rigidity of posture, the cultivation of the sacred trance—these had been long in vogue when Gotama first resorted to two distinguished teachers of the art, before he began to teach the method of the Noble Path. The adepts already claimed the possession of mysterious gifts. They could multiply their persons or become one again; vanish and reappear; pass through walls or mountains; walk upon water; fly through the air; touch sun and moon; and even ascend to the heaven of Brahmā.[1] In the Epic these pretensions appear in forms yet more extravagant. The Bhagavad Gītā exhibits the higher philosophical and religious character which gained for it the title Yoga-Çāstra (Scripture). The description of the ascetic in Manu (vi.) contains many characteristic touches (*e.g.* 49, 65, 72, 73), and the Vishṇu Smṛiti points in the same direction (xcvi. 24). But the first formal exposition only meets us in the Sūtras ascribed to Patañjali, formerly identified with the grammarian of that name in the middle of the second century B.C. Prof. Jacobi, however, has shown good reason for placing these Aphorisms at a much later date, probably not far from Īçvara Krishna, who first threw the Sānkhyan principles into poetic form. They show, in his view, the influence of advanced Buddhist speculation, and are not older than A.D. 450.[2] A gentle stream of commentarial literature flowed on through subsequent centuries. Vyāsa is placed in the seventh, Bhoja in the eleventh, and Vācaspati-Miçra (who founded his exposition on Vyāsa) in the twelfth.[3] The learned Mohammedan Alberuni, writing about 1030, quotes both Sānkhyan and

[1] Thus in *Dialogues*, i. pp. 88, 277. A strange list of ascetic practices occurs in the Kassapa-Sīhanāda Sutta, *ibid.*, p. 227. In *Dīgha Nikāya*, xxv. 9 ff. (vol. iii. p. 42) Gotama passes some caustic criticisms on the behaviour of such devotees.

[2] *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 1911, p. 29. Cp. Berriedale Keith, *The Sāṃkhya System*, p. 57.

[3] The Sūtras with the commentaries of Vyāsa and Vācaspati-Miçra were published in *The Sacred Books of the Hindus* (1910), transl. Rāma Prasāda. Dr Rājendralāla Midra had already translated the Sūtras and added abundant notes from Bhoja in the *Bibliotheca Indica* (1883). Modern discussions will be found in Garbe's *Sāṃkhya and Yoga* (1896); Max Müller, *Six Systems* (1899); Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads* (1906), p. 382; Tuxen, *Yoga* (Copenhagen, 1911).

Yoga works, though they cannot be identified with any surviving texts.[1]

The poets of the Epic represent the Yoga and the Sānkhya as substantially identical. It is true that in a moment of frankness it is affirmed that a Sānkhyan who does not believe in God (*anīçvara*) cannot expect to obtain final deliverance, but it is immediately added that there are wise men in both systems.[2] In the discourses of the venerable Rishi Yājñavalkya it is laid down that only the undiscerning suppose them to be different; they are in reality one and the same.[3] This is not due to indifference concerning the recognition or the denial of a Being who may bear the great name of God, but to the deliberate attempt to raise the Sānkhyan agnosticism to the theistic level. Both teachings accept the authority of the Vedas; both rest on the same eternal dualism of Prakriti and Purusha; both mourn the entanglement of the soul in matter, involving the possibility of millions and millions of successive births; both give the same account of the cosmic process; both recommend the same morals and blame the same faults;[4] both aspire after ultimate liberation. The pessimism of the Yoga is perhaps more gloomy; the evils of body and mind are painted in darker colours.[5] Well may the Purusha lament its folly in allowing itself to be caught by Prakriti like a fish in a net; here is a confession of a primeval fall, "The fault was mine."[6] When Jaigīshavya had attained the saving knowledge, the blessed Āvaṭya inquired whether in the ten great World-Ages through which he had passed—in hells, in the bodies of animals, among

[1] *Alberuni's India*, tr Sachau (1888), i pp. 27, 30 Yoga is included in Mādhava's survey in the fourteenth century. A modern Hindu view will be found in Dvivedi's translation, *The Yoga Sūtra of Patanjali* (1890); and an edificatory exposition in *Rāja Yoga* (1899, New York) by the late Svāmi Vivekânanda.

[2] xii. 301, 3.

[3] xii. 317, 3 f. Cp. 306, 19; 308, 44; 311, 8.

[4] xii. 301, 9; 240, 4; 302, 54 f.

[5] Cp. the story of King Bṛihadratha, *Maitr. Up.*, i. 1, 2 f., *SBE.*, ii. p. 287 f., who stood in the forest with uplifted hands facing the sun, performing the highest *tapas*.

[6] *Aparādho hy ayaṃ mama*, xii. 308, 33. This is, of course, true of each Purusha. Cp. Origen's view of the original equality of all souls, and their descent from the world of light through some kind of transgression.

men, and the Deva-worlds—he had experienced the larger quantity of pleasure or pain? The reply was unhesitating: "*All* my experience has been only pain."[1]

The Yoga, then, starts from the Sānkhyan scheme of evolution.[2] But when it has arrived at the twenty-fourth *Tattva*, and added the Purusha as twenty-fifth to the bodily frame, it does not stop there. The Sānkhyan teachers, indeed, recognised nothing higher.[3] But Yoga advanced to a twenty-sixth, a Highest Purusha in eternal freedom, the guide and helper of those who were battling with the storms of life upon the ocean of transmigration. Here is Īçvara, the Yogin's God, sometimes expressed in terms of Brahman; and sometimes unexpectedly identified with the individual Purusha, the Sānkhyan twenty-fifth. Thus it is affirmed that both philosophies recognise the Supreme, free from all contact with the *gunas* (*aguna*, *nirguna*), an Eternal Ruler,[4] the Twenty-fifth. Or he is the One and Indestructible, to whom another school of piety may give the name of Vishnu.[5] By such interpretations diversities were harmonised and seeming oppositions were conciliated. What, then, was the real ground of distinction between the two, and what causes led to the theistic development of Yoga?[6]

The Epic emphasises the characteristic of Sānkhya as a way of knowledge; the object of Yoga is the acquisition of the higher insight. The method of the one is severely intellectual; that of the other is a practical discipline. The Sānkhyan knowledge is founded on the investigation of the Scriptures;[7] it is imperishably firm, it is eternal Brahman![8] Yoga, on the other hand, seeks for the actual vision of the Most High, as the means of realising the true nature of the soul. It aspires after the same direct apprehension of supreme spiritual Reality which the senses supply in the material world.[9] For this end all bodily functions must be rigidly controlled. An early sketch

[1] Vyāsa on *Sūtr.* iii. 18. [2] xii. 236, 28–40. [3] xii. 307, 41.
[4] xii. 306, 31-33, *nityam adhishṭātāram.* Cp. 308, 7; 307, 44.
[5] xii. 303, 19, 38 f.
[6] The later terms are well known: Sāṅkhya is *nirīçvara*; Yoga is *sêçvara (sa-īçvara).*
[7] xii. 301, 4, 7; 302, 108. [8] xii. 302, 101.
[9] *Pratyaksha*, xii. 301, 7; "before the eye."

depicts the aspirant as seated tranquilly in some level place amid trees and streams, free from stones and dust, with a cave for shelter near at hand. There he holds his body erect, and learns to suppress his breathing and subdue every wandering thought.[1] The accepted meaning of Yoga, "concentration," expresses the endeavour after complete mastery over every form of external and internal activity. All sensual pleasure must of course be absolutely renounced; diet reduced to its simplest terms; and sleep curtailed within the strictest limits.[2] The professors of Yoga worked out various details of personal practice; they all were directed to one end—the achievement of the sacred vision.[3] Sitting in silence "like a piece of wood," the Yogin first withdraws his attention from all outward things, till sensation troubles him no more. Then it is the turn of the unstable mind, which flashes out from control like lightning from a cloud, or moves hither and thither like a drop of water on a leaf.[4] At length strange forms begin to appear "in Brahman" before the inward eye, "misty smoke, sun, fire, wind, fire-flies, lightnings, and a crystal moon."[5] Such are the elementary stages of the practice, which ascends through higher and higher reaches of detachment from all external matter till the soul can joyously recognise the Most High as his friend (*bandhu*). He is the Infinite Comrade; and the soul enters into mysterious likeness and unity with him.[6] It beholds the Supreme, and having seen him will not let the vision go.[7]

Is it not possible that we have here a clue to the theistic evolution of the Yoga scheme? It has often been suggested that Îçvara was raised into supremacy among the infinite and eternal Purushas by way of accommodation to the popular theology. Was it not a diplomatic device for commending

[1] *Çvetâçv. Up.*, ii. 8 ff.: *SBE*, xv. p. 241.

[2] The five hindrances of Yoga are desire, anger, cupidity, fear, and sleep, xii. 240, 5 f.

[3] Prof. Hopkins has devoted a remarkable study to "The Yoga Technique in the Great Epic," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, xxii. (1901), p. 333 ff.

[4] xii. 195, 11, 12.

[5] *Çvetâçv. Up.*, ii. 11: *SBE*, xv. p. 242.

[6] *Sâmyam ekatvam âyâto*, xii. 308, 27 f.

[7] *Ibid.*, 21; cp. 240, 35.

the godless Sānkhya to the approval of those to whom the traditional Brahman was still dear? Another explanation traces the process along the path of religious experience. The toils of the Yogin's discipline were severe; its physical hardships were strenuous; its moral perils were grave. Endurance often flagged, resolve grew faint, and in the quest of the vision the seeker might fail and lose all that he had gained. What would sustain him but the strange abnormal powers which seemed first to flow in upon him from without, and then to be actually discovered within himself? Tennyson has described a kind of waking trance which he had frequently had from his boyhood, when alone.

"This has often come to me through repeating my own name to myself silently, till, all at once, as it were, out of the intensity of the consciousness of individuality, the individuality seemed to resolve and fade away into boundless being, and this not a confused state, but the clearest of the clearest, the surest of the surest, where death was an almost laughable impossibility."[1]

Here is a specimen of *dhyāna*, or meditation, which set the consciousness at liberty from all bodily restraint. In such adventures all kinds of images and impressions seemed borne in upon the aspiring soul, awaking responses and perceptions of which it had never dreamed, and opening prospects into spiritual realities of light and knowledge, of truth and purity and joy, such as belonged to boundless and eternal Being, unstained by any contact with the world of ignorance and defilement. Here was, indeed, no Creator of the universe, no Lord of earth and sky; but here *was* a Deliverer from darkness and infirmity and pain, the Giver of enlightenment and the Inspirer of strength.[2]

Religion, of course, turned to philosophy to justify it. The other Darçaṇas worked out their schemes with proper supports of authority and reason; Yoga must do the same. All the six systems of philosophy which gained orthodox recognition had

[1] Dated 7th of May 1874; Waugh, *Alfred, Lord Tennyson* (1893), p. 192. The poetical version will be found in the "Ancient Sage."

[2] A modern Hindu writer, Mr Manilal N. Dvivedi, *The Māndūkyopanishad* (Bombay, 1894), finds it "impossible to resist the conviction that Patañjali's God was a mere fiction, invented for purposes of meditation, with a view to concentration of mind," Introd., p. viii.

their *pramāṇas*, their standards of evidence, their sources of knowledge and means of proof.[1] Patañjali admitted three (i. 7), *pratyaksha* or perception, *anumāna* or inference, and *āgamas*. The natural meaning of this last term would be "scriptures," *i.e.* the Vedas; but the commentators generalised the application of the word to include communicated truth derived from an *āpta* or competent authority.[2] On this triple foundation Īçvara is defined (i. 24) as a "distinct Purusha, untouched by the residues of affliction, action (*karma*) and its effects." From what, then, is Īçvara thus distinguished? From the infinite multitude of other Purushas, and from the world of Prakriti. He is, therefore, free from all bondage. No contact with matter has exposed him to ignorance and suffering, or involved him in desire, with its consequent action and its inevitable train of physical, mental, and moral issues. He is no creator, thinking out the universe like a divine Geometer; he has in no way guided Prakriti's evolution. That is his aspect for eternity in sublime detachment. Yet his deity consists pre-eminently in knowledge and the power of action. If he is to help toiling souls upon the upward way to freedom and light, he must in some fashion enter their world of birth and death. There Scripture shows him as the Teacher of all truth;[3] there experience apprehends his saving power. And this process is no less constant from eternity. He condescends, therefore, on behalf of struggling souls, to mingle in the scene of change by taking on himself one of the Three Strands (*gunas*), viz. *Sattva*, "goodness." Vāchaspatī-Miçra bravely faces the difficulties which this hypothesis involves. No passion or gloom, the other two *gunas*, can affect him; but as the Yogin's whole mental and moral life is a function of matter, even the assumption of *Sattva* implicates Īçvara to some extent in the sphere of ignorance. But this surrender of his infinite knowledge is purely

[1] *Pramāṇa*, from the root *mā*, to measure. Cp. Max Muller, *Six Systems*, p. 562.

[2] Literally, "one who has attained." Cp. Rājendralāla Mitra *in loc.*, p. 11.

[3] Vachaspati-Miçra includes four groups of religious authority, Veda, Smṛiti, Itihāsa, and Purāna, and finally refers to Kapila, an incarnation of Vishṇu, who attained the sacred knowledge by the grace of Maheçvara, just as he was born.

unselfish; it consequently lays up no *karma*; he is, in fact, untroubled by the restraints which action fixes on our individuality; he is still able to minister to the *purushas* who are seeking the way out. He has but disguised himself for a while; at the Great Dissolution, when Prakriti relapses into its unmanifested state, his veil of ignorance is laid aside. But in preparation for the next development he resolves to take upon himself the highest *Sattva* once again.[1] Accordingly, when the Three Strands begin to wind their coil again, the process is repeated. The same purpose adopts the same method with the same result. A quaint illustration explains the divine readiness. Chaitra[2] resolves overnight to wake at a certain hour the next morning, and does so through the suspended potency of his determination. So Īçvara has determined that when Prakriti begins a fresh evolution and the Purushas emerge from the Undeveloped into their appropriate bodies under the Law of the Deed, he will resume the character of Instructor and Guide, and subject himself again to participation in the mingled experiences of men.

This solemn design to "extricate the Purushas from the *samsāra* by teaching them knowledge and righteousness" rests on his omniscience.[3] "In him," it is affirmed, "the seed of omniscience rises above all limits"; it is infinite. The argument assumes that of any quantity which admits of degrees there must be at some point an absolute perfection. In magnitude at one end of the scale is the atom, the perfection of the small; at the other, the expanse of the all-inclusive heaven, the perfection of the great. Similarly in the field of knowledge and character there must be a lowest and a highest—a summit or God who fully realises the utmost possible. This plea might, indeed, be employed to justify the Buddha's claim. But we are warned that such an inference (*anumāna*) can only establish the general idea. Its application must be left to other tests. The Buddhist doctrine might wear the semblance of authority, but its principles of the non-existence of the soul and the momentary nature of all objects contradicted reason

[1] "Mayā sattva-prakarsha upādeya iti pranidhānaṃ kritvā." Vāchaspati-Miçra in *Patañjala-sūtrāṇi*, ed. Bodas (Bombay, 1892), p. 27.

[2] Chaitra and Maitra are like John Doe and Richard Roe.

[3] *Sūtra* i. 25, with Vyāsa's commentary, and Vāchaspati-Miçra's exposition.

and must be rejected. Scripture was the true source of knowledge and the means of progress to the Highest Good. A world full of pain could not have been created by a Being of boundless wisdom and compassion. It is his beneficent function to provide the means of their deliverance; "he is able by his work alone," writes Bhoja, "to liberate the whole world."[1]

The Yogin who steadfastly traversed the pathway to Emancipation gradually attained extraordinary mastery over his own person and the world around. The Epic already reckons twenty-two different modes of control over the breath;[2] and great Yogins who belong to the Twice-Born in the first three castes can roam freely through earth and sky, can enter the bodies of snakes and demons, men and women, and even pass into the greater deities like Dharma, Vishnu, and Brahman himself, and issue forth from them at will.[3] So, likewise, can the Devas occupy human beings.[4] When the venerable Bhīshma died at last upon his bed of arrows, his Yoga-power enabled his vital breaths to pass out through the crown of his head and shoot up like a meteor through the sky, till he became invisible, and thus "united himself with Time."[5] In the language of philosophy this was the consummation of detachment from the sphere of ignorance, defilement, and pain. Known as *kaivalya*, "isolation," it marked the complete fulfilment of the process of knowledge which released the Purusha from the grip of Prakriti.[6] Its immediate antecedent was the attainment of the sacred trance known as the "Cloud of *Dharma*" (truth, or righteousness).[7] In the language of religion this detachment from the

[1] Max Muller, *Six Systems*, p. 419.

[2] XII 307, 10–12 The number was afterwards much increased.

[3] So, for example, XII. 301, 58 ff.; cp. 236, 16–25.

[4] XV. 30, 21

[5] XIII. 168, 2–9; *Kālā* perhaps in the sense of the course of time (*i.e.* eternity), or more personally as the "Ender," but also the Beginner of a new life.

[6] *Sūtra* III. 54. As Tuxen remarks, *Yoga*, p. 204, the Soul (which is eternally the same) itself undergoes no change.

[7] *Sūtra* IV. 29. The *Dharma-Megha* was also the tenth and last *bhūmi* of the Buddhist Bodhisattva, "sending on creatures the good rain which lays the dust of passions and causes the growth of the harvest of merits." Cp. Poussin, in Hastings' *ERE*, II. 748, and *ante*, p. 68.

world was no negative condition. Whatever might be its relation to the other Purushas, who like itself shone as radiances by their own light,[1] it reached the fruition of its long pilgrimage in the vision of the Brahman. Even in his human life the Yogin might receive the Most High into his heart like a blazing fire or the shining sun. In its ascended state the Purusha entered on the contemplation of the Stainless and Unborn, in whom dwelt all powers of knowledge and action and beneficence in infinite measure, and thus united with Brahman in perpetual adoration it could "enjoy God for ever."[2] The Yoga ideal, though often grievously degraded by extravagances of fantastic self-torture,[3] undoubtedly exercised an enormous influence on Indian life. It was open to men and women of the lowest castes; and the Epic is full of tales of every kind up to the loftiest ranks of Deity concerning the wonders wrought by its means. Vishnu and Krishna employ it for their own divine ends, and Çiva is pre-eminent as the Great Yogin.[4] And thus men and gods were knit into one mysterious fellowship, and the barriers between earth and heaven were broken down.

Note to Lecture IV

A few words may be added on the other two systems named in the Epic, xii. 350, 63 (*ante*, p. 184), the Pāñcharātra and Paçupati.

The Pāñcharātras are classed among the worshippers of Vishnu, and were also called Vishnu-Bhāgavatas, or simply Bhāgavatas.[5] Their creed was monotheistic, the Deity being designated

[1] Vyāsa on *Sūtra* iii. 54.

[2] Cp. xii. 307, 18–25. In all the emphasis repeatedly laid on union with the Brahman or Most High, there seems no reference to the fellowship of the Eternal Purushas with each other in any common life of joy or praise.

[3] Manu stood on one leg and hung head downwards for 10,000 years (iii. 187, 4 f.). Hopkins, *JAOS*, xxii. (1901), p. 370, relates that there was a colony of devotees near Ajmere till some years ago who practised this inversion, and hung by their knees or ankles like bats from the trees.

[4] Among many instances, cp. xii. 328, 8 (Vishnu practises austerities to get a son), and 23 (Çiva stands on one foot for 1000 divine years). Cp. below, p. 233.

[5] Colebrooke, *Essays*, i. p. 437, ed. Cowell (1873). On Vishnu and the Bhāgavatas, see below, Lect. V.

Vāsudeva, identified in the usual fashion with the exalted Vishnu.[1] Briefly to anticipate their development it may be said that they had their own sacred books, and were philosophically allied with the Sāṅkhya by the doctrine of the eternity of Prakriti and the Three *Gunas*. Their special modification of Theism admitted a fourfold form of Deity. Vāsudeva, the Most High, with hands and feet and eyes everywhere, *i.e.* omnipresent and omniscient, the support of all, manifests himself in three additional modes,[2] known as Samkarshana, Pradyumna, and Aniruddha, in order of origination from the Supreme. The confused account in the Epic connects these three modes with the cosmic process by associating Samkarshana with the Individual Soul, Pradyumna with the Manas, and Aniruddha with the Aham-kāra or consciousness.[3] But Aniruddha is also Īçvara, the Creator from whom all things originate; and in 341, 27 f., he is identified with "the Great" and is said to create the Grandfather Brahman, cp. 340, 71, 72. The elements of the Sānkhyan scheme are thus most incongruously mingled with a theism which ascribed the actual production of the world to a divine First Cause. But the cult of Vishnu-Vāsudeva established itself in the South, and a series of Tamil saints known as Ālvārs from the fifth or sixth century to the twelfth, provided it with hymns of praise and devotion which gained great influence and are sometimes designated "a Vaiṣṇava Veda."[4] Severely criticised by Çankara (cp. Lect. VI.), it was defended by Rāmânuja (cp. Lect. VII.), who incorporated it into his exposition of the Vedânta. It thus ceased to be a really distinct system, and Mādhava did not include it in his survey of the leading types of doctrine in the fourteenth century.

The Pāçupatas worshipped Maheçvara, the "Great God" (Çiva), and were sometimes known as Çiva-Bhāgavatas. Their religious philosophy approximated to the Sānkhya-Yoga, recognising a material cause for the universe in unconscious matter (*pradhāna*),[5] and a Supreme Lord of infinite visual and

[1] For indications of the origin of Vāsudeva, cp. p. 245.

[2] Termed *vyūhas*. [3] xii. 340, 33–40.

[4] Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Saivism*, etc (1913, in Buhler's *Grundriss*), p. 50.

[5] Colebrooke, *Essays*, i. p. 434.

active power,[1] with whom the soul might attain union with God through intellect.[2] Yuan Chwang encountered Pāçupatas upon his travels, sometimes worshipping and even living in Çiva-temples. Bhandarkar has traced various references to cognate sects through medieval inscriptions;[3] and they were closely connected with the Tamil Çaivas, whose copious scriptures are now beginning to attract the attention of scholars. Cp. Lect. VI., p. 351.

The Nyāya school is not named in the Great Epic, as it was concerned rather with logic than with the philosophy of religion. Colebrooke, indeed, could lay it down that no department of science or literature had more engaged the attention of the Hindus than the Nyāya.[4] The Sūtras in which it is summed up under the name of Gotama have been ascribed by a recent native scholar to the fifth or fourth century B.C.,[5] but there are serious objections to so early a date. Prof. Jacobi suggests a much later origin, between A.D. 200 and 450.[6] Their bearing on theology is only incidental. Dr Muir even feels himself "unable to say if the ancient doctrine of the Nyāya was theistic."[7] It is certainly so expounded in the fourteenth century by Mādhava, who quotes from a previous writer of unknown date, Udayana Āchārya, in a work entitled "The Handful of Flowers" (*Kusumānjali*).[8] Its character is logical; it seeks to establish the existence of God, and to justify the validity of the premisses on which the proofs are founded. Like the other great schools of Hindu thought, its ultimate object is to show the way to the Liberation of the soul from the *samsāra*. That is accomplished by the service or worship (*upāsti*) of God, which produces merit and self-knowledge. The

[1] Mādhava, *Sarva-Darçana-Saṃgraha*, tr. Cowell and Gough, p. 107.

[2] Cp. *Mbh.*, xii. 285, 123–125. It transcended the duties of the Four Castes, and was open to men of all modes of life. Like other philosophies, it provided a way of Liberation from rebirth.

[3] *Vaiṣṇavism*, etc., p. 119 f.

[4] *Essays*, i. p. 284.

[5] Max Muller, *Six Systems*, p. 476.

[6] *JAOS* (1911), p. 29.

[7] *Sanskrit Texts*,[2] iii. (1868), p. 133.

[8] Cp. Mādhava's *Sarva-Darçana-Saṃgraha*, tr. Cowell and Gough, pp. 172–176: *Kusumānjali*, ed. Cowell, Calcutta, 1864.

existence of the Supreme Soul must therefore be investigated (i. 2). A broad basis of experience is laid down in a long enumeration of the various forms in which he is conceived (including even a Sānkhyan "perfect first Wise," though the Sānkhya teaching is afterwards opposed as "atheistic"), in the teachings of Revelation and Tradition, and the social order founded upon them. The chief arguments are founded on applications of the conception of causality. A supersensual cause of another world is found in the ethical notions of merit and demerit, which in their turn require an intelligent Power to give them effect (against the Sānkhyan impersonal Nature). The earth must have had a Maker, and not only a Maker, but a constant Supporter. Similarly the Veda must have had an author, and much stress is laid on the proof of its authority though the higher doctrine of its eternity is rejected. The revelation was apparently effected at the outset of a new world-age by God's assumption of "two bodies in the mutual connection of master and disciple"; he thus initiated the tradition of words, and taught their meanings to the newly created men.[1] When the authority of the Veda is established, the existence of the Supreme Being is secured.

Closely related to the Nyāya stood the Vaiçeshika of Kanāda, placed by Jacobi a little earlier in the philosophical series. Hopkins regards it as unknown in the main Epic, but finds references to it in i. 70, 43 f., and ii. 5, 5.[2] Like the Nyāya, it undertakes to show the way out of transmigration into eternal freedom. This requires proof of the existence of individual souls, against the Vedântists and the Buddhists, which involves theories of perception and self-consciousness, of action and causality, of merit and demerit.[3] The object of the system is the attainment of emancipation (i. 1, 2, with the commentaries), and this is gained by "knowledge of the truth" (*apavarga-sādhanatā*). Tradition ascribed the system to revelation vouchsafed to Kanāda by the grace of God (i. 1, 4, Upaskāra of

[1] *Kusumānjali*, p. 29 f.; cp. p. 84.

[2] *Great Epic*, p. 96. It is actually named in one of the hymns to Krishṇa, xii. 48, 70.

[3] Cp. *The Vaiçeshika Aphorisms of Kaṇāda*, tr. A. E. Gough (Benares, 1873).

Çaṅkara-Miçra). The bearing on the Theistic argument is slight. Against the critics of the Veda, who impeached its authority on the grounds of errors, inconsistencies, and repetitions, its supernatural character is vindicated (i. 1, 3; cp. x. 2, 9, with the commentaries) as the utterance of an eternal, omniscient, and all-holy Spirit (*nirdosha-Purusha*). Then the existence of souls and God is founded on the divinity of the Veda. But the power of God and the great Sages who were the instruments of his communication with mortals, must in its turn be established. For this purpose appeal is made to "names and works" (ii. 1, 17 ff.). To impose a name was the prerogative of Deity, and the production of effects belonged to omniscience and omnipotence. The authority of the sacred knowledge which the ancients thus promulgated by Scripture and Tradition must therefore be admitted. For the categories and other elements of the teaching, cp. Colebrooke, *Essays*, i. p. 293 ff.; Max Muller, *Six Systems*, p. 493.

LECTURE V

THE TRIMŪRTI

In the year A.D. 632, while Yuan Chwang was studying in Kashmir, King Harshavardhana made a grant of a village to two learned Brāhmans. The plate recording his donation was dug up in a peasant's field near Madhuban (N.W. Provinces) in 1888, and contained some valuable personal details. His father and the royal line for several generations back had been sun-worshippers. His elder brother, whose short reign was ended abruptly by his assassination, had been a devout Buddhist, who "like the Blessed One (*Sugata*[1]) solely found pleasure in doing good to others." He designates himself as a worshipper of Maheçvara, and claims to be, like him, "compassionate towards all created beings."[2] Maheçvara, "the Great God," was Çiva, to whom some eleven years later an image was installed with great solemnity at the sixth great Quinquennial Convocation at Prayāga.[3] But who was Çiva, and how had he acquired so august a title? He appears in that connection as the third of a group of which the Buddha is the principal member, with Vishnu and Çiva as his subordinates. Later theology will substitute Brahman for Buddha, and will present the three as equal constituents of the *Trimūrti*, or "Triple Form." What, then, was the process which issued in this result?

[1] A frequent epithet of the Buddha.

[2] *Epigraphia Indica*, I. (1892), p. 74

[3] *Ante*, p. 110 In and around Benares Yuan Chwang reckoned about 100 Deva-temples and 10,000 sectaries, most of whom were Çaivas (Beal, *Buddhist Records*, II. p 44). Çaçānka, who had murdered Harshavardhana's brother, and persecuted the Buddhists, was a worshipper of Çiva. He was the king of Karna-Suvarna, in Eastern Bengal.

I

The term *çiva* was a familiar adjective, meaning "kindly," "auspicious."[1] It is applied in the Rig Veda to various deities such as Indra or Agni, and among others to Rudra. Rudra has no very prominent personality; only three entire hymns are addressed to him; his name is said to occur about seventy-five times. He is associated with the destructive energies of the storm, and is the father of a group of violent winds known as the Maruts or "pounders."[2] A curious double character is, however, assigned to him. In one aspect he is a man-slayer, full of malevolence. The hymns deprecate his wrath; he is entreated not to use the celestial fire (the lightning), or attack the worshipper with fever, cough, and poison. On the other hand, as the storm clears the air, and fresh breezes revive drooping energies, he is implored to bestow blessings for man and beast; he grants remedies for disease; from his hand come restoration and healing. This secures for him the euphemistic epithet Çiva; and the baleful god, in virtue perhaps of the purifying action of the thunderstorm, becomes the helpful and beneficent. So many different attributes are assigned to him that it is difficult to determine his original character. Oldenberg suggested that he was a forest deity; von Schroeder pictured him as the "chief of the souls of the dead, leading the hosts of spirits storming along in the wind." Prof. Berriedale Keith derives him from a god of vegetation.[3] In the hymn known as the *Çata-rudriya*[4] he is addressed as the Mountain-dweller with a thousand eyes and braided hair; he is lord of trees and grass, and ruler of cattle; concerned with lakes and streams, with paths and roads; to be seen in sunshine and cloud, in lightning, rain, and fair weather. Like other deities, he may be identified with Agni, a great cosmic power. Already in the Rig Veda

[1] In the neuter it denoted welfare, good fortune, happiness.

[2] The origin of his name is uncertain. Sāyana derived it in the fourteenth century from a root *rud*, to "cry" or "howl." Modern philologists have sometimes connected it with "ruddy" and "red," and have seen a possible reference to the colour of forked lightning. Cp. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology* (1897, in Buhler's *Grundriss*), pp. 74, 77.

[3] *JRAS* (1907), pp. 933, 948.

[4] In the Yajur Veda; cp. Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*,[2] iv. p. 322 ff.

he can be described as "Lord (*īçāna*) of the world" (ii. 33, 9)[1] and father of the universe (vi. 47, 10), who by his sovereignty knows all things, divine and human (vii. 46, 2). So in the Atharva Veda, under the name of *Bhava*, he is lord (*īç*) of the heavens and the earth, and has filled the wide atmosphere;[2] all breathing things are his upon the earth, men and the animals of the homestead, the wild beasts of the forest and the eagle in the air. But withal he has a strangely local character. Homage must be paid to him at cross-roads, at the passage of a river, the entry into a forest, the ascent of a mountain. Awe and terror gathered round his name. His arrows were plagues, he commanded poisons and snakes, lightnings and thunderbolts. He came out of the common life of the people; he was the product of experiences of dread in lonely places amid Nature's violences. While Vishnu might be loved, Rudra must be feared.

When such a god was brought into the higher religion what could be made of him? As he came dancing down the mountain slopes with a coil of snakes round his neck and a troop of frenzied devotees behind him, he was identified by Megasthenes (300 B.C.[3]) with Dionysus. And just as the Greek god became to some of his worshippers the symbol of an exalted spiritual reality, so Çiva, in spite of the grotesqueries and brutalities which mythology piled around him, became an accepted type of Supreme Deity. Already in the second century the grammarian Patañjali mentions a sect of Çiva-Bhāgavatas.[4] The monotheistic movement in the name of Bhagavat[5] had attracted worshippers of Çiva, who boldly overcame the differences between the two deities by identifying them. In the schools of theology a corresponding assimilation was effected, and in the *Çvetâçvatara Upanishad* Rudra is presented as Brahman. It is a short poem of only six cantos and 113 verses. It embodies numerous quotations from the Vedas and the Kaṭha Upanishad. There

[1] In an early Buddhist text he is named *Īsāna*, cp. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues*, II. p. 310, associated with Indra, Soma, Varuna, Prajāpati, and Brahmā.

[2] *Atharva Veda*, XI. 2, 27; cp. Whitney-Lanman *in loc.*

[3] *Ante*, p. 200.

[4] Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism*, p. 115, quoting Patañjali on Panini's *Sūtras*, v. 2, 76.

[5] Cp. below, p 244.

are references to Sānkhya and Yoga; in the last two verses, which have the air of an addition (after the ascription of the poem to Çvetâçvatara), the Vedânta is designated by name; and stress is laid upon *bhakti*, piety and devotion, to bring it into the sphere of the new religious thought and life. The eternal souls, Prakriti in its two states, undeveloped and developed, the Three Strands, all belong to the Sānkhya. Yet the foundation both of thought and language rests on the Brahman of the older Upanishads. The *Ātman* is the ground of all certainty and reality. Here is the *Hiraṇyagarbha*, the "golden germ" of ancient Vedic terminology, as first-born of all creation. Here is Brahmā as creator and ender of the world, and here its renewal out of the impersonal Brahman.

The poem opens with an inquiry. What, after all, is the truth? Is Brahman the cause? The ultimate principle of existence, the real source of all causation, is it personal or impersonal? Is it Time, is it intrinsic Nature, or Fate, or Chance, the Elements, or Spirit?[1] The answer takes us at once into the heart of the disciplines of "concentration." They who have practised *dhyāna* and *yoga* have beheld God's own power[2] hidden by its own *gunas*. Nature and its Three Strands are there and real, but God is within them; they are not self-subsistent; "He it is who, as the One, superintends all these causes, Time, Self, and the rest." The whole scene of existence is one vast Brahma-wheel, at once all-living and all-resting—for the true seer always discerns "central peace subsisting at the heart of endless agitation,"—and therein flutters a swan (the human being), thinking itself and the great Mover to be different. Here seem to be three terms of a realist ontology: God, the world, and souls. But suddenly we are told that this Triad is included in the Most High Brahman. God, after all, is not the ultimate reality. The perishable and the imperishable, the manifest and the unmanifest, are alike sustained by God: but the riddling verses go on to tell how still behind the three terms of his Triad is an Absolute. "Two are there, one knowing, one not-knowing; both unborn, one Lord, the other

[1] i. 1, 2, *Purusha*.

[2] *Devâtmaçakti*; cp. the notes of Roer, *Bibliotheca Ind.*, xv. (1853), p. 46, and Max Müller, *SBE*, xv. p. 252.

no-Lord."[1] In his ignorance the subject of experience is attached to the objects around him, and receives the reward of his action; he does not recognise the Infinite Self under the vesture of the Three Strands. But at last he finds out these three, and knows the Brahman. Then by union with him[2] the illusion of separateness (not necessarily of individuality) is ended.

God is here at one time subordinated to the Absolute, and at another resolved back into it. Thought moves with swift transitions from one point of view to another. Already in i. 10 a fresh hint has been given: "Perishable is Nature, immortal and imperishable is Hara." For who is Hara? He is the one who seizes and carries away the spoil, no other than the storm-god Rudra, who is exalted as "sole Sovereign with sovereign powers" (iii. 1).[3] By these he rules the worlds, sublimely One while they arise and fulfil their course, One Rudra only, they allow no second. He dwells within all beings[4] till the end-time, and then in wrath commingles everything. Here is a personal God, depicted in ancient Vedic language with eyes, face, arms, and feet in every place. Like a mighty smith, he forges a new universe; he is invoked as the Mountain-Dweller, and entreated not to hurt man or beast. But he is more than creator or destroyer; the believer prays, "May He endow us with good thoughts."[5] The poet, however, is not content to rest there. Imagination ascends to something higher, Brahman Most High and vast, hidden within all creatures and encompassing the world; they who know Him as Lord become

[1] i. 9, *īç* and *anīç*; Max Muller, "one strong, the other weak."

[2] *Tattva-bhāvād*, "by becoming Thatness," a reference to the ancient formula *Tat tvam asi*, cp. *ante*, p. 197. In the last line the famous term *māyā* appears for the first time, cp. iv. 10, but not yet in the full meaning which it acquired later. The world is a product of *Māyā*, God's magic power; he is the great Enchanter; but, as Oldenberg has observed, *Lehre der Upan.*, p. 280, the world is, after all, really there.

[3] *Içita īçanībhiḥ*. The preceding epithet *jālavān*, "the net-spreader," recalls the figure of the spider and its threads (first in *Brihad-Ar. Up.*, ii. 1, 20: *SBE*, xv. p. 105; Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishads*, p. 297), cp. *ante*, p. 198[5]. There is no need to interpret it with Çaṅkara by the later *Māyā*; cp. vi. 10.

[4] Gods as well as men, and animals.

[5] iii. 4; iv. 12.

immortal. He is the infinite Spirit (*purusha*), All-pervading, the Bhagavat, the omnipresent Çiva.[1] And he who is freed from grief beholds, by the Creator's grace, the Unselfish, the Majesty, the Lord.[2]

So do theism and pantheism alternately melt into each other in this strange blending of philosophy and religion. The age of the poem cannot be determined, but it is universally regarded as older than the *Bhagavad Gītā*, and it endeavours to do for Çiva (as Sir R. G. Bhandarkar has remarked) what "the Lord's Song" afterwards did for Vishnu. It did not, indeed, like its more famous counterpart, secure admission into the Great Epic. But it marks an important stage of advance towards the eminence there ascribed to him.

The figure of Çiva in the Epic is of bewildering complexity. The most incoherent attributes are freely combined in his person, but the steps of the process are beyond our power to trace. In the Rāmâyana he is a god of the North, the mountain-region, but he rises to no supremacy above other *devas*.[3] The Mahābhārata, upon the other hand, presents him in the most diverse characters, and finally seats him on the throne of the universe and identifies him with the Absolute. He has one aspect as the hero of mythological imagination, a second as an object of personal devotion, a third as the supreme goal of religious and philosophical intuition. The study of the strata of poetical deposit has not proceeded far enough to establish any definite series of developments. But it is suggested that the praises of Çiva (for example in xii. 285, and xiii. 14, 16, 17) were among late interpolations into a work originally conceived

[1] iii. 11. The epithet occurs seven times, and seems to me to have become more than a mere adjective. It is the title of the supreme God who is identified with the Purusha dwelling in the heart of man, the mysterious cosmic figure with a thousand heads, a thousand eyes, a thousand feet (iii. 14). Rig *Veda*, x. 90, 1.

[2] iii. 20, cp. *Kaṭh. Up.*, iii. 20. The term *akratu*, "without *kratu*," conveys the idea of having no personal ends to serve in the creation and maintenance of the world. So in iv. 6, where two birds cling to the same bough, one eats the sweet fruit, in mundane enjoyment, the other looks on unallured by desire. It is a parable of man and God (*anīça* and *īça*, cp. p. 239[1]), here figuratively distinct.

[3] Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, p. 219.

in the interest of Vishnu, whose worshippers in their turn added the song of his thousand names (xiii. 149).[1] Different stories, for example, describe his origin from Brahman. Like Athena from the brow of Zeus, Çiva springs from Brahman's forehead.[2] Or under the name Sthānu he is the seventh of the mind-born sons of Brahman, who begets eleven Rudras, himself the tenth among them![3] He is, however, of yet more ancient and august descent, coeval with Brahman himself, born like him out of the huge primordial Egg.[4] And finally he will become Brahman's creator, the Manifest and Unmanifest, the Changeless and Eternal.[5]

His home is on Kailāsa, one of the loftiest of Himâlayan peaks; or sometimes on the summit of Mēru; he bears the Ganges on his head; yet he condescended also to dwell among the Kurus[6] as their maker. He is still the forest-god, familiar with all wild creatures, Kirāta, the huntsman (the name of forest tribes of rude ways in the East and West and North). Down the slopes he comes dancing furiously,[7] his naked person ringed with snakes, laughing and singing like a drunkard or a madman,[8] attended by a frenzied crew of revellers. It was in this guise that Megasthenes knew him, and identified him with Dionysus. In loftier style he fights in the forest with Arjuna.[9] Most prominent in his character is the element of anger, from which he was fabled to have drawn his being. When he is not invited to Daksha's mighty sacrifice, to which the other gods are bidden, provoked by his consort Umā to vindicate his outraged honour, he summons all his *yoga* powers and extinguishes the offering. In his wrath a drop of sweat falls from his forehead, a vast conflagration breaks out, and from the flames issues a giant, Fever, who rushes to attack the gods. Brahman intervenes, and entreats that this terrible person may be divided into parts, and Çiva yields, and produces a wondrous crop of ills

[1] Cp. Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, p. 222

[2] xii. 341, 74.

[3] i. 66, 1–3; xii. 341, 33.

[4] i. 1, 32.

[5] xiii. 14, 4, 189; 17, 142.

[6] The people of the Five Brothers, cp. *ante*, p. 131, xiii. 17, 107, *kuru-kartṛi*, *kuru-vāsin*. Cp. Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, p. 220.

[7] xiii. 17, 50, *nṛitya-priya*.

[8] xiii. 14, 151 ff.

[9] iii. 39.

down to sores in bulls' hoofs, maladies of sheeps' livers, and parrots' hiccups.[1] So he is the agent of destruction. Not only disease but also death is under his control;[2] and among his favourite haunts are the cremation ground and the cemetery.[3] Death, however, is but a form of Kāla, Time; and Çiva is accordingly the cause of the Great Dissolution which closes a world-age. With fire, water, and wind, the universe is finally devoured by immeasurable Space; Manas consumes Space, Ahamkāra Manas, and "the Great Soul" (Buddhi) Ahmakāra, and this in turn is devoured by Çambhu (Çiva), Lord of all.[4]

But in the cosmic rhythm there was no finality. In due season the wondrous renewal would begin, and into the darkness Çiva would bring light and life once more. So he is extolled as Maker and Creator of the world,[5] Maker and Producer of all beings;[6] he is the wondrous Golden Germ (Hiraṇyagarbha) from which all things proceed; the divine Architect, conversant with every art.[7] In this act of generation he is united with his consort, the Mountain-goddess Parvatī or Umā, "Mother of the world"; and it was said that he showed in his own form dual marks of sex. His person was actually represented as half male, half female;[8] and the *linga* was adopted as the sacred emblem of his productive power. Among his thousand names

[1] xii. 283. Another story, occasionally cited in later temple inscriptions, told of his wrath with Kāma, god of love (xii. 190, 10), who sought to inspire him with amorous passion for his consort Parvatī while he was engaged in the practice of austerity. Flames from the third eye on his forehead consumed Kāma to ashes. An effigy of Kāma is burned in commemoration at the close of the Holi festival following Kāma's new moon (Jan.-Feb.), cp *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. v. p. 13.

[2] He is himself Death, xii. 285, 68; xiii. 16, 49.

[3] vii. 203, 115. Cp. Cunningham, *Mahābodhi* (1892), p. 55, for sculpture at Buddha Gayā representing Çiva as god of Death, dancing on a corpse.

[4] xii. 313.

[5] *Loka-kartri*, *loka-dhātri*, xiii. 17, 79, 48.

[6] *Bhūta-krit*, xii. 285, 82; *bhūta-bhāvana*, xiii. 17, 34, 105.

[7] xiii. 17, 37.

[8] So Bardesanes recorded in the second century A.D. Cp. the fragment quoted by Stobæus, tr. M'Crindle, *Ancient India* (1901), p. 173. Monier Williams describes one which he saw at Elephanta, *Religious Thought and Life in India* (1883), p. 85.

was *lingâdhyaksha*, "linga-overseer."[1] Whence this element entered into Çaiva worship is uncertain; many eminent scholars[2] have suggested that it was derived from forest-tribes to which the cult of Çiva may have been indebted. It takes a lofty place in mythic fancy, for as the symbol of generation the god's linga-form is said to be the origin of all forms.[3] It is revered in heaven to his joy by devas and sages and other celestial ranks.[4] The earlier epic does not reckon it among his traits; it seems to make its literary appearance late.[5] It has escaped association with the passion element in Çiva's nature, and Monier Williams testifies that it is never connected with indecent ideas.[6] On the contrary, it became a philosophical type of the production of the universe from two eternal principles, Purusha and Prakriti, spirit and matter, or Âtman and Mâyâ.

The energy required to destroy and renew the universe is accumulated by intense austerities. In the creation stories of the Brâhmaṇas Prajâpati must practise *tapas* before he can produce this visible scene. Çiva had only attained his deity by offering himself up in an All-sacrifice.[7] So he must reinvigorate his powers by the severest concentration;[8] he alone as the Great Yogin knew what was the cost of the dissolution and reproduction of the world.[9] Heroes and sages who visit him on the summit of the Himâlaya, find him immersed in meditation. Krishna himself conducts Arjuna thither to obtain a celestial weapon for the destruction of the foe.[10] The god is lost in contemplation. He burns with his own fervour like a thousand suns. On his head are the matted locks of an ascetic; he wears the bark dress and the tiger skin of the devotee. Or he belongs to the air-clad order, with space for his garment and

[1] xiii. 17, 77. The word *linga* means simply "mark" or "sign," but was applied specially to denote the phallus.

[2] Bhandarkar among the latest, *Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism*, p. 115.

[3] vii. 202, 92, 97. [4] vii. 203, 123 f.

[5] B. C. Mazumdar, *JRAS* (1907), p. 337; Bhandarkar, p. 114; Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, p. 222.

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 68.

[7] xii. 20, 12; *Sarva-yajña*, apparently a collective sacrifice, or totality embracing all forms of offering; cp. *ante*, p. 43.

[8] Thus he stood on one foot for a thousand divine years, xii. 328, 23.

[9] xiii. 17, 39. [10] vii. 80.

the horizon for his vesture; he performs asceticism in the waters, and is devoted to the study of the Vedas. He is in truth their real author,[1] and naturally knows their meaning; from him come also the Upanishads, the law-books, all tales of old time, and even the Mahābhārata itself.[2] He is thus the Supreme Preceptor, the Revealer of all truth, the door of Deliverance, and to those who have purified their hearts by piety (*bhakti*) he vouchsafes to appear and let himself be known. When his consort Umā asks of him the essentials of religion and morality, he names first "Abstention from taking life, truthfulness of speech, compassion towards all creatures, charity"; there are prohibitions of adultery and theft, and each caste has its special obligations.[3] Thus moralised as the guardian of social righteousness, he is the first to receive the new created sword from Brahman, and is charged to suppress all wrong.[4] The strain of praise rises higher and higher above ancient myth, till he is presented as Mahādeva, the All-inclusive God. Transcending both Prakriti and Purusha, he comprehends both spheres of permanence and change, the eternal and the transient, *sat* and *asat*.[5] He is the Unmanifest, the ultimate ground of all existence, and the Manifest, creator of this passing scene. He can assume an infinite variety of forms, divine, human, or animal; he is the soul of all beings, dwelling in their hearts. To him the desire of every worshipper is known; "Seek then the protection of the King of the gods."[6] One and Many, he is omnipresent and conversant with all thoughts. For who but Çiva, asks Upamanyu in answer to Indra, according to the aged Bhīshma, could have made fire and water, earth, and air and sky;[7] who but he produced the senses and their corresponding subtle elements, Manas and Buddhi and "the Great"?[8] The whole range of intellectual and moral experience lies in him. In the "lauds" of Tandi he is identified with the Three Strands and desire; he is the region of the highest truth; he embraces

[1] xiii. 14, 134. [2] xiv. 17, 92, 78.
[3] xiii. 141, 25. [4] xii. 166, 45.
[5] xii. 285, 10; xiii. 14, 5 f. [6] xiii. 14, 148, 149.
[7] *Kha* has various meanings, and is applied indefinitely to empty space, air, ether, and sky.
[8] xiii. 14, 197 8. On these three technical terms, *cp. ante*, p. 207.

both knowledge and ignorance.[1] The fivefold way of religion is his, crowning the paths of liberal sacrifice, of vows and austerities, of renunciations of attachment and the fruit of acts, of the quest of Deliverance by the surrender of enjoyments and the extinction of the elements, of the lofty devotion to knowledge and science.[2] With relentless consistency he enfolds all opposites; he lays on the world its fetters, he is the bonds themselves, and his is the power that breaks them.[3] The fruit of the Deed, whether of virtue or guilt, is his, so that he is the principle of Karma. By holy shrines and sacred waters he purifies the sinner;[4] all forms of righteousness and skill are his; he is for ever seeking the well-being of the worlds, and saving all creatures from distress;[5] and faith in him, proved by the recitation of his names on the eve of death,[6] will enable the worshipper to reach the Supreme goal. Endued with a mystical body made up of all the gods, he is the Super-Sacrifice, the *Super-World*, *the Super-Knowledge*, *the Super-Soul*, *the Super-Deity*, the Super-Spirit.[7] Who would shrink from confiding his destiny to so wondrous a Being? Like the Calvinist who was ready to be damned for the glory of God, the true believer can say, "At Mahādeva's command I shall cheerfully become a worm; at Hara's word I would even become a dog!"[8]

II

Over against Çiva stands Vishnu, identified in the solemn opening of the poem with the eternal Brahman, ancient, undecaying One, the Good, Guide of all moving and immovable. He, too, like Çiva, has a long descent. He was an ancient Vedic deity, whom later native etymology described as the "Pervader," with reference to his omnipresent energy.[9] A modern interpretation conceives him rather as the divine "Labourer"[10] who daily climbed the skies, quickening all vegetation, and providing food for man.—no other, of course,

[1] xiii. 16, 20.
[2] xiii. 16, 58–63.
[3] xiii. 17, 101.
[4] xiii. 17, 132.
[5] xiii. 17, 112.
[6] xiii. 17, 19.
[7] xiii. 16, 17.
[8] xiii. 14, 182 f.
[9] Giving to the root *vish* the meaning "to pervade."
[10] Macdonell, "to be active," "to work."

than the sun. Only five hymns in the Rig Veda are addressed wholly to him, but he is named about one hundred times. Once associated with Indra in creation, his most famous feat earned him the epithet "wide-going" or "wide-striding," for in three steps he compassed the three divisions of the world, earth, atmosphere, and sky.[1] Many a poet's phrase dwells on the beneficence with which he traversed the earth on man's behalf when he was in distress. It was Vishnu who bestowed it for a habitation on man; he it was who propped up the lofty sky; he enveloped the world in light; his three steps maintained the steadfast ordinances.[2] Above all it was his *sumati*, his "good thought," his benevolence, which embraced all mankind.[3]

The emphasis on his constancy and his compassion awoke the trust and love of the believer. Vishnu was not the only object of such feeling. To Agni, god of the hearth and home, the dear house-priest, the worshipper prayed, "Be thou our nearest[4] friend and guardian, our gracious protector." When the poet Vasishtha laments his estrangement from Varuna through some offence, he boldly reminds the high heaven-God of the days when he had sailed over the ocean with him, or had been his guest in his palace —

> "What hath become of these our ancient friendships,
> When without enmity we walked together?
> O Varuna, thou glorious Lord, I entered
> Thy lofty home, thy house with thousand portals,
> If he, thy true ally, hath sinned against thee,
> Still, Varuna, he is the friend thou lovest."[5]

This is the utterance of devout faith, of trust in the goodwill of the Deity, who can deliver the suppliant from the bonds of evil: "May Varuna undo the bond that binds us." To this heartfelt devotion, full of reverence and humility, later Indian piety gave the name of *bhakti*. The term does not occur in the Rig Veda, but it is not far from the Faith (*Çraddhā*[6])

[1] So moderns, like Bergaigne and Macdonell. Early tradition fixed on the sun's rising, culmination, and setting

[2] Rig *Veda*, vi. 49, 13; vii. 100, 4; 99, 2, 3; i 22, 18.

[3] vii. 100, 2.

[4] v. 24, 1, *antama*, "intimate."

[5] vii. 88, 5, 6, tr. Griffith.

[6] Of the same root as the Latin *credo*.

already invoked as an object of prayer, and prominent in the early Buddhist texts as the expression of the disciple's attitude towards the Teacher. The word itself was then coming into use, to designate the emotional feeling which should be associated with the attainment of wisdom.[1] No such sentiment could be directed towards the Self or the Brahman of metaphysical speculation, and the Upanishads, consequently, do not attempt to evoke it. But when the figure of the Buddha gained more and more attractive power as the great Deliverer from ignorance and sin, Brahmanism was compelled to find some counterpart with like purpose, and out of the Vedic germ of Vishnu's love of man it developed a series of acts of divine self-sacrifice, and finally enrolled the Buddha himself in the long line of his "descents."[2] In the early Pāli texts Vishnu is but one of a long train of minor deities gathered in a Great Assembly under the Lord Brahma himself to see the Tathâgata and the company of the brethren.[3] The younger Upanishads, however, show his rising significance in Brahmanical circles.[4] The end of man's long journey, that goal of wisdom where there is no rebirth, is "the highest place of Vishnu."[5] And still later, Brahmā, Rudra, and Vishnu are among the chief manifestations of the Supreme Brahman.[6]

The Great Epic reflects this process of elevation for Vishnu as well as Çiva. At first he is but the youngest of the twelve sons of Aditi, last in birth, adds the poet significantly, but best in excellence.[7] This original subordination cannot be wholly concealed. When the Earth, burdened with the cruel

[1] *Theragāthā* (PTS, 1883), "bhattima ca pandito," p. 41, 370. Cp. Hardy, quoted by Garbe, *Die Bhagavadgita* (1905), p. 33.

[2] But with a different meaning, as will be noted below. Cp. the valuable collection of illustrative passages in Muir's *Sanskrit Texts*,[2] vol. iv.

[3] Venhu = Vishnu, *Dialogues*, ii. p. 290.

[4] In the "Brāhmana of a Hundred Paths," xiv. 1, 1, *SBE*, xliv. p. 441, Vishnu had already been declared the highest of the gods.

[5] *Kaṭha Up.*, i. 3, 8–9 : *SBE*, xv. p. 13.

[6] *Maitr. Up.*, iv. 5, vi. 5 ; *ibid.*, pp. 302, 308. Ritually, Vishṇu was identified with the sacrifice. See a curious story in the *Çatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, xiv. 1, 1, 5 ff., of his attainment of supremacy among the gods, his consequent pride and loss of his head, *SBE*, xxiv. p 441.

[7] *Mbh.*, i. 65, 16.

ravages of the Dānavas, sought the Grandsire's aid, Brahman bade the heavenly powers with Indra at their head take their birth below to free her from oppression. To Vishnu Indra communicates this command, and he meekly replies, "So be it."[1] And when the ocean has been drunk up by the great sage Agastya, and the Dānavas are slain, the Thirty-three gods took Vishnu with them to lay before Brahman the need of refilling it.[2] His ancient solar character still shines through many an epithet. Beautiful of wing (*suparṇa*), the sun-bird traverses the sky, or as the sun-horse he rises from the sea.[3] Or the sun is his eye; the rays of sun and moon are his hair; he is *chakrin*, dowered with the solar disc; thousand-rayed and seven-flamed, with seven horses to his car; and his three strides compass the three worlds, earth and sky and the realms below.[4] Mythologically he is younger than Indra and so beneath him (*Upendra*), but it is not long before he rises above him (*Atîndra*), and much of Indra's fighting character passes into the junior Āditya.[5] Again and again does Vishnu enter the field against the demonic powers. Famous among these contests was his encounter with Madhu,[6] it was to him that the gods applied for protection against the might of Vritra, Indra's heroic foe.[7] The enmity between this doughty pair caused universal misery, and the sages of heaven endeavoured to make peace. Vritra proposed, and they conceded, conditions for his safety. He should not be slain either in the daytime or the night; nothing should hurt him, wet or dry; no missile of wood or stone, no weapon of distant use or of close combat, should avail to take his life. But one evening Indra saw his adversary on the seashore. He invoked Vishnu, and lo! a mass of foam, mountain-high, rose from the waters. It was the work of a moment to

[1] i. 64, 54, *Aṃsenâvatāra*, literally "descent in part." Later theory worked out a regular scheme of fractional incarnations. Hopkins, *Epic Mythol.*, p. 197, remarks that it is useless to try to conceal Vishnu's inferiority to Brahman by the "defiant addition" in 53.

[2] iii. 105, 19. [3] v. 99, 5.

[4] Epithets mingled with the later attributions of universal Deity in xiii. 149. In iii. 12, 25 the three strides fill heaven, sky, and earth.

[5] He is *Indra-karman*, xiii. 149, 97.

[6] Cp. *ante*, Lect. III., p. 137.

[7] v. 10, 4.

fling it with his thunderbolt; Vishnu entered the foam, and Vritra fell.[1] At other times he uses his ordinary weapons, a wondrous fiery wheel with a thousand spokes,[2] a bow and club, refined at last into a sword of knowledge and a mace of understanding.[3] Or in his strange form half-lion and half-man he clawed the unbelieving king of the Daityas, Hiranyakaçipu, to death.[4] So he is the refuge of the inhabitants of heaven;[5] it is well that kings should look after their helpless relatives as Vishnu cares for the celestials.[6] Conqueror in battle, he becomes *Jagan-nātha*, "lord of the world" (an epithet also of Brahman), and *Gaṇeçvara*, "lord of hosts." It was he, according to Indra's testimony, who by his prowess saved gods and sages, prevented the destruction of the Brāhmans, preserved even the Creator of the world, and thus maintained the deities which would otherwise have all perished.[7]

All this was the development of his "good-mind," his benevolence, the prominent feature of his character. Here was the secret of his "Descents" (*avatāra*), when he condescended to assume various forms for the benefit of man.[8] Nine such manifestations are named in one of the latest sections of the Great Epic.[9] They are partly founded on venerable tales of mysterious animals, dowered with strange powers of helpfulness. As a Swan Vishnu had communicated the Vedas to Brahman. When the wondrous churning of the ocean was accomplished, it was Vishnu who, as the Tortoise king, bore the great mountain Mandāra upon his back.[10] In the older story of the Deluge in the *Brāhmaṇa of a Hundred Paths*, the wondrous Fish which towed Manu's vessel into safety was the impersonation of Brahman. Later mythology transferred the function of deliverance to Vishnu.[11] Among the most famous of these beneficent

[1] For the origin of this tale in the Rig *Veda*, viii. 14, 13, cp. Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*,[2] iv. p. 261.

[2] Given to him by Çiva, according to a Çaiva poet, xiii. 14, 75.

[3] xiii. 149, 120.

[4] iii. 271, 60; "for the benefit of the gods," xii. 340, 76.

[5] vii. 4, 4, *gati*. [6] iii. 248, 24–26. [7] xii. 64, 21–25.

[8] Cp. Prof. Jacobi, in Hastings' *ERE*, vii. p. 193, "Incarnation (Indian)."

[9] xii. 340, 100.

[10] i. 18, 11 f. Cp. *ante*, p. 147

[11] *SBE*, xii. p. 216 ff.; *Mbh.*, iii. 187.

operations was the rescue of the submerged earth.[1] When the primeval waters covered it at the beginning of a new world-age, Vishnu took shape as a mighty boar of league-long size, and with one of his tusks raised it to its proper place beneath the sun.[2] There is no need to recite the catalogue of these adventures. They are a part of the great war with evil which the Deity of the "good Mind" is for ever carrying on. "When virtue and morality decline," he explains to the Brāhman Mārkandeya, "and sin and wickedness increase, I create myself . . . and take my birth in the families of good men. And, assuming a human form, I restore peace by destroying all evils."[3] Such was the great sage Vyāsa, born through Vishnu-Nārâyana's uttered Word,[4] after his *Buddhi* (intelligence) had entered Brahman and enabled him to perform the work of creation.[5] From time to time Earth's burden must be lightened, the wicked punished, and the righteous supported; and for this end the illustrious Madhu-slayer revolved in his thoughts various forms. It is not a little curious that the Southern recension, in adding an *avatāra* as the Buddha, should explain that in this impersonation, clothed in yellow and with shaven head, his object would be to confuse men and lead them astray.[6] One more manifestation has yet to come. Tenth and last, at the end of the Kali age, when the earth is afflicted with all

[1] Ascribed in earlier texts to Prajāpati-Brahman, *e.g. Çatap. Br.*, xiv. 1, 2, 11: *SBE*, xliv. p. 451.

[2] *Mbh.*, xii. 271, 51–55. Mr Andrew Lang had no difficulty in gathering parallels from savage myths (*Myth, Ritual, and Religion*, 1899, i. p. 241).

[3] iii. 189, 27 ff. On Krishna, see below, p 247; and on Rāma, Lect. VII.

[4] *Vāch* or Speech, xii. 150, 4, 38 ff., 50, 59 [5] *Ibid*, ver. 24 ff

[6] Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, p 218 The Vishnu-Purāna describes Vishnu as emitting an "illusory form" (*māyā-moha*, bk iii., xvii, xviii, Wilson, iii. p. 206 ff.) for the purpose of undoing the authority of the Vedas This is the Buddha, but he is not reckoned as an *avatāra*. In the Agni Purāna (ed. M. N. Dutt, Calcutta, 1903) he is presented in that character (xvi.) for the same purpose. The Matsya Purāna gives a list of ten Descents, seven of them in human persons, a punishment inflicted on Vishnu by Çukra, priest of the Asuras, for killing his mother. In these ten Buddha occupies the ninth place (Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*,[2] iv. p. 156). In the Bhāgavata Purāna (cp. Lect. VII.) the number is extended to 22, the Buddha coming in at 21, and Kalki closing the series. Cp. Prof. Jacobi, "Incarnations (Indian)," in Hastings' *ERE*, vii. p. 193.

kinds of disorder, when the rites of religion are neglected, the duties of castes are overthrown, and family ties are dissolved; when crime multiplies and famine spreads, and the framework of nature seems giving way; when the sun is permanently eclipsed and the stars cease to shine and meteors flash and fall, and dreadful conflagrations break out in the four directions; —then Vishṇu will be born as a Brāhman named Kalki. Brāhmans and warriors will gather round him. The strength of his virtue will establish his rule.[1] Later imagination conceived him riding on a white horse with a blazing sword; the wicked will be exterminated, righteousness shall be established upon earth, the vigour of the world shall be renewed, and the Age of Purity (Krita-Yuga) shall begin again.[2]

Such a deity has many different values, for mythology, for philosophy, and for religion. Though he will be presented as omnipresent, the universal agent and the instrument of all action, identical with earth, water, ether, air, and fire,[3] he must be conceived as a wondrous Person. He dwells in his golden car to the north of the Sea of Milk.[4] In the mysterious form of Mahā-Puruṣha[5] with a thousand heads, a thousand eyes, a thousand feet, he lies upon the breast of the Himâlaya;[6] or as Great Lord of the universe he sleeps in Yoga upon the Endless Serpent, Çesha, who encircles and upholds the earth.[7] As the sun, the bull is his representative;[8] pervading space in all directions, he has four, eight, or ten arms.[9] Fourfold in form,

[1] iii 190.

[2] For an account of the late Kalki Purāṇa, see the interesting paper of Mr H. C. Norman, "The Kalki Avatāra of Viṣṇu," in the *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions* (Oxford, 1908), ii. p. 85. The white horse has sometimes been derived from the Apocalypse. But there can be little doubt that it is an Indian figure. It is the counterpart of the wondrous horse, all white but for a crow-black head and dark mane, on which the Buddhist King of Glory rode over the earth promoting his beneficent rule. Cp. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues*, ii. p. 204 f.

[3] *Mbh.*, vi. 8, 17.

[4] *Ibid.*, 8, 15.

[5] Cp. *ante*, p. 43, and below, p. 267.

[6] v. 111, 7.

[7] iii. 102, 11–13. He is always engaged in Yoga, xiii. 149, 31. For the austerities and self-denials by which Çesha obtained the privilege of this function from Brahman, cp. i. 36.

[8] Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, p. 206

[9] Adding zenith and nadir to the quarters and half-quarters.

he devotes himself to labour for the world's welfare. One remains on earth in the constant practice of austerities. The Second (*i.e.* the sun) surveys the good and evil deeds of the whole world. Still in the human sphere is the Third active, while the Fourth sleeps a thousand years.[1] But, philosophically, these are all blended in the unity of his eternal energy. Above all gods he rises, like Brahman of old, or Çiva as Maheçvara, into sole Deity.[2] Nature is the scene of his sovereignty; there he reigns as King of kings; foremost in the universe, there is no higher Being in the three worlds.[3] Hymn after hymn celebrates his unceasing activity. The mighty frame of earth and heaven constitutes his body; the sky is his head, the sun and moon his eyes, the winds his breaths.[4] Without beginning and without end, an infinite eternal energy, he pervades all worlds, the unchanging fountain of all power,[5] so that the whole creation springs from him and disappears in him.[6] He is the Infinite Self (*anantâtmān*), Teacher of the heavenly powers, the Unmanifest Spirit of all matter (*pradhāna*), Soul of the universe, with the All for his Form.[7] He is identified with the ancient Brahman of the Upanishads under the symbol *Tat*,[8] and he presides as the Beginner and the Ender over the sequence of the Ages and the processes of Time. From creation to dissolution, from the darkness of primeval matter back to the Undeveloped once more shrouded in gloom, the mighty rhythm obeys his changeless sway. And Vishṇu is no mere metaphysical entity transcending the Three Strands, an abstract magnitude, an intellectual identification of Cause and Effect, a ritual harmony of sacrificer, priest, offering, and deity. He is God with a character, Source of all Morality, Revealer of all Truth.[9] Not only is he the divine Author of the Vedas, the Instructor in all the sciences, the Master in all learning, he is the supreme Providence, Ordainer

[1] VII. 29, 26 f. He is thus *caturmūrti*. This must not be confused with the later doctrine of the Four *Vyūhas*, p. 221, though the numerical correspondence may not be wholly accidental.

[2] On the relations of the Holy Three, see below, p. 273.

[3] xiv. 44, 12; 45, 16.

[4] iii. 200, 15 ff.

[5] iii. 188, 20.

[6] xiii. 149, 11.

[7] *Viçva-mūrtimān*, iii. 271, 31.

[8] xiii. 149, 91; cp. *ante*, p. 197.

[9] *Dharma* constitutes his body, *Vishṇu Smriti*, i. 54: *SBE*, vii. p. 10.

of ordainers, "he who does good to everyone."[1] The active beneficence which first prompted the Three Strides is now bestowed impartially on all. When the Great Yogin as a mighty boar raised up the earth from the waters, it was "from love of the world" that he "plunged into the ocean."[2] True, he is the destroyer of sin as well as of grief and pain;[3] but he has no personal anger against the wicked; he forgives all injuries, he is inclined to show favour to all, he purifies the sinner and protects the pious, and he has come on earth a hundred times.[4] Such a Deity needed no slaughtered animals upon his altar; brandy, fish, meat, were of evil invention; rice-cakes and flowers were the appropriate symbols of worship and thanksgiving;[5] and the path to union of spirit with him lay through lowly surrender of all desire for personal reward of right action, and that meditation on the Eternal which freed the soul from bonds of sense and time.[6] In this faith the world was no scene of universal suffering. Creation was an act of divine benevolence, not a necessary evolution to provide for the operation of the unexhausted *karma* of a previous age. "Grant us happiness," said a later prayer to Vishnu; "may this thy activity in creation be beneficial to the earth";[7] and the true knowledge was described as "beholding the world at one with thee." The universe was not a regrettable necessity whose existence was to be deplored, nor was it to be thought away as an illusion; it was real, and to be "seen in God" (to use the phrase of Malebranche), the product of divine love, the sphere of discipline for man's fellowship with the Most High.

III

Thus Vishnu, like Çiva, rises into Supreme Deity. The motive of human service, of the world's welfare, so prominent in Buddhism, belongs also to the Vishnu religion. Like the

[1] xiii. 149, 27, 35, 36, 106.
[2] *Vishṇu Smṛiti*, i, 10: *SBE*, vii. p. 3.
[3] *Pāpanāçana* and *Çokanāçana*. xiii. 149.
[4] xiii. 149, 50, 53; *Vishṇu Smṛiti*, i. 57.
[5] xii. 265, 9 ff.
[6] *Vishṇu Smṛiti*, xcvii. 14, 21: *SBE*, vii. p. 290 f.
[7] *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, tr. Wilson (ed. Hall), i. p. 65.

Buddha, his person may be interpreted in terms of Purusha, he is *Purushottama*, "Purusha Most High." Both systems repudiated animal sacrifice; both were supposed to have taught infallible truth; both claimed to possess Scriptures of transcendent authority; both included (though in different forms) a doctrine of "Descents." The parallel between Vishnuism and Buddhism is much closer than the resemblance of either to the cultus of Çiva. And yet Vishnu and Çiva approximated in their higher forms much more nearly than either did to the Buddha. What other influence, then, was present in Indian religious life which could guide these two developments along lines that could ultimately touch? It has been already noted that in the second century before our era one of the Çaiva sects was known as Bhāgavatas, or worshippers of the Bhagavat.[1] Who was the Bhagavat whose name was given to this cult? and did it contribute any elements also to the Vishṇu faith? Recent research has been busy with these questions, and though many details are uncertain and obscure, some clear facts of great interest have been established.[2]

The name Bhagavat is derived from the same root as the word *bhakti*, "devotion" or piety. The root *bhaj* expresses faith, reverence, adoration, and as an epithet of Deity Bhagavat means "the Worshipful," "the Adorable."[3] In the early Middle Ages a remarkable sect of Bhāgavatas comes into view (about A.D. 1100), with important scriptures of their own, who developed what was known as the *bhakti-mārga*, the

[1] Cp. above, p. 221.

[2] See two articles by Sir G. Grierson in the *Indian Antiquary*, 1908, vol. xxxvii., Sept. and Dec., on the Bhāgavatas, and the same writer's article "Bhakti-Mārga," in Hastings' *ERE*, vol. II. (1909), p. 539. In 1913 the important work of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism*, etc., in Buhler's *Grundriss*, threw much additional light upon the group. With the help of these researches the following results seem to be attained.

[3] It is applied in the Epic to various deities, not only to Brahman and Çiva, but to others like Agni or Indra. Like the Greek *kyrios*, however, it may be used as a title of polite address, and in the Upanishads is often translated "Sir." Patañjali uses it to designate Pāṇini (Kielhorn in *JRAS*, 1908, p. 503). It has also the higher meaning of "saint," and is a familiar designation of the Buddha. A shorter form, *bhaga* (also applied to deities), appears in the Zend Avesta in the Old Persian *baga*, and in the Slavonic *bogu*; cp. Schrader, *Reallexikon der Indogerman. Alterth.* (1901), p. 302.

"path of Devotion," over against the ritual cultus known as the *karma-mārga* or "path of Works," and the disciplines of philosophy as the *jñāna-mārga* or "path of Knowledge." The doctrine and practice were of course not new, but the distinguished leadership of Rāmânuja and his successors lifted this conception of the religious life into fresh power.[1] It may be traced back through the Great Epic, where it forms the theme of a late edition to book xii., known as the *Nārâyanīya* section.[2] There Vishnu is identified with the Supreme Deity under the names of Nārâyana, Bhagavat, and Vāsudeva.[3] At this point archæology brings unexpected help. An inscription at Besnagar (near Bhilsa, in the south of Gwalior) records the erection of a column in honour of Vāsudeva, God of gods, by a Greek named Heliodora. He was ambassador from one of the Bactrian Greek princes, and was himself a native of Takkasīla (in Kandahar). The names in the inscription, identified with the help of coins, and the form of the characters, belong to the early part of the second century B.C. In worshipping Vāsudeva Heliodora describes himself as a Bhāgavata.[4] Another inscription on a stone brought from the village of Nagari in Udaipur (in the south of Rājputāna) refers to the construction of a wall round a hall of worship dedicated to Samkarshana and Vāsudeva. On palæographic grounds this is assigned to a date at least as old as 200 B.C.[5] The Epic tells us that Samkarshana was an epithet of Bala-deva, the eldest son of Vāsudeva-Vishnu.[6] Again in the second century the grammarian Patañjali mentions that the name Vāsudeva, employed by the great Sanskrit authority Pānini in one of his grammatical illustrations, was the name of *Bhavat*, understood by Sir R. Bhandarkar to denote "one who was pre-eminently worshipful," *i.e.* God. Pāṇini's date is exposed to the usual uncertainty affecting so many Indian

[1] Cp. Lect. VII.

[2] xii. 335–352 (Dutt); the numeration varies slightly in different Sanskrit editions. An earlier hymn, vi. 65, 44–75, belongs to the same theology. Cp. below, § v., p. 268.

[3] Cp. Lect. IV., note, p. 221.

[4] Bhandarkar, p. 3. [5] Bhandarkar, p. 3.

[6] vi. 65, 69 f.; xii. 340, 36, 71; i. 67, 152. Saṃkarshaṇa was also the name of the second of Vāsudeva's four *Vyūhas* (Vāsudeva being the first) cp. *ante*, p. 221.

literary products, but he is commonly placed in the fourth century B.C.[1] Another testimony from about the same period meets us in one of the books of the early Buddhist canon, where a list of divine persons and objects of worship (including Indra and Brahmā) opens with Vāsudeva and Bala-deva.[2] These figures in some way belong to the Vishnu circle They also point to a Bhagavat worship which was practised in North-west India. It was so entirely independent of the caste-system that it could be adopted by Greeks, and it was essentially monotheistic. There was but one Bhagavat, and his name was Vāsudeva.

Such a religion must have arisen and spread in communities less rigidly controlled by priestly rule. Sir G. A. Grierson has called attention to many indications that the seat of early Brahmanism was in the Midland country between the Sarasvatī on the west and the lower plains of the Ganges on the east.[3] Around it on the east, south, and west were various tribes, among which the Yādavas, descendants of an eponymous ancestor Yadu, are named in the Epic. Among their clans were the Sātvatas, who worshipped Vāsudeva, eternal, beneficent, and loving, as he was chanted by Samkarshana.[4] Later on, in the Bhāgavata Purāna, they are said to have identified the Supreme Brahman with Bhagavat and Vāsudeva.[5] Scanty as are these facts, they point to an amalgamation at an unknown date, and by a process equally unknown, between the old Vedic sun-god Vishnu and a monotheistic cult in N.W. India under the names of Vāsudeva and Bhagavat.[6] By analysing a remarkable story of the origin of the Vasudeva religion in the Nārâyanīya section (*Mbh.*, xii. 335–352), Sir R. Bhandarkar reaches the conclusion that there was an early monotheistic religious reform founded on repudiation of animal sacrifices.

[1] Mr Vincent Smith, however, has recently expressed the opinion that he may possibly have flourished as early as the seventh (*History of India*, 1919, p. 57[1]).

[2] *Niddesa* (ed. Poussin and Thomas, PTS, 1916), i. p. 89.

[3] *Indian Antiquary* (1908), p. 251.

[4] *Mbh.*, vi. 66, 40; Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism*, p. 8.

[5] ix. 9, 49. Bhandarkar, *ibid.*

[6] Grierson refers to solar elements in this cult which may have helped the fusion.

The Deity exalted by this movement was known as Hari, which afterwards became a familiar name of Vishnu. His worship was based on personal austerities and pious devotion (*bhakti*). A second stage presents the Deity under the name Vāsudeva, identified with Vishnu, among whose various Descents is Krishna, who can himself be designated Vāsudeva.[1] But here a new problem is started. Who was Krishna, and how was he brought into the Vāsudeva-Bhagavat-Vishnu cycle?

Vedic tradition told of an ancient singer of that name.[2] A later Krishna, son of a mother Devakī, appears as pupil of a sage called Ghora.[3] The name itself means dark, swarthy, black. It is an epithet of Night; it describes the complexion of the lovely Draupadī, the wife of the Five Pāndava brothers; it is the mark of Māra, the Tempter, god of desire and consequently of death, the Buddhist Satan, just as the Christian Barnabas familiarly styles the devil ὁ μέλας. Now in the Epic Krishna is represented as the son of Devakī. Two versions of his parentage ascribe to him a divine origin. He is begotten by Vāsudeva,[4] and he is born of a black hair by which Nārâyana (Vāsudeva) entered Devakī's womb.[5] Is this being to be identified with Ghora's disciple? Did he found the Vāsudeva religion, and himself ultimately become its object? Such is the interpretation of Prof. Garbe and Sir G. Grierson.[6] The elaborate investigations of Mr Kennedy distinguish three Krishnas of solar type,[7] while Prof. Berriedale Keith prefers to treat him as a vegetation spirit.[8] The tangle of incongruities does not yield to any definite solution, but Sir R. Bhandarkar seems to have clearly proved that in its original use Vāsudeva was a proper name and not a patronymic.[9] How the cowherd

[1] For example, xii. 47, 24.
[2] *Rig Veda*, viii. 74, 3–4.
[3] *Chhāndog. Up.*, iii. 17, 6: *SBE*, i. p. 52.
[4] i. 63, 99.
[5] i. 199, 33.
[6] Garbe, *Die Bhagavadgītā* (1905), p. 23; *Indian Antiquary*, xxxvii. p. 253.
[7] *JRAS* (1907), p. 961; (1908) p. 505.
[8] *JRAS* (1908), p. 169. Cp. an unsigned article on *Bhakti*, in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Soc.*, xxiii. (1910), p. 115 (attributed to Mr Sedgwick).
[9] Bhandarkar, p. 13. Sanskrit usage at first suggested that it was derived from a father's name Vasudeva. As this is the actual name of Krishna's father in later legend, earlier investigators accepted the relation-

Krishna was introduced into the sphere of Vāsudeva and identified with him is as obscure as his origin.[1] Equally so is the process by which Vāsudeva-Krishna entered the cult of Vishnu, so that Krishna was accepted as one of his Descents. No such association was effected by the Çiva-Bhāgavatas with their Deity; and the theology of which Brahman was the centre did not lend itself to this particular type of amalgamation.[2]

The figure of Krishna in the Great Epic combines the most widely different features. He is of royal descent, of the race of Yadu, first cousin of the Pāndava brothers; allied most closely with Arjuna, for whom he condescends to act as charioteer. Arjuna, it may be noted, is by contrast "the White" or Bright, beside his kinsman "the Dark" or Black. Together they are invincible;[3] they are known as the "Two Krishnas,"[4] "equal to each other in every detail of their nature."[5] But Krishna is also a cowherd (*gopāla*),[6] and in the later legends this function leads to awkward developments which religious imagination has much ado to spiritualise. The epithet *govinda* (which belongs also to Çiva) looks at first sight like "cow-finder," but is probably a later form of an ancient name of Indra, applied to him in the Rig Veda in connection with the imagery of the storm and the cloud-cows.[7] The poets of the Epic, however, gave to the word *go* the meaning "earth," and interpreted the title by reference to the rescue of the earth from the waters.[8] It is as guardian of the cows that he fights the demons in the *go-kula*, the cattle region on the Jumna which was his home during his youth.[9] And this character supplied the abusive language about his low origin and cowardly style of fighting with which

ship as historical, just as Baladeva's son was named Bāladeva. If Vāsudeva is the original datum, then Vasudeva was formed backwards from it, when it was necessary to provide Krishna as the incarnate Vāsudeva with a human parent. Prof. Jacobi, in Hastings' *ERE*, vii. p. 195, proposes another explanation.

[1] Cp. xiii. 158, 39.

[2] See hymn to Nārâyana-Vāsudeva-Krishna, vi. 65, 47 ff.; (on Nārâyana, see § V., below); in 66, 13, Brahman declares himself Vāsudeva's son.

[3] ii. 20, 14.

[4] iii. 86, 4–6.

[5] v. 68, 1.

[6] iii. 262, 10.

[7] Bhandarkar, p. 36.

[8] i. 21, 12; xii. 343, 68.

[9] ii. 41, 4 ff. Bhandarkar thinks this passage a later interpolation, p. 36.

his enemies assailed him.[1] On his human side he takes delight in sport and revels; he does not know where Arjuna is in the battlefield; by his own admission he was unable at any time to perform a divine act, but he would do what he could as a man.[2] He offers sacrifice to Çiva; and, after homage to Umā, consort of the three-eyed god, receives from her a promise of sixteen thousand wives.[3] How much of the epic story was known in the days of Patañjali, who mentions dramatic representations of his adventures, we cannot tell. At a still earlier date his character as fighter with powers of all kinds was sufficiently clear to suggest to Megasthenes his identity with Herakles.[4] How Vāsudeva-Krishna took up the cowherd tales remains uncertain. The literary authority for the stories of his infancy and boyhood is late; and in the course of centuries the festival of his birth is generally admitted to have incorporated some elements of far-flung Christian tradition.[5] It is impossible to fix dates with any precision even within the most elastic limits; Sir R. Bhandarkar suggests that the tale of his early years in the *gokula* was unknown till about the Christian era. In the meantime Vāsudeva-Krishna had become widely accepted—first of all in the North-West—as the Supreme God. There are, indeed, not a few indications that the Vāsudeva-Krishna faith was not unopposed.[6] But it was strong enough to make its way, to appropriate much of the old culture represented by the earlier Upanishads, and to absorb the general scheme of the Sānkhya and Yoga philosophies. In Vishnu it found the most appropriate expression of the Godhead with which to unite upon the lines of Brahmanism. But the fusion required time. The famous poem which is the most significant monument of the Bhāgavata faith—in the view of many the loftiest expression of the religious consciousness of India,—the *Bhagavad-Gītā*,

[1] ii. 44, 26; ix. 61, 26 ff.

[2] i. 220, 8; 223, 63; vii. 19, 21; *purusha-kāratah* (Hopkins, *Epic Mythol.*, p. 215).

[3] vii. 79, 4; xiii. 15, 7.

[4] According to a widely accepted view. Kennedy, however, makes Çiva Herakles, and Krishna Dionysos.

[5] See the famous essay of Albrecht Weber, *Ueber die Krishnajanmashtamī* (the birth-festival), Berlin, 1868.

[6] On Nārâyana, and his place in the Bhāgavata group, cp. below, p. 265.

does not present Vāsudeva-Krishna as an incarnation of Vishnu as Supreme God; he is only identified with him as one of the Ādityas, just as he is with Marichi as one of the Maruts (x. 21). And it is in this character of splendour, filling the whole world with his radiance, that Arjuna addresses him in the wondrous revelation of his sovran form (xi. 24, 30). That the poem has received various modifications and expansions is widely believed; it exhibits too many inconsistencies of philosophical and religious thought to be the work of one author at one time. On the somewhat precarious ground of what it does not contain, Sir R. Bhandarkar proposes to date it not later than about 400 B.C.[1] Prof. Garbe sees it begun in the second century before our era, and completed in the second century after.[2] What, then, is the main teaching of a book so widely influential and so deeply loved?

IV

The "Lord's Song," like all the higher Indian thought, is engaged with the threefold relation of God, the world, and man. For two thousand years it has provided the most concentrated expression of pious reflection on the powers and destinies of the soul, and the means of realising its participation in the divine nature.[3] It sets the tune on which so much of the medieval literature is one long series of variations.[4] In form it is an episode in the great strife which is the theme of the Mahābhārata, where it constitutes cantos 25–42 in the sixth book (*Bhīshma Parvan*). The armies of the contending powers, under the leadership of the Five Brothers and their Kuru cousins, are marshalled against each other. On the eve of battle Arjuna, knightliest of the Pāndavas, the winner of the

[1] Namely, the doctrine of the Four *Vyūhas*, cp. *ante*, p. 221, *Vaiṣṇavism*, etc., p. 13.

[2] In Hastings' *ERE*, ii. p. 538. Dr Barnett, in the very useful introduction to his translation (1905), does not attach a date to the poem itself, but suggests 400–200 B.C. as the period for the older portions of the Epic, in which Krishna "is simply a powerful demigod or divine hero," and 200 B.C.–200 A.D. for the later parts, in which he "figures as the incarnation of the supreme deity," p. 50.

[3] Cp. 2 *Peter* i. 4.

[4] Not only in the commentaries of Çaṅkara, Rāmânuja, Madhava, and others, but in the whole *bhakti* literature, cp. Lect. VII.

lovely Draupadī, gazing at the splendid array, is overcome by the thought of the coming slaughter, and exclaims to his charioteer Krishna, "I wish not to slay these though they slay me, even for the sake of sovereignty over the Three Worlds; what, then, for the sake of this earth." Bhagavat at first rebukes him for faint-heartedness, and then passes at once to the consolations of philosophy and religion. Bodies may change and die, but souls are eternal and imperishable. It is a warrior's duty to fight, and those who die in just battle go straight to heaven.[1] The doctrine of the indestructibility of souls was a familiar principle of the Sānkhya teaching (ii. 39), and the Adorable then passes at once to its Yoga application. This practically occupies the first division of the poem (cantos 1 6). A second group of discourses is mainly concerned with Bhagavat's own nature, and his relation to the world (7–11). After an exposition of two kinds of devout meditation (12) a third group, with various repetitions and analogies, treats of numerous topics, ethics, faith, the significance of the Three Strands on different modes of action and religious duty—food, sacrifices, austerities, charity,—and the poem concludes with a plea for the higher life of Renunciation in all the different fields of human activity (13–18).

The main object of the poem is thus to expound a way of deliverance from the *samsāra*. It is an individual utterance; it portrays the mind and reports the words of a believer. The speaker has had many predecessors, but they have established no school. He does not lead a missionary movement; he is not preaching to disciples; he addresses no community; he promulgates no discipline demanding withdrawal from the world.[2]

[1] ii. 37, *svarga*; not, of course, for ever, but for the period appropriate to their valour and sacrifice. This is a frequent theme of Kshatriya duty and destiny in the Epic. For the brave there was a place in Indra's heaven. Even an unbelieving king who falls beneath Kṛishṇa's superior might receives a promise of this reward.

[2] Dr Barnett's adoption of the term "Rule" for *Yoga* must not be understood in the sense of a method of monastic life like the *regula* of St Francis. In x. 9, however, there is a reference to the happiness of believers in the mutual communication of their experiences. The votary of Yoga had to pursue his way alone. The *bhakta* looked to others for sympathy. But this did not generate any organised "common prayer." Cp. Lect. VII.

He is the Divine Companion of a high-caste layman, involved in the ordinary social duties of his princely birth; and he endeavours to conciliate the higher religious practice with philosophy on the one hand and with family obligations on the other. The ascetic demands of the Path of Knowledge were severe; the claims of personal position were also urgent; the cultus, sacrifice, and ritual must be maintained, and all must be harmonised with the higher monotheism. Three philosophies lie behind this scheme. There is the Sānkhyan dualism of the eternal Prakriti and the eternal souls; matter and spirits are independent self-subsisting entities. There is its Yoga modification, where one Purusha is raised into a source of religious guidance and help for those who resolutely seek the deathless Vision. And there is the Ātman-Brahman conception of the older Upanishads, the poem itself being often reckoned in the same class. By what process were these elements combined? The interpretation of Nature and Man is throughout couched in Sānkhyan terms. Here are the Three Strands, the cosmic evolution, Buddhi, Ahamkāra, Manas, as the explanation of our individuality. How far the Yoga colouring implies the religious development of the later doctrine, how far it is the product of a definite scheme or recognised group of ascetic disciplines, it is not easy to determine. What account, then, is to be given of the Ātman-Brahman passages? Are they to be ejected as interpolations? The rigour of German criticism has not shrunk from the task, and Prof. Garbe has marked about 168 verses (nearly a quarter of the whole) as suspect.[1] It must, however, be observed that the criteria are altogether subjective.[2] No decisive tests of style can be detected; in passing from one philosophical conception to another the technical dialect may momentarily change, but the change is only a passing disguise over a deeper religious identity. As the divine forms can melt into each other and blend, it is not impossible for philosophies

[1] See his translation, Leipzig, 1905.

[2] The student may compare, for example, recent attempts to resolve the Fourth Gospel into a *Grundschrift* and the expansions of a Redactor, by Wendt, Wellhausen, and Spitta. Similar treatment has been applied to Ecclesiastes, where the glaring inconsistencies of thought and feeling are much more marked, and the "two voices" have been turned into a veritable debate.

to do the same. The kaleidoscopic variations in modes of thought are always subservient to the main purpose of the poem, the presentation of fellowship with the exalted Bhagavat as the goal of the believer's endeavours.

In fulfilling this purpose the poet insensibly creates a new atmosphere. The older Upanishads, while they laid stress on knowledge, did not forget the necessity of faith.[1] Just as Augustine argued that *fides* must in time and authority precede *intellectus*, though *intellectus* was prior in reality when brought into true apprehension of the ontological object, so *Çraddhā*, faith, must be the foundation of *Jñāna*, knowledge; but when this immediate perception of the ultimate spiritual reality is reached, the teacher's word is needed no more; the work of Revelation is done; direct vision renders all external aids superfluous. To *Çraddhā*, however, is now added *bhakti*, the worshipper's adoring love, evoked by the sense of the divine beneficence on the cosmic scale, as well as God's personal dealing with the individual soul. For this new element in religion a new term was needed, *prasāda*; in the physical sphere, clearness or radiance; in the moral, serenity or graciousness.[2] Behind these special terms lie the two fundamental conceptions which have given the poem its age-long hold on Indian thought. The highest reality in the universe is Spirit; it is called by many different names; it assumes different forms in different philosophical modes, but it is always eternal and supreme. And the highest reality in man is also Spirit, capable of controlling all the impulses and passions of the body, of recognising its kinship with the universal Spirit, and of finally entering into union with it in everlasting peace and joy. There is no definite promise of ultimate salvation for all, like that at length attained in later Buddhism. The Sānkhyan doctrine, with its infinite number of eternal souls, implies a continual process of emancipation, but it never reaches a completed end. A series of ages, without beginning, marked by recurring dissolutions and renewals, has

[1] *Chhāndog. Up.*, i. 10, and often.

[2] Thus in *Maitri. Up.*, vi. 20 and 34, *SBE.* xv. pp. 320, 333, it denotes the serenity of the believer's thoughts; in *Kaṭha Up.*, ii. 20, *Çvet. Up.*, iii. 20, *SBE.*, xv. pp. 11, 248, it describes the grace of the Creator. Both meanings in the Gītā, *e.g.* xviii. 37, 56, 58.

no goal. It marches on without arrest or cessation; it is never summed up; out of the boundless multitude of souls, however many extricate themselves from the *samsāra*, there is always a fresh supply of the entangled to carry on to the next world-period. Theoretically it might conceivably be possible for the whole multitude of animate existence (*bhūtas*, "beings that are born") from devas to demons to gain emancipation in one and the same *Kalpa*. Then no *karma*-potencies would survive to people a new universe after the great destruction. No fresh evolution would take place, and Prakriti would resume its undifferentiated state with nothing to disturb its silence and repose for ever. But the *Gītā* is not concerned with such visions of a final peace. It is enough for the poet to tell the believer of to-day how to escape from a world of change and pain.

The theme of the poem, therefore, is human action and destiny in their relation to God. It involves a threefold view of man's nature, of the world in which he lives, and the God after whom he aspires. On the Sānkhyan basis the human body with its associated activities, intellectual and moral, belongs to Prakriti and its Three Strands.[1] Under their influence ordinary men are attached to their "works" (iii. 28); they are prompted by the impulses which proceed from passion and ignorance to all kinds of egoistic actions which keep them in the material sphere. Out of the infinite variety of men's previous careers two main types emerge (xvi.). Under the influence of the Karma which they have accumulated some are born to *Daivī* (the god-like order), others to *Asurī* (the demonic). Lofty ethical qualities are seen in the first, fearlessness, patience, constancy, steadfastness, absence of malice, pity, and the like. The demonic are mean of understanding, they own no God (*anīçvara*, xvi. 8). Given to egoism and cruel of works, they sink to the lowest way, where Desire, Wrath, and Greed form the triple gate to hell (xvi. 20 f.). The Three Strands determine different groups of superhuman powers as objects of faith,

[1] As the *Guṇas* in the Gītā are treated almost exclusively in respect of men's dispositions and characters, Dr Barnett translates the term by "Moods." This word is an interpretation perfectly applicable within the human limits, but it must not be forgotten that it is a translation from a semi-material conception into terms of consciousness.

different types and purposes of sacrifice, different modes and aims of austerity (or "mortification," *tapas*). They thus play an important part in the moral life, in the capacities and energies of each individual, and represent significant elements in the Sānkhyan basis of the poet's thought (xvii.).

The philosophic emphasis of Sānkhyan teaching fell upon *jñāna*, "knowledge,"[1] viz. the realisation of the absolute difference between Prakriti and Purusha, Nature and Spirit. The method of attaining this intellectual apprehension is not described. It is enough for Krishna to affirm that *Buddhi* (understanding) has been imparted to Arjuna on Sānkhyan lines, and he passes on to its significance in Yoga as the means for casting off the bond of works (ii. 39). It is not, however, the formal Yoga of the Sūtras with its single Purusha exalted as guide and teacher above the rest. It is a Yoga which, indeed, practises the ancient disciplines (v. 27 f.), but it brings the devout believer into the presence of a God who rules the world, who delivers the disciple from sin, and receives him into eternal union with himself. This Deity bears many names, and has many aspects. He is *Maheçvara*, "the Great Lord" (x. 3), unborn, without beginning. He is identified with Brahman, Hari, Bhagavat, Vāsudeva, Purusha Parama ("Spirit Supreme"), Purushottama ("Spirit Most High"), Jagat-pati ("Lord of the World"), and many another form in the radiant glory of the gods. But though conceived as eternal, he does not exist in lonely isolation. He is no monad after the Greek type, immutable, impassible. He is conditioned by Prakriti, which indeed exists independently, yet owes all its form in creation to his energy; and he is Time, governing all succession and ruling over the birth and death of worlds. The effort to present such a Being to ordinary apprehension strains thought and language into fantastic shapes. The Bhagavat possesses a twofold nature; the lower is eightfold, constituted by earth, water, fire, wind, ether (or space), mind, understanding, and the "I-making" (*ahamkāra*). These account for the world and the consciousness of its inhabitants. But he has a higher nature, "life-endowed,"[2]

[1] Sixty-five times in all.

[2] *Jīva-bhūta*, "become living," vii. 4, a new term. Dr Barnett paraphrases it as "the Elemental Soul."

afterwards described as ancient or eternal, in the world of souls (xv. 7), and designated an actual portion (*amsa*) of him—so hard is it to escape from quantitative conceptions[1]—which, as the individual soul, draws the five sense-organs and the mind within to realise their personality. There in sovereign state it presides over sight, touch, hearing, and the rest; and they that have the Eye of Knowledge behold him; and so do the men of Yoga, who strive after concentration, see him abiding in their Self (*ātman*). Thus every created (born) being is in some sense a partial incarnation of Deity. The divine life does not constitute the sole element in the personality, as in some forms of the Ātman doctrine of the Upanishads. Nature (or matter) is real and not illusory; the transmigrating soul is also real. The body (*deha*) may cease to be, but its occupant (*dehin*, ii. 13), which has never ceased to pass from form to form, having had no beginning, will also have no end.

Now just as the true Yogin sees God lodged in his own Self, the source of memory and knowledge, so he sees him also as the light that lightens the whole world, the radiance of sun, moon, and fire, the support of all living creatures through the food-producing energy of the earth (xv. 12–15). But this involves no pantheistic absorption of the human spirit in the divine. There are really three kinds of Purushas: the Perishable, the Imperishable, and the Supreme.[2] The perishable, says the poet, are all "born beings," a term variously interpreted by medieval and modern commentators. It usually denote souls in connection with the material world, who may be found in every rank from Brahmā himself to the temporary occupant of a blade of grass, and this meaning is preferred by Rāmânuja.[3] They are still entangled in the *samsāra*, and suffer all the vicissitudes of its changes. They die and are born again. Even Brahmā at the Great Dissolution vanishes into the Un-

[1] Çaṅkara explains that the notion is only imaginary.

[2] The first two Purushas are treated collectively, and signify two conditions of the soul.

[3] Cp. Lect. VII. See the translation by A. Govindāchārya (Madras, 1898), p. 476. Others suppose it to include all material objects. Dr Barnett explains this application of the term Purusha by reference to the Purusha-hymn of the creation of the universe. Cp. *ante*, p. 43.

manifest. But there are others who have attained emancipation. They are reborn no more; they are imperishable, free from all the risks and mutations of mortality. They are said to be "set on high,"[1] and they abide in sublime independence, they share the very nature (*dharma*) of the Lord; "In the creations they enter not upon birth, and in the dissolutions they are not disturbed" (xiv. 2); "Many are they," says the Lord, "who, freed from passion, fear, and wrath, . . . purified by austerity of knowledge, have come into my Being" (iv. 10). So above the world as the scene of birth and death and the souls carried along the stream of transmigration, above the souls which have gained the unchanging heights, rises the Purusha Most High, the Supreme Self (*paramâtman*, xv. 17; xiii. 22, 31), the undecaying Lord who condescends to enter and sustain the threefold world.

Here is a theism not unlike that of the Çvetâçvatara Upanishad,[2] which fills the universe with God as the sole cause of all its changes, the author of its order, the disposer of its powers. Matter, indeed, he did not create; but he shaped it into form and filled it with beauty and use. The worlds, even up to Brahman's realm, come and go; the days and nights of Brahman, each a thousand ages long, perpetually succeed each other. When the great Day dawns over the silent formless Prakriti, the hidden worlds emerge to view; at the approach of Night they sink back into the dark, and melt into the Unmanifest once more (ix. 16-18). But behind this unmanifest in Nature is another Unmanifest, the abode of created beings. All dwell in him, and yet—for their relation can only be expressed in contradictions—they do not (ix. 4), they have no permanence. "Behold my divine Yoga," says the Lord. "I uphold creation as I have brought it into being, but I do not dwell therein"; he is, in modern phrase, at once immanent and transcendent, and

[1] xv. 16 (Barnett); *kûṭa-stha*, "heap-standing," either "standing on a heap," exalted, or "standing like a heap," steadfast, constant, immutable. As the word *kûṭa* may also mean "trick," "illusion," Çaṅkara finds here a hint of his doctrine of the unreality of the world; just as his annotator Ânandagiri treats the two Purushas as the *upâdhis* or "on-layings" by which the Supreme assumes the forms of individuality. Cp. the translation of A. Mahâdeva Sâstri (Mysore, 1901), p. 368.

[2] i. 8, 10.

the soul trained in *yoga* learns to "see the Self in all things, and all things in the Self" (vi. 29, 30). So he may be called the Father and Mother, or even the Grandsire (a favourite term in the Great Epic), of the world (ix. 17). The universe is strung on him like gems upon a thread (vii. 7). He gives the seed for which great Brahman is the womb (xiv. 4), a singular identification of the Sānkhyan Prakriti with the impersonal Brahman of the Upanishads. Conditioned thus by Matter, Space, and Time, he is yet higher than they all. He is, of course, himself Time, for he begins and ends each age, he is the mysterious power of all growth and decay. So completely does he combine and harmonise all opposites, that he can declare himself "Deathlessness and Death, *sad-asat*, Being and No-Being" (ix. 19).[1] Vāsudeva, then, is the All (vii. 19), but he is infinitely more than the sum of visible existence; he is the *Adhibhūta*, the Over-being, the Over-gods, the Over-sacrifice, the Over-soul (vii. 29). To express this symbolically a wondrous vision is vouchsafed to Arjuna (xi.), who has besought the Supreme Lord to show him his Sovereign form as Purusha Most High. As Krishna stands beside him in the car, he suddenly reveals his mysterious nature. It is a dread Apocalypse, full of awe and terror, though Western taste (whether nurtured on Greek or Gothic models) finds its figures grotesque. The warrior gazes on a body (*deha*) which is at once infinite, yet has a shape. It includes the gods around Brahmā seated on the lotus throne,[2] and all creation, animate and inanimate. This body has no beginning, middle, or end. Its infinite power is represented by infinite arms; its omniscience by infinite eyes; its omnipresence

[1] *Sat* and *asat* again give rise to divergent interpretations. Çankara equates *sat* with "manifested existence" or the effect, and *asat* with the unmanifested cause. Rāmânuja thinks of the time-sequence; *sat* denotes the present, what is now; *asat*, what was in the past but exists no longer, or what will be in the future but has not yet realised itself. Modern philosophy tends rather to view the antithesis in Greek style, the contrast between the Absolute and the phenomenal. Cp. on Manu, above, p. 141; and the commentators on *Gītā*, xiii. 12.

[2] This seems to be the lotus which sprang out of Vishnu's navel, according to the story (*Mbh.*, iii. 12, 37) which presents Vishnu as the source of Brahmā. Here, therefore, is a later development of the exaltation of Vishṇu, compared with x., where he is still only one of the Ādityas (21).

by infinite feet. Its destructive energy is typified by vast mouths grim with teeth and burning flame, and huge bellies capable of containing worlds. Into these appalling cavities Arjuna sees his enemies rushing with fearful speed, caught and crushed between the piercing fangs. So swift is the flight of time, that he beholds the worlds like moths attracted to the fire drawn into the blazing apertures and consumed. Well may he entreat this overwhelming Being to resume his human shape. In doing so the Deity declares—

"That shape of Mine that thou hast seen is very hard to behold; even the gods are everlastingly fain to see that form.

Not for the Vedas, not for mortifications, not for almsgiving, and not for sacrifice, may I be seen in such guise as thou hast seen Me.

But through undivided devotion (*bhakti*), Arjuna, may I be known and seen in verity, and entered, O affrighter of the foe.

He who does My work, who is given over to Me, who is devoted to Me, void of attachment, without hatred to any born being, comes to Me." [1]

For this is the new note of the Bhāgavata religion, announced in explicit terms in literary record for the first time:—

"Though birthless and unchanging of essence (or "soul," *ātman*), and though Lord of all born beings, yet in my sway over the Nature (*Prakriti*) that is Mine I come into birth by My own magic.

For whenever *Dharma* (Religion or Law) fails and *Adharma* (Irreligion or Lawlessness) uprises, then do I bring myself to bodied birth. To guard the righteous, to destroy evildoers, to establish *Dharma*, I come into birth age after age.

He who knows in verity My divine birth and works, comes not again to birth when he has left the body; he comes, O Arjuna, to Me." [2]

The Deity thus manifests himself for a purely moral purpose. He comes to protect the good, to overthrow (not to redeem) the wicked, to promote righteousness. As age succeeds age he must repeat his entry into the human scene. He reveals the truth, he shows the way to deliverance from ignorance and sin, he opens the path to divine communion, he is dowered with might to defeat those who resist. The mode of his advent is

[1] xi. 52–55 (Barnett). [2] iv. 6–9 (Barnett).

not specified.[1] No conditions are laid down for his birth such as were prescribed for the future Buddha. As the wondrous transformation before Arjuna's astonished gaze comes to an end, he knows that it is the whole Godhead who thus condescends to stand beside him in the car. The idea is here in distinct advance upon all the earlier Descents in the Vishnu cycle. Far beyond conflicts with particular demonic forms, the conception is generalised and exalted. The scene is transferred from the distant cities of the Asuras to the homes of human life; and since one such intervention can only meet the needs of one world-age, it must be repeated, that the multitude of voyagers over the ocean of existence may all have the knowledge how to reach the further shore.

In assuming human form, however, does not the Deity enter the sphere of *Karma*? From day to day he is inevitably engaged in thought and speech and act, the causes for finite beings of the accumulation of merit or guilt. Can these attach to him in his Self-manifestation? Nay, is not the whole process of the production and maintenance of the universe a Deed on a stupendous scale? Is it not thereby brought within the compass of the Moral Order? The answer is twofold. In the first place, the Law of the Deed is itself inherent in the being of the Deity. Vishnu is himself the embodiment of *Karma*, the very ground and energy of its operation, the unfailing director of its course.[2] The sovereign justice which insists that every temper, feeling, purpose, work, of good or ill, shall bear its fruit, belongs to his essence, and lies at the heart of all his causal power. And, secondly, his action is absolutely without self-regard. He has no duties, and experiences no wants. No obligations bind him, nor do desires prompt. "There is

[1] Cp. the list of his *vibhūtis* or manifestations of his power, x. 19 ff., where he is identified with various ancient saints and sages, such as Nārada, Kapila, Vyāsa, and others.

[2] In the Hymn of a Thousand Names, *Mbh.*, xiii. 149, he is the Lord of the Past, the Present, and the Future, who causes the acts of all living creatures to fructify, ordaining all deeds and their fruits, vv. 14, 17 f. In *Bhag. Gīt.*, v. 14, "the Lord" (Barnett) is *prabhu*, referring apparently to the *dehin* in 13; and the verse is to be understood of the Sānkhyan *Purusha*, not of Bhagavat. Causation is there ascribed to *svabhāva*, nature. Cp. *ante*, p. 205, and Barnett's note for a different view.

nothing in the Three Worlds," says the Lord, "that I must do; nothing ungotten or that I shall not get; yet do I abide in work."[1] Were he to cease, the worlds would perish in disorder, and all creation would be ruined. Why, then, does not God win merit by his work for the welfare of all beings? It is, in technical phrase, because he works without attachment. He labours selflessly, and in serene impartiality is ready equally to receive the devotion and return the affection of all. No caste or colour, no dignity of rank, no poverty of enlightenment, awakens his enmity or attracts his favour;[2] "They that worship Me with devotion dwell in Me and I in them." High in rank are all doers of righteousness, "but to the man of knowledge I am exceeding dear, and he to Me" (vii. 17). The impartiality of God is not therefore the absence of affection, but superiority to all favouritism; and this is carried to the extent of regarding the worship paid to other gods as offered to himself (ix. 23). The way to emancipation for the human spirit lies in the attainment of similar elevation above the selfishness which breeds jealousy and hate.

For this there are indeed two ways, the disciplines of Knowledge and of Works. The former is only for the few; it starts from faith, and it involves the life of austere endeavour and ceaseless Concentration.[3] The latter is the path for the many in the ranks of caste. Each has his own duties; the Brāhman must sacrifice, the warrior must fight.[4] But obligations discharged without self-regard do not bind men to the world of sense and time. When acts are done for God, they do not entangle the

[1] *Gītā*, iii. 22. Cp. *John* v. 17, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."

[2] The baldness of the statement, "None is hateful, none is dear to me," ix. 29, evidently caused some misgivings; for Mādhava says that one interpretation proposed to supply the words *bhakta* and *abhakta*. "Among all beings no Bhākta becomes hateful to me, and no Abhakta becomes the receptacle of my love. So I am impartial. There would be partiality if the Bhakta were hated and the Abhakta loved. But this I never do. I bestow fruit only according to *bhakt* or devotion." Cp. the translation by S. Subba Rau (Madras, 1906), p. 208.

[3] Cp. vi. 10 ff.

[4] The *bhakti* religion is open to all, women, and those of the lowest birth, ix. 32. Deliverance is independent of costly sacrifice and large priestly fees.

agent in the sphere of passion or ignorance. "Fulfil your works," says the Lord again and again, "but with the surrender (*tyāga*) of yourself; cast them on Me, and you shall be free."[1] It is the Indian equivalent of the Pauline demand that the Christian believer shall "do all to the glory of God." Even the *sannyāsin*, the man of austerities seeking the higher life, must get his food. "Whatever be thy work, thine eating, thy sacrifice, thy gift, thy mortification, make thou of it an offering to Me" (ix. 27). Such a life needed perpetual vigilance; to curb the unceasing fickleness of the mind, a constant control must be enforced (iii. 36 ff.; vi. 33–36). Nor do all seek God in the same way; so that he deals with each after his own method (iv. 11; xiii. 23 ff.). He gives understanding, knowledge, clear vision, patience, truth (x. 4). Even the evildoer who worships him with undivided service shall be deemed good (ix. 30 f.); he has a right purpose; he will become righteous of soul and reach lasting peace; "for to those who in undivided service think and wait on me, I bring power to win and to maintain" (ix. 22).

The issue of this long endeavour is expressed in the different idioms of the elder Brahmanism of the Upanishads, the Yoga insight, and the Bhāgavata's ideal of the mutual indwelling of God and the soul. To cast off all selfish desires, to renounce the claims of "Mine" and "I," is the way to final peace. This is to dwell in Brahma;[2] he that has reached it is not confounded; if even at his last hour only he dwell therein, he attains *Brahma-nirvāna*.[3] This is no passive or unconscious state. Joy, happiness, and light within attend the *Brahma-bhūta* who has "become Brahma." All impurity and unbelief are left behind, and they delight in the welfare of all creation (v. 25).[4] And he who in his last hour remembers Brahman,

[1] Cp. ii. 47 ff.; iii. 7 ff.; iv. 20, etc.; xii. 12; xvi. 2; xviii. 1, 2, 4, 8, 9; 11, 66. On different kinds of sacrifice, physical and spiritual, cp. iv. 24 ff.

[2] ii. 72, *Brahmī sthiti*, literally "Brahma standing." Cp. v. 19, *Brahmaṇi te sthitāḥ*.

[3] Cp. v. 24–26, the only occurrences of this term in the Upanishad literature.

[4] Cp. the early Christian language about becoming *theos*; J. E. C., *Phases of Early Christianity* (American Lectures, 1916), p. 56 ff. Like *Brahma-nirvāṇa*, the term *Brahma-bhāta*, though frequent in the Epic, does not

enters assuredly into his Being (viii. 5, cp. ii. 72). The path thither lies on the ancient route through the sun's northern course by the way of the *Devas*,[1] whence there is no return. The same peace is realised by the discipline of Concentration (vi. 15), when the disciple with mind controlled and steadfast thought reaches *nirvāna* and rests in the Lord. It may be that the Lord bestows on his loving worshipper the gift of energy of intelligence (*buddhi-yoga*), scattering the darkness of ignorance by the lamp of knowledge (x. 10 f. cp. xii. 8). Or it may be that the previous vision is vouchsafed which enables him to see the Self in all creation, and all creation in the Self. But this discernment knits an eternal bond between the worshipper and the Over-soul, for "If one sees Me in all things," says the Bhagavat, "and all things in Me, I am not lost to him nor he to Me" (vi. 29 f.). Such knowledge lifts the believer into likeness of nature with the Eternal.[2] This is liberation from the *samsāra*, the entrance into perfection (*siddhi*). No more will such souls be sown in Great Brahmā's womb; the Three Strands can never fetter them again. He who has served the Lord with concentrated devotion (*bhakti-yoga*), rises above them and is fit to become like Brahman.[3] "For I," says the poet triumphantly in the name of his God, "am the support of Brahman, the immortal and undecaying, of the eternal Dharma, and of absolute joy."[4] So is the elder tradition of Upanishad eschatology tinctured with the new piety. Lifted above all grief and desire, equal-minded towards all creatures, the devout

belong to the Upanishad teaching. When *nirvāṇa* is translated by "extinction," the student must always inquire what it is that is "extinguished." Here it would seem to cover the sins and doubts and attachments of earthly life. Cp. vi. 27.

[1] viii. 24, cp. *Brihad-Āraṇyak. Up.*, vi. 2, 15 f.

[2] xiv. 2, *Sādharmya*, unique in Upanishad style; "sharing the Dharma," the characteristic quality, the imperishableness of the Divine.

[3] xiv. 26, *Brahma-bhūya*, cp. xviii. 53; another word of Brahmanism in the Epic, but in no earlier texts.

[4] xiv. 27. Brahman is here identified by Rāmânuja with the soul, and Dharma with the happiness of heaven (which had, of course, a material character). Çankara understands Brahman in the higher sense, as the source of the eternal righteousness and the centre of absolute bliss. Such are the difficulties of interpretation. Garbe refers vv. 26, 27 to the Brahmanising interpolator.

worshipper knows his Lord in truth, and enters into him. Faithful in works, he seeks from them no reward; his refuge is in God, and God's grace helps him over difficult ways to the conquest of evil and eternal peace.[1]

V

The association of Arjuna and Krishna depicted in the Lord's Song was of long standing. After the banishment of the Five Brothers a number of nobles (Kshatriyas) from neighbouring kingdoms, with Krishna at their head, went to condole with them, and Krishna, in the name of eternal morality,[2] promised to install the eldest, Yudhishthira, on the throne of which he had been deprived. To calm his anger Arjuna recited a long list of his achievements, and the deity then made a solemn declaration of his real unity with the heroic prince: "Thou art mine and I am thine. All that is mine is thine also. He who hates thee, hates me; and he who follows thee, follows me. Thou art Nara and I am Nārâyana. We are born in the world of men for a special purpose."[3]

[1] xviii. 54–58, 62. Fifty years ago a German scholar, Lorinser, in an essay (1869) translated in the *Indian Antiquary* for 1873, p. 283 ff., endeavoured to prove the dependence of the Bhagavad Gītā on Christian teaching by a series of parallels drawn from the New Testament (Gospels, Acts, Epistles of Paul, James, and John, and the Apocalypse). The extravagance of Lorinser's method discredited his argument. No less an authority than Prof. Washburn Hopkins revived the theme in an essay entitled "Christ in India," in *India, Old and New* (1901). Doubtless there are striking correspondences in thought, feeling, and even in expression, between the Song and the Fourth Gospel. But these seem to receive an adequate explanation from similarities of religious belief and experience without resort to hypotheses of direct influence. And many of the alleged resemblances really lie on quite different planes of thought. For instance, the conception of Christ as the light of the world (spiritually) has nothing to do with the pantheistic phrase "I am the light in moon and sun" (*Gītā*, vii. 5). The comparison of *Gītā*, x. 33, "of letters I am the syllable A," with the Alpha and Omega of *Rev.* xxii. 13, breaks down in view of the mystical treatment of vowels and consonants in the older literature (cp. *SBE*, i. 234). In *Indien und das Christenthum* (1914), Prof. Garbe, after re-examination of the whole question, has emphatically vindicated the independence of the Gītā.

[2] *Mbh.*, iii. 12, 7, dharmah sanātanah.

[3] iii. 12, 44 f.

Who are these mysterious beings? Krishna describes them as Rishis, members of the group of primeval sages.[1] They are frequently identified with the two kinsmen,[2] but they are also designated as "ancient gods" (*pūrva-devau*).[3] Nārâyana, in fact, appears in that dignity in the "Brāhmana of a Hundred Paths." In the ritual order sacrifice was the means of gaining power, and under the instructions of Prajāpati (chief symbol of the Divine Unity in the Brāhmana) Nārâyana places all the worlds and all the gods in his own Self, and his own Self in all the worlds and all the Gods.[4] Another tale related that in his desire to surpass all beings and in solitary might become the universe, he performed in five days the tremendous ritual described in the famous Purusha-hymn (Rig Veda, x. 90), the immolation of the cosmic Man, and attained the eminence he sought.[5] He was thus identified with Mahā-Purusha, the Infinite Spirit, source alike of worlds and gods; the author, also, of the hymn which came to be known as his litany.[6] So he can be equated among numerous other forms with the sovereign Ātman, the universal soul;[7] and in a hymn to Vishnu, whose name he may also bear, he is presented as God of gods, Vāsudeva, Lord of heaven and earth, protector of all creatures.[8]

It is in this character that Nārâyana appears as the founder of the Religion of Devotion (*bhakti*) in the twelfth book of the Mahābhārata.[9] Earlier in the poem the illustrious sage Mārkandeya had been vouchsafed a wondrous vision within his illimitable person,[10] somewhat resembling Krishna's revelation of himself to Arjuna.[11] As source, creator, and destroyer of all he designates himself Brahman, Vishnu, Çiva, Indra, Yama, and other heavenly powers. He it is who from time to time assumes a human form to maintain the bonds of morality,[12] and has at last appeared as Krishna. And he calls himself *Nārâyana* because in days of yore he named the waters *Nārā*, and made

[1] Cp. xii. 344, 10, 33.
[2] i. 1, 172; 67, 119, etc.
[3] i. 224, 4; 228, 18.
[4] xii. 3, 4: *SBE*, xliv. p. 173 f.
[5] xiii. 6, 1, 1: *SBE*, xliv. p. 403.
[6] xiii. 6, 2, 12; *ib.*, p. 410.
[7] *Maitr. Brāhmana Upan.*, vi. 8: *SBE*, xxiv. p. 311.
[8] *Institutes of Vishnu*, xcviii. 98: *SBE*, vii. 296.
[9] xii. 335–352.
[10] iii. 188, 101 ff.
[11] *Gītā*, xi. 9 ff.
[12] *Mbh.*, iii. 189, 31.

them his resting-place (*ayana*).[1] The explanation is repeated in the later section (xii. 342, 39), with the addition that the waters bore that name because they were the offspring of Nara. Manu adopts the same punning device,[2] which is often repeated in later literature. But who was Nara? Sir R. G. Bhandarkar points out that etymologically Nārâyaṇa means the resting-place or goal of Naras. The word commonly means "man," and in its yet simpler form *nṛi* it is applied again and again in the Vedic hymns to the great gods of heroic prowess like Indra, Varuna, Agni, Vāyu, and others.[3] Ancient tradition regarded the waters as the original seat of the germinating power of the universe.[4] Prior to earth and sky and gods, "the waters held that same embryo in which all the gods exist; on the navel of the Unborn stood something in which all beings stood."[5] So Nārâyana, in his exalted form of Universal Spirit, is the ultimate source of the world and all its innumerable inhabitants of every class. But by his wondrous might he duplicates himself as the two sages Nara and Nārâyana, while he remains sublimely invisible even to the deities whom he has created. To Nārada, however, son of Brahman,[6] he condescends to make himself known, and explain the nature of the Religion of Devotion. The tale is narrated by the dying Bhīshma, in answer to Yudhishthira's anxious inquiry who was the God of gods, and what was the essence of Liberation.

In the Krita Yuga the eternal Nārâyana took birth in fourfold form from Dharma, as Nara, Nārâyana, Hari, and the Self-created Krishna.[7] The mysterious pair retired to a retreat named Badarī in the Himâlaya, at the sources of the Ganges, and there, in the midst of their incredible austerities, they were visited by Nārada. Engaged to his amazement in their daily rites, they told him that they were worshipping their own Soul,

[1] iii. 189, 3. [2] i. 10; *SBE*, xxv. 5.

[3] It is thus given both to Vishnu and Çiva in the *Mbh.* in the lists of their 1000 names.

[4] E.g. *Bṛihadāraṇy. Up.*, v. 5, 1; *SBE*, xv. p. 191.

[5] *Rig Veda*, x. 82, 6; Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism*, etc., p. 31.

[6] xii. 336, 5, where Parameshṭhin ("standing at the head") is identified by the commentator Nīlakaṇṭha with Brahman.

[7] xii. 335, 8 f. They were the four Guardians of the world, *loka-pālas*, ver. 11.