CHAPTER XIII

SUGGESTIONS OF AN APPROACH TO REALITY
BASED ON THE Upanishads

I

Philosophy is the attempt to think out the presuppositions of experience, to grasp, by means of reason, life or reality as a whole. It seeks to discover a rational explanation of the universe—an explanation which gives to all parts, nature, God and man, their due, views all things in their right proportion, and resolves the contradictions of experience. Philosophy has to find out an all-comprehensive and universal concept which itself requires no explanation, while it explains everything else. It must be the ultimate reality into which all else can be resolved and which cannot itself be resolved into anything else. Philosophy is the theory of reality if by reality we mean something that exists of itself and in its own right and not merely as a modification of something else. The test of a philosophical theory is its capacity to co-ordinate the wealth of apparently disconnected phenomena into an ordered whole, to comprehend and synthesise all aspects of reality.

Attempts to solve the problem of philosophy generally start from inadequate conceptions which lead us on to more adequate ones through their own inner logic. We start with some part of the whole, some conception which accounts for a portion of our experience, and soon mistake it for the whole or the final explanation of things.
We are surprised by contradictions and inconsistencies which condemn the theory as an inadequate solution of the riddle of the universe. The mechanical principles of the physical sciences are of great use and value in the region of inanimate nature, but so soon as we apply them to other fields of reality, say animal life, they confess themselves to be bankrupt. Their poverty becomes patent, and we, on the basis of these notions and their inadequacies, progress to more concrete and definite principles. Philosophy passes in review the different conceptions, which claim to represent the universe, and tests their varying fulness and worth. Philosophy, in this sense, is a criticism of categories. We start with a lower category, criticise it, discard it as incomplete and progress to a higher one wherein the lower receives its fulfilment. Philosophy, then, is a progressive discovery of reality or defining of reality in terms of fundamental conceptions or categories, or a gradual passage from lower, more abstract and indefinite conceptions, to higher, more concrete and definite ones.

The Vedanta thinkers sometimes approach the problem of philosophy from this standpoint. If we turn to chapter ii. of the Tattvārtha Upanishad we see there a progressive revelation of the true nature of reality to the seeking mind. The Absolute is identified first with one thing, then with another, until we reach a solution which stifles all doubt and satisfies all inquiry by its freedom from discord and contradiction. In that beautiful chapter we find expressed the central contention of the idealist that in all systems of philosophy there are elements of truth as well as inherent defects, limitations which lead us on to some other more concrete development which, again, has to be transcended. The pursuit of truth is more negative than positive, more an escape from incomplete conceptions than the attainment of perfect
truth. This does not mean that we do not reach any solid basis on which our feet can rest. By an imminent criticism of conceptions, we are enabled to discover the most complete or the most fundamental idea, relatively to the rest. We here propose to sketch the picture of the world as it appeared to those ancient seers in search of truth.

The discussion about the nature of reality is in the form of a dialogue between the father, Varuna, and the son, Bhrgu. The son approaches the father, entreating him to teach him the nature of reality. The father mentions the general characters or the formal aspects of the Absolute known in the Vedanta philosophy as Brahman. It must be something which includes everything else. It is that by which the whole universe is sustained. "That from whence these beings are born, that by which when born they live, that into which they enter at their death; try to know that. This is Brahman." (Visistadvya Upanishad, ch. iii. 1). The ultimate reality is that in which we live, move and have our being. It is the whole or the totality. "It includes all the world"; naught exists outside it; "there is nothing else beside it"; it is the res complete, that which is complete in itself, determined by itself and capable of being explained entirely from itself. Thus the father describes to the son the general features of reality. He gives him the empty formula and asks him to discover by reflection the content of it. The son proceeds to identify it with one thing after another.

II

The most immediate datum which may be regarded as given, and which strikes our mind at first thought, is the world of relatively unorganised matter. One who does not care to strain his thought to go deeper than surface appearances will be struck by the universality and the omnipotence of the material forces. Matter is the basis of life. It is the stuff of which the world is
made. So the son decides upon Ānāma 1 (food, matter) as the content possessing the characteristics of the Absolute above set forth. "He perceived that Ānāma is Brahmāna, for from Ānāma these beings are produced; by Ānāma when born they live; and into Ānāma they enter at their death." (Taittiriya Upanishad, iii. 2).

III

It is the nature of any partial or abstract theory to transcend itself and thus manifest its inadequacy. Matter, though it accounts for a part of experience, cannot be the final explanation of things. Thought can never rest in it. While materialism is a sufficient explanation of the immediate portion of reality, it does not account for the living and conscious aspects of it. If adopted in human affairs, it becomes a thoroughly inadequate and false guide. The materialist's picture of the world disregards the specifically human elements of life. The whole of experience cannot be identified with the part of matter. Our thought rebels against treating parts as wholes. So Bhrigu is convinced that materialism does not effect the unification of reality needed for the Absolute, and it is, therefore, not more than a temporary resting place for thought. Dissatisfied with his discovery that matter is the Absolute, he approaches his father for help, and his father asks him to think further. "Desire to know Brahmāna by reflection" or deep thought (Taittiriya Upanishad, iii. 3). Pravādaistham (reflection) is what the father advises.

The son adopts the advice. Further reflection reveals to him the precise inadequacy of the materialist’s theory. In organized matter, the plant world, we come across something of which ‘matter,’ though it is the indispensable basis and aid, is not the complete explanation.

1 Ānāma is used as equivalent to ‘matter.’ See the Vedānta Sūtras; Adiṣṭhāna, iii.; Prakṛti, i.; Sūtras, xi. and xiii. Vidyārṇava, referring to a Chandogya passage, says: ‘Here by Ānāma is meant ‘Earth’ or ‘matter.’"
So this theory that 'Matter' is Brahma leaves out a good deal of the world of existence, while a true theory should cover the whole range of actuality or existence. Mechanical formulas do not account for life-phenomena. The ultimate reality should be, not matter, but something akin to Prana (life). "He perceived that Prana is Brahma, for from Prana these things are born; by Prana when born they live; into Prana they enter at their death" (Taittiriya Upanishad, iii. 3). Modern scientists recognize what is termed the mystery of life. They have ceased to regard life as a property of matter, but give to it an independent character. From this it should not be inferred that the Vedanta philosophy supports a theory of vitalism. That life cannot be completely accounted for on physico-chemical principles is the element of truth exaggerated in theories of vitalism. Vitalism is no explanation, but only the statement of a problem, to be compared to Molière's virtus dormitiva. It emphasizes the autonomy of life. According to the Vedanta philosophy it is not correct to speak of a sudden revelation of spirit when we come to life, for even matter is spirit, though in its lowest mode of manifestation. When matter reaches a certain climax of development then life breaks out. Life is a later development on stage of the Real. The Real gradually progresses from one stage to another. We cannot say that the later stage of life is a mere product of the earlier stage of matter. Life is not an extension of matter. It is something different in kind from matter. The evolution of the world is not a mere development, but is a development of the whole or the Real. Both matter and life fall within an all-developing spirit whose very nature is to push onward from one to another and thus reach the full realization through the very impulse of its own movement. The Vedantic view does not involve the sandering of matter from life. It rejects both mechanism and vitalism. We cannot make life mechanical. The world of mechanism is not the same as the world of life. The two are
distinct, but the discontinuity between matter and life is not so great as to justify vitalism. The world of mechanism is the medium in which alone life has its being. Though life is not mechanism, still life dwells in it. To make life mechanical or mechanism alive is to dissolve the differences in an abstract identity. It would be to sacrifice wealth of content and speciality of service for the sake of symmetry and simplicity. To make mechanism alive would be to deprive matter of its specific function in the universe. Dead mechanism has its own purpose to fulfil, its contribution to make to the wondrous whole. It is, therefore, not right to reduce unity to identity. We must recognise the difference between the two as much as their unity. The world of matter exists for the purpose of responding to the needs of life. The name Ātman (Soul) is advisedly given by the Vedanta philosophers to the principle of matter. Matter exists for the purpose of being used up by life. It serves as food for living beings. It is not an alien element, but is something which can be 'eaten,' controlled and utilised. It is the food which enters into the organic life, the material which the organism uses to build up its body. The authors of the Upanishads make it clear to us that environment, with its necessity, is not a recalcitrant force, but some dark fate over against which we have to knock our heads in dull despair, but is rather the servant of the organism, the helper of life and consciousness, promoting the growth and perfection of higher beings. In short, 'life and matter, organism and environment are members existing for each other in a larger whole. They are unintelligible when viewed in separation. 'Matter is rooted in life, and life in matter' (Taittirīya Upanishad, ii. 3).

"Matter decays without life. Life dries up without matter. These two (life and matter), when they have become one, reach the highest state, i.e. Brahman" (Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, v. ii. 1). The science of physics, which seeks to divorce matter from life and study
matter in its isolation, studies an abstraction, however useful it may be. The ideal of physical science is an explanation of life in terms of mechanism. Anything which comes in the way of this mechanical ideal is unwelcome to physics. Again, if the science of biology confines itself with life in the exclusion of matter, it will be a science of dead abstractions. What we need is bio-physics and physiology. They only would do justice to the different aspects and their essential unity. The whole must be seen as a whole if it is to be seen at all. We see now the exact relation of life and matter. The same whole of reality manifests itself first as matter, then as life. The two are but lower and higher expressions of the deeper reality. They are but movements in one grand scheme. Life, being a higher stage than matter, is the completer truth. Life is the promise and potency of matter, its soul and spirit. The Upamishad says: "This Prana (life) is the soul of the body." Matter is on the road to life, the crystal on the way to the cell; the cell is striving to be a worm. Life includes and transcends matter. It is a more concrete thing than matter. Matter is a fragmentary abstraction from the standpoint of life, for in life the more externality of matter is transcended and overcome. The parts are no more external to each other, but are elements in an organic whole with a definite end. In the living body the elements co-operate in the preservation of the organism. But even in the living body there is an element of externality which will diminish as we proceed to the next higher category of Manas (mind) or consciousness.

IV

The whole world of reality refuses to be squeezed into the category of life. Though Prana or life is nearer to reality than matter or mechanism, still it cannot account for consciousness. The category of life, failing to embrace the whole of reality, confuses itself to be but a partial truth covering only a limited field of experience. It
cannot, therefore, be put forward as the ultimate essence or principle of the world of reality. Once again the son approaches the father. The father asks him to think to the bitter end without stopping at half-way houses. He pursues his reflection and discovers that the higher forms of life require us to introduce another category to describe their relations. The new factor of consciousness makes its appearance as life develops. Manas, or perceptual consciousness, is the sole reality. "He perceived that Manas is Brahmman, for from Manas these beings are born; by Manas when born they live; into Manas they enter at their death" (iii. 4). Here by Manas is meant perceptual consciousness which delights in sense objects and is moved by instincts and impulses.

The relation of mind to life is exactly of the same kind as the relation of life to matter. "Mind is the soul of Prana or Life." Mind is not a by-product of body or life, but is the central core of it. The two are different expressions of the one spiritual essence, lower and higher stages of a single all-embracing life. It is peculiar to minimise the distinction between the two by vitalising mind or mentalising life. While recognising the distinction we should not lose our grip on the essential unity which underlies the distinction. The two contribute in their own distinct ways to the same individual whole. The two are so fashioned and constructed as to develop and promote a complete identity. They are aspects of the ultimate spirit, through the interaction of which the whole realises itself. The science of biology which studies life, neglecting mind, the fruit and essence of life, studies an abstraction. Psychology, if it divorces mind from life and studies mind as an isolated phenomenon, apart from its setting in life and the organism, lays itself open to the fallacy of the abstract. It studies not human minds but disembodied ghosts. It is 'phantomology' and not psychology. It is a good sign that psychology at the present day views its subject matter from the biological point of view. Psychology studies not merely the
psyche, but the psychophysical organism. The conscious organism can be seen as a whole only by bio-psychology or psycho-biology. Only then shall we know mind in its origin and working.

V

The concept of Masses (mind) is higher than that of life or matter. It is the richer, fuller and more inclusive concept. But the searching intellect is not satisfied with its adequacy, for the perceptual consciousness does not exhaust the nature of reality. No doubt it accounts for the animal mind. Animals have only a perceptual consciousness, their mental horizon being restricted to mere perceptions of the present moment. The animal mind is devoid of the power of synthesis, and, therefore, of self-consciousness. But the human consciousness is capable of rising above itself, of comparing itself with other selves, and of passing judgments on its own character. The man judges while the animal only senses. He is a being of "wise discourse, looking before and after." He is able to transcend the animal limitations, break down the despotism of the senses and lift himself above himself. While the animal leads a life of mere feeling and impulse, the self-conscious individual regulates his life in conformity with the ideals of beauty, goodness and truth. The animal is at the mercy of impressions from without, abandoning his mind to every chance idea. But man gathers himself into himself and directs his impulses towards objective ends. Speaking of animals, Whitman observes:

They do not sweat and whine about their condition.
They do not lie awake in the dark and weep for their sins.
Not one is dissatisfied, not one is demented with the mania of owning things.
Not one knells to another, nor to His Kind that lived thousands of years ago.
Not one is responsible or accountable over the whole earth.

(Song of Myself, 32.)

It is the capacity to distinguish facts from idea which makes possible art, morality and science. A higher
category than animal mind or perceptual consciousness is felt to be necessary. The self approaches the father and is advised by him to think to the root of the matter. The self realises, on reflection, that the specific quality of man, which makes him the lord of creation, is his intellectuality. By his intellect or understanding he seeks the true, attempts the good and loves the beautiful. By it he combines sensations, compares and contrasts them with one another and derives inferences. It gives the power of synthesis. To it is due the self-consciousness of man. So the seeker after truth turns to Vijñāna or understanding. "He perceived that Vijñāna (intelligent) was Brahma, for from Vijñāna these beings are born; by Vijñāna when born they live; into Vijñāna they enter at their death" (III. 5).

What is the relation of Vijñāna to Manas, or understanding to perception? This is the familiar question of epistemology, the relation of the universal to the particular, concept to percept, thought to sense. Understanding is related to perception as mind to life, or as life to matter. Vijñāna is the higher form of the lower Manas. It is the soul of Manas in its essential reality. "Vijñāna is the soul (or spirit) of Manas" (II. 4). Nothing is gained by divorcing intellect from sense. Such a divorce leads to abstract explanations of reality. Sense is the condition of thought. Thought does not produce or create a new order of existence. The sense world is not a mere chaos of particulars into which thought, later and from outside, introduces order and system. Thought only discovers or explicates the order which already prevails in the world of facts. The ideals of the world reveal themselves to thought. We seek order of facts. As in science we try to interpret the order prevalent in the actual and discriminate it from our errors and prejudices, so in morality we try to seek the goodness of things and discriminate the good from the bad. We are not creating a new moral world by our action. The tendency to neglect the perceptual basis is
the besetting temptation of the intellectualist temper. Rationalist theories which sacrifice the particular to exalt the universal reduce the universe, in the vivid phrase of Bradley, to an "unearthly ballet of bloodless categories." We get a philosophy of abstract concepts having nothing to do with the flowing experience of life. Truth becomes a dead conformity to certain logical conceptions and ideas with no promptings from life. In art, technique gains the mastery over temperament. Art expresses the critical and not the creative attitude of life. There is a predominance of form and a weakening of creative genius. Morality comes to be of the drill-sergeant type, insisting on nothing more than a blind unthinking obedience to the commands delivered. Moral life becomes identical with correct routine. Rationalism thus murders reality to dissect it. We miss the music of the stars in calculating their exact orbits. We find a mechanical perfection in place of spiritual beauty, cold uninspired reason in place of the vivifying light of synthesis, logic in place of life. Organisation is the ideal, but the process of starving the real leaves no material to organise. Philosophy becomes void and abstract, art mechanical and soulless, and ethics formal and dead. The dire consequences resulting from the adoption of this exaltation of brain over the soul, in practical affairs of the world, we see today on the fields of Europe. We have noticed systems of philosophy which protest against this debasement of intellect. But in their righteous revolt against the abuse of logic they are led to the opposite extreme of advocating indiscriminately the claim of immediate experience. The tendency to exclude logic from life is as vicious as the other tendency to exclude life from logic. The abstract and one-sided nature of mere empiricism is reflected in the world of philosophy, art and morality. Under its influence the superficial aspects of things are noted and the underlying principles neglected. Naturalistic explanations become dominant in philosophy. Art is sensualistic, and ethics economic or utilitarian in
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the lowest sense of the term. Buoyant undiscipline and unrestricted are sometimes enthroned. More percept and more concept are both good for nothing. Both are abstracts refined. Kant spoke a great truth which the world cannot afford to forget when he said that "percepts without concepts are blind; concepts without percepts are empty." Percepts are blind without the universal of the mind that introduces order into chaos, but universals are abstract and empty until we actually see them operating in facts. The essential unity of these two distinct factors the Vedanta thinkers recognise. They hold that true insight is born of the union of the universal and the particular.

VI

The self-conscious individual in whom Vijnana functions in its best becomes the highest expression of reality, if there is nothing higher than intellect. But self-consciousness which is the product of intellect presupposes self-distinction, at the intellectual level that which is conscious of itself is exclusive of others. The self is a one among many. The self not only distinguishes itself from others, but excludes others from its nature. A "pluralistic universe" is the last word of wisdom if intellect represents the highest phase of reality. Pluralism is true within limits, but it is not final. It is but a step on the way to ultimate truth. The thinking mind recognises certain difficulties in the way of accepting the pluralistic solution as final. The natural outcome of such an intellectualist pluralism will be a narrow, philistine spirit of individualism, sensualism, and selfishness. The individuals enter into rivalry with one another for the satisfaction of their appetites and ambitions. Such a view will develop a sort of morbid ease and self-satisfaction with the actual, and thus curb all efforts for the improvement of mankind. It would make it impossible for the finite mind to transcend its finiteness. It gives man no ideal of the solidarity of the universe to which he has to work himself up. The
religious experience in which the human consciousness in a mood of exaltation feels itself to be at one with the whole universe baffles this intellectual analysis. The fact of ever aspiring, ever striving for something higher which man has not, but hopes to have, is not satisfactorily explained. Man recognises his incompleteness and imperfection and seeks for something above himself, an ideal, an infinite. If the individual's highest aim is merely to secure an independent status for himself, he becomes divorced from his real, i.e. his divine self. It is impossible for man, a child of eternity, to distinguish himself from God in the long run. He cannot fix any boundary to his real self. If he seeks his private self-satisfaction he seeks the finite as if it were the infinite. It is the self-contradiction of a being who knows not what he really is, and seeks his good where it can never be found. If the world is a number of distinct and isolated units, then peace and harmony are a priori impossible. Pluralism by itself cannot give any satisfactory account of the unity of the world of spirits. Most of the modern pluralistic systems, as we have seen, suffer from this weakness.

There is no doubt that human self-consciousness represents, though not the highest, yet a very high manifestation of reality. "The Atman is expanded only in man. He is most endowed with intelligence. He speaks what is known, he sees what is known. He knows what is to come, he sees the visible and the invisible worlds. He desires to obtain immortality by appropriate means. Thus endowed is man" (see Aitareya Aranyaka, ii., iii. 2. 4). He has ideals of knowledge, beauty and goodness, but he does not as a finite consciousness realise the aspirations. He only struggles toward union, peace, and harmony. Though he ever strives toward union with the whole of the divine, he never grasps it on account of his finiteness and impotence. Finite souls never realise, though they ever strain after the pure bliss and self-forgetful realisation, which in Vedantic philosophy is called Ananda. The sciences
REALITY BASED ON THE UPAISHADS 425

belonging to the intellectual level are sciences of struggle and endeavor and not sciences of fruition or fulness of attainment. They are sciences of approach to reality. Logic with its inquisitive toward totality demands a complete and consistent world; love struggles for union with the whole, and life attempts to realize the all-perfect in conduct. In all these regions of mind we catch glimpses of the real, but do not have the full vision with its joy unspeakable and the peace that passeth all understanding. We have demands, struggles and attempts. We are in the striving stage. We are only on the road with a dim vision of the end; the fulfillment is still a distant scene. The full splendor is not yet. So human self-consciousness, which belongs to the intellectual level, is incomplete and imperfect as it has still to pray and aspire. It is only a grade of reality to be transcended in something higher, but not the whole of reality. On the other hand, if intellect should be the highest phase of reality, then morality, law, and justice become the ultimate terms and struggle the end of existence. What a poor, imperfect thing man will be if he has no prospect of realizing his ideals! His effort to become something greater, higher and higher than his own finiteness will be unsuccessful. The world will be cut into two as with a hatchet, self and not-self, with the result of a metaphysical and moral dualism, antagonism between soul and body, and separation between God and man. Man's desire for unity cannot remain with such a state of division. If we do not embrace the two, self and not-self, in a final higher unity, then man's spiritual endeavors are doomed to failure. The uncertainty of life, the vanity of human wishes, the dream of love are writ large in the face of the earth, and man toils himself an utter stranger in it. It is vain to attempt to subdue the stars or overcome death. Pessimism is man's only refuge, and prayer all his business. He presses on towards a higher life, but cruel fate crushes the human soul. He desires to throw off his brutish heritage and reach heaven; but the blind forces
of nature, which go on their relentless way carrying unblunt for the human victims, dash him down to the bottomless void. He wishes to touch the Happy Isle, but the gulls wash him down. The world which surrounds him is a dark and immovable slate which clutches, crushes and swallows up that priceless possession whose soul is worth more than all the worlds put together. He is a rebel against the universe, a Prometheus fighting against the course of nature with its silence and darkness, emptiness and immensity or space. The intellect, with its vision confined to outward appearance, is struck with "nature red in tooth and claw." Such an outward vision gives the impression that we are caught in the wheels of a soulless engine, which has neither the eyes to see nor the heart to feel for us. We are the victims of a merciless fate, trapped in the grip of destruction. It is the Everlasting May of Carlyle. "I lived," writes the Tiefesdreck, "in a continual, indefinite, pining fear; tremulous, pusillanimous, apprehensive of I know not what; it seemed as if all things in the heavens above and the earth beneath would hurt me; as if the heavens and the earth were but boundless jaws of a devouring monster wherein I pulsitating lay awaiting to be devoured." Intellectualist despair is the mental attitude of those who break the real into self and non-self and make the universe a tug-of-war between the two. Matthew Arnold's inmost mores of sadness is due to his theory of the opposition of self and non-self.

"No, we are strangers here, the world is from of old. To tunes we did not call, our being must keep chime." 1

1 Nature so cruel, man is sick of blood; Nature so stubborn, man so blind above; Nature is Call, man in the mood of fare; Nature forgives no deed, and sees no grace; Man would be mild and with one conscience kist; Man would begin, know this, where nature ends; Nature and man can never be fast friends. Fool, if thou cannot not pass her, nest her slave.

M. ARNOLD.

How pathetic is this expression of despair, born of an intellectual vision which declares to live heavenly, spiritual!
The world is foreign to us, and we are not tuned to it. "There is indeed one element in being, destiny that, not blindness itself can controvert; whatever else we are intended to do, we are not intended to succeed; failure is the fate allotted." That is the verdict of R. J. Stevenson. The system of nature does not sympathise with the blues for which we sigh. Our boundless hopes are shattered to dust and our tenderest ideals mocked by the stern indiffERENCE of nature. The insufficiency is pitted against the macabre, and to all outward appearances the external world seems to be the more potent force. If a man takes arms against the leagued powers of darkness, his whole moral fabric collapses, and he will be struck by the pitiful impotence of virtue. The condition of man in eternal subjection to the dark and unreasoning but still eternal power is only an object of pity. If such a power that is alien to the human soul rules the universe, there is nothing left but to fold one's hands and be damned for ever. What can man do in this plight except withdraw from the world and obtain inner freedom by renunciation and contemplation? He must be ready to undergo every pang of personal and individual suffering inflicted on him by the blind and brutal forces working darkly towards an intelligible goal. He is the ideal man who tempers himself to go through the furnace unscathed, who trains himself to be indifferent to all extremity of physical suffering, and faces boldly and with proud endurance and resignation whatever befalls him, happiness or misery, good or evil. We should possess a will that is ready in suffer and endure. "By the Ganges, ethical man admits that the cosmos is too strong for him, and, destroying every hand which ties him to it by ascetic discipline, he seeks salvation in absolute renunciation." (Huxley, Romanes Lecture, p. 29). Meredith bids the soul seek peace in solitude and sainthood. The Samhaya philosophy of ancient India starts with a dualism of Puruska (self) and Prajrihi (non-self). They are the two eternal uncreated substances differing essentially from
each other. Deliverance is to be obtained by realising the separateness of the two and dissolving the bond between them. Man to gain his freedom has to cut himself off from the ties that bind him to nature. We are exhorted by Mr. Russell in his admirable essay on the Freemason's worship to cherish, adore, and love the ideals where the mind is at home, caring naught for the universe. He builds an ethic of renunciation on a 'firm foundation of despair.' The dreary asceticism of the sick soul who is not reconciled to the world, and not the robust and joyous asceticism of the healthy-minded is recommended to us. We are engaged in an unequal struggle between man and nature, self and non-self. A mere contemplation of it would produce a static calm combined with a storm pathos. We may adopt militant heroism if we care for the martyr's crown. We may oppose our will to the dark power of that immense and mercless God of sheer chance and necessity which dominates the course of time. But even martyrs die with the complaint, My God, why hast thou forsaken me? When even a Christ had been left forsaken in the agony of the cross, why should we believe in the existence of God and the reality of spiritual values? It is not given to us to triumph over the shocks of circumstance. The destiny of man seems to be struggle, pain, and baffled hope. This pessimistic conclusion of the world-weariness is the essential theme of the Buddhists. To them pily is the highest virtue. A hard world of terror cannot but produce a stream of tears. They say there is nothing else than this world-process or Samsara. They have no idea of another world where life will be transformed. So long as the spiritual vision of harmony does not supplement the intellectual vision of discord, life will be one continuous shedding of tears for human suffering. According to Buddhism, there is neither a changeless God responsible for the world of misery nor a suffering duty struggling against the attacks of Satan. Buddhism considers the appearance of opposition to be final, and exhorts man to
get out of this whirlpool by sinking his selfhood. That is the only way of escape from the terror of the Samsara. The tendency of Buddhism is to drift away from the world, taking submission to fate as the chief virtue and exalting the contemplative life above activism. But this is too harsh a conclusion to be accepted by all. The necessity for a God who somehow helps us over this pass arises. Buddhism is deistic and made the means of escape in the great peace beyond from the confusion of the world. A supreme soul or Isvara soon appears to help the individual in his warfare against the not-self. So God along with man battles with the prince of darkness. The atheism of the Saṁkhya system gives place to the theism of the Yoga philosophy. We have, then, the individual self, God and nature; the individual self, according to Saṁkhya Saṅkhya, Vaiśnavism and Christianity and other theistic systems, has to extricate himself from the fetters of Nature by the grace of God. The Highest in all these theistic systems is looked upon as a personal godhead, a father, creator or Providence, accessible to prayer and propitiation, ever loving man and granting his requests. By the help of God it is possible for man to escape from the world of Samsara. If we think in the acquired dialect of the intellect we will not be able to reach the highest, which includes all other things. We will get a pluralistic universe presided over by a God, whose position in the world is ambiguous. If we say that God is over against a number of spirits and that the Absolute is a republic of spirits including God, we seek what is the position of God in the republic? If he is one among the many, he is reduced to the level of the finite beings. If man himself is part of God we shirk the whole problem by raising man to the level of the infinite. Pluralism is displaced by an abstract monism. But the pluralist’s God is not the perfection transcending both good and evil, not the Absolute which absorbs them both, but only a force within it fighting with another. Such a God can only be an aspect of reality, and not the
whole of it. Besides this conception of God opposed to the world naturally culminates in design. God is transcendent to the world because the world is evil and he is good. He has nothing which nature has, and can only be defined negatively. The universe is reduced to an opposition of self and not-self, God and the world, the infinite and the finite. Certainly both cannot be real, for the two are exclusive of each other. The finite world is dismissed as illusion and the absolute posited as real. Earth is a dream and heaven the reality. Nor if we argue about the problem of the origin of the world and man's place in it, we will be drowned in a sea of contradictions. Kant, and after him Bradley, have shown the difficulty of reconciling the antinomies with which our understanding endures. The self-contradictory cannot be real. Therefore the finite world is illusion and the Absolute is real, for it is pure affirmation. But the Absolute, which repels the relative, cannot be anything more than an undifferentiated unity which is the negation of the finite and the determinate. The Absolute is related, if we can talk of relation in this sense, only negatively in the world. The Absolute collapses into a self-identity, negatively related to the particulars, a featureless unity leaving aside all differences. To this Absolute none of the attributes of finite being belongs. If we attach any predicate to it we will bring it down to the level of the finite. It is not anything which the finite world is. If the finite world is many, it is one; if it is complex, it is simple; if it is varying, it is constant: if it is temporal, it is eternal. Strip off everything finite and what remains is the infinite or God. Everything positive is excluded from the real, mind and matter not excepted. Escape from the finite life is the goal of humanity. Such are the views of some of the neo-Platonists. The fatal criticism against all such abstract notions of the Absolute is that they do not give any explanation of the finite universe. To say that the Absolute is the external and accidental cause of the
universe is no answer. To dismiss the world as illusion only removes the difficulty a little farther, for the question still arises, What is the cause of this world illusion? If we stick fast to the intellectual level we have either a bare unity or a collection of separate elements. But in no case is it possible for us to have a unity in diversity, an organic system in which the whole should be known through the distinction and relation of all the parts. Are we to stick to this vision of the world where we do not see the two, unity and diversity, as elements in a whole or facts in a unity? That vision is not satisfying.

The distinction between self and not-self is not an irrational surge which cannot be eliminated, but a distinction within a unity. In man there is a struggle between the higher and the lower self and not-self (Purusha and Prakriti). He is an amphibious animal living in two worlds. Born of matter, entangled in it, and oppressed by want and misery, he still has the divine spark which gives him a place in the spiritual realm of freedom. But the struggle between the divine and the human is bound to result in a complete triumph of the spirit, and the consequent idealisation of the material aspect. The self with its "ought" comes down on the not-self and, in spite of the refractory nature of the latter, transforms it. Knowledge presupposes a unity between subject and object; without this basis knowledge is impossible. The very distinctions made by the intellect presuppose a unity which is not grasped by intellect. The interpretability of nature is proof positive of the kinship of subject with subject, nature with mind. The obvious correspondence between the nature in which we live, and the constitution of the intellectual powers we possess to explain it, points to their belonging to one whole. There is a reason in things to whose guidance we may confidently trust ourselves. The antithesis between self and not-self is resolved in the Vedanta philosophy, and the two are reconciled; "Purusha (the self) is the cabor, Prakriti (not-self) is the food, and, abiding
with it, he says (Maitrayana Brahmana Upanishad, vi. 10). The not-self offersthe conditions which are the material of self, and the self, instead of being the
slave of the not-self, is the highest and the most articulate expression of the not-self. Self and not-
self do not run counter to each other. They are no
rivals; rather do the two help each other in fulfilling
the mission of the divine. They are co-operating and
not conflicting elements in the whole. We cut in two
the whole and then view the environment as an alien
influence checkmating the individual at every step of
his progress. An antagonism is set up between man and
nature, and man is supposed to wrest treasures from
nature, but truly man is in an environment which is
human and spiritual. The world grows with God. The
individual is said to progress by fighting and conquering
nature. We forget that nature could not be conquered
by him if it were different from him in its essence. It
is unnecessary for man to tear himself away from his
environment, place himself over against it to master it
as if it were something alien. It is a kind of peaceful
and restful union with the environment where its life
grows over into his life. The world of intellect is not the
absolute reality. It is only the half real world of claims
and counter-claims. There is a higher stage, the life
of spirit. The sceptic hypothesis that human experience
with its strivings and defeats, mistakes and limitations, is
the most complete is not in accord with fact, while the
other view that there is a world where the problems are
solved, ends attained, defeats overcome, and mistakes
corrected, is. There is an experience which is the per-
fecction of all imperfections in us. We are compelled to
concede that man is but a transition stage, a rope, as
Nietzsche puts it, between the beast and the superman of
the future. It is therefore a system of absolute idealism,
however much we may try to disguise it by giving it
other names, that preserves to us the reality of the ideals
and the unity of the pluralistic world. We have seen
how even thinkers strongly inclined to the pluralistic notions are compelled by sheer force of logic to embrace their pluralism in a higher idealism. "We may here give another illustration. Professor Upton says: "It follows, therefore, that, though atoms and bodies appear to be isolated no existences in space, this complete isolation and seeming independence of each other is only an appearance; for the reciprocal causality by which all these atoms and bodies are linked together inevitably forces us to the conclusion that deeper than the apparent spatial distance and division there is a metaphysical unity, or, in other words, that the self-subsistent creative ground of all finite existence does not wholly separate Himself from any one of the plurality of dependent energies or beings into which He differentiates Himself; and therefore, as every finite atom or finite soul still remains, as regards a part of its nature, in indivisible union with its self-subsistent ground and source, the common relation of the self-subsistent one affords a true explanation of the metaphysical unity of the cosmos, and also of the possibility of reciprocal action of the monads of nature on each other, and of reciprocal action of the finite mind on nature and of nature on the mind. Thus the most recent science and philosophy appear to assert at once a real pluralism or individualism in the world of finite beings, but at the same time a deeper monism. The Eternal, who differentiates His own self-subsistent energy into the infinite variety of finite existence, is still immanent and living in every one of these different modes of being, and it is because all finite or created beings are only partially individual, and still remain in vital union with their common ground, that it becomes possible for them through the medium of this common ground to act dynamically on each other; and it is for the same reason that these finite beings such as man, who have attained to self-consciousness, are able to enter into intellectual, moral, and spiritual relations, both with other rational finite minds and also with
the eternal being with whom their own existence is in some measure indivisibly conjoined." (Bases of Religious Belief, pp. 12-13). Pluralist thinkers are driven to admit the existence of an all-embracing unity as the ground of the world and recognise the finite selves as differentiations thereof, though they try very hard to give the finite souls separate individualities.

The reality of the ideals of knowledge, art and action has for its basis the highest unity such as cannot be realised by Vigya (Intelect) which reveals in distinctions of self and not-self, subject and object, man and the universe, organism and environment. Our knowledge aspires to something more than knowledge, an intuitive grasp of the fundamental unity; our morality to something more than morality, viz. religion; our self in something more than personality, viz. God or the Absolute. Our knowledge is incapable of bringing us into contact with the whole. It turns at the unity, though the limitations of intellect forbid the attainment of unity. The highest unity "from which all speech with the mind turns away, unable to reach it." (Tattvānātha Upanishad, ii. 4) cannot be grasped by intellect.1 A more thinker cannot understand the nature of reality. He cannot have the feeling of aesthetic satisfaction or enter into the life of the religious consciousness. If the nature of man is exhausted by pure thought, then perhaps the nature of the Absolute may be reduced to a mere skeleton, mere symbols by which we represent it, in methods by which we approach it.

Our many-sided nature is a reflex of the many-sidedness

1 Kena Upanishad says: "The eye does not go thither, nor speech, nor mind. We do not know, we do not understand. How any one can teach it. It is different from the known, it is also above the unknown." (i. 3-4. See also i. 2-4.) Compare what an English abstracter, Mr. Jastrow, says in the Nature of Truth: "It is obvious that the demands thus made cannot be completely satisfied by any metaphysical theory. For the complete satisfaction of these demands would be complete truth, reduced to itself. And every metaphysical theory, as the outcome of experience which is partial and not absolute, is at least a partial manifestation of the truth, and not the whole truth wholly and revealed" (p. 151. Hall in The original).
of reality. We must become conscious-intellectual-intuitional to know reality in its flesh and blood and not merely its skin and bone. The universe does not spell out its secret to finite man. It withholding from him the mystery which he strains to see. The human understanding can classify, relate and create out of given data, but it cannot say anything about the Absolute which is one without a second, and which is no object of the senses, but constitutes the Self of the whole world. The *Kena Upanishad* says: "It is other than the known and above the unknown." Simply because it is not open to knowledge we cannot say it is unreal. The illusions and contradictions of the intellect according to the Vedanta philosophy only exhibit the insufficiency of intellect to grasp the whole. They only show that there is a higher form of experience or order of consciousness, and that the spiritual life is not exhausted by the intellectual. To realise that there is the one all-encircling reality including self and non-self, we have to proceed to the next higher stage. Finding the finite intellect infected with duality, and realising its inadequacy to represent the real, the son approaches the father, who asks him to persist in his inquiry. Bliss (or Ananda) reveals itself as the final explanation. He perceived that Ananda is Brahman; for from Ananda these beings are born; by Ananda when born they live; into Ananda they enter at their death" (iii, 6). The whole world is Ananda taking form. Infinite in space and endless in variety, it is incontestably the whole. We have direct experience of this bliss or delight in philosophic contemplation, artistic worship and religious devotion. In them we gain the ultimate peace beyond the unrest of life, attain the glorious harmony transcending all discord, and grasp the unity of purpose which works through the apparent conflict of natural and social forces. The seer, the sage and the saint all enter into direct communion with the heart of things. In that stage self and non-self are felt to be clamped in one. "All tears cease."
Incidents of the earth no more trouble the knower. Timidity and despair cannot live in that spiritual climate. The self has the consciousness that there is nothing else beside the Absolute. "One finds nothing else, knows nothing else, but the self." "All this is the self and self alone" (Brhadaranyaka Upanishad, ii. 1-6). So long as the individual holds to the hard distinction between self and not-self, he has not reached the highest. It is said, "Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, understands nothing else, that is the infinite. Where one sees something else, hears something else, understands something else, that is the finite" (Chandogya Upanishad, vii. 84). The oneness of the universe cannot be characterised by anything else but bliss, joy, or delight. "Seeing the self by the self, he is satisfied in his own self" (Bhagavad Gita, vi. 20). The saying attributed to Jesus in a Clement vi., "When the two shall be one, that which is without, and that which is within," refers to this highest experience. It is the heaven of Dante, free from darkness, confusion and antagonism. It is characterised by peace, perfection and tranquillity. The aspirations of knowledge, love, morality are here transformed into actualities. The dim and fleeting consciousness of the ultimate oneness of the lower stages is transfigured into an enduring and all-transforming possession. The real and the ideal, the final and the efficient, become one in the self-realising whole. The split of subject and object is no more an ideal, but we see it face to face. The oppositions of the finite consciousness are all reconciled. The soul arrives at this stage and is no more troubled with doubts. His inquiry ceases. From Ananda matter, life, consciousness and understanding are born; in Ananda they live, and to Ananda they return. The harmony of man and the universe, Chit (intelligence) and Sat (reality) is realised. In that moment of divine vision described in the Bhagavad Gita, the whole choir of heaven and furniture of earth was seen by Arjuna moving in the radiance of God. In
those awful moments of mystic illumination we see things with the eye of eternity. This religious or intuitional experience is the summit of the whole evolution. It is the crowning round of human life. It is the completion and the consecration of the whole struggle. It is "the light that never was on sea or land, the consecration, and the poet's dream." Here terminates the philosopher's quest for reality in which thought can rest.

If self-consciousness is the distinctive mark of the intellectual experience, self-forgetfulness characterizes the Akasha (bliss) condition. It is the state where the self loses itself in the universe and by so losing finds its own realization. Peace and harmony we have, for the self offers itself up wholly and completely to the service of the Absolute. So long as we feel ourselves to have individualities of our own, we will be beset with conflict and contradiction, pain, and pleasure, but when once we disinterestedly give ourselves up to the whole, there is an end of all discord. We are small and feeble creatures until the light shines upon us, the light that reveals to us that God is the central reality. But when once we are lit up by the fire, our imperfection and our little notions are consumed in it and we are fused with the great purpose of God. "Whatever thou dost, whatever thou eateth, whatever thou sacrificest, whatever thou givest, in whatever austerity thou engageest, do it as an offering to Me" (Bhagavad Gita, ix, 27). "Fix thy mind on Me, be devoted to Me, sacrifice to Me, bow down to Me. Thus steadied. with Me as thy Supreme Goal, thou shalt reach Myself the Self" (Bhagavad Gita, ix, 34). Only this complete renunciation of self and delivering up to the whole will liberate us from the pairs of opposites (cf. Bhagavad Gita, ix, 28). The beautiful tradition that no

3. Thou, thou know what wise I prime? 
He who delius all ill deeds, 
And ever awhile throw out the flames 
Of self, the God we worship, all.
man can see God and live\(^1\) points to this truth that
finite selfhood is incompatible with the life of the spirit.
It shows how we cannot see God until we roll the stone
of self away. The religious individual feels himself to
be, not a selfish atom in the universe, but part of an order
with a station to occupy and a function to fulfill in the
economy of things. With his vision ever on the supreme,
the religious soul approaches the facts of existence.
Nothing daunts him as he is convinced that his soul
cannot be conquered. "What do you think is the
grandeur of storms and dismemberments, and the dead-
liest battles and wrecks, and the wildest fury of the
elements, and the power of the sea, and the motion of
nature, and* the thrones of human desires, and dignity,
and hate, and love. It is that something in the soul
which says, 'Rage on, whirl on, I tread master here
and everywhere; master of the spasms of the sky and
of the shelter of the sea, master of nature and passion
and death, and of all terror and all pain'" \(\text{(Preface to}
Leaves of Grass, Whitman)}\). He knows that the forces
of the world co-operate with him in the realization of
the highest. He then cries with Marcus Aurelius, "O
universe! what thou wishest I wish." He lives above
the plane of human experience, but still in it. He is
the hero of the world who deserves worship at our hands.

It is not right to presume that intuition, by which we
see the oneness of things, negates whatever intelligence
posits. Intuition does not cease to be rational simply
because reason is transcended. Intuition is the crown of
reason. "The blindness of intellect begins when it would
be something of itself" \(\text{(Emerson)}\). Intuition is really
the soul of intelligence. The unity we will be able to
grasp by means of intuitive insight is the presupposition
of all intellectual progress. Intuition is only the higher
stage of intelligence, intelligence rid of its separatist
and divisive tendencies. While it liberates us from

\(^1\) "The Lord said to Moses, Thou canst not see my face: because
man cannot see me, and live."


the prejudices of the understanding, it carries our intellectual conclusions to a deeper synthesis. Instead of being an unnatural or a mysterious process it is a deeper experience which, by supplementing our narrow intellectual visions, amplifies it. Intuition is not an appeal to the subjective whims of the individual, or a dogmatic faculty of conscience, or the uncritical morbid views of a psychopath. It is the most complete experience we can possibly have. It is the experience which devout souls have in moments of spiritual exalation or religious devotion. Hegel, and after him Bradley, testify to the highest worth of this religious experience. Hegel says: "All the various peoples feel that it is in the religious consciousness they possess truth, and they have always regarded religion as constituting their true dignity and the Sabbath of their lives. Whatever awakens in us doubt and fear, all sorrow and all care, we leave behind on the shores of time; and as from the highest peak of a mountain, far away from all definite view of what is earthly, we look down calmly on all the temptations of the landscape and of the world, so with the spiritual eye man, lifted out of the hard realities of the actual world, contemplates it as something having only the semblance of existence, which, seen from this pure region bathed in the beams of the spiritual sun, merely reflects back its shades of colour, its varied tints and lights, softened away into eternal rest" (Philosophy of Religion, English translation, i. 3). So Hegel. Bradley says: "We can see at once that there is nothing more real than what comes in religion. To compare facts such as these with what comes to us in outward existence would be to trifle with the subject. The man who demands a reality more solid than that of the religious consciousness knows not what he seeks." (Appearance and Reality, p. 445). The religious consciousness represents the highest possible relation to reality. "So far then—psychologically and historically—there is nothing unique in religious faith at all; it is only the
crowning phase of a long series" (James Ward, Faith and Science, quoted in Edinburgh Review, January 1916, p. 86). Mysticism is the most scientific form of religion according to Dean Inge. "There is," Walt Whitman writes, "apart from mere intellect in the make up of every superior human identity, a wondrous something that realises without argument, frequently without what is called education (though I think it the goal and apex of all education deserving the name), an intuition of the absolute balance, in time and space, of the whole of this multifariousness, this revel of fools, an incredibly made belief and general unsettledness we call the world; a soul-sight of that divine clue and unseen thread which holds the whole congeries of things, all history and time, and all events however trivial, however momentous, like a leashed dog in the hand of the master" (Sylvain Days and Collect, p. 174). It is the fault of neo-realism that it does not recognize this experience, the genuineness and validity of which are admitted by poets and philosophers alike.

When we talk of intuitional truths we are not getting into any void beyond experience. It is the highest kind of experience where the intellectual conscience of the philosopher and the soaring imagination of the poet are combined. Intuitional experience is within the reach of all provided they themselves strain to it. Those intuitional truths are not to be put down for illusions simply because it is said that intellect is not adequate to grasp them. The whole, the Absolute, which is the highest concrete, is so rich that its wealth of content refuses to be forced into the fixed forms of intellect. The life of spirit is so overflowing that it bursts all barriers. It is vastly richer than human thought can compass. It breaks through every conceptual form and makes all intellectual determination impossible. While intellect has access to it, it can never exhaust its fulness. The real is no mere a pulseless identity excluding all difference, nor is it a chaotic disconnectedness with no order in it,
It is the spiritual life, embracing the facts of nature which are shot through and through with the forms of mind. Philosophy is neither purely conceptualist nor merely empirical, but is intuitional. Art is the living expression of the soul which feels itself to be in tune with the infinite. Morality is no more self-satisfaction or blind obedience to a set of categorical imperatives, but is the life of a soul which feels its grip firmly on the spiritual destiny of the world. Philosophy, art and religion become different expressions of the one feeling of unity with the universe. This feeling of the essential oneness of the world-spirit failed the facts in the lower stages and made them lower, but now the identity is revealed and the Absolute is reached.

The relation of this Absolute Atman to the other categories is one of higher to lower. The lower is included in the higher. The whole world is in Atman, "The other beings live upon a small part of this Atman." This joy is the reality or essence of the lower categories. "Life is the essence of matter, mind of life, knowledge of mind, joy of knowledge" [Mashayana Brahma Upanishad, vi. 73]. The highest and the most concrete category is Atman. It is the first and the last thing. It is the one fact of life. All the rest are imperfect revelations of it. The whole variety of being rests in the Absolute and "is an evolution from that alone" [Bhagavad Gita, xii. 30]. The world process is the evolution of spirit. The Vodanta philosophy cuts itself away from all materialistic doctrines of evolution. According to it, spirit must be postulated as the ultimate reality, the initial cause of the whole process of evolution; otherwise we cannot account for the rise of the organic from the inorganic, the mental from the organic, the

---

1 The categories cannot adequately bring out the nature of Brahman though they all rest in it. "That which is not expressed by speech and by which speech is expressed;... that which does not think by which mind is thought; that which does not breathe by breath and by which breath is drawn, that alone know as Brahman, not that which people here adore" [Kena Upanishad, i. 5, 6, and 9].
rational from the mental, and so on. These constitute the limits of materialist evolution. Again, we cannot credit human reason with any authority if it is ultimately traceable to non-rational causes. The upper tendency or ascending effort, which is the central fact of evolution is not thinkable without a central spirit, which is not a mere blind cosmic force, but an infinite and eternal spiritual energy purposeful and intelligent. The Clavadogyo Upanishad says: "From the Self is life, from the Self is desire, from the Self is love, from the Self is Aimsa, from the Self is light, from the Self are waters, from the Self are manifestation and disappearance, from the Self is food" (vii. 26).

I knew, I felt . . .
What God is, what we are,
What life is - how God shares an infinite joy
In infinite ways - we everlasting bliss.
From whom all being emanates, all power
Proceeds: in whom is life for ever more,
Yet whom existence in its lowest form
Includes.

Browning.

Ultimately, life, mechanism, consciousness and intellect are parts of this comprehensive whole. They are all abstracts from it, and the Absolute is the only res composta. It is the only individual. We cannot attribute a substantial existence to the individuals of sense. If we do so we remain, to use Spinoza's language, at the level of imagination without rising to the level of reason. The Absolute, therefore, is the whole, the only individual, and the sum of all perfection. The differences are reconciled in it, and not obliterated. The dead mechanism of stones, the unconscious life of plants, the conscious life of animals, and the self-conscious life of men are all part of the Absolute and its expression at different stages. The same Absolute reveals itself in all these, but differently in each. The ultimate reality sleeps in the stone, breathes in the plants, feels in the animals and awakes to
self-consciousness in man. We see the unity that links being to being, the unity of spirit which slowly passes from inert matter to living plants and so on, upwards through great travail gathering itself into its own substance until we reach God. It progressively manifests itself in and through these particulars. The Absolute thus is an organised whole, with interrelated parts in it. It embraces time, its events and processes. The finite universe is rooted in the Absolute. Life, mechanism, etc., are all members together in one whole. The Absolute is not an abstract unit, but a concrete whole binding together the differences which are subordinate to it. The whole has existence through the parts, and the parts are intelligible only through the whole. The values we find and enjoy while on the way to it are preserved and receive their full supplementation in it. They are not annihilated.

On this view there cannot be any "creation." The question as to why the Absolute limited itself, why God became man, why the perfect became imperfect, is irrelevant. For there is no such thing as infinite which first was an infinite and then transformed itself into the finite. The infinite is the finite. The Absolute is the self and its other. Gaudapadas in his Kaivalya on the Mandukya Upanishad mentions the different theories of the creation of the universe. The universe may be the creation of an extra-cosmic God, or an illusion, or the product of evolution. He dismisses these theories as incorrect, and declares that it is in the nature of God to express himself. It is the essence of spirit to manifest itself. The word Brahman which stands for the Absolute in the Vedanta philosophy is derived from the root "brah" = to grow. It is the nature of the Absolute to grow into the world. The world is the affirmation of the Absolute. The universe is the energising of God. God realises himself in the world. We do not have the infinite and the finite, God and the world, but only the infinite as and in the finite, God as and in the world. The Supreme,
the Eternal, is the unity of all things finite and infinite. But when we consider the development of the Absolute, the distinction of self and not-self appears. The first existent or object in the Absolute is God, Iswara or the world-soul. He is the first-born Lord of the universe, the creator of the world and its ruler. The Absolute breaks up its wholeness and develops the reality of self and not-self. The self is God, and the not-self the matter of the universe. All Hindu systems of philosophy posit these two ultimate principles. In the Sankhya it is Purusha and Prakriti; in the Vedanta it is Iswara and Maya; in Vedantaism it is Krishna and Radha; and in Shriavatarism it is Shiva and Shakti. Maya, Radha and Shakti are respectively the intellectual, the emotional and the volitional aspects of Prakriti. Krishna, Shiva and Iswara are one in essence, and so are Radha, Shakti and Maya. In the Upanishadic phraseology "the self separates itself from itself to return to itself to be itself." We come across similar conceptions in the Hebrew doctrine of Wisdom, the Greek doctrine of the Logos and the Christian doctrine of the Son. This not-self is not a positive entity, as the Sankhya philosophers view it, but is only the reflection of the Iswara, the negative side of the affirmative. Iswara or the personal God is not the Absolute, but the highest manifestation of the Absolute. But even its highest manifestation is only a partial expression of it, and not the whole. The opposition of self and not-self necessary for the universe arises. The universe is due to the conjunction of Maya (not-self) with Iswara (self): "I know Maya as Prakriti (matter), him who is contriving her as the great ruler (Makarsana). The whole world in truth is pervaded by his parts" (Sukrsanasana Upanishad, iv. 10; cf. Bhagavad Gita, xii. 29). By the further differentiation of this original duality of self and not-self, Iswara and Maya, the whole universe arises. The world process.

1 Sankara speaks of Sriristha, i.e. Soller: Incarnation of God according to the tradition as "Asmesa sambhava," born of a part.
is viewed as an eternal sacrifice, of which the one all-embracing reality is the victim (see Gagadatha Brahmana, x. 2. 2. 1; iii. 5. 3. 1; and xiii. 3. 1. 1)."

We see now how the popular conception of the world as Maya or illusion is erroneous. Brahman, the Absolute, is described in the Vedanta texts as an all-inclusive and not as an exclusive idea. It is the life of life, "the reality of reality" (Brahmanda Upanishad, ii. r. 20). It is "existence, intelligence and bliss."¹ It is not a homogeneous one but a unity or a harmony of different constituent elements. The Absolute is the fulfillment and completion of everything that is in the universe, and not their extinction. It is the consecration of the lower forms of reality and not their destruction. The Vedantic Absolute is not the abstraction of an "Ere supreme which deletes all differences but is a spirit that transcends and at the same time embraces all living beings. The Maya theory simply says that we are under an illusion if we think that the world of individuals, the pluralistic universe, the intellect, is the absolute reality. Pluralism is true only within limits. But it has to be transcended, that is, completed and supplemented, and not rejected and abolished. The lower is not unreal, which later reductionist must attempt to explain away, but is only an aspect of truth that has to be fulfilled at the end. If in that way we make absolutely real what is only relatively real, and mistake a stage for the goal or the final resting-place, we are bound in the chains of Maya.² All things are real only as they exist in God. The finite is not truly existent. Again, the Vedanta system cannot be considered pantheistic if by pantheism we mean an identification of the world with God. According to the Vedanta,

¹ "He in whom the universe, the earth and the sky are one, the mind also with all the limbs, know Allah alone as the Self" (Mundaka Upanishad, ii. 1. 11). "That immortal Brahman is before, above, behind, Brahman is to the right and the left" (Brahman, ii. 2. 4).

² See the writer's paper at "The Doctrine of Maya in the Vedanta Philosophy" in the July number of the International Journal of Ethics, 1904.
nature or the world is only an expression of God. God is more than the world. The finite reveals the infinite but it is not the whole infinite. The Vedanta does not say that the human self-consciousness of the twentieth century is an adequate revelation of the absolute mind. The Absolute is more than man or for that matter the finite universe which includes man. "This whole world is sustained by one part of myself" (Bhagavad Gita, x. 42). "All beings form his soul" (Taittiriya Aryanukha, iii. 12).

VII

We will conclude this discussion with a few remarks on the place of imperfection and evil in the Vedanta philosophy. The whole universe has in it the impulse toward union with the Absolute. The pulse of the Absolute beats through the whole world, self and non-self. The world is an imperfect revelation of the Absolute striving to become perfect, or to reach harmony. The universe is the Absolute dynamically viewed. If eternity is a circle, then the process of the universe may be viewed as a straight line. The universe of finite objects gives us, in the words of Plato, a moving image of eternity. The eternal is viewed as a growth or a becoming or a working out. In the universe we have the self-evolution of the Absolute. The lower stages, which are important as compared with the higher, strive to become perfect. The whole universe is a vast struggle to realize the unity which is the ideal. This tension of the universe is mirrored in man, reflected in his individuality. The Taittiriya Upanishad declares that man is a microcosm in which all parts of reality are represented on a reduced scale.²

² In chapter ii. of the Taittiriya Upanishad it is said that the individual should not be identified with either the physical or the vital or the mental or the intellectual self. The sense of the individual nature lies in the field of that which is the lowest self of all. Man's highest endowments are imperfect until they culminate in the infinite, viz. the apprehension or realization of God. Only when he knows God or the Absolute from whom he proceeds.
Man is the mirror of creation. His nature reaches up to the Absolute and down to the plant and the animal. While confined to a material organism, the individual self has the capacity to rise beyond intelligence into immediate contact with the divine. To bring about the unity between the higher and the lower is the aim of the individual self as it is the aim of the universe. The individual self is the theatre in which is enacted the drama of the universe, namely, the realisation of a central duality in and by means of the difference of mechanism and life, consciousness and intellect. The impulse toward union and harmony is present in all finite objects. The finite strives to pass out of itself. All objects of the universe are thus double-natured. Whatever being is born, the unmov ing or the moving, know man, O best of the Siddhas, that in being in the union of Vijnana and Bhavatmas (matter and spirit, finite and infinite) (Bhagavad Gita, xiii. 26). They are finite-infinite. The finiteness qua finiteness is a standing contradiction to the infiniteness. The presence of the infinite enables the individual to make the finite and proceed higher up. It is by such a breaking of the shell of finiteness that the infinite self finds itself and develops. To gain the higher, we must give up the lower. Unless our little self is sacrificed, progress is not possible. Every step on the upward path of realisation means sacrifice of something else. This sacrifice, which means friction, opposition and pain, is the penalty we have to undergo in rising to ourselves on account of our finiteness. Throughout we have these incidents in the growth of a soul. Pain and suffering are phases of all progress. The process of the life of self is also a process of death. To have the fruit

[Excerpt from source: Man is the mirror of creation. His nature reaches up to the Absolute and down to the plant and the animal. While confined to a material organism, the individual self has the capacity to rise beyond intelligence into immediate contact with the divine. To bring about the unity between the higher and the lower is the aim of the individual self as it is the aim of the universe. The individual self is the theatre in which is enacted the drama of the universe, namely, the realisation of a central duality in and by means of the difference of mechanism and life, consciousness and intellect. The impulse toward union and harmony is present in all finite objects. The finite strives to pass out of itself. All objects of the universe are thus double-natured. Whatever being is born, the unmov ing or the moving, know man, O best of the Siddhas, that in being in the union of Vijnana and Bhavatmas (matter and spirit, finite and infinite) (Bhagavad Gita, xiii. 26). They are finite-infinite. The finiteness qua finiteness is a standing contradiction to the infiniteness. The presence of the infinite enables the individual to make the finite and proceed higher up. It is by such a breaking of the shell of finiteness that the infinite self finds itself and develops. To gain the higher, we must give up the lower. Unless our little self is sacrificed, progress is not possible. Every step on the upward path of realisation means sacrifice of something else. This sacrifice, which means friction, opposition and pain, is the penalty we have to undergo in rising to ourselves on account of our finiteness. Throughout we have these incidents in the growth of a soul. Pain and suffering are phases of all progress. The process of the life of self is also a process of death. To have the fruit]
we must sacrifice the flower, though it is hard and painful to sacrifice it. Evolutionary hedonism which makes the life-promoting process pleasant, is wrong, for all progressive processes from birth and teething onwards are frequently painful. The destructive ones like disease and vice, for example drinking and opium-eating, are pleasant. It is through suffering that man has to rise both physically and spiritually. Sorrow is the birthplace of the life of spirit. "Out of the ferment of sin comes as it changes into foam spirit exhales its fragrance." (Hegel, Philosophy of Religion, English translation, i. 124).

Wisdom is rooted in sorrow, and in suffering lies salvation. It was in the blood-stained trenches of Europe that many who were previously atheists discovered God. On the day red with judgement and terror man sees the face of God. The day of suffering is the day of reckoning. The old atheist Lucretius is reported to have said: "Who is there whose mind does not shrink into itself with fear of the gods, whose limbs do not creep with terror when the parched earth rocks under the terrible blast of the thunderbolt and the roaring winds sweep across the heavens?" Suffering is organically related to the higher interests of man and is a necessary phase in the development of the individual self. Suffering is as real as the finite being is real. In the universe there is always development, we can never say "It is finished." The Absolute is never in history completely revealed. The end of the world will come when the last man becomes divine. Then there will be no universe and no finiteness. As Schelling says, "God never is, if it means exhibition in the objective world; if God were, we should not be." Again, "The ultimate goal of the finite ego, and not only of it but of the non-ego—the final goal, therefore, of the world—is its annihilation as a world." As Bradley puts it: "Fully to realise the existence of the Absolute is for finite beings impossible. In order thus to know we should have to be and then we should not exist." When we see Brahman we
become Brahman. That is the verdict of the Vedanta philosophy. As finite, we cannot see when we see, we become infinite. In the finite universe there will never be approximation to the goal of reaching the infinite and never realisation. The Absolute in this world is half dream, half reality. The universe is only a partial revelation of the Absolute. Knowledge is an infinite progress; mortality, a ceaseless growth. That is why the Vedanta philosophy considers this finite world to be a beginningless and endless Samākrama. We can never completely break the shell of egotism and attain the infinite if we remain in the finite universe, giving a substantial existence to our own individual self. The release from this world of trouble, risk and adventure can be had only by losing the separate self. Absolute surrender of self to God, a perfect identification with the divine will, will "let us pen-up creatures through into eternity, our due." The Sāramānanda Upanishad says: "In this wheel of Brāhmaṇ, which is the support as well as the end of all beings, which is infinite, there is about the pilgrim soul when it lances itself and the supreme ruler as different. It obtains immortality when it is upheld by him," i.e., when the soul thinks itself to be one with him (v. 6). If the soul does not gain this height of spiritual Splendour when it loses itself in the all, it will find itself again and again taking births in the finite universe, as a separate self with all the results of the past Karmas entering into its nature. It will revolve in the wheel of births and deaths until it reaches the highest, when it gives up all subjection to time.

Pain and suffering then are necessary incidents in the development of a human soul, which, as given, is a discord. Man is at a parting of the ways. There is a conflict between the different elements, the higher and the lower. Man is the completion or fulfilment of the lower and the anticipation of the higher. But growth means the death of the lower and the birth of the higher self, and so it will be accompanied by the agony of death and the
travail of birth. We have moral evil and sin if the finite self assumes a false sufficiency and independence, and adopts a more or less indifferent, if not a hostile attitude to the universe at large. He is a sinner who, owing to imperfect understanding, takes up a false defiant attitude to the not-self. He is an ignorant man who fails to recognize the incompleteness of the finite mind, and sets himself up as an independent and self-contained individual.

"For this was my sin that set in God Himself, but in His creatures, in myself and others, I sought my pleasures, my excitements, my truths, and so fell into sorrows, confusions and errors" (St. Augustine). Sin is putting trust in things that perish. Intellectually this act is error and morally it is evil. If a man considers his supreme good to be in the satisfaction of the appetites and the desires of the organism, he is a sinner. Self-will is the essence of sin. It is the opposition of the finite to the infinite, the rebellion of man against God. Evil is the separation of the soul from the source of life. Evil is as necessary as any other element in the universe. A universe without evil will be a universe where the finite is swallowed up in the infinite. A mere infinite universe without finite is an impossible conception. Therefore evil is a permanent factor in the universe, challenging the fighter to come out, though it has no immortal life in the transcendent spirit.

The Upanishads present us with the elements of a philosophic system and thus try to satisfy a permanent want of human life. They give us the formulas by which we represent the nature of the one great Face of Life, God. Perhaps they may not explain everything, but there is no question that later philosophy has only been a series of attempts to give a fuller form of expression to the suggestions of the Upanishads. We do not mean to say that the philosophy subsequent to the Upanishads made a conscious attempt to start with the Upanishadic

1 This is different from the Christian view, which holds that evil was not in the beginning and shall not be in the end.
ideal and develop it. What we urge is, the Upanishads being the earliest form of speculative idealism in the world, all that is good and great in subsequent philosophy looks like an unconscious commentary on the Upanishadic ideal, showing how free and expansive and how capable of accommodating within itself all forms of truth that ideal is.