pāli Dict.*, s.v. *pattidāna*; Poussin, *The Way to Nirvāna*, p. 33). In the later inscriptions recording charitable endowments the motive of benefit to parents or other relatives is very frequent.—In the political philosophy expounded in *Mbh.*, xii., the solidarity between king and people is such that the king acquires a fourth part of the merit gained by his subjects under his virtuous rule, and if he neglects his duty he is laden with a fourth part of their sins: 75, vv. 6–8: (cp. 69, 79 ff., where it is laid down that the "king makes the age" for good or evil); v. 132, 12 ff.

[1] Against Fausboll, *Indian Mythology* (1903), p. 136. In iii. 163, 8–10, Yama's abode is on Mount Asta. The geography is in difficulties, because that was in the West.

[2] ii. 3, 25. [3] xiii. 73, 2. [4] ii. 8.

[5] v. 42, 6; ii. 8, 30. A distinction, however, is sometimes made (ix. 50, 27).

[6] Thus Arjuna beholds sages and heroes on his ascent to Indra's heaven, (iii. 42, 38 f.).

[7] *Mūrtimanto*, ii. 8, 32.

The hall of Indra, born of his deeds, was glorious as the sun. Like Yama's, it could move at his pleasure.[1] There, too, were holy sages, whose sins had been removed, like burning flames; the heavenly waters and plants; there Duty and Profit and Desire, the three ends of human action; there gifts to Brāhmans and the sacred formulæ of sacrifice; there heroes who had fought valiantly and fallen. In his city Amarāvatī, on the summit of Mount Mēru, was the abode of the venerable Thirty-Three, the deities of the Rig Veda. Glittering with jewels, shaded with trees yielding all sorts of fruits, with cool lakes and fragrant breezes,[2] it was the seat of Indra's sovereignty. On his ascent from the Himâlaya Arjuna was carried up past many palaces of the gods, like the golden houses of the immortals on Olympus, adorning the ancient Deva-way (*deva-yāna*), the counterpart for the higher righteousness of the *pitri-yāna* which led to the home of the Fathers.[3] Various were the conditions of access to it. Sometimes they were limited to devout sacrificers, austere hermits, or the mighty in battle.[4] With wider sympathy it might be affirmed that heaven had many doors.[5] It was the reward of those who cherished father and mother with filial piety, or who abstained from killing any living thing (*ahiṃsā*), or practised truth, or with pure souls suffered death at the hands of the wicked. There Yayāti, once king, then ascetic, who had learned never to return injury for injury, or to give pain to others by cruel words, and had discovered that there was no charm in the three worlds like compassion, good-will, charity, and gentle speech,[6] lived for a thousand years, and then rose higher yet to the abodes of the Lord of creation (Prajāpati) and Vishnu, god of gods.[7] But at length a terrible voice sounded "Ruined, Ruined, Ruined!" Proudly had he told Indra that he could find none in earth or heaven to equal him in ascetic merits. His vanity now met its punishment, and

[1] ii. 8, 34; 7, 2.
[2] iii 168, 46 ff.
[3] Cp. *Chhāndog. Up.*, v. 3, 2 ff.: *SBE*, i. p. 77. In the "Brāhmaṇa of a Hundred Paths" the gates of the Deva-world were placed in the N.E., and those of the Fathers' world in the S.E. (*SBE*, xli. p. 252; xliv. p. 424).
[4] iii. 43, 4–6.
[5] xii. 355, 9 ff.
[6] i. 87, 7–12.
[7] i. 89, 16–18.

he fell.[1] A boon from Indra limited his descent; he was to sink no further than the earth.[2] Upon the way he met a royal sage, Ashtaka, a king Pratardana, Vasumāna, and Çivi, who offer him the merits they have acquired and the felicity in the realms above to which they were entitled—so numerous (says Yayāti) that even if they stayed but seven days in each they could never traverse them all. But Yayāti refuses to accept such sacrifices. Then heavenly cars appear, and Ashtaka (who turns out to be his grandson) bids Yayāti enter and ascend, he and the others will follow in due time. Yayāti sees the shining path to heaven flash into view; the great deeds of the past and his kinsman's readiness of sacrifice have rescued him; and they mount together, Çivi rising swiftly above them in virtue of immeasurable good acts of liberality, truth, asceticism, and forgiveness, to win admittance to the heaven of Brahmā.[3]

Only the most virtuous and holy could enter there.[4] It has, indeed, no dimensions like those of the lower gods.[5] It rests upon no pillars, it is surrounded by no gardens; whoever would try to describe it, saying "It is like this," would see it assume a new aspect the next moment. Eternal and undecaying like the Grandsire who sat within, Creator of all by his own mystic power, it had no need of sun or moon to lighten it; self-luminous, it shed its brilliance everywhere. Round the Supreme were his mind-born sons, with Daksha at their head; there in wondrous personations were Mind, Space, Knowledge, Air, Heat, Water, Earth, the Senses, Nature, and Change, and the other

[1] Cp. i. 90, 22, seven gates (austerity, charity, etc.) of admission to heaven, which may all be lost through vanity.

[2] Such descent might occupy sixty or eighty thousand years! (90, 8).

[3] i. 92–93.

[4] See, for example, the attempt of Asita Devala to follow his silent guest, the ascetic mendicant Jaigīshavya, to that exalted height (ix. 50). After successfully passing through a great variety of regions where various kinds of ritual and asceticism were rewarded, he lost sight of him in the abode of chaste and devoted wives, and on trying to mount further found himself falling back. Jaigīshavya reaches the eternal realm; but when Devala returns to his hermitage, there to his amazement his guest is once more seated (ix. 50).

[5] See the narrative of Nārada, ii. 11.

causes of the world. The Science of Healing brought eight branches to the court: Purpose and Principle in ritual and sacrifice, Morality, Utility, and Pleasure,[1] Joy, even Hate, *Tapas*, and Self-Control, mingled with the ministering throng. The sacred Verses, the Libations, the Four Vedas, Seven Sounds,[2] Understanding, Patience, Memory, Wisdom, Intelligence, Fame, Forgiveness, Hymns, Dramas, Histories, the Wheels of Time and Virtue, and all orders of Creation, moving and moveless, a vast and motley multitude from gods to animals, joined in the ceaseless worship.[3] Seven ranks of Fathers were included, four in bodily form and three discarnate, presumably like the dwellers in the four upper Brahmā-worlds of the Buddhist scheme, simple effulgences, or shining flames.

Thither, so ran the tale, a heavenly messenger would fain have conveyed the pious Mudgala. With wife and son he lived a sage's life, under a vow to gain his food by picking up grains like a pigeon.[4] His hospitality never exhausted his store; it wondrously increased, so that hundreds of Brāhmans were maintained upon it. But a naked ascetic with a vast appetite again and again consumed the little hoard; yet he was always received with due courtesy, and Mudgala cheerfully abstained from eating. Such spotless charity was proclaimed with admiration in heaven, and an aerial car was sent to bear him in his own body to the skies. But Mudgala hesitated. "Tell me," he said, "what is the happiness of the worlds on high, and what their drawbacks." The Messenger was surprised. "This is, indeed," he thought, "a man of noble mind." He told of realm above realm, with wondrous fellowship among the wise, the self-controlled, the charitable, the brave, sages and gods of every degree; where envy and fear were unknown, and there was no grief or old age, no toil or lamentation. But there was

[1] The three aims of human life, *ante*, p. 160.

[2] Supposed to be metres, or perhaps the notes of the scale.

[3] Contrast, for example, the brevity and self-restraint of the Christian Apocalypse, *Rev.* iv., or the account of the Seven Heavens in the *Secrets of Enoch*.

[4] Cp. Korakkhattiya, whom the Buddha sees among the Bumms at Uttarakā on his hands and knees picking up food from the ground. But he comes to a bad end a week later! *Dīgha Nikāya*, xxiv. 7 (vol. iii. p. 6).

one drawback even in Brahmā's world. No new merit could be laid up there; and when the *karma* of the past was exhausted, the life of happiness would end, the garlands of those about to fall would fade, strange emotions would agitate the mind, and bitter regret would haunt the spirits forced to descend to a harder lot. "I do not desire heaven on those terms," says Mudgala; "I seek one without defect."[1] "There is one yet higher," replies the Messenger; "it is known by the name of Supreme-Brahman. It is for the unselfish and the humble-minded, for those who do not punish but forgive; who practise meditation and concentrate themselves on Knowledge."[2] And Mudgala stayed contentedly below, awaiting the hour of *Moksha*, when he should be released from the weariness and vicissitudes of change, and attain the Unchanging, the Highest Brahman.

At this point we touch the inmost heart of ancient Indian philosophy. Long before the rise of Buddhism or the early speculations of the Ionian thinkers, the forest sages of the Ganges valley had been haunted by the problems which, from Plato to Plotinus, occupied the Hellenic mind. Like Philo, they had a foundation in a sacred literature of mingled character; like Plutarch, they were confronted with a great ritual tradition; like Alexandrian Clement, they sought to find a path of knowledge which should lead them to immediate vision of the Ultimate Reality. As they reflected on their own experience, on the correspondences of sensation and thought which alone rendered human intercourse possible, and on the succession of changes in the world around them, two great questions pressed for answers.

"What is man?" they asked themselves; "how is it that he thinks and feels?" He has a body, they replied, and a Soul or Self, the *Ātman* within. But while this Self provided an explanation of the continuity of any single person's life-history, it suggested a further inquiry: "How is it that your feelings and mine agree, so that we see the same objects, hear the same

[1] The *Anugītā*, in *Mbh.*, xiv. 17, 41 f., implies that as there are degrees of happiness in heaven, there is dissatisfaction among some of the inhabitants at the more splendid dignity of others. Contrast the well-known episode of the nun Piccarda in the lowest circle of Dante's *Paradiso*.

[2] iii. 260, 45, *dhyāna* and *jñāna-yoga*.

sounds, think the same thoughts, and reason by the same processes? What is the Unity that shows itself in this Diversity?" And behind the multitude of separate selves a Highest Self dimly rose into the field of vision, unchanging like our mortality, the eternal ground of all our being, the Supreme, the *Paramâtman*. Not subject to conditions of locality, for it dwelt unseen, "smaller than the small," in every heart, and could not be contained in infinite space, it was the secret energy of all consciousness, veiled by the mysterious fabric of personality woven by Karma in the loom of Time. To escape from its meshes, from its network of pain, of unsatisfied longing, of baffled hope and sundered affection, became the aspiration of reflective minds, seeking to rise above the turbulence of passion and the bitterness of disappointment and grief into the peace of union with the Universal Self.

If the conception of the *Ātman* supplied an interpretation of one aspect of human experience, there remained another problem no less insistent. What was the cause, not of its identities from one individual to another, but of the changes within any single consciousness from dawn to eve? What was the world, whence came it, and how were its ever-varying events to be combined into a single whole? Ancient imagination had piously meditated on the hidden power of spell and prayer known as *Brahman*; and as this rose into the force that moved the gods, it supplied a term for the august cause of the universe, just as the *Ātman* was the accepted symbol of the interior unity of human thought. Earth and sky, present and future, found their reality in it. It burst the bounds of ritual use, escaped from sacerdotal control, left the priest-magician behind, and passed out into the field of speculative thought. There it became a vast metaphysical entity, the One whose boundless being embraced the All, the foundation of every kind of existence. A gross figure might depict the gods as all shut up in it like cows in a cow-house.[1] With more refinement the idea might be applied to the human person, where vigour of limb and capacity of intelligence were both due to its presence. So the heart was a city of Brahman, where five door-keepers were posted, mysterious correspondences of breathing,[2] connected with various physical

[1] *Atharva Veda*, xi. 8, 32.

[2] The *Prâṇas*, cp. above, p. 11.

organs and cosmic powers. Here was the Brahman's palace, abode of the small "ether"[1] which was identical with infinite space, for both heaven and earth are contained in it, fire and air, sun and moon, lightning and stars. In transcendental cosmography of this kind the part may include the whole. This is no matter of localities and measurements, but of chambers of imagery and adventures of mind. The natural result was that when the Ātman and the Brahman met, the one from the depths of consciousness, the other from the immensity of the world, they coalesced, and became joint expressions of the great mystery. The teacher who unfolded the secret of existence to his pupil, summed it up in the formula, "*Tat tvam asi*," "That (the Ātman) art thou";[2] and the enlightened disciple did not shrink from the solemn recognition, "*Aham Brahmâsmi*," "I am Brahman."[3] But this view of Brahman tended to raise him into some kind of sovereignty over other powers. He was their commander (*adhipati*), king of all beings, protector (*bhūtapāla*), Lord.[4] So he became more than a pervasive energy, an impersonal principle of pure intelligence, vaguely omnipresent, infinite, indestructible; he was realised as the Creator of the world, the Author of its life, the Disposer of its destiny. Thus conceived he was the *Satya*, the "True," the reality of the existing scene. But behind the *Satya* lay the *Satyasya Satyam*, the Real of the real, the ultimate Reality, the Absolute,[5] *avyaktam uttamam*, the Unmanifest, the Last, or Highest.[6]

Here is the Indian equivalent of the Hellenic τὸ ὀντῶς ὄν. It is incapable of definition, for it can only be described by negatives.[7] Brahman cannot be comprehended, or perish or decay; it is infinite and undying; simple in nature, uncom-

[1] *Ākāça*, which is both ether and space.

[2] *Chhāndog. Up.*, vi. 8, 7: *SBE*, i. p. 101.

[3] *Brihad. Up.*, i. 5, 17: *SBE*, xv. p. 96.

[4] *Ibid.*, ii. 5, 15; iv. 4, 22. The root *īç* yields the forms *īça*, *īçâna*, *içvara*, the last being the accepted term for Lord or God in the Sanskrit version of the Hebrew Scriptures.

[5] Compare the Monad of the Pythagoreans, and Plato's phrase of the Good which is beyond (ἐπέκεινα) the existence and essence of things known (*Rep.*, vi. 587).

[6] *Katha Up.*, ii. 6, 7. Cp. more fully below, p. 194.

[7] "Na, na" (no, no). *Brih. Up.*, iii. 9, 26; iv. 4, 22; iv. 5, 15.

posite,[1] unattached to external objects, unbound to a world of change involving instability, apprehension, suffering.[2] Every effort is thus made to free the presentation from all contact with the impermanent, the world of want and pain and death. It cannot be expressed in dimension, for Brahman is at once greater than all three worlds, earth, air, and sky, and yet smaller than a grain of rice or mustard-seed. Similarly it cannot be identified with duration. There is no counting its years; it abides in the Deathless. Immutability, not endless succession, is the mark of the Eternal.

But three characteristics are, after all, ascribed to the Unmanifest. The Undeveloped Brahman possesses Being, Knowledge, and Bliss or Joy. As the Real of the real Brahman of course *is* (*asti*), and can be designated *sat* (existent, the neuter participle of the verb "to be"). In the chapter on "Bliss"[3] it is expressed by three terms: *satya* or reality, *jñāna* or knowledge, and *ananta*, the infinite.[4] As the ultimate existence Brahman is the sole Knower, and includes all knowledge. The very essence of its being is *vijñāna*, understanding or comprehension. It is the Brahman which does all the seeing and hearing without being seen or heard; apart from it there is none that sees or hears, that comprehends or knows.[5] It is in that character that its world is light, and Brahman's Self the "light of lights." To understanding Yājñavalkya adds *ānandā*, Bliss or Joy.[6] "He who knows Brahman as Reality, Knowledge, and Infinity, hidden in the depth of the heart and in the highest ether or farthest space, he enjoys all blessings, at one with the omniscient

[1] Cp. Philo's epithets, φύσις ἁπλῆ, ἀμιγής, ἀσύγκριτος.

[2] It is in this sense that Brahman is often said to be "without fear."

[3] *Taittirīy. Up.*, ii. 1: *SBE*, xv. p. 54.

[4] There would seem, however, to be two modes of reality, experiential or phenomenal, and metaphysical. The world is to us relatively *sat*, but as subject to change it is metaphysically *asat*. Thus we hear of *amritaṃ satyena channam*, "the Deathless veiled by the Real," where the *satya* is the phenomenal scene which covers and conceals the eternal (*Brihad. Up.*, i. 6, 3: *SBE*, xv. 1, 6, 3). The *satya* is explained as "name and form," *nāma-rūpa*, the summary expression for everything which falls within the cognisance of the senses.

[5] *Brihad. Up.*, iii. 9, 28, 17; iv. 5, 15: *SBE*, xv. pp. 151, 185.

[6] *SBE*, xv. 151, 157.

Brahman."[1] Negatively this bliss consists in freedom from the mutations and alarms of the world of birth and suffering, decay and death. It is more difficult to say what are its positive characteristics. But in the symbolic figure of the Brahman as bliss we are told that love is its head, joy its right side, and bliss its trunk; and the sages asked, "Who could breathe, who live, if that bliss were not in the *ākāça* (either the "vasty deep," in which the universe originated, or the mysterious ether in the heart)? for it is that alone which creates bliss." "God," said Browning's Paracelsus, "tastes an infinite joy in infinite ways." Here is the root of the famous formula of later days, that Brahman is *Sachchidānanda*,[2] "Being, Thought, and Joy."

The worshipper under the ancient ritual had sought the fellowship of the deity to whom his sacrifice was offered. He would be admitted to union with Agni or Varuna or Indra (*sāyujya*) in the world which the god of his choice deigned to share with him (*salokatā*).[3] Another form of devotion, the reading of the Veda in a particular way, freed the believer from liability to death in the realms above, and gave him entrance into the very Self (*Ātman*) of Brahman (*sâtmatā*).[4] Here was a preparation for a possible escape from the rigid consequences of the Law of the Deed. True, in the broad sense, every act produced its fruit. To acts of ceremonial propriety, of household duty, of pious alms, of military valour, of royal responsibility for the welfare of the realm, appropriate merit and reward were attached. But might not these be done for their own sake in fulfilment of sacred ordinance, without thought of future gain? In detachment from the world, in the practice of self-control, in the avoidance of injury to any creature, in the suppression of anger against the froward, might it not be possible to reach a mood in which action was no longer dictated

[1] *Taittirīy. Up.*, ii. 1.

[2] *Sat, chit, ānanda*, reduced to one compound word.

[3] "Brāhmana of the Hundred Paths," ii. 6, 4, 8: *SBE*, xii. p. 450; xi. 6, 2, 2–3; *ibid.*, xliv. p. 113. Cp. *sâyujya*, in *Chhāndog. Up.*, ii. 20, 2: *SBE*, i. p. 32; *Brihad. Up.*, i. 3, 22; 5, 23: *SBE*, xv. pp. 82, 98; *Maitr. Up.*, iv. 1; vi. 22: *SBE*, xv. pp. 299, 321.

[4] *Ibid.*, xi. 5, 6, 9: *SBE*, xliv. p. 99.

by the desire for heaven or the fear of hell?[1] Life in the body must, indeed, always involve some kind of action, for thought and feeling were inward acts like word and deed externally. But the "fruits" of action might be renounced. The soul, thus purified from the lusts of the world, turned its gaze within, and there discerned at first dimly and with difficulty, and at last with growing clearness and joy, the likeness of the Universal Self.

This was the meaning of the distinction already noted between "acts which secure the fulfilment of wishes in this world or the next" (*pravritta*), and those which are performed without any desire for reward, preceded by the acquisition of true knowledge (*nivritta*).[2] The gods, indeed, even Brahman himself in his Manifested form as Creator, have adopted the Religion of Action; they have not followed the path beyond all change and decay; they have not known the joy of Liberation.[3] But there is a Brahman described in the Vedânta,[4] the home of those who have made the great Renunciation, and striven by self-discipline and inward concentration to reach the region of eternal peace.

The way, indeed, was not easy. To the worldly mind poverty was no road to tranquillity of heart. Life in the forest had its own dangers and hardships; berries and roots were not always

[1] *Mbh.*, xii. 201, 12. Similarly the Sūfī Rábía al-Adawiyya (eighth century A.D.): "O God, if I worship thee for fear of Hell, send me to Hell; and if I worship thee in hopes of Paradise, withhold Paradise from me" (Browne, *Literary History of Persia* (1902), p. 426). Readers of De Joinville will recall the figure of the strange woman whom St Louis' envoy Ives met near Acre carrying a porringer of fire in one hand and a vial of water in the other, bent on burning up paradise and extinguishing hell, that God might no longer be sought through fear of pain or in the hope of joy, but only for the surpassing value of his own love. Compare the state of freedom attained by men "enlightened by the true Light," who have "lost the fear of pain or hell and the hope of reward in heaven" (*Theologia Germanica*, x.).

[2] *Manu*, xii. 89: *SBE*, xxv. p. 503; cp. above, p. 160.

[3] *Mbh.*, xii. 341, 10 ff.

[4] *Ibid.*, xii. 238, 11. The term is of rare occurrence in the Mahābh., and refers apparently to the teaching of the Upanishads, not to the later systematic philosophy known by this title. Cp. Hopkins, *The Great Epic of India*, p. 93.

an agreeable diet; bark clothes were rough to sensitive skins; to sleep on the ground with no other pillow but an arm was to court (at any rate at first) bad nights; and severer mortification called for the sacrifice of sleep altogether. Retreat to a hermitage involved separation from wife and child as well as the surrender of prospects of wealth and advancement. The life of a wandering mendicant, without even a rude hut of boughs for shelter, demanded yet sterner austerity, the humiliation of begging for food, exposure to contempt, to gibes and taunts, harder to bear than days and nights of wind and rain or agonies of disease. Graver still was the battle with spiritual pride, in which many a victory was lost; burdensome was the necessity of incessant watchfulness, for the city of the soul was constantly assailed by enemies within as well as without. Only the highest ranks of holiness could transcend this obligation. He who had reached complete self-restraint, had gained the mastery of desire, and severed all attachments to the things of sense, might take the vow *Ajārgara*, "non-vigilance,"[1] which lifted him above all the prohibitions laid on the ordinary ascetic. He might pass days without food or be replenished with dainties; sleep on the naked earth or a palace couch; be clad in rags or sackcloth, deer-skins or costly robes. To preserve an even mind through these alternations, to recognise the Self in all created beings, to see all created beings in the Self, and thus to rise into impartial goodwill to all—this was the result of the twofold discipline of Knowledge (*jñāna*) and Concentration (*yoga*).[2] This was the secret of deliverance from the vicissitudes of birth and death, from all liability to future sin, and it secured entrance into Brahman, or union with the Most High. What then were the implications of this august issue of life's conflict? What did the "attainment of Brahman" really mean? When the sage or the saint was said to become a *Brahma-bhūta*, "Brahma-being," what was his condition?

Like all spiritual states, it could only be expressed by figures and described by symbols. Sometimes it would seem to be

[1] xii. 179, 25; or, perhaps, "non-wakefulness," in the sense of not keenly looking out for opportunities of self-gratification.

[2] Cp. *Manu*, xii. 91, 118, 125.

reached in this life; sometimes the passage to it lies through death. The language of poetry is not systematic, like the terms of technical philosophy; and in the discourses with which the narrative is sometimes long suspended for the recital of traditional teaching the same terms may be employed with different shades of meaning. The first and indispensable element in the process of Liberation (*moksha*) is the conquest of Self. It is sometimes presented in the form of an inner conflict between the powers of Death and Brahman. "The two-lettered word *mama* ('mine') is veritable Death, the three-lettered opposite *na-mama* ('not-mine') is eternal Brahman. These entering unseen into the soul cause creatures to act."[1] Usually, however, the whole stress falls on the human initiative. Withdraw all your desires from outward circumstance and condition, like a tortoise drawing in all his limbs; live without fear, cherish no hate, control all pride, commit no sin in deed, word, or thought; break the fetters of affection for wife and child or for sacrifice and ritual, abandon the house made for the soul by its past works like the liberated silkworm quitting its temporary cell, and you may then ascend first of all to the stainless ether (the abode of Brahman), and freed from all ties in the Great One behold Him who has no marks.[2] The way of attainment is not a method of reasoning or inference, it is an immediate vision. The mind that is free from passion reaches the "serene and blessed mood" in which it learns to "see into the life of things"; "recognise the *Ātman* in all things and all things in the *Ātman*, and you will attain to Brahman."[3] This may be the achievement of the present life. When Manki had suffered many disappointments in the quest of wealth and had lost his last two bulls, he learned the great lesson of renunciation, and sang a song of victory and peace; he was "stablished on Brahman," as one who plunged from summer heat into a cool lake, he had found his way to the deathless city of Brahman, where he would pass his days in happiness like a king.[4] For

[1] xii. 13, 4–5. Sanskrit letters included the sound *a*; *mama* is thus a word of two letters. Cp. xiv. 13, 3; 53, 30.

[2] xii. 26, 14–15; 219, 45–46.

[3] xii. 239, 21; 17, 23; cp. *Manu*, xii. 125.

[4] xii. 177, 48, 50; cp. 12, 25.

such a conqueror over Desire what was the meaning of physical death?

If it is true, said King Janaka, that no one retains any knowledge on leaving this world, what do we gain by knowledge or lose by ignorance? If that is Liberation, all acts of religion end in annihilation.[1] The answer is that the ascertainment of truth is the highest aim of Existence; this is the seed (of Emancipation); the Undecaying, the Great One, is Intelligence (*buddhi*).[2] An ancient tale[3] related how a pious Brāhman, long practised in austerities and devoted to the recitation of the Vedas, and King Ikshvāku, offspring of the Sun, were received into Brahman. The goddess of the sacred Gāyatrī verse promised the ascetic that he should be visited by Dharma, Time, Death, and Yama, and as he gave them the usual courtesies of hospitality and water for their feet, the king arrived in the course of a pilgrimage to sacred shrines and waters. After a long discourse with these dread powers on duties and merits, and the Brāhman's offer to the king of all the fruits acquired by his recitation, a dispute arises which is settled by the intervention of Heaven in personal form, who declares them both equal in merit. Finally a great apocalypse of Indra and the heavenly hosts takes place, trumpets sound and songs are heard from the sky, Heaven once more pronounces a blessing on the hallowed pair, and they gather their five *Prāṇas* for departure from the body.[4] Successive acts of internal control bring their souls within the brain, and passing through the suture of the skull they mount as flames of surpassing brightness to the third heaven. The Grandsire advanced to receive them with words of welcome: "Live you in me," and thus speaking he gave them again perpetual consciousness. Thus freed from trouble, they entered the divine Grandsire's mouth.[5] In this pictorial ascension the Unmanifest is partially presented in a visible scene, and the two saints are figured as radiances like the dwellers in the topmost Brahmā-heavens of Buddhist imagination, or the shining spirits of Dante's Paradise. Usually, indeed, the language of the poets is more restrained.

[1] xii. 219, 2–3.
[2] *Ibid.*, 13.
[3] xii. 199.
[4] Cp. Lect. I., p. 11.
[5] xii. 200, 25–26.

They cannot escape from the analogy of space, they must employ verbs of motion,[1] implying some kind of local transfer to the region of the Eternal and the Uncreate. That is inevitable when the conditioned strives to approach the Unconditioned. It is more important to observe that he who enters that high realm as a *Brahma-bhūta*, a "Brahma-being,"[2] one who is fit for the Brahma-state and able to enjoy his grace,[3] does not necessarily lose all individuality. Those who are set free from birth and death, who have reached the Most High, the Undeveloped, the Ever-Firm, and are no longer in the bonds of opposite pairs like pleasure and pain, love and hate, joy and sorrow, in thought or deed, are alike (*sama*) to all, are ever friendly, and delight in the welfare of all creatures.[4] There are, indeed, phrases which may imply the disappearance of all consciousness in *Brahma-nirvāṇa*. In the stainless Brahmā who is also alike to all, they rest "compassed around by extinction";[5] yet Brahman may be also said to shine forth in them.[6] The union is figured in the ancient image of smaller rivers flowing into larger, and the larger losing themselves in the sea;[7] yet this also could be applied with different meanings in different schools of philosophy. When the individual soul

[1] Thus *gacchati*, i. 62, 36; *adhigacchati*, vi. 29, 6; *sampadyate*, i. 75, 51; *āpnoti*, vi. 42, 50; *abhyeti*, 205, 7; *praviçati*, 200, 25; and so often. For Çankara's later interpretation of language of this type, cp. his commentary on the Vedânta-Sūtras, *SBE*, xxxviii. p. 400. How inevitably the mystic uses the figure of entry into Deity may be seen in the words of Augustine: "Quid est credere in Deum? Credendo amare, credendo diligere, credendo *in eum ire*, et ejus membris incorporari." *In Joh. Evang.* vii. tract. xxix. 6.

[2] There were various classes of *bhūtas*, from those to whom the householder made daily offerings upwards (*Manu*, iii. 70, 80 f.). The term is often added to another word to denote becoming like, consisting of, united with; and in composition with Brahman this meaning may have different degrees of intensity for different interpreters.

[3] *Brahma-bhūyāya kalpate*, vi. 38, 26; 42, 53–4; xii. 160, 25; 215, 21; xiv. 42, 47.

[4] *Samāḥ sarvatra maitraçca sarva-bhūta-pite ratāḥ*, xii. 241, 14.

[5] xii. 29, 26 = *Bhag. Gītā*, v. 26 (Barnett). The student must, of course, always ask what it is that "goes out" or is extinguished.

[6] xiv. 42, 14.

[7] xii. 219, 42, cp. *Brihad Up.*, iv. 5, 12: *SBE*, xv. p. 184; *Chhând. Up.*, vi. 10: *SBE*, i. p. 102.

drops all its personal characteristics and is received into the Universal Soul, all difference ceases. Even in this world the trained disciple may be "posited in Brahman";[1] rapt without spot into the home of his being in deathless conjunction, the highest end.[2]

But the doctrine of Brahman does not end here. Two new figures appear at his side, acquire his attributes, and even surpass him in glory. "The Father-God (Prajāpati)," says the poet,[3] "has three *avasthās*, states or conditions. In the form of Brahman he creates; having a human body (as Vishnu-Krishna) he protects; and in the form of Rudra he destroys." Who are these deities, and whence did they acquire such shares in the administration of the world? How was it that it could be confessed with naked selfishness that "Men worship Çiva the Destroyer because they fear him; Vishnu the Preserver because they hope from him; but who worships Brahmā the Creator? *His work is done*"?[4]

[1] xiv. 26, 17, *Brahmaṇi samāhitaḥ*

[2] xii. 302, 78–9.

[3] iii. 271, 47.

[4] Quoted without reference by Hopkins, *India, Old and New*, p. 113. In the ninety thousand odd couplets of the poem I have not been able to find the passage.

LECTURE IV

PHILOSOPHY IN THE GREAT EPIC

Behind the popular religion depicted in the multitudinous forms of mythology stand different types of philosophical thought. Through all the vicissitudes of the fortunes of the Five Brothers the problems of life are never long out of sight. The origin of the world, the demands of human duty, the nature and destiny of the soul, provide the themes for innumerable discourses. The theories of sacrifice worked out with so much detail in the ritual treatises for the instructions of the Brahmanical celebrants are here ignored. They did not concern the layman, and the story of the Sons of Pandu was a layman's tale. It came out of the chants of heroic deeds sung by the court-bards, not from the guilds of the priesthood engaged in elaborating their ceremonial and extending their professional claims. It rests indeed upon a sacred tradition, in charge of a sacred caste. The Brāhmans are not slow to vindicate the superiority of their order. But they are by no means the only leaders of the intellectual life; from ancient times the path of speculation had been open; and kings had guided those who proudly declared themselves "human gods" along the way to higher truth. Even Yājñavalkya, perhaps the most original thinker of Indian antiquity, who first sketched the outlines of a scheme of absolute idealism, received instruction from the Videha King Janaka of Mithilā.[1] Tradition told of the hundred

[1] *Çatap. Brāhm.*, xi., vi. 2, 4 ff.: *SBE*, xliv. 113. The grateful Brāhman granted his royal teacher a boon, and Janaka chose the privilege of asking questions when he wanted. When Yājñavalkya visited him one day at his capital as he was giving audiences, "Have you come for cows or questions?" he inquired. "For both," promptly replied the Brāhman. The

teachers at his court, and his dissatisfaction with their views of the nature of the soul and its destiny after death.[1] Tale after tale rehearses the answers given to inquiring rulers on the values of different objects and modes of life, and the prospects of extinction or deliverance hereafter. There are descriptions of the process of the periodic creation and dissolution of the world; expositions of psychology and metaphysics; vindications of the Law of the Deed; ethical discourses on the duties of the four castes, or the conduct appropriate to successive stages in the career of the Twice-born, as student, householder, forest-hermit, and wandering mendicant. Janaka lectures the lady devotee Sulabhā,[2] who, however, turns the tables on her critic, and, like other pious women, asserts her right to the independent practice of the higher disciplines. From time to time small bodies of teaching under famous names are inserted in the text, such as the discourses of Mārkandeya (iii. 182–231) and Sanatsujāta (v. 41–46),[3] the consolations of Vidura (xi. 2–7), the instructions of Parāshara to Janaka (xii. 291–299). This last group is only an item in the manifold recitals of traditional wisdom ascribed to the dying warrior Bhīshma, who gathers up the wealth of his experience on his bed of arrows for the benefit of the victors in the great battle. Two complete poems, steeped in religious philosophy, are thus accommodated at different points in the story, the Bhagavad Gītā (vi. 25–42) and the less known Anugītā (xiv. 16–51). Reserving the first of these for separate treatment later on, let us briefly trace the movements of thought reflected in the life-panorama of the Epic.

Five current systems are recognised in one of the latest sections of the poem under the names of Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Pañcharātra, Vedas, and Paçupati.[4] Of these the Sānkhya and Yoga are frequently exhibited in close affinity, so that the

king proceeds with a long series of inquiries which draws from Yājñavalkya an exposition of the philosophy of the Absolute and the delighted sovereign offers himself and his people to be the teacher's slaves (*Brihad-Ār. Up.*, iv. 1–4: *SBE*, xv. pp. 152–180).

[1] *Mbh.*, xii. 218, 4 f.

[2] *Ibid.*, 321.

[3] The Mārkandeya section contains a smaller group, the counsel of a pious fowler to a Brāhman named Kauçika (205–215).

[4] xii. 350, 63; cp. 349, 82.

second may even be included in the first.[1] Oldest of all is the Vedâranyaka (or, as it is elsewhere called, Vedânta), the teaching of the Âranyakas or forest-books, with their appended Upanishads, which formed the end (*anta*) or close of the Veda in the character of Revelation. Here was the first great literary deposit of Indian speculation. Its fundamental conceptions supplied the starting-point either for inner development or for different types of rationalist reaction. A brief sketch must therefore be offered to indicate the main position which it occupied in the wondrous metaphysical web woven through the centuries by the subtle Indian mind.[2]

I

The Vedic poets, looking out on the varied aspects of earth and sky, the sunshine and the storm, the mountains and the waters and the star-lit heaven, had sung of the wondrous building of the world, and sought to describe the nature of the "One with many names." The high gods might be linked into groups like complex personalities, or actually identified with each other in function and power. The ancient seers handed on their problems to later generations, and fresh answers were devised for which new terms must be invented. One day five Brâhman priests met in the house of a member of their order, Aruna Aupaveçi, and the talk fell on Agni (fire, *i.e.* heat) in his universal aspect (*Vaiçvânara*), a cosmic principle underlying the whole world.[3] The disputants could not agree, and they proceeded to lay the difficulty before King Açvapati Kaikeya, who was reputed to "know Vaiçvânara thoroughly." They were received with due honours and royally entertained with sacrifice and gifts. The next morning they had come to no agreement, so they took fuel in their hands like pupils to a

[1] *Mbh.*, xii. 350, 1.

[2] Besides the translations by Max Müller (*SBE*, i. and xv., and Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishads*, 1897), the student will find different presentations in Gough, *Philosophy of the Upanishads* (1882); Deussen, *Philosophy of the Upanishads* (tr. Geden, 1906); Oltramare, *L'Histoire des Idées Théosophiques dans l'Inde* (1906); Speyer, *Die Indische Theosophie* (1914); Oldenberg, *Die Lehre der Upanishaden* (1915).

[3] *Çatap. Brâhm.*, x., vi. 1, in *SBE*, xliii. p. 393.

teacher, and besought the king to instruct them as disciples. He asks in turn what each one recognises as Vaiçvānara. They name successively great powers or objects in the world of sense, earth, water, ether, wind, sun, sky. None has the true secret which lies in the unity of *Purusha*, "spirit," of which all visible existence is the manifestation.[1] Immediately after, in the famous philosophical *credo* of a teacher named Çāndilya, Purusha is described as a smokeless light, shining like bright gold within the heart; it is unconfined by space, for while it is small as a grain of rice, it is larger than earth and sky; and, as the unity which encompasses and pervades all existence, it bears two names: it is the *True Brahman*, and the *Ātman* or Self.

Here are the terms with which later speculation will be concerned. Each (as we have already seen) had a long history behind it. Centuries before the development of metaphysical speculation the ancient singers had employed the term *brahman* in meanings ranging from "spell" to "prayer." Here in the venerable words connected with the sacrifice lay a mysterious power which could even constrain the gods. The "triple knowledge" contained in the three Vedas first acknowledged as authoritative was a sort of medium or expression of this power.[2] It was the key to the priestly philosophy which interpreted the ritual order first as the reproduction, and then as the actual maintenance, of the cosmic order. Brahman thus became the designation of the creative energy. It was the fountain-head of the whole stream of existence; the "first-born," yet without a sire,[3] the *svayambhū* or "self-existent." It has its low and vulgar side, to point a spell against worms, or impart energy to an amulet;[4] but on the other hand it is exalted into the sovereignty over earth and sky, the present and the future, which all find their reality within it.[5] The Brahman thus escapes from the sacerdotal web, and rises above the control of

[1] *Purusha*, man, or male, has acquired in the philosophical terminology of the Upanishads the more abstract meaning of "spirit."

[2] Cp. Winternitz, *Gesch. der Ind. Lit.*, i. (1908), 211.

[3] In *Çatap. Br.*, vii., iv. 1, 14, in application to the sun. Elsewhere, to Agni and Bṛihaspati.

[4] *Atharva Veda*, v. 23, 10; x. 6, 30.

[5] *Ibid.*, x. 2, 24 f.; x. 8, 1.

the priest-magician. It passes into the field of speculative thought, and becomes a vast metaphysical quantity, the ultimate Unity which embraces all things. Brahman is without end in space or time, infinite in extension, eternal in duration. It is the abiding substance within all change, and is capable of identification with everything in turn.

What, then, was its relation to the human being? If it contained all present and future existence, it was the strength of the bodily life and the essence of the conscious life. The energy of limb and the process of thought alike found their explanation in it. We have already cited the parable of the "City of Brahman" in the heart. Five "deva-openings" let out five forms of breathing (*Prāṇas*[1]), which are the means of various physical blessings, connected with different organs, in mysterious correspondence with certain cosmic powers like sun and fire and rain. These are the "five men of Brahman,"[2] the doorkeepers of the heavenly world. In the midst is the palace of Brahman, which is smaller than a mustard-seed, and yet vast as infinite space, for heaven and earth are contained within it. Imagination is not concerned with facts of physiology or astronomy, but with realities of spirit. Let no one say, therefore, that by the old age of the body Brahman also waxes old, or by the death of the body Brahman perishes; Brahman is the true Brahma-city, and in it all desires are contained.[3] Or, starting from the ancient figure of creation by the sacrifice of the cosmic Man (*Purusha*[4]), a later Upanishad described the issue of all kinds of beings from the Imperishable, like sparks from a fire.[5] From him, as he became personalised in creation, were born breath (*manas*[6]), and all organs of sense, ether, air, light, water, earth. Fire is his head; the sun and moon his eyes; the wind his breath; his heart the universe. From him come the devas, men, cattle, birds, the up and down breathings. Mountains

[1] Cp. Lect. I., p. 11. [2] *Chhândog. Up.*, iii. 13: *SBE*, i. p. 47.
[3] *Ibid.*, viii. 1: *SBE*, i. p. 126.
[4] *Rig Veda*, x. 90.
[5] *Mund. Up.*, ii. 1: *SBE*, xv. p. 34.
[6] Said to be identical philologically with *mens*, mind; but psychologically limited to the "common sensory" which co-ordinates sense-impressions and converts them into perceptions.

and seas and rivers are from him, all herbs and juices, rice and corn for sacrifice, austerity,[1] faith, truth, the religious life,[2] and law. In short, Purusha is this All, Brahman the Deathless. "He who knows this, hidden in the cave of the heart, scatters the knot of ignorance here on earth."[3]

The problem of the external world thus begot a theology and a cosmology. But there was another field of investigation. How is it that we feel and think? What is the explanation of our self-consciousness, the secret of individuality? The answer to this question was supplied by the doctrine of the *Ātman* or Self. The root of the word is commonly found in a verb meaning "to breathe," and the term is thus assimilated to the long series of names which may be gathered from language all round the world connecting the soul with the breath.[4] The Self may be viewed under different aspects. It may include the whole bodily presence which marks a man off from the world of objects around him, and from other personalities like his own. Or it may be identified with that which gives life and secures continuity of existence, placed by primitive physiology now in the breath, now in the blood. Once more, it may be regarded as the agent which can both receive impressions and initiate activity, can on occasion leave the body and encounter new experiences, and serve as the permanent ground of both conscious and unconscious being.

Many were the attempts to fix precisely the seat of this mysterious power. Where did it reside, asked the early thinkers; how should it be recognised and defined? The answers were numerous, and rested fundamentally on two different planes of thought, the lower animism and the higher

[1] *Tapas*; the rendering "penance" has unsuitable theological implications.

[2] *Brahmacharya*, involving the control of the senses and passions.

[3] *Mund. Up.*, ii. 1, 10: *SBE*, xv. p. 35. An interesting exposition of this Upanishad will be found in the *Calcutta Review*, lxvi. (1878), p. 314 ff., from the pen of Mr A. E. Gough.

[4] Deussen's bold attempt to derive it from a combination of the first person and demonstrative pronouns (*a* in *aham*, I, and *ta*, this = "this I"), *Gesch. der Ind. Phil.*, i. p. 285, has not found support. The Petersburg lexicographers propose a root *an*; Curtius, Grassmann, and others a root *av*, comparing ἄυτμή, *athem*, etc.

metaphysic. Prajāpati, the "lord of creatures," so ran the tale,[1] once proposed as the object of quest and comprehension "the Self which is free from sin, from old age, death, and grief; which desires nothing but what it ought to desire, and imagines nothing but what it ought to imagine." The Devas and the Asuras, now opposed as gods and demons, hear the announcement and the promise—"He who has searched out that Self and understands it, obtains all worlds and all desires." Without communicating with each other, they approach Prajāpati as students, and wait patiently thirty-two years till he inquires why they are there. They answer that they wish for that Self. The teacher informs them that it is the Purusha seen in the eye. The reply has a double meaning; the hearers understand it like the Macusi Indians, who supposed that when the body dies "the man in the eye" is set free to move about.[2] The pupils, however, have a fresh question ready. "Who is it who is perceived in the water, or in a mirror?" "Look into a pan of water," says Prajāpati; "what do you see?" "We see the Self altogether down to the very hairs and nails." "Well," says the god, "put on your best clothes and ornaments"; and they return and tell him, "Just as we are, with our best clothes and clean, thus are both there." "That is the Self," declares Prajāpati. So the Fijian, placed before a mirror, said softly, "Now I can see into the world of spirits."[3] The Asuras are satisfied, and go away believing that the Self is like the body.

Indra, however, perceives a difficulty. If the Self of the well-dressed person is well-dressed, the Self of the blind man will be blind, of a cripple crippled. He returns to Prajāpati to state his objection. "You are quite right," says the Deity; "stay with me another thirty-two years." Then a fresh secret is communicated: "He who moves about happy in dreams is the Self." Yet the dream-experience is not altogether satisfactory. The lame man may be able to walk, but he may suffer pain or wounds or oppression, and weep. So Prajāpati goes a step further: "When a man is asleep at perfect rest, without dreams, that is the Self." There are hidden reasons

[1] *Chhāndog. Up.*, viii. 7: *SBE*, i. p. 134.
[2] Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, i. p. 431.
[3] Williams, *Fiji and the Fijians* (ed. Rowe, 1870), p. 203.

why the unconscious life should be higher than the conscious; but Indra does not yet understand, and raises the serious objection, "But then he does not know himself that he exists, nor does he know any other beings; he has gone into utter dissolution. I see no good in this." "That is so," says the divine Teacher calmly; "stay five years more, and I will explain it to you."

Thus did thought approach its problem from the ancient animistic level. In the oldest texts the soul is located in the heart, which in the Indian psychology, like that of Israel, was the seat of intellect.[1] Of minute size, like a grain of rice or barley, sometimes of the shape of a thumb, or of the form of a man though of diminutive stature, it is called "the Dwarf" who sits in the centre.[2] Form involves colour, though it be only dusky, like smoke-coloured wool; or it resembles a yellow robe, or the flame of fire, a white lotus, or sudden lightning.[3] All these are the physical qualities of highly divided attenuated matter, suited for the hue and texture of a soul. Such a being, leaving the body during sleep, may not be able to find its way back if the sleeper is awakened too suddenly. "Let no one," it is said, "wake a man brusquely, for it is not an easy matter to remedy, if the soul does not get back to him."[4]

Does he, however, after all, really quit the body and mingle in an actual world? Does he drive in veritable chariots, behind living horses, over well-paved roads? Does he pass tanks and lakes and rivers where men can actually bathe? The manifold shapes that he sees, the scenes of enjoyment and suffering, as he rejoices with women, laughs with his friends, or grieves at sights of terror or death—are all these real? No, he is their creator; all this is his playground, where fancy shapes its puppets as it will. They exist only for mind; they are illuminated only by his own light. The Self is *manas*, "mind," *vijñāna*, "consciousness," and it is added in one of those bewildering lists which baffle the student; it is the vital airs (*prāṇas*), it is eye and ear,

[1] Cp. T. W. Rhys Davids, in *JRAS* (1899), p. 76.

[2] *Katha Up.*, v. 3: *SBE*, xv. p. 18.

[3] *Brihad-Arany. Up.*, ii. 3, 6: *SBE*, xv. p. 107.

[4] *Ibid.*, iv. 3, 14: *SBE*, xv. p. 165. Cp. Frazer, *Golden Bough*,[3] pt. ii. "Taboo and the Perils of the Soul," p. 39 ff.

it is earth, water, air and ether; it is heat and no-heat, desire and no-desire, anger and non-anger, right and wrong (*dharma* and *adharma*)—in a word, all things.[1]

Are earth and air, then, right and wrong, alike creations of the mind? Is the whole external world one immense dream-projection? Is it constituted by our own activity, and does nothing exist except as it exists in and for the knowing Self? Here are the beginnings of philosophy, and in the records of debate at unknown times and in unnamed places it is not to be expected that the answers given to such questions by different teachers should be consistent with each other. This is not a philosophy starting from external observation. It has no basis in the discovery of intellectual relations in the objects around; it is not concerned with regularities of movement, periodicities of phenomena, possibilities of calculation in advance, relying on nature's punctuality in keeping the appointment of an eclipse. In the absence of any form of science such as the Ionian thinkers began to construct out of their scanty data, inquiry began from within. At one of the great sacrificial celebrations held by King Janaka, in a vast assembly of Brāhmans from other lands as far as the Kurus and Pañchālas around the Jumna and the Upper Ganges, one of the speakers asks a question about the thread which strings together this world, the other world, and all beings. It is known as the *antaryāmin*, the "Puller-within." He has heard that whoso knows him and the thread he pulls, knows also the worlds, the Devas, the Vedas, the *bhūtas* (beings), and the Self.[2]

It is the great sage Yājñavalkya who replies. He first of all suggests a physical agent, *vāyu*, the wind, which had been called by the Vedic poet the *ātman* of the gods; there was the thread on which the limbs of a living man were strung together, to be unstrung by death. But this analogy is speedily dropped, and the teacher passes on to enumerate earth, water, fire, air, sky, all sorts of objects above and below, which all require a "puller-within," winding up with breath, speech, eye, ear, mind, skin, knowledge or consciousness (*vijñāna*), and seed—a list in most admired confusion,—till the whole universe without

[1] *Brihad-Ār. Up.*, iv. 4, 5: *SBE*, xv. p. 176.
[2] *Ibid.*, iii. 7, 1: *SBE*, xv. p. 132.

and the conscious life within are exhibited as penetrated and held together by the all-pervading Self. But is there, after all, a distinction between "within" and "without"? The issue is pushed to the uttermost. The Self is really the only existence, embracing all apparently external objects, and constituting all internal processes. The whole field of thought and feeling is his, or rather He. The *antaryāmin* is the sole subject in all the diversity of our experience. "Unseen, he sees; unheard, he hears; unperceived, he perceives; unknown, he knows. There is none that sees but he; there is none that hears but he; there is none that perceives but he; there is none that knows but he. He is thyself, the Ruler within, the Immortal. Whatever is different from him is full of pain."

Here is the ultimate reality. There is but the One. Mind, self-consciousness, which seem to confer upon us individuality, only exist so far as the Universal Self is manifested in them. Each function and faculty, the vital breath, the senses, the whole apparatus of the bodily frame, only appear in relation to something else. They all serve an end beyond themselves; the activities of the unconscious energies minister to the purposes of conscious beings. They have some deeper ground of existence, therefore, than their own changing states; they do not feel and move on their own account. Is not this the case also with the secret of knowledge which we fondly call our Self? Divest that of all that surrounds it; withdraw it from the bodily mechanism by which it is encompassed; cast out of it all the contents of experience; strip from it all memory; reduce it to its simplest terms, a bare potentiality of thinking, a pure intelligence from which all actual thought has been abstracted—what can we say of it but that *it is*? This being does not come within the common categories which we apply to the world around us. It has no dimensions. We cannot conceive of thought as extended; or of the thinker as occupying so much room. Intelligence is not capable of division; it is not quantitatively distributed from heart to heart; it is always and everywhere the same. There is in it no plurality. It is as much in one as in another; it is as insusceptible of multiplication as of partition. We only live, that is, through sharing a Universal Life; we only think because a Universal Thinker thinks in us. Our whole

sensible experience is only possible because it is first his; or rather, there is no first, no second, no time succession or order of degrees; all is really one. It is the same with all the mental processes founded on what we call contact with the external world. To us knowledge appears to consist in a relation, and we name its two terms subject and object. But when both of these are merged in the Self, the distinction disappears. Vision, touch, perception, knowledge, suggest to us a knower and a known. The conscious subject puts the object over against itself. If both terms are included in the Universal Self, the relation is destroyed; its opposite factors are absorbed in a higher unity. Feeler and feeling, percipient and perceived, knower and knowledge, thinker and thought, are all carried up to another plane of being. "When the Self only is all this, how should he see another, smell another, taste another, salute another, touch another, know another?"[1] Yājñavalkya had two wives, one of whom had only such knowledge as women possess; the other, Maitreyī, was conversant with Brahman. But she found this doctrine hard to understand. Her husband announced it as his parting gift of truth when he left home for the life of a forest-hermit. "Here, Sir," she pleaded, "thou hast landed me in utter bewilderment." "Maitreyī," he replied, "thou hast been instructed"; and he went away.

We touch here the famous principle of *advaita* or "non-duality,"[2] which was to play so great a part in the later philosophy of the Vedânta in the hands of Çankara.[3] Apart, however, from this peculiar type of absolute idealism, it is plain that the conceptions of the Brahman and the Âtman were too closely allied to remain separate. The one approached the ultimate unity from the world without, the other started from the world within. Each, however, found it necessary to include the other, and they inevitably therefore coalesced.[4] In their identification the Brahman proved the more comprehensive term, and dominated the subsequent language of theology. The

[1] *Brihad-Âr. Up.*, iv. 5, 14: *SBE*, xv. p. 185.

[2] *Ibid.*, iv. 3, 32: *SBE*, xv. p. 171.

[3] Cp. below, Lect. VI., p. 307.

[4] See the series of illustrations in the section known as the *Madhu-vidyâ* or honey-doctrine, *ibid.*, ii. 5: *SBE*, xv. p. 113 ff.

practical union of the two produced all kinds of symbolic applications of the Brahman in connection with the Self, just as it also produced a whole crop of problems concerning the relation of the Brahman to the gods and to the world, and its nature as the Ultimate and Absolute Reality. Few thinkers could maintain themselves upon the dizzy heights of the *advaita*. Thus when the universe was apprehended as a unity, and its symbol was found in the universality of *ākāça* (space), Brahman was conceived as in some sort all-pervading, omnipresent, infinite. It embraced and included all things. This kind of unity was primarily local. The departmental gods of the separate zones were all folded in Brahman's immensity. Had not one of the ancient poets described them as seated in it like cows in a cow-house?[1] Here was realism with a vengeance! The same actuality which belonged to space and the whole external world, belonged also to the Devas. And just as Faith (*Çraddhā*) or Right (*Dharma*) or sacred Speech (*Vāch*) grew into living powers, so the mysterious energy of Brahman might be personalised and rise into majestic lordship over the ancient gods. Conceived as sovereign, Brahmā (masculine) is the personal Director and Guide, as he is also the Maker or Creator of the world. He is the Author of its life, and the Providence of its destiny. This usage is rare in the earlier Upanishads, but it was well established five hundred years before our era, as the recurring formula of the Buddhist texts sufficiently proves.[2] Such theism Gotama might repudiate, applying the solvent of his irony. But it could not be ignored, and thus conceived Brahman was the God of *satya*, the reality of the external world. But behind the *satya* lay the *satyasya satyam*, the Real of the real, the Absolute. How was this to be conceived?

The formula was known as the teaching of Brahman by *na, na*, "no, no."[3] The conception has its parallels in the later Greek speculation. Philo must use negatives to figure the φύσις ἁπλῆ of the Deity. He is ἀμιγής, unmixed; ἀσύγκριτος, uncompounded; ἄποιος, without qualities, in the sense that he is unique and belongs to no class with common properties. In the Kaṭha Upanishad, one of the earliest in verse, though later

[1] *Atharva Veda*, xi. 8, 32.
[2] Cp. Lect. I., p. 10.
[3] *Brihad-Ār. Up.*, ii. 3, 6; iii. 9, 26: cp. *ante*, p. 174[7].

than its two great prose predecessors, it is laid down that the Ātman-Brahman cannot be reached by speech, or mind, or sight; it can only be apprehended by the simple affirmation, *asti*, "he is."[1] But already thought is at work organising its experience into an ascending scale. "Beyond the senses there are the objects; beyond the objects the mind; beyond the mind the intellect (*buddhi*); beyond the intellect the Great Self; beyond the Great Self there is the Undeveloped."[2] Here is a distinction destined to play a great part in later theology, between the *vyakta* and the *avyakta*, the Manifest and the Unmanifest, the world of experience and the hidden, secret, mysterious Absolute.

The Brahman thus conceived is incapable of definition, and yet attempts must be made to present it to imaginative apprehension. The ultimate Being must be released from all contact with a scene of change and its inevitable elements of want and pain, decay and death. Hunger and thirst, old age and dissolution, belong to the "impermanent"; by none of these could the Brahman be affected. Removed from the spheres of space and time, the True of the True dwelt in ontological solitude. It could not be expressed in terms of dimension, for it was at once greater than earth and air and sky, and smaller than a grain of rice or mustard-seed. Just as the Rabbis of Israel affirmed that God was the "place" of the world, so did the Indian sages affirm that space rested in Brahman.[3] But Brahman was not distributed or diffused; it was wholly everywhere, as Augustine said of God, *semper ubique totus*. The bold figure of the Schoolmen would have suited the ancient thought—a circle whose centre is everywhere and whose circumference nowhere. Nor could Brahman be identified with duration. Our days and years roll on, they do not add to the age of Brahman. In the "deathless" there is no counting of generations. The Immortal is light, and the gods worship it as the "light of lights." Augustine rebuked the foolish in-

[1] *Kaṭha Up.*, ii. 6, 12: *SBE*, xv. p. 23.

[2] *Ibid.*, i. 3, 10-11: *SBE*, xv. p. 13.

[3] *Bṛihad-Ār. Up.*, iv. 4, 17: *SBE*, xv. p. 178, "ether" = *ākāça*, or space, conceived sometimes as a kind of subtle all-pervading fluid of the utmost tenuity.

quirers who mockingly asked what God was doing before he made the world. There was no "before." Time was measured only by the motions of succession and change. It only began, therefore, with creation. A similar distinction was drawn by the wisdom of India. "There are two forms of Brahman, time and non-time. That which existed before the sun (*i.e.* the visible creation) is non-time; it has no parts, it is not divisible. That which began to be with the sun is time, and has parts."[1] The timeless admits of no vicissitudes. To be above mutation rather than to be infinitely prolonged is the mark of the Eternal.

Space, time, change, causality, from all these the Unmanifest Brahman is carefully kept apart. What then can be affirmed of this hidden Absolute? Three characteristics acquired especial significance. They have been noted before, but their importance justifies repetition.

1. As the "Real of the real" Brahman emphatically *is*. In the chapter on "Bliss"[2] it is identified first of all with *satya*, reality, then with *jñāna*, knowledge, and thirdly with *ananta*, the boundless. Ultimate being, universal cognition transcending the opposition of subject and object, infinity—these are its sublime attributes. But the terms *sat* and *satya* are used with twofold meaning. There is the world of our actual experience, where nothing *is* but is always *becoming*, the world of mutation which nevertheless is actual for us; and the world that lies within it (or, if you will, beyond or above it, whatever spatial figure be preferred), accessible to thought but not to sense. This is "the Deathless veiled by the real" (*amritaṃ satyena channam*),[3] where the *satya* is the phenomenal scene which covers and conceals the Eternal.

2. The Brahman is *vijñāna* or cognition.[4] This, as we have seen, was Yājñavalkya's inmost secret. In the last resort there is but the Imperishable One, who sees but is not seen, hears but is not heard, comprehends but is not comprehended, knows but is not known. Beside him is none that sees, or hears, or

[1] *Maitr. Up.*, vi. 15: *SBE*, xv. p. 317.
[2] *Taittir. Up.*, ii. 1: *SBE*, xv. p. 54.
[3] *Bṛihad-Ār. Up.*, i. 6, 3: *SBE*, xv. p. 99.
[4] *Ibid.*, iii. 9, 28, 7: *SBE*, xv. p. 151.

comprehends, or knows. As such his world is perpetual *light*, and he the Light of lights.[1]

3. As Brahman is knowledge, transcending all personal limitations, so is it also *ānanda* or bliss.[2] This is added by Yājñavalkya to *satya* (reality) and *prajñā* (knowledge) among other attributes, including infinity and *sthiti*, stability, firmness, or certainty.[3] Negatively this bliss consists in transcendence above all the vicissitudes of the world of birth and death. It is more difficult to say what are its positive characteristics, and it will give later expositors much trouble to explain it;[4] but its changeless peace became the Indian ideal of the blessed life. "When a man finds his rest in that Infinite Incorporeal One, then he has attained security."[5]

And the goal of human knowledge, the secret of tranquillity, lay in union with this infinite Reality. He who could say to himself, *Tat tvam asi*, "That art thou,"[6] had risen above the pain of division and the limits of the personal self. The lofty consciousness, *Aham Brahma asmi*, "I am Brahman,"[7] gave him the victory over the world.

II

The early Upanishads thus contain a large body of doctrine, which reflects the views of different teachers who wrestled generation after generation with the problems of the world, the soul, and God. In the freedom of speculation the results of meditation, inquiry, and debate were often inconsistent with each other, and the compilers of these ancient documents made no efforts to force them into an unnatural harmony. The Vedic hymns, which provided the starting-points of their theology, had ascribed the formation of the universe to different

[1] In this character he, too, may be called *Buddha*, *Mbh.*, xii. 309, 1, in contrast with the individual, who is *abuddha*.

[2] *Vijnānam ānandam Brahma*, says Yājñavalkya; see *ante*, p. 196[4].

[3] *Brihad-Ār. Up.*, iv. 1: *SBE*, xv. p. 153 ff.

[4] Cp. Çaṅkara, *Vedânta Sûtras*, etc., i. 1, 19, in *SBE*, xxxiv. p. 71; cp. Lect. VI., p. 326[1].

[5] *Taittir. Up.*, ii. 7; cp. *SBE*, xv. p. 59.

[6] *Chhândog. Up.*, vi. 8, 7: *SBE*, i. p. 101.

[7] *Brihad-Ār. Up.*, i. 4, 10: *SBE*, xv. p. 88.

manifestations of the "One with many names," and the ritual treatises known as Brāhmanas presented numerous types of creative activity woven into the web of sacrificial detail. Such pictures are not wanting in the Upanishads, and they undoubtedly attempt to describe the origin of a real world. There are repeated references to *idaṃ sarvam*, "this all," this universe, with its multifarious contents, its sun and moon, its earth and air, its fire and water, not yet summed up under one term, "Nature." "In the beginning," said Uddālaka to his son Çvetaketu, "there was only *sat*, one only, with no second. And it thought, 'May I be many, may I grow forth,' and it sent forth fire";[1] and from fire or heat comes water (as men perspire when they are warm), and from water food (for rain is needed to produce most food). Similarly Brahman desired "May I be many," and after brooding over himself like one performing austerity, he sent forth (created) everything which is, and entered into it.[2] Or, with a more evolutionary conception, the world is presented as "undeveloped" or "unmanifest."[3] But the Self entered thither to the very tips of the finger-nails, as a razor might be fitted in a razor-case. The whole visible scene, inanimate and animate, up to the gods themselves, is penetrated by it. "This," it is written,[4] "is Brahman, Indra, Prajāpati, all these gods; it is the five great elements, earth, wind, ether, water, fire . . . horses, cattle, men, elephants, all that walks or flies, all that is motionless" (the plant-world). And as the Brahman-Ātman is the source, so is it also the sustainer of all things. Thence, as from a central fire, all worlds, all gods, all living creatures spring forth like sparks.[5] They fly forth a thousand-fold from the Imperishable, and thither (it is added) they return again. Here is the beginning[6] of the great cosmic rhythm of the creation and the dissolution of the universe. The composite for ever tends to fall asunder.

[1] *Chhāndog. Up.*, vi. 2, 1, 3: *Tejas* may be fire or heat or brilliance.

[2] *Taittir. Up.*, ii. 6: *SBE*, xv. p. 58.

[3] *Brihad-Ār. Up.*, i. 4, 7: *SBE*, xv. p. 87.

[4] The subject is apparently the Ātman in the form of *prajñāna*, consciousness· *Aitar. Up.*, v. 3: *SBE*, i. (with a different division), p. 245.

[5] *Brihad-Ār. Up.*, ii. 1, 20: *SBE*, xv. 105. The associated image of the spider and its threads became a favourite in later use.

[6] *Muṇḍaka-Up.*, ii. 1, 1: *SBE*, xv. p. 34.

"In God," says the sage, "this world comes together and comes apart."[1]

It was a long way from these cosmologic sketches to the absolute idealism of Yājñavalkya's *advaita*. If the king of the Videhas, Janaka, at whose court he was a frequent visitor, may be identified with the prince of the same name in Buddhist story, Yājñavalkya must have been active about 600 B.C., when Thales was entering on that career of travel and observation which inaugurated Greek science and philosophy. The Hellenic world in the Eastern Mediterranean was full of eager thought. From Ionia to South Italy questions were asked and answered. Only snatches of their solutions have been preserved, but enough survives to stimulate admiration as well as to suggest comparison. The Milesians, Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes; Pythagoras of Samos, Heracleitus of Ephesus, Xenophanes of Colophon; Parmenides of Elea, Empedocles of Agrigentum, Anaxagoras of Clazomenæ (for thirty years the friend of Pericles in Athens)—what a constellation of minds is here! They had behind them traditions of Babylonian lore and Egyptian culture. They were men of important cities; some were aristocratic and wealthy. They took their part in civic functions, they founded communities, they drew up laws. Thales is merchant, statesman, and engineer. He is a student of geometry and astronomy, and predicts the eclipse on May 28, 585 B.C. Mathematics, acoustics, geology, and physiology are coming into view. The Logos of Heracleitus, the Nous of Anaxagoras, will provide the foundations for the higher theology of later days. But while Indian thought had been engaged in interpreting the world in terms of the Self, early Greek interest had been occupied with it on its own account. Instead of withdrawing into forest solitudes, controlling respiration, fixing their postures, concentrating their attention, and gathering their energies into intense inward recollection, they sailed the seas, they watched the stars at night, they gathered knowledge by day,[2] and on the basis of fact and experiment began

[1] *Saṃ-ca vi-caeti*, in *Çvetâçv. Up.*, iv. 11: *SBE*, xv. p. 252; cp. iii. 2, p. 244.

[2] Xenophanes noted impressions of fishes in the quarries at Syracuse, and marine shells in the older Tertiary stratum at Malta, and drew the appropriate inference. Cp. Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*, i. p. 162.

to rear the fabric of cosmology. They, too, had their doctrines of the Infinite, the Deathless, the Imperishable, the Unborn.[1] Xenophanes equates his One God with the All, and sings:

Οὖλος ὁρᾷ, οὖλος δὲ νοεῖ, οὖλος δε τ' ἀκούει.

"He is all eye, all thought, all hearing."[2] Does this mean that he is the Seer in our sight, the Thinker in our thought, the Hearer of our hearing? Is he, in Yājñavalkya's sense, the Universal Knower, in whom subject and object are identical? Is he, too, only to be described as "No, no"? Hardly; Xenophanes is still a Realist. So, too, was Heracleitus, whose Logos had its physical base in heat; and Pythagoras, who represented his ἄπειρον as a mighty breath (πνεῦμα) which the universe inhaled.[3] He, too, has hit on the idea of a world-rhythm, as all things fall back into that from which all things came; and Heracleitus, who had traced the evolution of the existing scene back to fire, anticipates its return by a vast conflagration into the same element.[4]

It was not surprising, then, that Megasthenes, who was sent by Seleucus Nicator from Babylon as his ambassador to the court of Chandragupta at Pātaliputra (the modern Patna), on the Ganges, about 300 B.C., should have been struck with the resemblances between Indian and Hellenic cosmology.[5] The earth was in the centre of the universe, which was spherical in shape. Various principles were operative within it, but water was that employed in its original production. The Deity who made it was diffused through all its parts; and as it had issued from a beginning, so it would come to an end. Megasthenes does not distinguish different schools of philosophy, and is concerned chiefly with the Brāhmans in their capacity as teachers, and the forest ascetics.[6] But a valuable little treatise by

[1] Cp. the ἄπειρον, ἄθανατον, ἀνώλεθρον, ἄφθαρτον, ἀγένητον, with the *ananta*, *amrita*, *akshara*, *aja* of Indian philosophy.

[2] Diels, *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (1906), i. p. 50, fr. 24.

[3] Cp. the Indian *prāṇa*.

[4] Cp. Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*, i pp. 65, 536.

[5] See the summary of his observations by Strabo, xv. 59; M'Crindle, *Ancient India, etc.* (1877), p. 101; cp. *ante*, p. 26.

[6] Whether the reference to Buddha by Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, i. § 71, 6, ed. Stahlin (1906), ii. p. 46, was derived from Megasthenes is doubtful.

Chandragupta's prime minister, Kautilya, who had helped to establish him upon the throne, was brought to light ten years ago.[1] It is concerned with the utilities of the social order, with the production of wealth, and the science of government. The author distinguishes four fields of knowledge: (1) Philosophy as it is based on reasoning and investigation; (2) Theology; (3) Business; (4) Jurisprudence.[2] The second term, *Trayī*, the "threefold" (viz. *vidyā*, or knowledge), is the familiar name of the Triple Science founded on the three Vedas (*Rig*, Yajur, and Sāma), and included the lower teaching of the ritual and sacrificial practice, and the higher lore of the Brahman. These are based upon Revelation. Philosophy, on the other hand, depends on methodical inquiry and logical proof. There were different schools, claiming descent from founders whose doctrines were transmitted by their successors, sometimes in the form of verses, constituting a body of tradition, and expounded in authoritative *çāstras*. Of these Kautilya names three: Sānkhya, Yoga, and Lokâyata. The precise meaning of this last term is doubtful. In the fourteenth century of our era it is employed by Mādhava, the famous head of the religious community of Çringeri, in the Mysore territory, originally founded by the great Vedântist teacher Çankara. In his description of different systems of Hindu philosophy,[3] Mādhava starts from the Chārvākas, whom he identifies with the Lokâyata school. They are depicted as materialists of the crudest type. The only realities are the four elements: earth, water, fire, and air. Intelligence arises from their mixture, like intoxication out of a fermented drink. Did not Brihaspati say that "there is no heaven, no final liberation, nor any soul in any other world"; "the three authors of the Vedas were buffoons, knaves, and demons"?[4] To such scepticism has the Lokâyata teaching been degraded, and the verses are mockingly placed in the mouth of Brihaspati, once the teacher of the gods. But in the Epic the

[1] The *Artha-çāstra of Kauṭilya* (Mysore, 1909), ed. R. Shama Sastri. Cp. Jacobi, "Zur Fruhgesch. der Ind. Philos.," in the *Sitzungsber. der Königl. Preuss. Akad.* (1911), xxxv. Kauṭilya was otherwise known as Chāṇakya.

[2] *Daṇḍa-nīti*, "the method of the rod." Cp. *Manu*, vii. 43.

[3] The *Sarva-Darçana-Saṃgraha*, tr. Cowell and Gough (1882), chap. i.

[4] Pp. 5, 10.

Lokâyata philosophy is mentioned at the end of a list of the accomplishments of learned Brāhmans,[1] while the teachings of Bṛihaspati are of quite orthodox morality,[2] and a mythical Chārvāka appears as a demon in a Brāhman's form, denouncing the eldest of the Five Brothers for destroying his kinsmen.[3] It is impossible to suppose that the Lokâyata philosophy, which had been professed by the Brāhmans for centuries since the days of the Buddha,[4] could have been of this coarse materialistic kind. From the scanty hints which are alone available, Prof. Rhys Davids has argued with great skill that it was originally a kind of "nature-lore."[5] Kautilya, unhappily, gives us no clues to its contents or purpose, and it fades into the mist in the procession of philosophies, a pathetic instance of the effect of orthodox denunciation upon a mode of thought which it took no trouble to understand.

Very different was the destiny of the Sānkhya, and the Yoga teaching which grew out of it. The Ātman-Brahman philosophy provoked many reactions, and the incorporation of the doctrine of Karma into its scheme of life was met by agnostic professions of ignorance or by plump denials. Time, Nature, Fate or Necessity, Chance, the Elements,[6] had all their advocates as the ruling principles of existence, and, as the Epic shows, held their own for centuries. Buddhism itself, and the teaching of Mahāvīra, the founder of the Jains, arose in similar opposition to the claims of Vedic authority. Older than both, it would seem, were the modes of thought which came to be known under the name of Sānkhya, and the practical disciplines which grew up by its side in the form of Yoga. These titles meet us already in the Çvetâçvatara Upanishad,[7] but the date of this poem is unfortunately beyond our reach, and the oldest certain occurrence of the terms as philosophical systems leaps unexpectedly out of Kautilya's treatise on public administration in the days of

[1] *Mbh.*, i. 70, 45. [2] iii. 32, 60. [3] xii. 39, 26.

[4] Cp. *Dīgha Nikāya*, i. v. § 14; Rhys Davids, *Dialogues*, i. p. 178.

[5] *Dialogues*, i. pp. 166–172.

[6] *Çvetâç. Up.*, i. 2: *SBE*, xv. p. 232. Compare the views summarised in the Brahma-jāla and Sāmañña-Phala Suttas, Rh. Davids, *Dialogues*, i., and F. Otto Schrader, *Ueber den Stand der Indischen Philosophie zur Zeit Mahāvīras und Buddhas* (1902).

[7] vi. 13: *SBE*, xv. p. 264.

Chandragupta. The first formal exposition of Sānkhyan theory, the *Kārikās* of Īçvara-Krishna, belongs to a much later date;[1] and the *Sūtras* are now definitely assigned to the end of the fourteenth century.[2] But between Kautilya and the *Kārikās* comes the important testimony of the great Epic.

How the Sānkhyan scheme arose it is no longer possible to determine. Legend ascribed it to a sage named Kapila; and on the strength of the name Kapila-Vastu, "Kapila's city," the traditional birthplace of the Buddha, Garbe pleads for his historical reality, which native scholars naturally accept.[3] In the Epic he is already an incarnation of Vishnu, or one of the "mind-born" sons of Brahman; "the incomparable philosophy, the means of deliverance," was already taught to the thousand sons of Prajāpati Daksha from whom sprang all creatures.[4] The system was thus regarded as of primeval antiquity; nay, we read that the Sānkhya and Yoga are eternal.[5]

Historically, however, they were only gradually evolved into distinct bodies of organised teaching. The tendencies of thought from which they sprang may be already traced in the later Upanishads.[6] If there was a hidden Brahman in unmanifested unity, might not the world also be regarded as an undeveloped magnitude before it received the impress of "name and form," the differentiation of genera and species?[7] For the world thus

[1] Translated into Chinese between A.D. 557 and 583.

[2] Cp. Garbe, *Sāṃkhya und Yoga* (1896), in Buhler's *Grundriss*, p. 8. *Sāṅkhya* is derived from *saṅkhyā*, "number," but the application of the term is not clear. Garbe conjectures that it may have been a nickname applied to "those numerationists" in consequence of their constant use of numerical groups. But this was not peculiar to them, as the numerical groups of Buddhism sufficiently exemplify.

[3] So does Hopkins, *The Great Epic*, p. 98, though not on that fanciful ground. Mr R. C. Dutt, *Civilisation in Ancient India*, ii. (1889), ingeniously compares Kapila and Buddha to Voltaire and Rousseau, "the man of intellect and the man of feeling." Prof. Berriedale Keith, *The Sāṃkhya System* (Heritage of India series, 1918), p. 8, points out that he is first engendered out of the highest Brahman in *Çvetâçv. Up.*, v. 2 (cp. *SBE*, xv. p. 255, where Kapila is translated by Max Müller as an adjective, "fiery"; see his discussion of the verse, *ibid.*, p. xl).

[4] *Mbh.*, iii. 47, 18; xii. 341, 67; i. 75, 5–7. [5] xii. 350, 72.

[6] Cp. Oldenberg, *Lehre der Upanishaden* (1915), p. 202 ff.

[7] The universe as *avyākrita*, *Brihad-Ār. Up.*, i. 4, 7: *SBE*, xv. p. 87.

imagined, no longer made up of earth and sky, of waters and winds, of fire and sun and star, a new name was needed, and two fresh terms came into use, *Pradhāna* and *Prakriti*.[1] Of these the second took its place in the Sānkhyan scheme as the primeval matter, eternal, vast, formless, indeterminate. Already in the Kaṭha Upanishad (believed to be the earliest in verse) the Undeveloped (*avyakta*) stands at the top of an evolutionary series on the plane of matter; beneath it is "the Great"; beneath "the Great" is the intellect (*buddhi*); beneath the intellect is the mind (*manas*); beneath the mind are objects; beneath objects are the senses.[2] These provide the field of our immediate experience. Here are the stages by which the Sānkhya will conduct the great transition from the Unmanifested Prakriti to the scene we know.[3] The Upanishads, indeed, still place it under the control of the all-pervading Purusha, the Universal Self. But here the Sānkhya strikes out a new path in vigorous reaction against the teachers of the Brahman.

Like Buddhism, it accepted with full conviction the doctrine of the Deed, the process of the *samsāra*, and the need of final release. Like the Brahman philosophy and Buddhism no less, it was forced to give some account of the world and the soul. It had to explain the powers of man, the arena of his existence, the cause of his appearance in it, and the method of his escape from it. But against the absolute idealism of Yājñavalkya and the empirical idealism of Gotama, it affirmed the reality of Prakriti, and threw the whole evolution both of the universe and of the human being on to its agency. It is true that this was no common materialism. The Sānkhya still recognised an element of Spirit (*Purusha*), and was fundamentally dualist. But Purusha was no unity, mysteriously transforming itself into the variety of the world. It was an infinite multiplicity, en-

[1] *Pradhāna*, in *Çvetâçv. Up.*, i. 10; vi. 16; *Maitr. Up.*, vi. 10; *Prakriti Çvetâçv. Up.*, iv. 10; *Maitr. Up.*, vi. 10; frequent in the *Bhagavad Gītā*.

[2] iii. 10, 11, cp. vi. 7–8; *Çvet. Up.*, i. 8; *Maitr. Up.*, vi. 10, 22; cp. ii. 7 (*SBE*, xv. p. 295).

[3] Deussen, *Philos. of the Upanishads* (1906), points out that they represent the same order as the return into the primeval being, only in a reverse direction.

tangled in Prakriti, dowered with no creative might, and only needed as an element in our personality to illumine the mental processes which were the outcome of the physical organisation. How the original all-pervading Purusha was thus broken up into an innumerable plurality it is difficult to understand; it is possible that in this respect Sānkhyan thought is not so much a reaction against a philosophical principle as a survival of primitive animism. Oldenberg has suggestively pointed out the difference in the grammatical usage of the terms *Ātman* and *Purusha*. The Ātman as a principle of life and light is firmly united with the being to which it belongs by the genitive case. The Purusha dwells *in* the body (the locative case), which it can leave. This term was therefore more appropriate to emphasise its separation from Nature and indicate its independent existence.[1]

The eternal dualism of the Sānkhya is founded on a principle —recognised by other systems of thought but variously applied —known as *sat-kārya-vāda*, "existence-effect-doctrine." All schools were practically agreed that there was a necessary relation between cause and effect; but they differed as to the nature of the effect, and consequently as to the character of the cause.[2] The Sānkhyan teaching, emphasising the reality of the external world, declared that as a product it must contain the same substance as that out of which it came. The effect was really inherent in the cause. Form, condition, arrangement might all change, but the actual stuff remained. Trace this back through modification after modification, you can never reach a beginning. The primeval matter was indestructible, and as it could never perish, so it could never have been created; it had no origin, it was eternal. No God, therefore, was needed to produce it as its efficient cause; no Brahman was required as its material cause; nor was it, as heretics taught, uncaused.[3]

[1] *Lehre der Upanishaden*, p. 224.

[2] Cp. Satish Chandra Banerji, *Sāṅkhya Philosophy* (Calcutta, 1898), in exposition of the ninth *Kārikā*, p. 53.

[3] See the *Sāṅkhya-Tattva-Kaumudī*, the earliest commentary on the *Kārikās*, by Vāchaspati-Miçra (about A.D. 1100–1133), tr. Garbe, *Abhandlungen der Philos.-Philolog. Classe der Konigl. Bayer. Akad.*, xix. (1892), on *Kārikā*, 56, p. 615. Cp. Banerji, *Sāṅkh. Phil.*, p. 255; *Sarva-Darçana-Saṃgraha*, p. 224; *The Sāṅkhya Aphorisms* (*i.e.* Sūtras), tr. Ballantyne (ed. 3, 1885),

If it had no cause, it must either exist absolutely (for ever unalterable, whereas we see it undergoing perpetual modification), or it could not exist at all. It cannot have Brahman as its material cause, because the power of mind cannot be subject to any change (spirit cannot be transformed into matter). And it is not brought forth from its primeval undifferentiated state under God's guidance, for the Eternal and Immutable cannot *act*, and no one who never does anything can be a guide, just as an inactive carpenter uses no tool. To what, then, was the evolution of Prakriti due, and what did it produce? The answer to the first of these questions lies in the doctrine which goes sounding on in poetry and philosophy and law[1] for so many centuries—the doctrine of the "Three Strands" (*guṇas*), out of which the great world-rope was twisted.

Far, far back in early speculation the material world had been ascribed to a combination of warmth, water, and food.[2] "The lotus-flower of nine doors," the human body, was described in the Atharva Veda as "covered with three strands" (*guṇas*).[3] The nature of these "strands" is not exemplified, and their names first meet us as a trio in the Epic, *Sattva* ("being" or "goodness"), *Rajas* (commonly understood as "passion"),[4] and *Tamas* ("darkness" or "gloom"). They are, on the one hand, impalpable energies or potencies, hidden in the bosom of Prakriti; and on the other they tend to become its actual constituents, with a substantial character of their own. Inasmuch as the significant field of their operation is human nature, they have an especially

i. 92; *Aniruddha's Commentary*, tr. Garbe (Calcutta, 1892), p. 53. The Sūtras are content to lay stress on the absence of proof of Içvara's existence, *e.g.* i. 92, 93; v. 1–12.

[1] Cp. *Manu*, xii. 24–52, 85, 105; *Institutes of Vishṇu*, xix–xxii, xcvi–xcvii.

[2] *Chhāndog. Up.*, vi. 2 · *SBE*, i. p. 93 f. Cp. Oldenberg, *Lehre der Up.*, p. 214 f., for this and other groups of three.

[3] x. 8, 43, tr. Whitney and Lanman. The figure is that of a thread or strand of a cord or rope.

[4] Applied in the *Rig* Veda to the atmosphere with its clouds and mists; then to dirt or impurity; and again, perhaps from the mobile character of the air in which it was said to predominate, it acquired the meaning of activity.

ethical significance, and stand for different types of disposition.[1] In the Unmanifest their power is latent. Poised in equilibrium, they abide inactive. But at length it becomes time for them to stir, for even Prakriti (it will be seen) feels an inscrutable impulse to production, and step by step out of the formless mass a world of conscious beings is evolved. First to appear is the subtle principle known as "the Great."[2] It is identified with *Buddhi* or "Intelligence," conceived, however, as a cosmic principle of Matter. From this issues another attenuated medium, subtle, invisible, but still material, *Aham-kāra*, literally "I-making," the basis of future consciousness in living man.[3] Hence come a series of subtle essences (*bhūtas*) of sound, form, touch, taste, smell, followed by five corresponding elements of ether, light, earth, water, and air. For the human personality five organs of action are provided,[4] and five of sensation; these are co-ordinated by *manas*, which stands twenty-fourth in the series beginning with the Unmanifest. These twenty-four bear the name of *tattvas* (literally "thatnesses"). They all belong to the sphere of Nature; they are its modifications; they share its character; they are the products of its *kshetra*, or "field." Buddhi and Aham-kāra are functions of matter not yet individualised; but under the Law of the Deed they generate first of all a kind of subtle body, and then the actual frame of man or god or demon in its proper sphere. Psychologically all the processes of sensation, perception, thought, emotion, and will are material processes, conditioned by Prakriti and Karma, the fundamental assumptions of the entire scheme.

Where, then, is the place for the eternal Purusha, and what

[1] See two lists of the manifestations of *Rajas* and *Tamas*, in *Maitr. Up.*, III. 5; *SBE*, XV. p. 298; as men can light thousands of lamps from a single lamp (a favourite illustration), so Nature multiplies the *guṇas* into thousands of objects. Their characteristics are then described as affecting human nature, *e.g. Mbh.*, XII. 314, 6 ff., 315, 6 ff. On the Sānkhyan interpretation of *Çvetâçv. Up.*, IV. 5, see Çankara's criticism, on the *Vedânta-Sūtras*, I. 4, 8 *SBE*, XXXIV. p. 253.

[2] Among many passages, cp. *Mbh.*, XII. 311, 16 ff.; 312, 7 ff.; 308 reverses the order; on their connection with Yoga, see below, p. 213.

[3] This has analogies with the cosmic "mind-stuff" of some modern writers which is subsequently differentiated into separate personalities.

[4] Voice, hands, feet, and the organs of excretion and generation.

are its powers? Nature has caught it somehow in her web. It is immersed in the *samsāra*, and it is actually the purpose of the whole evolutionary series to set it free. Lodged in their several individualities, the Purushas are the silent spectators of the proceedings of the physical organism with which they are temporarily connected. The soul is a twenty-fifth *tattva*; it is the "field-knower" (*kshetra-jña*); it does not govern, suggest, impel or restrain, for the whole moral life is vested in a subtle or internal body which accompanies the soul from birth to birth; its character is light, and its function is to bring the products of the evolutionary chain into self-consciousness, and illuminate the whole sphere of thought and feeling. Here is the opportunity for the apprehension of that knowledge which will finally secure its everlasting release.

In such an interpretation of the world there was no place for God. The Epic frankly recognises that the Sānkhyan teaching was *anīçvara*, godless or atheistic.[1] Yet it did not, like Buddhism, repudiate the authority of the Vedas, or wholly reject the practice of sacrifice. Kapila, indeed, when King Nahusha was about to kill a cow in honour of a visit from Tvashtri,[2] was heard to exclaim, "Alas, ye Vedas," and drew down upon himself a reproof from a sage who promptly entered the cow, and through its lips vindicated the ritual of sacrifice.[3] The Sānkhya secured recognition as orthodox by partial compromise with ceremonial duty.[4] But the commentators were not afraid to face the consequences of their philosophy. The whole world groaned under the threefold pain; internal, from pain of body and distress of mind; pain from external causes, cold, heat, wind, and rain, mosquitoes, snakes, or tigers; pain from supernatural powers, whether gods, planets, or demons. Īçvara Krishna opens his verses with the statement that their attacks suggest an inquiry into the means of their removal.

[1] xii. 302, 3.

[2] One of the builders of the universe, in the *Rig* Veda.

[3] *Mbh.*, xii. 268, 5 ff.

[4] Later speculation, I believe, hit on the happy justification of the violation of the principle of *ahiṃsā* or "non-injury," which forbade all animal slaughter, by suggesting that victims so killed in accordance with Vedic demands went straight to heaven and were reborn in deva-worlds suited to the merit acquired by their loss of life.

The later Sūtras declare emphatically that the complete cessation of the threefold pain is the complete end of man.[1] The universality of suffering, and the impossibility of reconciling it with the goodness of God, formed the basis of a serious criticism by Vāchaspati-Miçra in his commentary on *Kārikā* 57.[2] Every conscious act, it is laid down, is conditioned either by an egoistic purpose, or by compassion or goodwill, an altruistic purpose. The first motive cannot have led to creation, for a God of perfect bliss could have no personal want impelling him to bring a universe to birth. The motive of kindness is equally excluded. Before the start of the evolutionary movement the external souls were not exposed to any pain. No physical bodies, no senses within, no objects without, had yet arisen to produce suffering by their interaction. There was nothing from which souls needed deliverance; no pity could improve their lot. If after creation God looked compassionately on their sufferings, the argument moves in a vicious circle. He produces the world out of goodwill, and then is filled with tenderness on discovering that the condition of souls is so much worse than before; a God moved by goodwill would have created only happy creatures.[3] If it is asserted that differences of conduct require a God to adjust the issue, to recompense the good and punish the wicked, the reply is simple. The operative energy of merit and guilt needs no external agent to give them efficiency. The Law of the Deed is thus a kind of self-acting power. No explanation is sought or given; it is a fundamental fact of the moral life for the Sānkhyan as for the Buddhist. So firmly fixed was it in Indian thought, that the invocation of an omniscient God to "render to every man according to his works" was resented as a gross interference with the principle of "moral causation." Moreover, if God had made creatures so that they wrought evil deeds, he was really responsible for their commission. And lastly, God must either be "liberated" or "bound." If the first, he was pure spirit, without body or

[1] *Kārikā* I; *Sūtra*, I. 1. To the three ordinary human aims, Morality, Wealth, and Pleasure (*ante*, p. 160), is now added a fourth, *Moksha*, or final liberation.

[2] Garbe, *Abhandlungen*, etc., p. 616.

[3] Cp. the *Sarva-Darçana-Saṃgraha*, p. 228.

inner organs free from the *gunas*, without desire or will, a pure intelligence, without motive for the production or guidance of a world. And if bound, he would belong to the *samsāra*, and would be entangled in all its perils and weaknesses; unfit, in consequence, for the lofty functions of Creation and Providence. And if the Theist replied that God belonged to neither category, but transcended both, the philosopher retorted that there was no longer any common ground of argument.

Such was the Sānkhyan reply to the critic who pointed out that the evolutionary process contained after all an implied principle of rationality. No cause was specified to account for the original entanglement of the eternal souls, once free, in the equally eternal Prakriti. But the great Development was not, after all, without a meaning. It was an effort (*ārambha*) not for its own benefit but for another's; it sought the deliverance of each individual soul.[1] The method of deliverance is the attainment of perfect knowledge, the knowledge of the absolute difference between Prakriti and Purusha. For this end is the whole physical basis of consciousness provided, and its illumination by Purusha secured. But such a process, it was argued, revealed an aim of reason; the purpose was unintelligible without a Guide. Not so, the philosopher would reply; Nature may act unconsciously for the benefit of another, just as the cow for the sake of her calf produces milk. The illustration upheld the argument for centuries,[2] and sufficed to support the hope of universal salvation. But if, like human beings engaged in action to satisfy their desires, the Unmanifested sought to set every soul free, what would happen when its work was done? When the food is ready, it was said, the labour of the cook is ended. When the play is over, the dancers retire.[3] As soon as the occupant of the body can say "I am not, nothing is mine, there is no ego,"[4] the world of

[1] *Kārikā* 56, cp. the *Sūtras*, book iii.

[2] *Kārikā* 57; *Sūtras*, ii. 37, Aniruddha on ii. 1 adds that trees without intelligence produce useful fruits. So, after all, Prakriti produces beings who are bound to suffer in order to give them an opportunity of extricating themselves!

[3] *Kārikās* 58, 59; *Sūtras*, iii. 63.

[4] *Kārikā* 64.

sense has been overcome, and the soul is once more free. The consummation, when this is to be reached by all the infinite number of Purushas, would seem to be immeasurably distant; and the release of Prakriti from her continuous rhythm is indefinitely delayed. The eternal souls, as they have been for ever passing into the entanglement of matter, so they are for ever extricating themselves by the Path of Knowledge. At length they will be emancipated from every tie of self-consciousness. From the theatre of the universe when Nature's part is finished, all will relapse into the Undeveloped. The Purushas, seers with nothing to look at, mirrors with nothing to reflect,[1] will subsist in lasting isolation[2] as pure intelligences in the timeless void, thinking of nothing and not even knowing that they are doing so.

III

Beside the Sānkhya, which was still the subject of active study in the sixteenth century, Kautilya and the Epic place the Yoga.[3] The Epic, indeed, presents it as of immemorial antiquity. Çukra had been its teacher among the Devas.[4] Vishnu was its lord, nay, he was himself Yoga and the guide of Yoga-knowers.[5] Çiva must, of course, be credited with it too, he is the giver of the profit of Sānkhya and Yoga; he is equated with the Most High Brahman, the goal of both Sānkhyas and Yogins.[6] The beginnings of the ascetic practices which were wrought into the formal disciplines of Yoga may be traced far back beyond Buddhism.[7] They belonged originally to the order of fasts and mortifications by which the medicine-man and the seer apparently acquire superior power. Solitary meditation, suppression of appetite, control of breath,

[1] Oldenberg, *Lehre der Up.*, p. 256.

[2] *Kaivalya*, the condition of the *kevalin*, completely detached from all contact with matter, and hence unaffected by modifications of feeling.

[3] The Brāhman Çaunaka instructs Yudhishṭhira in both, iii. 2, 14. So also the *Çvetâçv. Up.*, vi. 13: *SBE*, xv. p. 264.

[4] i. 66, 43.

[5] vi. 65, 62; 67, 23; xiii. 149, 16. As Krishna, vi. 35, 4 (*Bhag. Gītā*); xii. 52, 4.

[6] xiii. 14, 194; 16, 25, *gati*.

[7] Cp. Sēnart, *RHR* (1900), xlii. p. 345.